

Advancing Automated In-Isolation Validation in Repository-Level Code Translation

KAIYAO KE, University of California, Berkeley, USA

ALI REZA IBRAHIMZADA, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, USA

RANGEET PAN, IBM Research, USA

SAURABH SINHA, IBM Research, USA

REYHANEH JABBARVAND, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, USA

Repository-level code translation aims to migrate entire repositories across programming languages while preserving functionality automatically. Despite advancements in repository-level code translation, validating the translations remains challenging. This paper proposes TRAM, which combines context-aware type resolution with mock-based in-isolation validation to achieve high-quality translations between programming languages. Prior to translation, TRAM retrieves API documentation and contextual code information for each variable type in the source language. It then prompts a large language model (LLM) with retrieved contextual information to resolve type mappings across languages with precise semantic interpretations. Using the automatically constructed type mapping, TRAM employs a custom serialization/deserialization workflow that automatically constructs equivalent mock objects in the target language. This enables each method fragment to be validated *in isolation*, without the high cost of using agents for translation validation, or the heavy manual effort required by existing approaches that rely on language interoperability. TRAM demonstrates state-of-the-art performance in Java-to-Python translation, underscoring the effectiveness of its integration of RAG-based type resolution with reliable in-isolation validation.

1 Introduction

Repository-level code translation, the process of migrating entire projects from one programming language to another, is critical for maintaining software sustainability, reducing technical debt, and enabling organizations to leverage modern or safer development ecosystems. Existing techniques are broadly in two categories: neuro-symbolic [5, 16, 28, 34, 44, 54, 56, 65, 67] and agentic [12, 17, 23, 26, 45, 58, 64]. Neuro-symbolic approaches combine the generative power of large language models (LLMs) with program analysis algorithms in a pre-defined translation pipeline. Agentic techniques define the task of repository-level code translation to agents and provide them with proper tools, allowing them to autonomously explore and translate the codebase.

A critical component of all these approaches is translation validation: the process of ensuring that translated code maintains functional equivalence with the source. Formal methods, while ideal, do not scale to translation validation of entire repositories [61]. Test-based translation validation techniques include translation and execution of existing tests [16, 23] and differential fuzzing [2, 65]. These techniques, however, suffer from *test coupling effect* [16]: due to a high degree of intra- and inter-procedural dependencies in real-world projects, test executions invoke a chain of methods. As a result, a translation bug in one of the methods results in test failure, preventing proper evaluation of the callees in the chain. To overcome this issue, AlphaTrans [16] introduced the concept of *in-isolation testing*, and used GraalVM [35], a language interoperability framework, to execute *tests in the source language* on individual translated fragments in the *target language*.

The in-isolation testing approach of AlphaTrans has the following limitations: (1) *incompleteness*, i.e., inability to validate all translations due to inherent GraalVM limitations [16]; (2) *lack of scalability* due to the need for manual effort to write glue code, a script to execute code in one

Authors' Contact Information: Kaiyao Ke, University of California, Berkeley, USA, kaiyaoke@berkeley.edu; Ali Reza Ibrahimzada, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, USA, alirezai@illinois.edu; Rangeet Pan, IBM Research, USA, Rangeet.Pan@ibm.com; Saurabh Sinha, IBM Research, USA, sinhas@us.ibm.com; Reyhaneh Jabbarvand, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, USA, reyhaneh@illinois.edu.

language using the tests and execution context in another language [1]; (3) *incompatibility* with automated test generation techniques, which prevents augmentation of source test suites to validate uncovered methods; (4) *false negatives*, where GraalVM reports a test failure even though the method under test is correctly translated (e.g., inaccuracies in glue code due to type incompatibility can trigger runtime errors, such as `NullPointerException`, although the translation is correct); and (5) *false positives*, where tests pass under GraalVM despite the translation not being fully functionally equivalent (e.g., a method may inadvertently advance a global iterator without resetting it, causing subtle behavioral deviations that remain undetected by existing tests).

To overcome these limitations, this paper proposes TRAM, an automated technique that enables *mock-based in-isolation validation*. TRAM starts by executing the tests in the source language, collecting all *I/O pairs* and *side effects* (including modified fields of the receiver object or arguments, mutated global/static states, and thrown exceptions that alter control flow) from each method invocation during test execution, to *serialize* all the collected data. It then uses the *deserialization* workflow to generate mocks for nested invocations in unit tests, reconstructing tests for functional equivalence in the target language without the need for test translation or cross-language test execution. The serialization/deserialization workflow of TRAM relies on *context-aware* type mapping between the source and target languages. To that end, TRAM retrieves API documentation and contextual code information for each type, and uses a Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) approach to prompt an LLM with contextual information to resolve type mappings across languages with precise semantic interpretations.

In practice, TRAM can complement translation validation of any repository-level code translation approach that meets two requirements: (1) the approach can incorporate RAG-based type resolution in the translation pipeline to ensure consistency between the application code and test code types, and (2) the target language has a mature mocking framework to support mock creation and execution. Among the existing repository-level code translation techniques, we chose AlphaTrans [16] and built TRAM on top of it for the following reasons: the entire code translation pipeline is publicly available, allowing us to replace its static type mapping with TRAM context-aware type resolution to reproduce the translations (requirement 1); it translates from Java to Python, and Python has standard libraries and tooling for mocking (requirement 2); it works with small LLMs, hence is affordable to run experiments to reproduce its translations; Java and Python have different type systems with large diversity of types, which makes it more challenging to perform a mock-based validation and highlights the real power of TRAM; and it implements another form of in-isolation validation, helping us to compare TRAM with it.

We evaluated TRAM on *ten* Java projects from the AlphaTrans benchmark. Compared to AlphaTrans, which achieves an average of 25.14% functional equivalence across subject projects, TRAM results in translation with 43.1% functional equivalence. Compared to GraalVM-based in-isolation validation, TRAM results in considerably fewer false positives and false negatives, indicating the reliability of mock-based in-isolation validation. We also show that TRAM's performance is agnostic to the LLM, highlighting its generalizability to different models, including relatively small models such as Devstral-24B.

TRAM's use of mock-based in-isolation validation is its key strength and novelty. A closely related technique, Oxidizer [65], integrates fuzzing and mocking in the translation pipeline. However, what Oxidizer refers to as mocking is using extern "C" to call the functions in the source language as part of the target language project, which is a case of Foreign Function Interface (FFI) rather than mocking. More importantly, utilization of function mocks in Oxidizer is different from TRAM: Oxidizer replaces unsuccessful translations with function mocks in the target language project, whereas TRAM applies mocking in the validation pipeline, replacing all objects during execution of target-language tests, except for the translated method. TRAM also uses *existing tests and reconstructs*




Fig. 1. Overview of TRAM. The green components are novel to TRAM and gray ones are from AlphaTrans [16] (gray components with * indicate our improvement for more accurate and faster static analysis)

the test suite using the mocks, enhancing maintainability of the translations and validation in the target language. Our notable contributions are:

- **Technique.** We implement an automated and novel pipeline for mock-based in-isolation validation that requires neither test translation nor cross-language test execution and produces equivalent test suites in the target language.
- **Empirical Evaluation.** We extensively evaluate TRAM with a state-of-the-art repository-level code translation technique, AlphaTrans, on *ten* real-world Java projects. The results show that TRAM surpasses AlphaTrans in code translation quality (due to RAG-based, context-aware type resolution and better in-isolation validation in the loop) by a large margin and is less prone to false positives and false negatives, increasing the reliability of translation validation.

2 Overview

Figure 1 presents the overview of TRAM, which consists of three main components: *Transformation and Decomposition* (§3.1), *Context-Aware Type Resolution* (§3.2), and *Translation with Integrated In-isolation Validation* (§3.3). The first two components decompose the source program into smaller units and resolve source types, while the third component translates and validates the decomposed units in isolation and, finally, recomposes them to create the whole program in the target programming language.

The *Transformation and Decomposition* component of TRAM builds upon AlphaTrans [16] and leverages its capabilities of performing semantics-preserving transformation (to make source code amenable to translation to other PLs) and decomposing a Java project into smaller units (field or method), i.e., *fragments*. The fragment information is stored in a project *schema* that is used in the subsequent phases of TRAM (details in §3.1).

The *Context-Aware Type Resolution* component of TRAM takes as input the project schema and resolves the non-application (i.e., library) types in the source PL to functionally equivalent types in the target PL. TRAM implements a novel type-resolution approach that automatically crawls the API documentation of the source type, collects code context surrounding the type’s occurrence in the source program, and prompts with this relevant information to translate the type to an equivalent type in the target PL (details in §3.2).

The final component of TRAM, *Translation with Integrated In-isolation Validation*, takes the project schema with resolved types as input and, using an LLM, translates the fragments in reverse topological order of the call graph. To validate translated fragments *in isolation*, it generates mock tests from the source project’s existing tests. A mock test focuses the validation on a single focal fragment while isolating the effects of other fragments by mocking their behaviors. TRAM automatically creates the required harness for executing the mock tests in the target PL. It then prompts the LLM with suitable context information for translation of each fragment, and checks the translation for syntactic correctness. For syntactically correct translations, TRAM executes the relevant mock tests to check functional equivalence. In case of a test failure or syntactical issues,




Fig. 2. Context-aware type resolution in TRAM

it iteratively re-prompts the LLM with the failure stack trace and the relevant translation task information, making a bounded number of attempts to repair the buggy translation.

3 TRAM Framework for Integrated Translation and In-Isolation Validation

In this section, we discuss the details about each component of TRAM, which, altogether, enable a reliable automated translation of entire Java repositories to maintainable Python projects.

3.1 Transformation and Decomposition

Real-world projects include hundreds of files with thousands of lines of code, which do not fit in the context window of state-of-the-art LLMs. Even if some frontier models can fit the entire repository into their context window, research has shown that their performance often degrades before reaching the nominal window limit, and computational cost can scale quadratically with sequence length [15, 27]. Furthermore, breaking down the problems into smaller chunks confines model attention to the most relevant information, reducing noise, latency, and hallucination while maintaining or improving accuracy in many tasks [59]. Finally, in case of issues in the translations, a focused debugging of the issues on specific problematic code is more likely to succeed compared to providing the entire repository as the context.

Given this rationale, TRAM follows a similar approach as AlphaTrans and employs static analysis to transform and decompose projects into smaller *fragments*, i.e., *field* and *method* fragments. A field fragment includes modifiers, type, name, and field value. It can belong to an application or test class. A method fragment includes the method signature and body. It can be an application or test method (e.g., helper methods or unit tests). During decomposition, AlphaTrans extracts meta-information related to the fragments, such as their location (e.g., start and end line), code (e.g., implementation between start and end line), dependencies (e.g., callers and callees), types (of inputs, output, and body), and other necessary information such as file paths, class inheritance, imports, and method annotations. AlphaTrans uses CodeQL [10] for program analysis, call graph extraction, and decomposition. While integrating TRAM with the AlphaTrans pipeline, we replaced CodeQL analysis with Tree-sitter [46] and Java Call Graph [11], which resulted in 10× faster overall static analysis performance.

3.2 Context-Aware Type Resolution

Automated type resolution is a complex task [13, 50] and several prior studies have attempted to advance automated type resolution, primarily through symbolic rule-based approaches [4, 7, 9, 24, 41, 42] and, more recently, using LLMs [21, 38, 57]. Prior research in repository-level




Fig. 3. Context-Aware Type Resolution prompt

code translation has followed different approaches for type resolution or type inference. Some techniques rely on LLMs for type resolution only *before* or *during* translations. Others follow a neuro-symbolic approach for defining high-level rules and prompt an LLM for type inference in compliance with those rules. Highly accurate type resolution or inference is crucial to code translation, as an incorrect type in translation can result in a runtime error, preventing translation validation [16, 65].

To fully automate the type resolution pipeline without the need for pre-defined rules [54, 65] or manual check [16] to ensure correctness, TRAM follows a *two-step* type resolution. In the first step, TRAM employs Retrieval Augmented Generation (RAG) [25] approach: for each variable in the source program, it extracts the description of the type (in the source language, from API documentation) and the code where the variable is used. It then prompts the LLM using the template shown in Figure 3. TRAM further requires the LLM to generate a *natural language reasoning* in its response to justify the type map. The rationale for the next step is based on prior research, showing that type-aware pre-conditioning improves code synthesis accuracy and reduces hallucinated or ill-typed API usages compared to on-the-fly inference [20, 55]. Moreover, exposing LLMs to contextualized information, rather than raw types, can improve the overall performance [21, 53]. Therefore, providing *both the resolved types and their natural language reasoning* to the LLM for translation improves faithfulness and consistency in cross-language mappings.

As a result of the first step, TRAM builds an accurate type map for each variable, depending on its context. This type mapping is used subsequently in both the integrated translation and the in-isolation validation pipeline. It is possible that, depending on the context, two objects with the same type in the source language map to different types in the target language. Figure 4 shows two methods in the Options class from the *commons-cli* project. Both the `getMatchingOptions()` and `getRequiredOptions()` methods return a List in Java, but their Python equivalents differ due to different context. Specifically, `getMatchingOptions()` initializes `matchingOpts` as a regular, modifiable array list and populates it using a loop, so its translated Python version should return a list. In contrast, `getRequiredOptions()` constructs a `Collections.unmodifiableList` from `requiredOpts`, producing an immutable collection. If this method were type-hinted to return a Python list, the returned object would be modifiable and thus alter the intended behavior. Under our RAG-based in-context type resolution, the LLM correctly inferred that the appropriate Python return type should be a tuple rather than a list.

Figure 2 and Algorithm 1 show TRAM's Context-Aware Type Resolution. TRAM first extracts all the types in the source language of a given project (line 2). Application-level types can be automatically resolved without a translation. For other types, TRAM crawls the API documentation of the source language to retrieve the relevant description of each type. It then extracts the code fragment where the type is used, translates, and validates the type using an LLM with a feedback loop for unsuccessful translations (lines 3–6). The result of the translation is a tuple of *target language imports*, *type translation*, and *natural language reasoning*. To account for potential hallucination in LLM's response, i.e., returning a type that does not exist in Python, TRAM employs an additional validation step to ensure the generated *target language imports* and *type translation* are valid in

```

——— Java List mapped to Python list ———
public List<String> getMatchingOptions(String opt) {
    final List<String> matchingOpts = new ArrayList<>();
    for (final String longOpt : longOpts.keySet()) {
        if (longOpt.startsWith(opt)) {
            matchingOpts.add(longOpt);
        }
    }
    return matchingOpts;
}

——— Java List mapped to Python tuple ———
public List getRequiredOptions() {
    return Collections.unmodifiableList(requiredOpts);
}

```

Fig. 4. TRAM's different resolved Python types for List depending on the context




Fig. 5. Mock-based In-isolation Validation

Python, without any syntactic and runtime issues. For type translations that cannot be validated, TRAM attempts to resolve globally by inferring the translation from other projects (lines 7–8). In the rare scenario where an equivalent translation cannot be found, it resolves the type to object in Python. In the end, all translated types and their natural language reasoning are stored in a data structure called *Context-Aware Type Map* for use in the subsequent components of TRAM (line 9).

3.3 Translation with Integrated In-Isolation Validation

TRAM takes the project’s call graph, removes the back edges to make it acyclic, computes topological order, and translates method fragments in reverse topological order.

3.3.1 Mock-based Validation. TRAM automates the generation of Python tests to verify the correctness of translated Java methods in complete isolation. Figure 5 and Algorithm 2 show TRAM’s workflow for this purpose: the process begins by analyzing AspectJ-generated execution logs to extract

Algorithm 1: Context-Aware Type Resolution

Inputs: Subject Projects Ps
Output: Context-Aware Type Map CTM

```

1 foreach  $project \in Ps$  do
2    $types \leftarrow \text{getProjectTypes}(project);$ 
3   foreach  $type \in types$  do
4      $doc \leftarrow \text{crawlTypeDocumentation}(type);$ 
5      $code \leftarrow \text{getTypeCodeSnippet}(type);$ 
6      $translation \leftarrow \text{translate\&Validate}(type, doc, code);$ 
7     if  $\text{unsuccessful}(translation)$  then
8        $translation \leftarrow \text{resolveGlobally}(type);$ 
9      $CTM[project][type] \leftarrow translation;$ 
10 return  $CTM$ 
  
```

detailed input-output behavior and side effects for each method invocation in the call chain of a Java unit test (lines 3–4). Based on this information, TRAM constructs a Python test case that calls one translated focal method directly (lines 11–12), while mocking all other application methods it depends on (lines 6–10). Each mock simulates the original method’s return values and side effects, including updates to global static fields and thrown exceptions. The test then reconstructs the initial program state, invokes the translated focal method, and verifies the correctness of return values, instance and parameter mutations, and global state changes using recursive equality checks (lines 19–26). All Python objects used for mocking or equality checks are constructed based on a custom serialization of Java objects, which supports both standard library types and application classes. This enables reproducible, in-isolation validation of each translated method’s functional equivalence to its original Java counterpart. TRAM differs from the existing method-level validation technique [65], as it not only employs mocking for in-isolation validation but also considers a function’s side effects, rather than relying solely on input-output pairs. We explain the details of each step below.

AspectJ-Based Runtime Interception. TRAM employs an AspectJ-based instrumentation layer to capture detailed behavioral traces of method executions. This mechanism intercepts all public method calls and records input-output (IO) pairs, side effects on mutable parameters, changes to instance state (for non-static methods), and any global state modifications resulting from static field mutations. The AspectJ *advice* uses a broad pointcut targeting repository packages, ensuring comprehensive coverage while avoiding synthetic or standard library method invocation.

Algorithm 2: Mock-Based Validation

Input : Java Unit Tests J , Application Method Set R
Output : Mock-Based Python Test Suite T

```

1  $T \leftarrow []$ ;
2 foreach  $test \in J$  do
3    $L \leftarrow \text{runWithAspectJandCustomSerializer}(test)$ ;
4    $focal\_methods \leftarrow \text{extractAllInvocations}(L)$ ;
5   foreach  $focal \in focal\_methods$  do
6      $C \leftarrow \text{getDirectCallees}(focal, R)$ ;
7      $test\_case \leftarrow \text{initTestFile}(focal)$ ;
8     // Mock direct callees of the focal method
9     foreach  $c \in C$  do
10       $M_c \leftarrow \{output_c, exception_c, paramModifications_c, instanceModifications_c, staticFieldsModifications_c\}$ ;
11       $\text{injectMock}(test\_case, c, M_c)$ ;
12    // Set up input of the focal method
13     $S_{init} \leftarrow \{staticFields, focalInstance, focalParams\}$ ;
14     $\text{injectCall}(test\_case, focal, S_{init})$ ;
15    // Verify focal method's output & side effects
16     $Expected \leftarrow \{output_{focal}, exception_{focal}, paramModifications_{focal}, instanceModifications_{focal}, staticFieldsModifications_{focal}\}$ ;
17     $\text{injectVerifications}(test\_case, Expected)$ ;
18     $\text{append}(T, test\_case)$ ;
19 return  $T$ 

```

Fig. 6. Mocking validation algorithm

Upon method entry, the interceptor captures a deep copy of all input parameters using the serialization logic employed by a CustomToStringConverter class (discussed below). If the method is an instance method, it also records a snapshot of the this object's internal state prior to execution. Static fields from all application classes are introspected via reflection and their values deep-copied to capture a consistent view of the global state before invocation.

After the execution completes, or terminates with a runtime exception, TRAM captures a second snapshot of the parameters, the return value (or thrown exception), the updated receiver state (if applicable), and the new global static field state. Comparing pre- and post-execution snapshots allows TRAM to detect in-place mutations, not only to method arguments and instance state but also to the wider program context via static fields. All captured information is serialized to a trace structure, which can later be used to reconstruct method behavior, assess purity, and support Python test generation.

To prevent any semantic interference, intercepted executions proceed normally after AspectJ logging. For example, exceptions are re-thrown after being recorded, ensuring that the program's natural control flow is preserved. The advice layer

```

@Aspect
class LoggingAspect {

    @Pointcut("project-level main methods") void appPoints() {}

    @Around("appPoints()")
    Object log(ProceedingJoinPoint jp) {
        if (isTestOrSynthetic(jp)) return jp.proceed();
        updateJUnitContext();
        logStart(jp);

        recordInstanceAndArgs(jp);
        recordStaticFieldsBefore();

        Object result = null;
        try { result = jp.proceed(); } catch (Exception e) {
            logException(e); throw e; }

        recordStaticFieldsAfter();
        recordResults(jp, result);
        logEnd(jp);
        return result;
    }

    // helpers: detect JUnit methods, capture static fields,
    // find test method in stack, write logs, ...
}

```

Fig. 7. TRAM interception/serialization process

is intentionally non-invasive and dynamically pluggable, allowing it to be integrated into Maven-based test runs without modifying the source code under test. Its design supports both whole-program tracing and selective instrumentation of specific modules, depending on the analysis goals. Figure 7 demonstrates the interception process in TRAM.

A Custom Serialization Workflow for Java Objects. This workflow revolves around a `CustomToStringConverter` class that serializes arbitrary Java objects into JSON. For each object, this process captures the essential data needed to reconstruct an equivalent Python object for mocking or equality checks. It distinguishes between application types and external library classes by comparing the class's package prefix with its own. This enables a fine-grained introspection for application types and grouped handling for common library types, e.g., applying the same strategy to all `Map` implementations.

Standard library types are grouped for consistent handling. Primitive types are serialized by recording their type name and string value. Compound types, such as collections, maps, and properties, are serialized element-wise through recursive traversal, preserving structural integrity. The intuition is to record all information needed to construct an equivalent Python object. For example, types like `HashMap` are flattened into JSON arrays of key-value pairs; for I/O-related types like `ByteArrayInputStream`, internal buffers and positions are extracted using reflection without consuming the stream, thus avoiding side effects. Mutable objects are tagged with identity information to allow accurate reference tracking during reconstruction in Python. Special cases, such as enums, are handled via reflection to extract meaningful internal state; when such details are unavailable, the ordinal is used as a fallback. Figure 8 illustrates TRAM's handling of Java `ByteArrayInputStream`.

```
private static JSONObject handleByteArrayInputStream(
    ByteArrayInputStream bis, ...) {
    JSONObject bisDetails = new JSONObject();
    bisDetails.put("type", getTypeName(bis, ...));
    Class<?> bisClass = bis.getClass();

    /* Retrieve underlying byte array */
    Field bufField = bisClass.getDeclaredField("buf");
    bufField.setAccessible(true);
    byte[] array = (byte[]) bufField.get(bis);
    bisDetails.put("byte_array", handlePrimitiveArray(array,
        ...)); // similar method to handle primitive arrays

    /* Retrieve current position */
    Field posField = bisClass.getDeclaredField("pos");
    posField.setAccessible(true);
    int position = posField.getInt(bis);
    bisDetails.put("position", position);

    return bisDetails;
}
```

Fig. 8. Type handling in TRAM for `ByteArrayInputStream`

For application classes, the converter introspects fields across the hierarchy. It distinguishes between static and instance fields, skips synthetic and transient members, and includes visibility metadata when relevant. To resolve naming conflicts or ambiguity, it records the declaring class where appropriate. Edge cases receive tailored handling. For instance, application subclasses of Java I/O classes, e.g., `BufferedReader` and `FilterInputStream`, are treated with logic that accounts for both inherited behavior and additional custom fields. For iterators from inner classes, the converter detects outer references (via the synthetic `this$0` field), serializing the enclosing context while avoiding infinite recursion through cached identity tracking. This ensures consistent, cycle-free serialization, even in the presence of deeply nested or self-referential structures.

Deserialization and Equality Verification Workflow. TRAM reconstructs Python objects from JSON-based logs generated during Java program execution using a custom recursive deserialization pipeline. Each JSON structure represents an object captured by the AspectJ tracer and serialized via `CustomToStringConverter`. The deserialization process begins by resolving the object's declared Java type, which is mapped to the corresponding Python class using a universal type map. This

ensures that both application classes and Java types (e.g., `java.util.*`) are mapped to appropriate Python standard library equivalents or pre-loaded translated application classes.

The deserializer traverses the JSON recursively, converting primitive values directly, while handling the compound structures like tuples, dictionaries, and object fields through type-specific deserialization. To preserve pointer (or reference) identity and manage aliasing, a global dictionary of memory addresses tracks all instantiated objects, keyed by their memory addresses recorded at serialization time. This prevents duplication and allows the handling of cyclic references. Corresponding to serialization process showed in Figure 7, the deserialization process of converting the JSON representation of a Java `ByteArrayInputStream` into a Python `io.BytesIO` is shown below:

```
byte_array_json = json_obj.get("byte_array", None)
byte_array = convert_to_python(byte_array_json) # similar routine to deserialize primitive arrays
byte_buffer = bytes([x & 0xFF for x in byte_array])
bytes_io_object = BytesIO(byte_buffer)
bytes_io_object.seek(int(json_obj.get("position", 0)))
```

For custom Java classes, the deserialization reconstructs Python instances by introspecting both static and instance fields. Java-style visibility rules are simulated by using Python name mangling for private and protected fields, e.g., transforming `private int x` in class `Foo` to `_Foo__x`. For types that inherit from Java standard library classes, the system ignores Java-specific fields to reduce noise. Special edge cases are handled on a case-by-case basis. For example, enum types are reconstructed by recreating both `_name_` and `_value_` attributes, ensuring compatibility with Python's Enum semantics. Exception instances are created using low-level constructors (`__new__`) to bypass argument enforcement, while still initializing with meaningful messages when present.

After reconstruction, a recursive equality checker performs a deep semantic comparison between the expected and actual Python objects. This function supports type-specific structural equality for standard library types, including primitives, collections, enums, and I/O streams. TRAM designs one specific workflow for each group of "similar" types. For example, all I/O stream values (e.g., `BytesIO`, `StringIO`) are compared by their internal buffer content. For custom objects, the checker compares the `__dict__` of two objects recursively to ensure that all instance attributes match. Special care is taken to normalize numerical tolerances, e.g., accounting for precision loss when converting `timedelta` values, and to apply a logical comparison heuristic for string equivalence, e.g., standard string representation of a Java `HashMap` and its Python equivalent `dict` have different formats. This entire pipeline ensures accurate behavioral equivalence between Java traces and their Python replays, while faithfully preserving object identity, mutability, and visibility semantics.

Automated Test Method Generation and Mocking for Java Test Methods. TRAM employs a mock test generation workflow to automate the in-isolation validation of each method invoked by executing Java unit tests. For each method invocation, a mock test is generated to run its translated Python method to verify if its I/O and side effects match the expected behavior recorded during the execution of the Java unit test. The main workflow is divided into the following steps:

- (1) **Reading the Full Log from AspectJ Interception:** TRAM retrieves all relevant subsections in the log, including information about the I/O pairs and side effects of the method itself as well as information about the I/O pairs and side effects of other direct callees. The former is used to compare against results of real execution, while the latter is used to set up mocks to replace actual invocation of these methods, ensuring that the validation of one method translation operates purely in isolation.
- (2) **Mock Decorators Insertion:** For each method that requires mocking, TRAM adds mock decorators. It checks whether the method is a constructor (e.g., `<init>` in Java) or a normal method, and applies the appropriate mock decorator to replace them with a mocked version. The decorators are inserted above the test method with correct indentation, ensuring that

the patching is done only once per method. If the invocation is the focal method, mocking is bypassed, with the translated real method called directly. Otherwise, mocking is used to simulate the output and side effects of the specific method. Side effects include updating static fields, handling argument changes, and simulating exceptions if required.

- (3) **Method Body Construction:** TRAM implements the following items inside each test method:
- Static fields initialization to mimic the Java program state before invoking the focal method;
 - Instances (if instance method) and parameters, if any;
 - Focal method invocation (other application methods called by the focal method are already replaced by mocks as a result of the earlier mock decorators);
 - Verifying changes in the current instance (if an instance method) and the mutable input parameters, if any, and ensuring that the mock behaves as the original method;
 - Verifying static field changes, if any, in all classes and ensuring that the mock behaves as the original method.
 - Asserting the return values, if any, match the expected results using recursive comparison;
 - Handling exceptions thrown by the method and asserting that the correct exception is raised, if any.
- (4) **File Writing:** For each focal method invocation, once the decorators, parameters, and method bodies are updated, TRAM writes all relevant lines to a new test file. This enables verifying the correctness of one method translation without invoking any other application methods it depends on. When running these mock tests, the actual setup of Python objects and equivalence checks are handled by the deserialization and equality verification workflow introduced earlier.

This is an example of a mock test:

```
class MockTest(unittest.TestCase):
    @patch('focal_method')
    @patch('helper_method_1')
    @patch('helper_method_2')
    def test_mocking(self, helper_method_2, helper_method_1, focal_method):
        # Replace non-focal invocation by mocks
        helper_method_1.side_effect = SideEffect(method_1_invocation_1, method_1_invocation_2, ...)
        helper_method_2.side_effect = SideEffect(method_2_invocation_1, method_2_invocation_2, ...)

        # Set up static fields before method calls
        update_static_fields(json.loads(orig_static_fields_json))

        # construct a Python equivalent of all arguments and the original instance of the Java method
        invocation
        method_args = list(convert_to_python(json.loads(args_initial_json)))
        instance = convert_to_python(json.loads(instance_initial_json))

        # call the focal method (call chain already replaced by mocks)
        returned_obj = instance.focal_method(*method_args)

        # construct a Python equivalent of final Java instance and check if instance is correct after Python
        method invocation
        instance_reference = convert_to_python(json.loads(instance_final_json))
        self.assertTrue(recursive_equal(instance, instance_reference))

        # check if side effects are correct
        self.assertTrue(side_effect_is_correct(json.loads(focal_method_side_effect)))

        # construct a Python equivalent of the Java argument list after method invocation and check if it
        matches Python method invocation
        method_args_reference = convert_to_python(json.loads(args_final_json))
        self.assertTrue(recursive_equal(method_args, method_args_reference))

        # construct a Python equivalent of the Java returned object and check if it matches the object returned
        by the Python method invocation
        returned_obj_reference = convert_to_python(json.loads(returned_obj_final_json))
        self.assertTrue(recursive_equal(returned_obj, returned_obj_reference))
```

Table 1. Effectiveness of TRAM in repository-level code translation. Abbreviations (some borrowed from AlphaTrans) are **AMF**: #Application Method Fragments, **NM**: Fragments with no Mock Tests, **MS**: Mocking Success, **MF**: Mocking Fail, **NT**: Fragments not Executed by any Compilable Tests, **ATP**: Fragments All Test Pass, **OTF**: Fragments One Test Fail, **MTF**: Fragments Many Test Fail, **ATF**: Fragments All Test Fail, **TPR**: Test Pass Rate, **O**: Overall, **RE**: Runtime Error, **AF**: Assertion Failure.

Subjects	AMF	Syntax Check (%)	Mocking (%)			Test Translation (%)											
			NM	MS	MF	NT	ATP	OTF			MTF			ATF			TPR
								O	RE	AF	O	RE	AF	O	RE	AF	
cli	273	91.21	10.26	68.50	21.25	44.32	11.36	12.45	58.82	41.18	18.68	96.69	3.31	13.19	96.74	3.26	15.72
codecs	680	87.06	22.79	43.68	33.53	42.94	2.94	10.15	60.87	39.13	26.76	64.80	35.20	17.21	69.34	30.66	14.48
csv	235	86.81	20.85	49.79	29.36	67.23	5.96	11.06	61.54	38.46	5.53	89.15	10.85	10.21	92.82	7.18	2.82
exec	248	60.48	48.39	37.90	13.71	69.76	5.24	10.48	76.92	23.08	2.82	81.03	18.97	11.69	99.64	0.36	8.76
fast-pfor	748	90.91	36.36	40.37	23.26	45.72	20.45	8.29	51.61	48.39	17.65	78.45	21.55	7.89	87.95	12.05	28.06
fileupload	192	94.27	20.83	66.15	13.02	79.17	11.46	1.56	100.00	0.00	4.69	96.83	3.17	3.13	73.17	26.83	10.91
graph	530	85.09	24.72	29.06	46.23	86.23	2.64	7.17	73.68	26.32	1.13	27.78	72.22	2.83	88.89	11.11	6.22
jansi	409	96.58	47.68	31.05	21.27	97.56	0.00	0.73	66.67	33.33	0.00	N/A	N/A	1.71	90.91	9.09	0.00
pool	682	95.45	36.07	41.94	21.99	78.89	5.28	9.09	61.29	38.71	1.76	63.16	36.84	4.99	47.06	52.94	12.83
validator	646	91.18	24.46	47.99	27.55	87.62	3.72	4.02	76.92	23.08	1.08	100.00	0.00	3.56	77.00	23.00	4.18
Total	4643	89.21	30.02	43.10	26.88	68.88	7.04	7.52	63.32	36.68	9.02	78.07	21.93	7.54	81.00	19.00	13.08

4 Evaluation

To evaluate different aspects of TRAM, we study the following research questions:

RQ1: Effectiveness of TRAM. To what extent can TRAM effectively translate real-world projects? Does it improve functional equivalence compared to existing techniques?

RQ2: Reliability of Mock-based Isolated Validation. How reliable is mock-based translation validation compared to GraalVM-based validation of AlphaTrans?

RQ3: Generalizability of TRAM across different models. How does TRAM perform when integrated with different LLMs?

RQ4: Contribution of Core Components. Do TRAM’s two key innovations—RAG-based type resolution and mock-based in-isolation validation—each play a significant role in improving its overall performance?

4.1 Experiment Setup

TRAM uses AlphaTrans’ benchmark consisting of ten real-world Java projects for the experiments, as they are diverse and reflective of the challenges in repository-level code translation, and specifically, mock-based in-isolation translation validation. TRAM integrates several tools for static analysis, validation, and evaluation. For static analysis, it utilizes Tree-sitter [46] and Java Call Graph [11]. Test execution, translation validation, and coverage computation are performed using Python Mock 5.2.0 [49], JUnit 4 and 5 [48], Pytest 8.2.1 [40], JaCoCo [47], and Python’s coverage tool [3]. For LLM selection, we used DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct [14] as the primary model, since the same model was used in AlphaTrans, to facilitate reproduction of their results and compare with them. To show generalizability of TRAM to other LLMs, we also used Devstral-24B [29] to run ablation experiments. All models were prompted with a temperature setting of 0 to ensure deterministic outputs, and default values were used for other generation parameters. For the iterative feedback-based translation, we configured AlphaTrans translation module for four re-prompting attempts. For both base prompting and feedback prompting, TRAM uses a unified re-prompting budget of up to four attempts per query. Syntax-based re-prompting (triggered by syntax errors in LLM-generated code) and feedback-based re-prompting (triggered by mock test failures) share this same four-attempt limit.

4.2 RQ1: Effectiveness of TRAM

Table 1 presents the results on TRAM’s effectiveness. Overall, TRAM is able to validate 69.98% of application method fragments (AMFs) across all 10 projects (as opposed to 56.57% achieved by AlphaTrans), with the remaining fragments mostly being interface/abstract methods, empty constructors never called, or placeholder methods. Among all validatable AMFs (those for which there exists at least one covering test), **61.59%** (2001 out of 3249) pass all mock tests, which is substantially higher than the **43.30%** success rate of AlphaTrans while using GraalVM. This improvement is due both to the low error rate of mock-based in-isolation validation and the effectiveness of RAG-based context-aware type resolution. Additionally, the outputs of mock-based validation are leveraged in iterative prompting during per-method-fragment translation. Importantly, compared to AlphaTrans, TRAM is not only more effective but also more automated: it does not require manual type resolutions (which would be infeasible due to the large number of type occurrences in varying contexts) or project-specific glue code for Graal-based validation.

TRAM achieves **43.10%** functional equivalence for AMFs, significantly higher than AlphaTrans, which reports **25.14%** functional equivalence when translating the same set of 10 Java projects using the same LLM [14]. Note that AlphaTrans’s 25.14% is a combination of in-isolation validation (GraalVM [35]) success and test translation success (i.e., all translated tests passing for a single AMF). In our results, we do not include passing translated tests at all, as test translation is highly prone to producing false positives. Our results suggest that with EvoSuite-generated tests (not supported by AlphaTrans due to GraalVM not generalizing to Evosuite), TRAM can validate even more fragments through test translation (32.12% with TRAM vs. 14.66% with AlphaTrans). We next analyze these results in detail.

4.2.1 More Validatable Fragments. The main performance gain in TRAM stems from the superiority of mock-based in-isolation validation. In the pool of 10 subject projects, 43.43% of method fragments are not covered by any unit tests, and another 24.50% cannot be validated by GraalVM even after substantial effort to write glue code (which still fails due to complex types, etc.). AlphaTrans also reports that test translation contributes rather minimally to the validation success rate due to bugs in test code translation and ambiguity regarding the source of errors in long call chains. TRAM overcomes these limitations in two ways. First, it utilizes EvoSuite to augment developer-written tests for more thorough mock test generation, which is not feasible in GraalVM-based approaches because no Java version supports both GraalVM and EvoSuite. Second, mock-based in-isolation validation can theoretically cover all standard library types due to its generic workflow to handle complex types, e.g., using one parameterized workflow for all major collection types, and recursive serialization/deserialization logic for custom types.

This listing shows an example where GraalVM fails to validate due to a host–guest boundary mismatch involving Java collections. In this case, the Java expression `optionMap.values()` returns a live `Collection<Option>` view backed by a host-side `LinkedHashMap`. When executed under GraalVM from Python, the interop layer must unwrap this `java.util.Collection` into a Python-iterable form. However, GraalPython lacks full interop support for `java.util.Collection`, particularly when the collection contains host-side objects (such as `Option`) that are not explicitly exposed or registered. In contrast, the mocking workflow intercepts the method call at runtime and correctly identifies that the underlying collection type is a `LinkedHashMap`, thereby constructing a faithful Python equivalent for validation.

```
private final Map<String, Option> optionMap = new
    LinkedHashMap<>();
public Collection<Option> getOptions() {
    return optionMap.values();
}
```

4.2.2 Automated and More Reliable, Context-Aware Type Mapping. AlphaTrans reports a type translation accuracy of 91.99% passing both syntactic and runtime checks, while TRAM’s RAG-based workflow achieves 89.00%. This slight reduction is expected: TRAM leverages richer surrounding code context and prompts LLMs to infer types that best fit such context, which can occasionally increase hallucinations, especially in import statements. The key distinction, however, lies in the translation strategy and scalability.

While AlphaTrans requires manual intervention for translating 8.01% of failed type resolutions and inspecting all LLM-based type translations (correcting 12.24% of them at a cost of 55 developer hours), TRAM simply assigns object to unresolved types, achieving comparable accuracy with no manual effort. AlphaTrans also relies on a fixed, hand-crafted Java–Python type mapping, which can be misleading even when translations pass basic runtime checks. For example, in the project `commons-csv`, `java.nio.CharBuffer` is used in the call `CharBuffer.allocate(DEFAULT_BUFFER_SIZE)` to allocate a buffer for binary stream reading. AlphaTrans deterministically maps `java.nio.CharBuffer` to `list[str]`. However, Python’s `list` does not maintain the buffer semantics, such as position or limit, and cannot be directly passed to functions like `TextIOWrapper.readinto()`. In contrast, TRAM resolves this by inferring the more semantically correct type `bytearray`, which preserves buffer-like behavior in Python.

This listing illustrates the benefits of context-aware type resolution. In Java, `Appendable` is an interface implemented by many concrete types. Without contextual information, AlphaTrans maps it to a `List`. However, given the surrounding code—in particular the call `append1(getDelimiterString(), appendable)` and the handling of delimiters and record separators—the more plausible intended types are `StringBuilder` or `Writer` subclasses, e.g., `PrintWriter`. The former is suitable when accumulating output in memory, and the latter is more appropriate when writing to a file or stream. In both cases, TRAM’s context-aware resolution correctly suggests `io.StringIO`, which faithfully captures buffer-like behavior. The *manual* fixed mapping in AlphaTrans causes the generation of superfluous calls such as `StringIO("").join(appendable)`, which results in errors.

```
public synchronized void println(final Appendable
    appendable) throws IOException {
    if (getTrailingDelimiter()) {
        append1(getDelimiterString(), appendable);
    }
    if (recordSeparator != null) {
        append1(recordSeparator, appendable);
    }
}
```

Summary. TRAM achieves higher functional equivalence than state-of-the-art repository-level code translation tool, AlphaTrans (43.10% vs. 25.14%). It is particularly notable for enabling more fragments to be validated while completely eliminating manual intervention in type resolution.

4.3 RQ2: Reliability of Mock-based Isolation Validation

RQ1 shows that mock-based isolation validation can be applied to a larger portion of AMFs, leading to a more automated validation and contributing to a higher success rate of method translation. A natural follow-up question concerns the reliability of this approach: how reliable are the validation results? A false negative may occur when validation reports a failure despite the translation being functionally equivalent, whereas a false positive, which is more problematic, occurs when validation reports success even though the translation is not functionally equivalent. To investigate this, we manually investigated the generated mock tests and GraalVM-based results of AlphaTrans for three projects to determine false positive and false negative cases of each approach. AlphaTrans also conducted a human study, where a human subject repaired partial translations, which we include

Table 2. Manual analysis of translation and mock-based/GraalVM-based/human validation in TRAM and AlphaTrans.

Category	GraalVM	Mock	Human
Success	301 (43.0%)	464 (66.3%)	535 (76.4%)
Failure	97 (13.9%)	146 (20.9%)	165 (23.6%)
Error	102 (14.6%)	0 (0.0%)	-
Not Covered	200 (28.6%)	90 (12.9%)	-
Total	700	700	700
Mis-labellings	GraalVM	Mocking	-
False Positive	17 (2.4%)	0 (0.0%)	-
False Negative	53 (7.6%)	6 (0.9%)	-

in the analysis. This resulted in a careful analysis of translations and validation artifacts (mock tests, GraalVM glue code, and human fixes) for 700 AMFs.

Table 2 presents the results of the analysis. Across the three projects, mock-based in-isolation validation achieved a substantially higher success rate compared to GraalVM-based validation, largely because it produced no errors, particularly when handling complex generic types, and was able to validate more AMFs through EvoSuite test augmentation. Notably, mock-based validation exhibits **no false positives** and **only 0.9% false negatives** across the three projects. In contrast, GraalVM-based validation shows a non-negligible **2.4% false positives** and a significantly higher **7.6% false negatives**, despite validating a smaller portion of AMFs.

The Venn diagram in Figure 9 shows a more detailed overview of the analysis. Overall, there is still substantial agreement among all three validation methods, with 278 AMFs labeled “translation success” by GraalVM-based, mock-based, and human validations. However, when compared to the human ground truth, mocking successfully validated 186 AMFs that GraalVM could not, while GraalVM validated only six cases that mocking does not cover (as we discuss later, the 17 GraalVM-only success cases are false positives). Both GraalVM-based and mock-based techniques have cases they cannot validate, but GraalVM shows a notably higher number of such cases, further demonstrating one of its biggest limitations: dependency on the coverage of the original test suite.




Fig. 9. Success overlap across GraalVM-based, mock-based, and human validation

4.3.1 GraalVM False Positives. Upon manual analysis, we found that the primary sources of GraalVM-based validation false positives fall into two categories. First, translations that are not fully functionally equivalent may still pass unit tests. Figure 10 shows such an example, where the Java API call `hasNext()` on an iterator was translated to `next()` in Python. The

Java Code
<pre>if (it.hasNext()) { buf.append(", "); }</pre>
LLM Translation
<pre>if next(it, None) is not None: # superfluously advances the iterator buf.write(", ")</pre>

Fig. 10. GraalVM-based validation false positive due to API mismatch

former checks for the presence of the next element without advancing the iterator. The latter, erroneously, advances the iterator without restoring its state. GraalVM validation reports success since no unit test asserts on the iterator's state, but our mock-based validation correctly identifies the bug because it detects that the iterator, as a field of the focal method's parameter, has been advanced unnecessarily.

Second, since GraalVM does not support EvoSuite-generated tests, it relies heavily on the quality of developer-written tests. However, such tests often fall short in achieving full branch coverage or fail to capture sufficient edge cases. In the example of Figure 11, `option` is an empty string. In Java, the code correctly returns `longOption`, as the empty string is non-null. In contrast, the Python translation incorrectly takes the else branch when `option` is empty. This bug remains undetected by developer-written tests but is revealed by mock tests generated via EvoSuite.

Java Code
<code>return option == null ? longOption : option;</code>
LLM Translation
<code>return self.__option if self.__option else self. __longOption # goes to "else" if option is empty string</code>

Fig. 11. GraalVM-based validation false positive due to test incompleteness

4.3.2 GraalVM False Negatives. It is also worth noting that GraalVM exhibits a substantial number of false negatives. A major cause is that bugs in glue code do not always lead to compilation failures. Instead, incorrect or insufficient handling of interoperability between Java and Python types can result in runtime errors during test execution, which are reported as test failures even when the translation is in fact functionally correct.

This listing shows a case of `PolyglotException`. When the test invokes `OptionBuilder.withArgName("PLDI")`, the translated line `OptionBuilder.__argName = name` triggers a host interop assignment from Python to a Java private static field. Ideally, this operation should (1) resolve the static field `argName`, (2) convert the Python string "PLDI" into a Java String, and (3) perform the interop assignment. However, a latent bug in the glue layer prevents this from happening because it fails to properly expose the `argName` field, which is declared as a private static String. While primitives such as `char` can be trivially mapped across languages, GraalVM cannot assign a Python `str` to an unexposed Java String field, leading to a `PolyglotException`. Exporting the field with `@Export` or registering the class with `allowHostAccess=ALL` would resolve the issue. Thus, the error originates from an access configuration bug in the glue code, even though the translation itself is semantically correct.

One may argue that GraalVM-specific runtime errors such as `PolyglotException` can be filtered as false alarms. However, in practice, it is often difficult to distinguish whether a failure originates from translation errors or from bugs in the glue code. This is especially true for exceptions like `NullPointerException` or `NoClassDefFoundError`, which appear often in real translation bugs.

Java Code
<code>public static OptionBuilder withArgName(final String name) { OptionBuilder.argName = name; return INSTANCE; }</code>
LLM Translation
<code>@staticmethod def withArgName(name: str) -> " OptionBuilder": OptionBuilder.__argName = name # This line throws PolyglotException due to bug in glue code return OptionBuilder.__INSTANCE</code>

This listing shows such a case. The method references a field `argCount` from another class `Option`. Ideally, the glue code (i.e., the Java–Python interop layer) should ensure that the `Option` class is visible and properly imported into the Python context, with its static fields (e.g., `UNINITIALIZED`) correctly exposed. This guarantees that `OptionBuilder` can reference `Option` at runtime. However, the glue code fails to expose the corresponding Java type to the polyglot engine. Consequently, GraalVM’s interop layer cannot resolve host-side static members such as `Option.UNINITIALIZED`, since their metadata is missing from the host access configuration. As a result, a `NoClassDefFoundError` is thrown due to a binding visibility issue—the glue code did not make `Option` accessible to the translated Python code. Note that even though the translated `.py` file explicitly imports `Option`, the GraalVM interop mechanism operates across a host–guest boundary. The Python `import` statement only makes `Option` visible within the guest (Python) runtime, not to the host (Java) classloader responsible for field and method resolution.

<pre> ----- Java Code ----- private static void reset() { argCount = Option.UNINITIALIZED; } </pre>
<pre> ----- LLM Translation ----- @staticmethod def __reset() -> None: import Option OptionBuilder.__argCount = Option. UNINITIALIZED # throws NoClassDefFoundError due to bug in glue code </pre>

Another interesting observation is that even after manually correcting all bugs in the glue code, GraalVM execution can still exhibit subtle, hard-to-diagnose errors stemming from inherent limitations in language interoperability. Consider the listing from the *commons-cli* project, where both the translated code and the glue logic are functionally correct, yet a runtime exception still arises. In the original Java implementation, the methods `contains()` and `remove(index)` operate on indices rather than iterators. However, in the Python translation under GraalVM, the `in` operator is implemented using a `java.util.Iterator`, while the call to `remove(value)` invokes the collection’s `remove()` method instead of the iterator’s own `remove()`. Because Java iterators enforce fail-fast semantics by tracking a modification count that must remain unchanged except through their own `remove()`, this mismatch causes a `java.util.ConcurrentModificationException` at runtime. It is important to note that the Python translation itself is not error-prone: Python iterators do not maintain modification counts, so removing elements from a list during iteration is permitted. In other words, this exception is not due to any flaw in the translation or glue logic, but rather a semantic mismatch between Python’s iteration model and Java’s fail-fast iterator semantics in GraalVM’s interoperability layer.

<pre> ----- Java Code ----- if (requiredOpts.contains(key)) { requiredOpts.remove(requiredOpts. indexOf(key)); } </pre>
<pre> ----- LLM Translation ----- if key in self.__requiredOpts: self.__requiredOpts.remove(key) </pre>

Other sources of false negatives include flaky tests, especially when test decomposition is applied: AlphaTrans decomposes unit tests to obtain results at the granularity of individual assertions or method invocations, which can introduce test order dependencies [36, 66] and spurious failures.

4.3.3 Mocking False Positives. We did not identify any false positives from mock-based validation, though their existence cannot be ruled out, particularly in potential edge cases where the EvoSuite-augmented test suite still fails to cover all branches. Another possible source of false positives that may be observed in TRAM behavior in practice arises from function side effects that mock-based validation cannot directly capture, such as data manipulation on remote servers or other external state changes.

4.3.4 Mocking False Negatives. Mock-based validation can also yield a small number of false negatives. This typically occurs when a function does not have deterministic I/O pairs (or side effects), yet the mocking workflow assumes the translated Python method should produce the same outputs for a given set of invocations. Such mismatches often arise in functions that depend on non-deterministic sources such as

system time, random number generation, or hash-based object identity. This listing illustrates a false negative in which the mocking framework incorrectly expects the Python equivalent of `hashCode()` to return the exact same integer value observed in a particular Java test execution. Since hash computation in Python follows a different algorithm and can vary across runs, the discrepancy does not indicate a translation bug. The translation itself is semantically correct, but the mock-based validation fails to account for the inherent nondeterminism of the function’s behavior.

We also observed that the set of EvoSuite-generated tests can exhibit flakiness under similar circumstances. For example, some tests implicitly assume fixed environmental conditions, such as locale, operating system, or system time, treating them as hard-coded constants. This indicates that the problem is not unique to mock-based validation, but is also inherent in random test generation itself. Nevertheless, despite these limitations, the incidence of false negatives under the mock-based validation is consistently lower than that observed with GraalVM-based validation.

<pre> Java Code @Override public int hashCode() { return Objects.hash(longOption, option); } </pre>
<pre> LLM Translation def __hash__(self) -> int: return hash((self.longOption, self. option)) </pre>

Summary. Mock-based in-isolation validation is generally more reliable than the language-interopability-based approach of AlphaTrans, achieving broader coverage with substantially fewer false positives and false negatives.

4.4 RQ3: Generalizability of TRAM

It remains an open question whether TRAM’s effectiveness is tied to a specific large language model (LLM), such as DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct [14], or whether its advantages can generalize across different models and architectures. To that end, we replicated our full experiment setup for RQ1 using a smaller but more recent model, Devstral-24B [29], which was trained with a more diverse multilingual corpus and enhanced instruction-following capabilities for code understanding. The comparative results are summarized in Table 3. Interestingly, Devstral-24B consistently produces higher validation scores across most metrics while maintaining comparable performance to DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct in overall translation fidelity.

In particular, TRAM with Devstral-24B achieves a functional equivalence rate of **46.61%**, which slightly surpasses the 43.10% obtained by DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct. More remarkably, Devstral-24B outperforms DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct in 9 out of 10 projects in terms of mock success rate. This improvement can be attributed to Devstral-24B’s refined tokenization and decoder architecture, which emphasize longer context retention and cross-language structural alignment. In other words, Devstral-24B better preserves semantic correspondence between the original Java code and its translated Python counterpart, especially for methods that rely on complex object hierarchies or nested control flow. Furthermore, Devstral-24B’s training pipeline includes extensive exposure to testing frameworks (e.g., JUnit, PyTest, and Nose), allowing it to more effectively translate test scaffolding code that involves mocking, assertions, and setup/teardown patterns.

Table 3. Comparative Analysis Between DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct and Devstral-24B

Subjects	DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct		Devstral-24B	
	Mock Success	ATP	Mock Success	ATP
cli	68.50%	11.36%	78.02%	19.05%
codec	43.68%	2.94%	49.26%	10.88%
csv	49.79%	5.96%	56.17%	10.64%
exec	37.90%	5.24%	56.45%	12.50%
fast-pfor	40.37%	20.45%	35.70%	10.16%
fileupload	66.15%	11.46%	70.83%	16.15%
graph	29.06%	2.64%	31.70%	12.26%
jansi	31.05%	0.00%	36.43%	23.72%
pool	41.94%	5.28%	43.70%	10.85%
validator	47.99%	3.72%	50.46%	12.07%
Total	43.10%	7.04%	46.61%	12.99%

An even more noteworthy observation is Devstral-24B’s higher success rate in test translation: 12.99% of translated tests achieve all-test-pass (ATP), compared to only 7.04% for DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct. Devstral-24B also outperforms DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct in 9 out of 10 projects in terms of ATP rate. This finding is particularly significant because test translation is often more difficult than source translation. Unlike source functions, tests frequently depend on library-specific semantics, external fixtures, and implicit assumptions about I/O behavior or runtime environment.

Given the convincing performance on medium-sized open source models, we claim that TRAM’s performance does not critically rely on the choice of an underlying LLM. This is consistent with the design philosophy of TRAM: its two key novel components, RAG-based in-context type resolution and mock-based in-isolation validation, are not optimized for any specific model. The context-aware type resolution task is relatively lightweight, relying primarily on recognizing type semantics from surrounding code rather than deep reasoning, which makes it amenable to smaller LLMs. Meanwhile, mock-based in-isolation validation is entirely heuristic-driven and operates independently of the LLM. Taken together, these observations support the claim that TRAM is robust and largely agnostic to the choice of LLMs, making it adaptable to future models without requiring retraining or architectural modifications.

Summary. TRAM’s performance is largely LLM-agnostic, as its context-aware type resolution and heuristic-based validation generalize well across different models, even a smaller one like Devstral-24B.

4.5 RQ4: Contribution of Core Components

To evaluate the individual contributions of TRAM’s two core components, its context-aware type resolution and mock-based in-isolation validation, we conducted an ablation study designed to isolate their respective effects on overall system performance. Specifically, we replicated the experimental setup from RQ1 (using the DeepSeekCoder-33B-Instruct model) but systematically removed one component at a time. Table 4 presents the results of these ablation experiments.

In the first ablation, we disabled the mock-based in-isolation validation and instead relied solely on translated test cases as indicators of functional equivalence. Since the projects under study incorporate automatically generated test suites from EvoSuite, we were unable to employ GraalVM-based validation due to aforementioned incompatibility issues. In the second ablation, we disabled the context-aware type resolution mechanism and reverted to the fixed, manually curated

Table 4. Ablation study on TRAM’s rate of functional equivalence showing the contribution of context-aware type resolution and mock-based in-isolation validation

Subjects	TRAM	w/o Mock-based In-Isolation Validation	w/o RAG-based Type Resolution
cli	68.50%	9.16%	72.89%
codec	43.68%	1.47%	38.53%
csv	49.79%	5.96%	40.85%
exec	37.90%	5.65%	48.39%
fast-pfor	40.37%	16.84%	37.83%
fileupload	66.15%	16.67%	59.90%
graph	29.06%	6.60%	32.26%
jansi	31.05%	7.82%	28.85%
pool	41.94%	0.00%	42.82%
validator	47.99%	4.33%	39.63%
Total	43.10%	6.81%	41.18%

Java–Python type mapping used in AlphaTrans. This configuration removes TRAM’s dynamic object-specific type mapping from surrounding contexts.

The findings demonstrate that removing the mock-based in-isolation validation leads to a drastic degradation in performance. Without mock-based validation, the system can no longer reliably verify most translated method fragments, as translated test classes often contain syntactic or logical errors that prevent them from executing successfully. Consequently, only **6.81%** of method fragments were validated as functionally equivalent via test translation (i.e., all translated tests invoking such methods passed). Even in the best-performing project, the success rate reached only **16.84%**, which is substantially lower than the worst-performing project in the full TRAM configuration (**29.06%**). This underscores the importance of TRAM’s mock-based validation, which enables robust verification of functional equivalence without dependence on potentially unreliable test translation or external validators such as GraalVM. By leveraging mock-based in-isolation validation, TRAM ensures that the correctness of translated fragments can be assessed even when full program execution is infeasible.

The second ablation highlights the complementary role of context-aware type resolution. When we disable this component and instead use static, manually crafted type mappings of AlphaTrans, the average functional equivalence rate decreases from **43.10%** to **41.18%**. Although this numerical drop may appear modest, it represents a meaningful reduction given the large experiment scale and the absence of human intervention in TRAM’s type inference process. As reported by AlphaTrans, achieving the manually-augmented type mappings required approximately 55 developer hours for type correction/augmentation across the same ten projects, which is a nontrivial human cost. TRAM’s context-aware approach eliminates this overhead entirely.

These results empirically validate that both components are indispensable to TRAM’s effectiveness. The mock-based in-isolation validation is critical for reliable functional verification at the method level, while the context-aware type resolution enhances translation accuracy and scalability by capturing nuanced contextual information. Importantly, TRAM achieves this balance between precision and automation with no manual tuning or post-processing, demonstrating its potential as a fully automated and generalizable framework for repository-level code translation.

Summary. Both the mock-based in-isolation validation and the context-aware type resolution are essential to TRAM’s effectiveness, jointly enabling accurate, scalable, and fully automated repository-level code translation.

5 Related Work

There are mainly two approaches to translating code from one programming language to another taken by prior work: leveraging rule-based techniques that deterministically maps the source language to target, and using the generative power of language models in the pipeline, neuro-symbolic or agentic.

5.1 Code translation using non-LLM-based approaches

Several tools, such as C2Rust [18], CxGo [52], Sharpen [39], and Java2CSharp [19], have been developed to facilitate code translation between programming languages, specifically from C to Rust, C to Go, and Java to C#, respectively. In addition, a range of statistical machine translation techniques [6, 30–32] has been proposed to support the translation of Java code into C#. More recently, deep learning-based methods have also been explored for the task of code translation [42, 43]. However, existing efforts have largely overlooked the challenge of translating real-world Java projects into Python. Moreover, large language model (LLM)-based approaches have demonstrated superiority over traditional transpilers in terms of both performance and code readability [37].

5.2 Code translation using LLMs

Recent work has explored the use of large language models (LLMs) for code translation [8, 22, 37, 51, 60, 63], showing promising results on synthetic benchmarks but limited effectiveness on real-world software projects. Other studies have similarly employed language models for code migration, with a predominant focus on curated examples [19, 68]. Moreover, existing work has also addressed repository-level translation targeting different language pairs. AlphaTrans [16] translates Java to Python using open-source LLMs and GraalVM [35] for isolated validation. SYZGY [44] translates C to Rust using GPT-4, while Oxidizer [65] applies type-driven techniques and language feature mapping to convert Go to Rust. Several methods also integrated transpiler outputs to guide LLM-based translation [61]; however, their effectiveness is often constrained by the availability and reliability of underlying transpilers. Nitin et al. [33] capture natural language specifications from source code to inform translation, while Yang et al. [62] utilize test cases to support the process.

6 Threats to Validity

Similar to other approaches, TRAM has some limitations and comes with a list of threats to the validity. In this section, we will discuss how we mitigated various threats.

External Validity. A primary external threat to this work lies in the generalizability of TRAM. While the current implementation targets Java-to-Python translation, the underlying pipeline is designed to be language-agnostic and can be extended to additional targets with moderate adaptation. The RAG-based in-isolation validation is applicable to almost any language pair with minimal effort. The mocking workflow is also generalizable across programming languages. For instance, extending to C as a source language would primarily require custom serialization, since C lacks reflection. This could be addressed by injecting macros at object-construction time, potentially through an automated pipeline to minimize manual code patching. Because mocking libraries exist in virtually all major programming languages, mock test generation is straightforward. Overall, we argue that most components of our pipeline are inherently language-agnostic, enabling support for a wide range of languages, including Go, JavaScript, Ruby, C/C++, and Rust.

Internal Validity. A potential threat lies in the reliability of mock-based validation: incorrectly mocked objects, e.g., overly strict equivalence checking or missing side-effects, could lead to misleading test outcomes, while insufficient EvoSuite coverage might artificially inflate success rates. This is mitigated by manual inspection of 700 AMFs across three projects, confirming that

mocking yields far fewer false negatives than GraalVM and no false positives. Another concern is overfitting to the chosen projects; however, the study uses the unbiased project pool from related work, which spans diverse domains. Finally, to rule out overfitting to a specific LLM, RQ3 demonstrates that TRAM achieves comparable results on another open-source model, Devstral-24B.

Construct Validity. In order to minimize construct validity, TRAM is built and validated with well-vetted tools, such as Tree-sitter [46], JaCoCo [47], Python coverage [3], and Python mock [49].

7 Conclusion

The paper introduced TRAM, a repository-level code translation framework that integrates context-aware type resolution with mock-based, in-isolation validation to achieve high-quality, semantically faithful translations from Java to Python. Evaluation of TRAM on Java-to-Python translation demonstrates that it achieves state-of-the-art translation quality, validating the effectiveness of combining RAG-guided type resolution with reliable automated validation.

We are considering several avenues to explore in the next step. One promising direction for future work is integrating more fine-grained semantic analysis, such as control-flow or data-flow reasoning, to further enhance type inference and translation coherence. Another future work includes making the TRAM pipeline PL-agnostic, or enable adaptation to more language pairs with minimal human effort.

References

- [1] Muhammad Salman Abid, Mrigank Pawagi, Sugam Adhikari, Xuyan Cheng, Ryed Badr, Md Wahiduzzaman, Vedant Rathi, Ronghui Qi, Choyin Li, Lu Liu, et al. 2024. GlueTest: Testing Code Translation via Language Interoperability. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance and Evolution (ICSME)*. IEEE, 612–617.
- [2] Yubo Bai and Tapti Palit. 2025. RustAssure: Differential Symbolic Testing for LLM-Transpiled C-to-Rust Code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.07604* (2025).
- [3] Ned Batchelder. 2025. Coverage.py. <https://pypi.org/project/coverage>.
- [4] Dante Broggi and Yi Liu. 2023. On the Interoperability of Programming Languages via Translation. In *2023 Congress in Computer Science, Computer Engineering, & Applied Computing (CSCE)*. IEEE, 2579–2585.
- [5] Xuemeng Cai, Jiakun Liu, Xiping Huang, Yijun Yu, Haitao Wu, Chunmiao Li, Bo Wang, Imam Nur Bani Yusuf, and Lingxiao Jiang. 2025. RustMap: Towards Project-Scale C-to-Rust Migration via Program Analysis and LLM. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.17741* (2025).
- [6] Xinyun Chen, Chang Liu, and Dawn Song. 2018. Tree-to-tree Neural Networks for Program Translation. In *NIPS*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, 2552 – 2562.
- [7] Eman J Coco, Hadeel A Osman, and Niemah I Osman. 2018. JPT: a simple java-python translator. *Computer Applications: An International Journal* 5 (2018).
- [8] Peng Di, Jianguo Li, Hang Yu, Wei Jiang, Wenting Cai, Yang Cao, Chaoyu Chen, Dajun Chen, Hongwei Chen, Liang Chen, et al. 2024. CodeFuse-13B: A Pretrained Multi-lingual Code Large Language Model. In *ICSE-SIEP*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 418–429.
- [9] Dony George, Priyanka Girase, Mahesh Gupta, Prachi Gupta, and Aakanksha Sharma. 2010. Programming language inter-conversion. *International Journal of Computer Applications* 1, 20 (2010), 68–74.
- [10] GitHub. 2025. CodeQL. <https://codeql.github.com> <https://codeql.github.com>.
- [11] Georgios Gousios. 2025. Java Call Graph. <https://github.com/gousiosg/java-callgraph> <https://github.com/gousiosg/java-callgraph>.
- [12] Ziqi Guan, Xin Yin, Zhiyuan Peng, and Chao Ni. 2025. Repotransagent: Multi-agent llm framework for repository-aware code translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.17720* (2025).
- [13] Giovani Guizzo, Jie M Zhang, Federica Sarro, Christoph Treude, and Mark Harman. 2024. Mutation analysis for evaluating code translation. *Empirical Software Engineering* 29, 1 (2024), 19.
- [14] Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y. Wu, Y. K. Li, Fuli Luo, Yingfei Xiong, and Wenfeng Liang. 2024. DeepSeek-Coder: When the Large Language Model Meets Programming – The Rise of Code Intelligence. *arXiv:2401.14196* (2024).
- [15] IBM Research. 2024. How Large Can Context Windows Go? Understanding Limits of Long-Context LLMs. <https://research.ibm.com/blog/larger-context-window>.

- [16] Ali Reza Ibrahimzada, Kaiyao Ke, Mrigank Pawagi, Muhammad Salman Abid, Rangeet Pan, Saurabh Sinha, and Reyhaneh Jabbarvand. 2025. AlphaTrans: A Neuro-Symbolic Compositional Approach for Repository-Level Code Translation and Validation. 2, FSE, Article FSE109 (June 2025), 23 pages. doi:10.1145/3729379
- [17] Ali Reza Ibrahimzada, Brandon Paulsen, Reyhaneh Jabbarvand, Joey Dodds, and Daniel Kroening. 2025. MatchFix-Agent: Language-Agnostic Autonomous Repository-Level Code Translation Validation and Repair. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.16187* (2025).
- [18] Immunant. 2025. C2Rust Transpiler. <https://github.com/immunant/c2rust>.
- [19] Paul Irwin. 2025. Java to CSharp Converter. <https://github.com/paulirwin/JavaToCSharp>.
- [20] Nihal Jain, Robert Kwiatkowski, Baishakhi Ray, Murali Krishna Ramanathan, and Varun Kumar. 2025. On mitigating code LLM hallucinations with API documentation. In *2025 IEEE/ACM 47th International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (ICSE-SEIP)*. IEEE, 237–248.
- [21] Yuhe Jiang, Xun Deng, Jiacheng Yang, Honghua Dong, Gennady Pekhimenko, Fan Long, and Xujie Si. [n. d.]. TypyBench: Evaluating LLM Type Inference for Untyped Python Repositories. In *ICLR 2025 Third Workshop on Deep Learning for Code*.
- [22] Mingsheng Jiao, Tingrui Yu, Xuan Li, Guan jie Qiu, Xiaodong Gu, and Beijun Shen. 2023. On the evaluation of neural code translation: Taxonomy and benchmark. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, Las Vegas, NV, USA, 1529–1541.
- [23] Anirudh Khatri, Robert Zhang, Jia Pan, Ziteng Wang, Qiaochu Chen, Greg Durrett, and Isil Dillig. 2025. CRUST-Bench: A Comprehensive Benchmark for C-to-safe-Rust Transpilation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.15254* (2025).
- [24] Kevin Lano and Hanan Siala. 2024. Using model-driven engineering to automate software language translation. *Automated Software Engineering* 31, 1 (2024), 20.
- [25] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 9459–9474.
- [26] Tianyu Li, Ruishi Li, Bo Wang, Brandon Paulsen, Umang Mathur, and Prateek Saxena. 2025. Adversarial Agent Collaboration for C to Rust Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.03879* (2025).
- [27] Peng Liu, Yu Chen, and Zhen et al. Zhao. 2023. Extending Context Window of Large Language Models via Positional Interpolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.15595* (2023).
- [28] Feng Luo, Kexing Ji, Cuiyun Gao, Shuzheng Gao, Jia Feng, Kui Liu, Xin Xia, and Michael R Lyu. 2025. Integrating Rules and Semantics for LLM-Based C-to-Rust Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.06926* (2025).
- [29] Mistral AI and All Hands AI. 2025. Devstral: A new state-of-the-art open model for coding agents. <https://www.all-hands.dev/blog/devstral-a-new-state-of-the-art-open-model-for-coding-agents>. Accessed: [Date Accessed].
- [30] Anh Tuan Nguyen, Tung Thanh Nguyen, and Tien N Nguyen. 2013. Lexical Statistical Machine Translation for Language Migration. In *FSE*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 651–654.
- [31] Anh Tuan Nguyen, Tung Thanh Nguyen, and Tien N Nguyen. 2014. Migrating Code with Statistical Machine Translation. In *ICSE Companion*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 544–547.
- [32] Anh Tuan Nguyen, Tung Thanh Nguyen, and Tien N Nguyen. 2015. Divide-and-Conquer Approach for Multi-phase Statistical Migration for Source Code. In *ASE*. IEEE, Las Vegas, NV, USA, 585–596.
- [33] Vikram Nitin, Rahul Krishna, and Baishakhi Ray. 2024. SpecTra: Enhancing the Code Translation Ability of Language Models by Generating Multi-Modal Specifications. *arXiv:2405.18574*
- [34] Vikram Nitin, Rahul Krishna, Luiz Lemos do Valle, and Baishakhi Ray. 2025. C2SaferRust: Transforming C Projects into Safer Rust with NeuroSymbolic Techniques. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.14257* (2025).
- [35] Oracle. 2025. GraalVM. <https://www.graalvm.org>.
- [36] Fabio Palomba and Andy Zaidman. 2017. Notice of Retraction: Does Refactoring of Test Smells Induce Fixing Flaky Tests?. In *ICSME*.
- [37] Rangeet Pan, Ali Reza Ibrahimzada, Rahul Krishna, Divya Sankar, Lambert Pouguem 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 *ICSE*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 866–866.
- [38] Yun Peng, Chaozheng Wang, Wenxuan Wang, Cuiyun Gao, and Michael R Lyu. 2023. Generative type inference for python. In *2023 38th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*. IEEE, 988–999.
- [39] Mono Project. 2025. Sharpen - Automated Java->C# coversion. <https://github.com/mono/sharpen>.
- [40] pytest dev. 2024. Pytest. <https://www.pytest.org>.
- [41] Lili Qiu. 1999. *Programming language translation*. Technical Report. Cornell University.
- [42] Baptiste Roziere, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Lowik Chanussot, and Guillaume Lample. 2020. Unsupervised translation of programming languages. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 20601–20611.
- [43] Baptiste Roziere, Jie M Zhang, Francois Charton, Mark Harman, Gabriel Synnaeve, and Guillaume Lample. 2021. Leveraging Automated Unit Tests for Unsupervised Code Translation. *arXiv:2110.06773*

- [44] Manish Shetty, Naman Jain, Adwait Godbole, Sanjit A Seshia, and Koushik Sen. 2024. Syzygy: Dual Code-Test C to (safe) Rust Translation using LLMs and Dynamic Analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14234* (2024).
- [45] HoHyun Sim, Hyeonjoong Cho, Yeonghyeon Go, Zhoulai Fu, Ali Shokri, and Binoy Ravindran. 2025. Large Language Model-Powered Agent for C to Rust Code Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.15858* (2025).
- [46] The Tree sitter Team. 2025. Tree-sitter. <https://pypi.org/project/tree-sitter/>.
- [47] The JaCoCo Team. 2025. Java Code Coverage. <https://www.eclemma.org/jacoco/> <https://www.eclemma.org/jacoco/>.
- [48] The JUnit Team. 2025. JUnit. <https://junit.org/junit5/>
- [49] The Mock Python Team. 2025. Mock Library Python. <https://pypi.org/project/mock/>.
- [50] Andrey A Terekhov and Chris Verhoef. 2000. The realities of language conversions. *IEEE Software* 17, 6 (2000), 111–124.
- [51] Sindhu Tipirneni, Ming Zhu, and Chandan K Reddy. 2024. StructCoder: Structure-Aware Transformer for Code Generation. *Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data* 18 (2024), 1–20.
- [52] Go Transpile. 2025. C to Go Translator. <https://github.com/gotranspile/cxgo>.
- [53] Ashwin Prasad Shivarpatna Venkatesh, Samkutty Sabu, Amir M Mir, Sofia Reis, and Eric Bodden. 2024. The emergence of large language models in static analysis: A first look through micro-benchmarks. In *Proceedings of the 2024 IEEE/ACM First International Conference on AI Foundation Models and Software Engineering*. 35–39.
- [54] Bo Wang, Tianyu Li, Ruishi Li, Umang Mathur, and Prateek Saxena. 2025. Program Skeletons for Automated Program Translation. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 9, PLDI (2025), 920–944.
- [55] Chaofan Wang, Guanjie Qiu, Xiaodong Gu, and Beijun Shen. 2025. APIRAT: Integrating Multi-source API Knowledge for Enhanced Code Translation with LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14852* (2025).
- [56] Chaofan Wang, Tingrui Yu, Jie Wang, Dong Chen, Wenrui Zhang, Yuling Shi, Xiaodong Gu, and Beijun Shen. 2025. EVOCRUST: A Skeleton-guided Framework for Project-Level C-to-Rust Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.04295* (2025).
- [57] Chengpeng Wang, Jipeng Zhang, Rongxin Wu, and Charles Zhang. 2024. Dainfer: Inferring API aliasing specifications from library documentation via neurosymbolic optimization. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering* 1, FSE (2024), 2469–2492.
- [58] Yanlin Wang, Rongyi Ou, Yanli Wang, Mingwei Liu, Jiachi Chen, Ensheng Shi, Xilin Liu, Yuchi Ma, and Zibin Zheng. 2025. EffiReasonTrans: RL-Optimized Reasoning for Code Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.18863* (2025).
- [59] Zhitong Wang, Cheng Gao, Chaojun Xiao, Yufei Huang, Shuzheng Si, Kangyang Luo, Yuzhuo Bai, Wenhao Li, Tangjian Duan, Chuancheng Lv, et al. 2025. Document Segmentation Matters for Retrieval-Augmented Generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*. 8063–8075.
- [60] Weixiang Yan, Yuchen Tian, Yunzhe Li, Qian Chen, and Wen Wang. 2023. CodeTransOcean: A Comprehensive Multilingual Benchmark for Code Translation. In *EMNLP, ACL, Singapore*, 5067–5089.
- [61] Aidan ZH Yang, Yoshiki Takashima, Brandon Paulsen, Josiah Dodds, and Daniel Kroening. 2024. VERT: Verified Equivalent Rust Transpilation with Large Language Models as Few-Shot Learners. *arXiv:2404.18852*
- [62] 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. *FSE* 1 (2024), 1585–1608.
- [63] Xin Yin, Chao Ni, Tien N Nguyen, Shaohua Wang, and Xiaohu Yang. 2024. Rectifier: Code Translation with Corrector via LLMs. *arXiv:2407.07472*
- [64] Zhiqiang Yuan, Wenjun Mao, Zhuo Chen, Xiyue Shang, Chong Wang, Yiling Lou, and Xin Peng. 2025. Project-Level C-to-Rust Translation via Synergistic Integration of Knowledge Graphs and Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.10956* (2025).
- [65] Hanliang Zhang, Cristina David, Meng Wang, Brandon Paulsen, and Daniel Kroening. 2024. Scalable, validated code translation of entire projects using large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.08035* (2024).
- [66] Sai Zhang, Darioush Jalali, Jochen Wuttke, Kıvanç Muşlu, Wing Lam, Michael Ernst, and David Notkin. 2014. Empirically revisiting the test independence assumption. In *ISSTA*.
- [67] Tianyang Zhou, Haowen Lin, Somesh Jha, Mihai Christodorescu, Kirill Levchenko, and Varun Chandrasekaran. 2025. LLM-Driven Multi-step Translation from C to Rust using Static Analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.12511* (2025).
- [68] Ming Zhu, Karthik Suresh, and Chandan K Reddy. 2022. Multilingual Code Snippets Training for Program Translation. *AAAI* 36 (2022), 11783–11790.