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Abstract

In this paper, we leverage low-level compiler intermediate representations (IR) to improve code translation. Traditional transpilers rely on syntactic information and handcrafted rules, which limits their applicability and produces unnatural-looking code. Applying neural machine translation (NMT) approaches to code has successfully broadened the set of programs on which one can get a natural-looking translation. However, they treat the code as sequences of text tokens, and still do not differentiate well enough between similar pieces of code which have different semantics in different languages. The consequence is low quality translation, reducing the practicality of NMT, and stressing the need for an approach significantly increasing its accuracy. Here we propose to augment code translation with IRs, specifically LLVM IR, with results on the C++, Java, Rust, and Go languages. Our method improves upon the state of the art for unsupervised code translation, increasing the number of correct translations by 11% on average, and up to 79% for the Java → Rust pair. We extend previous test sets for code translation, by adding hundreds of Go and Rust functions. Additionally, we train models with high performance on the problem of IR decompilation, generating programming source code from IR, and study using IRs as intermediary pivot for translation.

1 Introduction

Automatic code translation allows to port old codebases to new frameworks, or high-level (but slow) languages to low-level (and fast) ones. Current industry solutions, known as transpilers or transcompilers rely on handcrafted rules that are applied systematically. They produce unidiomatic translations that prove hard to read for human programmers. This is a serious limitation: the translated code should be easy to read and understand, as it will eventually be maintained by human developers.

In recent years, Neural Machine Translation (NMT) was proposed as an alternative to rule-based code translation [Roziere et al., 2020, Weisz et al., 2021, 2022]. These models, trained from existing human-readable code, produce idiomatic, easy to understand, translations. Unfortunately, neural transpilers are unreliable, and often produce code that would not even compile or execute. This is, again, a serious limitation: if the human work saved by the transpiler has to be reinvested debugging its output, there is little interest in using it.

We propose to improve the reliability of NMT by leveraging information from compiler toolchains. When processing source code, compilers create Intermediary Representations (IR): language-agnostic pseudocode that describes the semantics of the program. Augmenting training data with the corresponding IR can benefit a Neural Transpiler in two ways: it helps align embeddings for different languages, and serves as a pivot for translation between two languages. As shown in Figure 1 this can greatly improve the semantic quality of neural translations.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input function</th>
<th>TransCoder</th>
<th>TransCoder-IR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>// C++ int nthTerm ( int n ) { return ( n<em>n ) + ( n</em>n*n ) ; }</td>
<td>// Rust fn nth_term ( n: usize ) -&gt; usize { ( n<em>n ) + ( n</em>n*n ) }</td>
<td>// Rust fn nth_term ( n : i32 ) -&gt; i32 { ( n<em>n ) + ( n</em>n*n ) }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>//Java static int divisorSum (int n){ int sum = 0 ; for(int i=1; i&lt;=n; ++i ) sum += ( n / i ) * i; return sum ; }</td>
<td>// Go func divisorSum(n int) (int, int){ sum := 0 for i := 1 ; i &lt;= n ; i ++ { sum += ( n / i ) * i } return sum , n }</td>
<td>// Go func divisorSum ( n int ) int { sum := 0 for i := 1 ; i &lt;= n ; i ++ { sum += ( n / i ) * i } return sum }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>//Java static boolean isDivBy9(int n){ if ( n == 0 n == 9 ) return true; if ( n &lt; 9 ) return false; return isDivBy9( (int)(n &gt;&gt; 3) - (int)(n &amp; 7) ) ; }</td>
<td>// Go func IsDivBy9 ( n int ) bool { if n == 0 n == 9 { return true } if n &lt; 9 { return false } return IsDivBy9 ( (int)(n - (int)(n &amp; 7)) } }</td>
<td>// Go func IsDivBy9 ( n int ) bool { if n == 0 n == 9 { return true } if n &lt; 9 { return false } return IsDivBy9 ( (int)(n &gt;&gt; 3) - (int)(n &amp; 7)) }</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Improvements over TransCoder. The first example shows a translation from C++ to Rust, where TransCoder generates code using unsigned instead of signed integers. In the second example, a translation from Java to Go, it generates a function with the wrong return type. In the third example, which is also a translation from Java to Go, the model outputs a function that looks similar to the correct solution but it confuses > with > and closes an expression with a parenthesis too early. In these cases and many others, TransCoder makes mistakes that are small in terms of edit distance, but have a large impact on the semantics of the code. Using the IR to ground the representations to the semantics often helps solving these issues.

Decompilation, translating from a low-level representation of a program (e.g. assembly) to a high-level one (source code), is another application of IR-augmented Neural Machine Translation. A compiler is used to produce the low-level IR , and the model is trained to invert the mapping from source code to low-level representation.

In this work, we leverage LLVM [Lattner and Adve, 2004] to augment source code with corresponding Intermediary Representation and train models for code translation and decompilation. We experiment with four languages: C++, Java, Rust and Go, and show that adding IR to the training data allows for an average increase of 11% in the number of correct translations.

Our main contributions are:

- We implement and evaluate two methods leveraging LLVM IRs for code translation, improved representations with IR and using IR as pivot:
  - we show that improved representations allow us to increase the number of correct translations generated by TransCoder for C++, Java, Go and Rust by 11%,
  - we study the pivot method to recast the problem of translation as a problem of decompilation of the source’s IR in a new language,
  - we extend the parallel evaluation dataset of 852 functions in C++, Java and Python from [Roziere et al., 2020] with 343 more functions in Go and 280 more in Rust with corresponding test cases.

- We achieve 78% accuracy when decompiling LLVM IRs to C++, a large improvement over existing tools, and achieve a similar performance across the four languages we consider.

2 Related Works

Source-to-Source Translation. Many rule-based methods are available for transpilation, an inventory of which can be found at [2]. In particular, C2Rust [3] and CxGo [4] along with manual corrections,
were central for us in translating evaluation tests to Go and Rust (See Section 4.3). Similarly, 2to3[^5], a Python library porting Python 2 code to Python 3, was used in [Aggarwal et al., 2015] to create a parallel dataset and train a machine learning model.

Neural Machine Translation for code is hampered by the lack of parallel data between programming languages. Indeed, apart from a few language pairs, such as Java-C# [Nguyen et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2018], and specific domains (e.g. competitive programming code), it is difficult to collect large datasets of semantically equivalent code in different languages. TransCoder [Roziere et al., 2020] aims to bridge this gap by introducing Unsupervised Machine Translation, taking advantage of large monolingual code bases to learn to translate between C++, Python and Java with high performance. Later, DOBF [Lachaux et al., 2021] improved the model pre-training method used in TransCoder, and Roziere et al. [2022] used automatically generated unit tests to improve translation performance between Java, C++ and Python. Recently, large language models trained on code, such as Davinci Codex [Chen et al., 2021] and PALM [Chowdhery et al., 2022], have been used for unsupervised code translation.

Starting from the outputs from Transcoder, Weisz et al. [2021] and Weisz et al. [2022] survey the links between humans and NMT methods for code translation, and view neural translation methods as aids to programmers and not as a final goal. In this context, they demonstrate that even imperfect models can improve the quality of an engineer’s work for code translation, and plead for an improvement of human-machine interfaces.

**Decomposition.** Like transpilation, decomposition is usually performed using rule-based methods that rely on pattern matching to parse the control flow structure of the program. RetDec, an open source decompiler created by Avast [Kroustek et al., 2017], can decompile an executable to C and a Python-like language via LLVM IR, and took seven years to be completed by a team of 24 developers[^6]. Other tools exist, such as the Hex-Rays Decompiler[^7] and Brumley et al. [2013], and a thorough review of rule-based methods can be found in papers such as Liang et al. [2021a] and Katz et al. [2019]. With these methods, decomposition can fail if the code is too convoluted, or if it contains language features that were not explicitly translated. Most methods also produce unstructured programs, relying on a large number of goto statements to simulate the control flow of the lower level programming languages. This is semantically correct, but very rarely found in human-written code.

There has been only few works on neural decompilation, using sequence-to-sequence neural networks. Katz et al. [2019] uses LSTM networks to decompile LLVM IRs and assembly code to C. Their approach generates code templates, based on the IRs, that will determine the structure of the output, then fills them with correct variable assignments and numerical values. In the same vein, Fu et al. [2021] tries to address limitations of neural decompilation, with two sequential phases: code sketch generation and iterative error correction. Finally, Liang et al. [2021b] use a method close to ours, and train Transformer models to translate between binary code and C.

**Intermediate representations** are almost as old as compiler design. The first IR, UNCOL [Strong et al., 1958] was introduced in the mid-1950s, together with the idea of reusing the same compiler for several languages and machines. In 1960, NELIAC (a variant of ALGOL) [Huskey et al., 1960] was the first retargetable compiler, portable to different architectures. Feldman [Feldman, 1979] describes how a compiler for Fortran 77 can be added to the C compilers of Johnson Johnson [1979] and Ritchie [Ritchie, 1979]. GCC Stallman [2001] introduces Register Transfer Language (RTL), a low-level IR inspired by [Davidson and Fraser, 1980], and then GENERIC and GIMPLE [Merrill, 2003], precursors of the IR used in LLVM [Lattner and Adve, 2004].

3 Intermediate representations in compilers

Compilers translate programs written in a computer language into executable code for a specific machine. Most compilers consist of a front-end taking source code as input, and a back-end, which produces machine binary code. The front-end lexes (tokenizes) and parses the program. Then, it produces an abstract syntax tree (AST), and translates it into some Intermediate Representation (IR). The back-end converts the IR into machine-specific executable code.

[^5]: https://docs.python.org/2/library/2to3.html
[^7]: https://hex-rays.com/decompiler/
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- O0 version of foo.ll:
define i32 @main(i32 %0, i8** %1) #0 {
  store i32 26, i32* %6, align 4
  %7 = load i32, i32* %6, align 4
  %8 = add nsw i32 16, %7
  ret i32 %8
}

- Oz version of foo.s:
pushq   %rbp
.cfi_def_cfa_offset 16
.movq    %rsp, %rbp
.cfi_def_cfa_register %rbp
.movl    $42, %eax
.popq    %rbp
retq

Figure 2: A bird’s eye view of a compiler toolchain, exemplified with LLVM. The unoptimized version (-O0) is shown here for illustration. In practice we used the size-optimized version (-Oz) of the IR as boxed, which does the compile time optimization of computing the addition of 26 and 16.

In modern compilers, like LLVM [Lattner and Adve 2004], the IR is generic across different input languages (and thus different front-ends). This allows transformations and target agnostic optimizations to be applied to the IR, in a middle-end module independent from the source language and target machine. This results in an efficient compiler structure: new languages can be implemented by rewriting the front-end, and new target machines by rewriting the back-end.

Several IRs usually co-exist in a compiler: each stage in the toolchain (Figure 2) introduces a new representation. Early stage IRs are language-dependent (e.g. ASTs mirror the syntax of the source language). Late stage IRs replace named variables by registers and reflect the specifics of the target architecture. In this work, we are interested in middle-end IRs, which are independent from the target machine, and similar for all source languages (like dialects in natural languages).

4 Data

4.1 Training Data

Our monolingual training data was extracted with Google BigQuery, which indexes over 2.8 million open source repositories from GitHub 8. We selected projects whose license explicitly permits re-distribution of parts, and extracted all individual C++, Java, Rust and Go functions. To learn to decompile IRs, we also used the CodeNet dataset [Puri et al., 2021], a repository of 14 million competitive programming solutions in 55 languages. Our models work at function level: this reduces compilation failures over missing dependencies, while keeping sequence length short.

Table 1: Dataset coverage across languages, in number of standalone functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>C++</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Java</th>
<th>Rust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monolingual data</td>
<td>6.6 M</td>
<td>9.4 M</td>
<td>7.8 M</td>
<td>576.3 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code / IR Parallel Data</td>
<td>344.4 K</td>
<td>384.4 K</td>
<td>2.2 M</td>
<td>19.2 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful IR Compilation</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Generating Intermediate Representations

While the LLVM ecosystem is large, not every language has an LLVM front-end, and not every front-end can produce LLVM IR out-of-the-box. We use clang++ [Lattner and Adve 2004] from the established LLVM C++ compilation toolchain, JLang 10 for Java, Gollvm 11 for Go and rustc 12 for Rust. For the same program, written in different languages, different front-ends may produce different IR. To minimize these variations, we process the source code as follows. First, we generate the most size-optimized IR (-Oz flag), which makes the IR more uniform across languages. Second, we strip all unnecessary information (e.g. header and footer with attributes, debug information, comments). Finally, block names are canonicalized and symbol names demangled

8 https://console.cloud.google.com/marketplace/details/github/github-repos
9 https://clang.llvm.org/
10 https://polyglot-compiler.github.io/JLang/
11 https://go.googlesource.com/gollvm/
to facilitate their recovery. The functions that fail to compile at this point (e.g. because of missing
dependencies) are not included in the parallel dataset, as seen in the last row of Table 1.

4.3 Evaluation

Traditional NMT evaluation relies on metrics such as BLEU, that measure the semantic similarity
between pieces of text. However, when dealing with programming languages, syntax and in particular
compilation and computation outputs can be very different despite minor changes in the code.
Conversely, semantically equivalent code, that differ only in variable names or order of operations can
have a low BLEU score. To take this into account, we use and enhance the computational accuracy
test suite from Roziere et al. [2020], that contains 852 parallel competitive programming solutions
in C++, Java and Python. Using C2Rust, CxGo and some manual code cleaning, we translated 280
functions and test suites in Rust and 343 in Go to measure the performance of our models in these
languages. We measure our performance using the computational accuracy (CA@1) metric [Kulal
et al., 2019] Roziere et al. [2020], which considers that a translation is correct if it passes all tests.

5 Training objectives

Unsupervised machine translation consists of two tasks: training language embeddings for each
language and aligning them [Lample et al., 2018]. We now present the training objectives associated
with those tasks. In Section 5.1, we briefly describe the objective functions of our baseline NMT
system, TransCoder. These objectives are also used for training all of our models. In Section 5.2,
we present our methods for training an IR decompiler and a code translation model using the
IR as a pivot. In Section 5.3, we present three new objectives leveraging LLVM IRs to improve
multilingual representations of source code, and the translation capabilities of machine translation
models. Compared to the pivot, this method does not require to generate IRs at test or inference time.

More formally, we denote \( x = x_1 \ldots x_N \) the source sentence, \( z = z_1 \ldots z_N \) the corre-
sponding IR, and \( y = y_1 \ldots y_N \) the target sentence. Let \( L_{CE}(\hat{x}, x) = \sum_i \ell_{CE}(\hat{x}_i, x_i) \), with
\( \ell_{CE}(\hat{x}_i, x_i) \) the pairwise cross-entropy loss of \( \hat{x}_i \) and \( x_i \), and \( L_{MT}(x, y) \) be the machine translation
loss (also named seq2seq loss) from \( x \) to \( y \) (the lengths of \( x \) and \( y \) can differ). \( L_{MT} \) is the negative
log-likelihood of tokens in \( y \) given \( x \) and previous tokens in \( y \):

\[
L_{MT}(x, y) = - \sum_i \log \left( P(y_i|x, y_1 \ldots y_{i-1}) \right)
\]

5.1 Common Objective Functions

TransCoder [Roziere et al., 2020] learns to translate between programming languages using three
unsupervised objectives developed for natural language processing [Devlin et al., 2018]:

**Masked Language Modeling (MLM).** The Masked Language Modeling (MLM) trains an encoder
to recover randomly masked inputs. It is commonly used to pre-train embeddings for natural [Devlin
et al., 2018] Liu et al. [2019] and programming languages [Kanade et al., 2020] Feng et al. [2020].
Using this objective on code allows the model to quickly learn the syntax and achieve lower losses than
with natural languages. Other objectives have also been developed for programming languages [Guo
et al., 2020] Lachaux et al. [2021] Ahmad et al. [2021] Wang et al. [2021], but MLM remains quite
effective and easy to use on a wide range of programming languages. It uses the following loss:

\[
L_{MLM} = L_{CE}(\text{enc(mask(x))), x}).
\] (1)

**Denoising Auto Encoding (AE).** The denoising Auto-Encoding (AE) objective corrupts a sequence
and trains a seq2seq model to retrieve the original sequence. Sequence corruption is done by randomly
masking spans of tokens, removing and shuffling tokens. The loss is:

\[
L_{AE} = L_{MT}\left(\text{noise}(x), x\right).
\] (2)

**Back-Translation (BT).** Back-Translation [Sennrich et al., 2015] uses the existing model to generate
a noisy translation of the input sentence. Then, it trains the model to regenerate an input from the
noisy translation. It is a simple yet powerful objective for unsupervised machine translation [Lample
Figure 3: IR Decompilation objective. Here, we generate the IR corresponding to each function and train a model to decompile it. The IR pivot model uses this objective, as well as back-translation objectives, allowing it to generalize to IRs generated from any language.

et al., 2018, Artetxe et al., 2018]. More formally, for a every code snippet \( x \), we generate a noisy translation \( \hat{y} \) in other languages and train the model to reverse it with the loss:

\[
L_{BT} = L_{MT}(\hat{y}, x)
\]  

5.2 IR Decompilation and Pivot

IR decompilation. In this supervised task, we use LLVM to generate IR from source code, and train a language model to reverse the process, i.e. learn to predict the source code from the IR. Models are pre-trained using the MLM and AE objectives, then decompilation is learned using the loss:

\[
L_{Decomp} = L_{MT}(z(x), x)
\]

IR Pivot. In this task, we use the IR as a pivot for code translation. For instance, to translate from Rust to C++, we first translate a Rust program into IR and then from IR to C++. The IR corresponding to isolated functions is generated by the LLVM compiler. Then, we translate the IR into source code in the target language, by a process similar to neural IR decompilation.

Naive implementations of this task prove challenging. Simply training a neural decompiler model on all (IR, language) pairs leads to poor performance, because slight variations exist between the IR generated for different languages (i.e. C++-IR and Rust-IR behave like dialects of the LLVM IR). To mitigate this, instead of using a single IR language embedding (like we do in all other tasks), we create separate embeddings for each IR dialect (i.e. IRs generated from different languages). We then use back-translation to align the embeddings for different dialects, i.e. train models to translate from any IR into any programming language. More formally, for every code snippet \( x \) in language \( l_{so} \), we generate a noisy translation \( \hat{z}(y) \) in the IR dialect corresponding to language \( l_{ta} \) (i.e. IRs generated from different languages). We then use back-translation to align the embeddings for different dialects, i.e. train models to translate from any IR into any programming language.

We use the encoder of the IR decompilation model to pre-train the encoder for this model. For the decoder, pre-training from the IR decompilation decoder often leads to training failure, because the model “learns” back-translation by translating a language into itself. Instead, we initialize the decoder randomly and use denoising auto-encoding (AE) for every source language and IR dialect at train time.

5.3 IR for code representations

Leveraging IR to help train translation models is a promising idea, but providing the IR and source code as the input to our model creates practical difficulties. At inference, before it can be translated, every code snippet would need to be compiled with LLVM, to generate the IR.

To leverage LLVM IR at train time, without needing the IR at inference, we add these three objectives to those presented in Section 5.1.

Translation Language Modeling (TLM). First introduced in Lample and Conneau [2019], the translation language modeling objective aims to generate common representations for parallel sentences in different languages. It is similar to the masked language modeling (MLM) objective, as it
Figure 4: IR for code representation objectives. We show examples of masking (used in TLM and TAE) and IR generation used to improve code representations with IRs. The masking objective in TLM or TAE makes the model understand the relationship between code and IR. The IR generation objective helps the model to build semantic representations of the code. For instance, another C++ function computing $39 + 3$ would result in the same IR. A Go function that returns 42 would also have a similar LLVM IR. Therefore, the IR Generation objective encourages the model to build similar representations for these three semantically equivalent functions.

trains an encoder to recover random masks. The main difference is that TLM is trained on parallel sentences which are concatenated in the same sequence. In our case, we concatenate (symbolized by $|$) standalone functions and their IRs and train to recover random masks. It allows the model to find relevant information in the IR to fill the blanks and vice versa. The tokens at the beginning of the sequence are given token embeddings corresponding to the source code language, and the next tokens (corresponding to the IR) are given the language embeddings of the IR.

$$\mathcal{L}_{TLM} = \mathcal{L}_{CE} \left( mask(x|z^{(x)}), x|z^{(x)} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

Translation Auto-Encoding (TAE). The translation auto-encoding (TAE) objective is a generalization of the TLM objective to auto-encoding. Here, we add noise and masks on the source code and its corresponding IRs and concatenate the two modified sequences. Like for TLM, we make sure that the token embeddings of each token correspond to whether it is a token from the IR or from the source code.

$$\mathcal{L}_{TAE} = \mathcal{L}_{MT} \left( noise(x)|noise(z^{(x)}), x|z^{(x)} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

IR Generation (MT). We use machine translation (MT) steps to learn to generate LLVM IRs from the corresponding source code. Basically we train a model to compile into IR. The goal is to make the encoder learn representations of the source code based on the semantics contained in the IR.

$$\mathcal{L}_{IRGen} = \mathcal{L}_{MT} \left( x, z^{(x)} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

These objectives require parallel data of code and corresponding IRs. Since we could only compile a fraction of the functions and files, we also train our models on the full monolingual data using the MLM and AE objectives described above. In this setup, the back-translation (BT) objective is the same as in [Roziere et al., 2020].
6 Results

6.1 Experimental details

For TransCoder, we consider a sequence-to-sequence (seq2seq) transformer model [Vaswani et al., 2017] with attention [Bahdanau et al., 2015, Sutskever et al., 2014] Our model has 12 layers (6 in the encoder and 6 in the decoder), 8 attention heads, and a hidden dimension of 1024. For the objectives that add noise and masks to the input sentence, such as MLM, TLM, AE, and TAE, we choose the masked tokens and noise randomly on the fly at each epoch. We mask 15% of the tokens in MLM and TLM. In AE and TAE, we mask 20% and drop 10% of the tokens. MLM is trained on streams of data, while the other objectives are trained at function level. We use the Adam optimizer [Kingma and Ba, 2015] and an inverse squared-root learning rate scheduler, with an initial learning rate of $10^{-5}$ in most of our experiments. Our models are implemented in PyTorch using half-precision floats. The pre-trained models were trained until convergence. The translation models presented in Tables 3 and 4 were trained for a week on 32 NVIDIA V100 GPUs.

6.2 Decompilation

We tried two separate configurations for decompilation: a shared decoder with 6 layers for all language / IR pairs, or four separate decoders of with two layers each (one per language). Using a shared decoder improves the performance for all languages, and particularly when the data is scarce (e.g. Rust). See results in Table 2.

As a baseline, we use RetDec [Kroustek et al., 2017] that is a standard tool to decompile LLVM IR language to C. It obtains a computational accuracy (see Section 4.3) of 38.1 on our C++ dataset and a BLEU score of 8.54, which is far below our model that obtains a computational accuracy of 77.9 and a BLEU score of 63.6 in the same setting. In general, the computation accuracy of the rule-based methods is lower because they fail to decompile many of the files.

Table 2: Performance of LLVM IRs Decompilation. This table shows the computational accuracy (CA@1) of our neural decompiler and the RetDec C++ rule-based decompiler. Our neural decompiler outperforms RedDec on C++ and is more broadly applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C++</th>
<th>Go</th>
<th>Java</th>
<th>Rust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline - RetDec</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Decoders</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Decoder</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Translation

We compare our results to the performance of a TransCoder [Roziere et al., 2020] MLM model trained on the same dataset. Our new TLM, TAE, and IR generation (MT) objectives are able to use the IR to improve the semantic representations of the model. As shown on Table 3, they lead to improved performances compared to the TransCoder baseline (pre-trained with MLM) when translating from and to any of our four languages. In average, the improvement reaches 4.4% points, or an 11% relative improvement. They are especially useful in the low data regime: with relative improvements reaching 19.3% when translating to Rust and 25.6% when translating from it. Qualitatively, it helps the model translate types correctly when the source and target types are represented by different tokens (e.g. `int` and `i32` in Figure 1) and to better translate the actual semantics of the input function. Improving code representations using the IR with the TLM, TAE and MT objectives leads to models that are just as simple to use as TransCoder: computing the IR is not required at test time and the model generates the translation directly from the source function.

Pivot translation achieves non-trivial performances for translating to and from any language. The IR is computed using a compiler, and the model only needs to generate code in the target language from the IR. Hence, the IR pivot performs relatively well when translating from low-resource to high-resource languages (e.g. from Rust), and badly when translating to low-resource languages (e.g. to Rust). However, the methods using IRs to improve code representations outperform the IR pivot method, even for translating to Rust.
Table 3: Translation performance (CA@1). See Table in the appendix for more detailed results. All combinations of the TLM, MLM and TAE objectives improve the performance of the model. Our best results are obtained when using all three at the same time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>from C++</th>
<th>to C++</th>
<th>from Go</th>
<th>to Go</th>
<th>from Java</th>
<th>to Java</th>
<th>from Rust</th>
<th>to Rust</th>
<th>AVG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransCoder (baseline)</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR Pivot</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLM + TAE</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM + TAE</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLM + MT</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM + MT</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM + TAE + MT</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Discussion

Pivot vs Embedding TransCoder is an unsupervised model that learns to align code representations and translate code from one language into another. It does not use the IRs for translation. The pivot method uses automatically generated parallel sentences to learn to decompile IRs, and back-translation to adapt to different IR dialects. It performs relatively well when little data is available for the source language, because the IR can be computed using a rule-based compiler. However, it requires to compute IRs at test time, which can be cumbersome. This method learns to translate using only IR-level similarities, and does not use the source code itself to learn to translate. Adding the TLM, TAE, and MT objectives to the objectives generally used for unsupervised code translation allows the model to get the best of both worlds. It can learn multilingual representations of source code from similarities in the IR and in the source code itself, and outperforms both TransCoder and the pivot. At the same time, this model does not require to compute IRs at test time, and is as easy to use as TransCoder. Using both types of input allows our model to outperform both TransCoder and the pivot method, as shown in Table (last row).

Different IR and interpreted languages The four languages considered in this work have front-ends that can output LLVM Intermediate Representation. LLVM presently covers more than 30 computer languages. Using IR as pivot requires that the source and destination language have front-ends that use the same IR. This rules out some widely-used languages (e.g. Python). Using the IR to improve embeddings is less restrictive: the source and destination language can be trained on different IR, and aligned with back-translation. In this paper, we focus on compiled languages, but it is important to note that Intermediate Representations are usually available for interpreted languages as well: modern interpreters translate the source code into byte-code, that can serve as an IR.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we leverage LLVM IRs to improve neural machine translation for source code. The IR provides a common semantically-rich language, into which C++, Go, Java and Rust code can all be compiled. We develop three objectives, designed to leverage IRs for better multilingual representations of source code, which lead to a 11% relative average improvement for code translation. We also show that sequence-to-sequence transformers perform well for neural decompilation, and use this for pivot translation.

We only worked with the LLVM IR, but our approach is broadly applicable to any pair of languages that share a common Intermediate Representation. More generally any IR can help improve the code representations by tying them to the semantics. Another limitation is the scale of our current source and target sequences. As future work, LLVM IRs could be generated at a larger scale by compiling entire projects, which would greatly improve the percentage of successful IR compilations in Table. More languages and IRs could be used, and those extensions could be powered by larger models.
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A  Full Scores Table

Table 4: Results on unsupervised code translation. The metric shown is the computational accuracy for a single generation (CA@1), measuring the translation correctness using unit tests. It is the full version of Table 3. The models were all trained with the same budget. Although it is not the case for every language pair, TransCoder-IR, which uses the TLM, TAE, and MT objectives outperforms other methods on average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C++ → Go</th>
<th>C++ → Java</th>
<th>C++ → Rust</th>
<th>Go → C++</th>
<th>Go → Java</th>
<th>Go → Rust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (MLM)</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pivot</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLM + TAE</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM + TAE</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLM + MT</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM + MT</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM + TAE + MT</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Java → C++</th>
<th>Java → Go</th>
<th>Java → Rust</th>
<th>Rust → C++</th>
<th>Rust → Go</th>
<th>Rust → Java</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline (MLM)</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pivot</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLM + TAE</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM + TAE</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLM + MT</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM + MT</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLM + TAE + MT</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B  Translation Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input function (C++)</th>
<th>LLVM IR</th>
<th>Decompilation code (C++)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>int max(int a, int b){</td>
<td>define i32 @&quot;max&quot;(i32 %a, i32 %b)</td>
<td>int max(int a, int b){</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for (int i = 0; i &lt; 10; ++i)</td>
<td>local_unnamed_addr #0 {</td>
<td>return a &gt; b ? a : b;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a = 2 * a + a;</td>
<td>bb1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c = b</td>
<td>%cmp = icmp sgt i32 %a, %b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>return a - b + c &gt; b ? a : b ;</td>
<td>%cond = select i1 %cmp, i32 %a, i32 %b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>}</td>
<td>ret i32 %cond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bool is_even(int n){</td>
<td>define dso_local zeroext</td>
<td>bool is_even(int n){</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>}</td>
<td>i1 = &quot;is_even&quot;(i32 %0)</td>
<td>return false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>return n &amp; 1 == 0;</td>
<td>local_unnamed_addr #0 {</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>}</td>
<td>ret i1 false</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long multiplyBySeven(long n){</td>
<td>define dso_local</td>
<td>long multiplyBySeven(long n){</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>}</td>
<td>i64 = &quot;multiplyBySeven&quot;(i64 %0)</td>
<td>return n * 7;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>return ((n &lt;&lt; 3) - n);</td>
<td>local_unnamed_addr #0 {</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>}</td>
<td>%x = mul i64 %0, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ret i64 %x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Code simplification examples with Decompilation / Pivot. Since the LLVM IR is optimized, functions that are semantically equivalent after optimization map to the same IR. In the first example, it allows to remove useless code by decompiling the generated LLVM IR. In the second example, the simplification allows to find a bug: the & operator has precedence over == in C++, causing this function to always evaluate to false. It is not obvious when looking at the input code, but becomes clear with the IR and simplified C++ code. In the third example, it replaces a bitwise operation by a more straightforward multiplication. In all examples, we can run the compiler again to check that the IR of the decompiled code is exactly the same as that of the input. It guarantees that the input and simplified code have the same semantics.
### Java to Rust translation examples

In the first example, the IR allows the model to understand that the Java bitwise complement operator `~` should be replaced by `!` in Rust. Also, it allows the model to translate the type correctly in both examples and avoids unnecessary casts. The IR allows the model to generate the right types (e.g. `i32` instead of `u32` when translating `int`) and operator (e.g. `!` instead of `~` in Rust).

### Rust to Go translation example

This function performs binary search to find the insertion index for an element in an ordered vector. The model translates types, function definitions, variable definitions, and while loops correctly.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input function</th>
<th>TransCoder</th>
<th>TransCoder-IR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Java</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>static int addOne ( int x ) { return ( - ( - x ) ) ; }</td>
<td>fn add_one ( x : int ) -&gt; int { ( - ( - x ) as int) }</td>
<td>fn add_one ( x : i32 ) -&gt; i32 { (- ( ! x)) }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Java</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>static boolean isEven int n){ return ( n % 2 == 0 );}</td>
<td>fn is_even ( n : u32 ) -&gt; bool { ( n % 2 == 0 ) as bool }</td>
<td>fn is_even ( n : i32 ) -&gt; bool { ( n % 2 == 0 ) }</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pub fn binary_search(nums: Vec&lt;i32&gt;, target: i32) -&gt; i32 { if nums.is_empty() { return 0 } if target &lt; nums[0] { return 0 } let mut left = 0; let mut right = nums.len() - 1; while left &lt;= right { let mid = left + (right - left) / 2; if nums[mid] == target { return mid as i32; } else if nums[mid] &lt; target { left = mid + 1; } else { right = mid - 1; } } return left as i32; }</td>
<td>func binarySearch(nums[] int, target int) int { if len(nums) == 0 { return 0 } if target &lt; nums[0] { return 0 } left: = 0 right: = len(nums) - 1 for left &lt;= right { mid: = left + (right - left) / 2 if nums[mid] == target { return mid } else if nums[mid] &lt; target { left: = mid + 1 } else { right: = mid - 1 } } return left }</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Figure 8: Go to C++ translation example. This function computes the number of pairs of elements that sum to a given target in a sorted and rotated array. Our TransCoder-IR model translates it correctly.
Input function

```rust
// Rust
divide function get_max_repetitions(s1: String,
    n1: i32,
    s2: String,
    n2: i32,
) -> i32 {
    if n1 == 0 {
        return 0;
    }
    let mut indices = vec![0; n1 as usize + 1];
    let mut counts = vec![0; n1 as usize + 1];
    let mut index = 0;
    let mut count = 0;
    for i in 1..=n1 as usize {
        for j in 0..=s1.len() {
            if s1.as_bytes()[j] == s2.as_bytes()[index] {
                index += 1;
            }
        }
        if index == s2.len() {
            index = 0;
            count += 1;
        }
        counts[i] = count;
        indices[i] = index;
    }
    counts[n1 as usize] / n2
}
```

Translated function

```go
// Go
func getMaxRepetitions(s1 string,
    n1 int,
    s2 string,
    n2 int,
) int {
    if n1 == 0 {
        return 0
    }
    indices := make([]int, n1 + 1)
    counts := make([]int, n1 + 1)
    index := 0
    count := 0
    for i := 1;
        for j := 0;
            if s1[j] == s2[index] {
                index++
            }
        if index == len(s2) {
            index = 0
            count++
        }
        counts[i] = count
        indices[i] = index
    for k := 0;
        if indices[k] == index {
            preCount := counts[k]
            patternCount := int(n1 - k)
            remainCount := counts[k + (n1 - k) % (i - k)]
            remainCount
            return (preCount + patternCount + remainCount) / n2
        }
    count[n1 as usize] / n2
    return counts[n1] / n2
}
```

Figure 9: Rust to Go translation example. We call S1 the string \( s1 \) repeated \( n1 \) times and S2 the string \( s2 \) repeated \( n2 \) times. This function finds the largest number of repetitions of S2 appearing in any subset of S1. The model translates the types correctly, understands that casting vector indices to unsigned int (i.e. with `as usize`) is not required in Go, and correctly translates other Rust constructs to Go.