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ABSTRACT

 Compared to other programming languages (e.g., Java), Python has more idioms to make Python code concise and efficient. Although pythonic idioms are well accepted in the Python community, Python programmers are often faced with many challenges in using them, for example, being unaware of certain pythonic idioms or do not know how to use them properly. Based on an analysis of 7,638 Python repositories on GitHub, we find that non-idiomatic Python code that can be implemented with pythonic idioms occurs frequently and widely. Unfortunately, there is no tool for automatically refactoring such non-idiomatic code into idiomatic code. In this paper, we design and implement an automatic refactoring tool to make Python code idiomatic. We identify nine pythonic idioms by systematically contrasting the abstract syntax grammar of Python and Java. Then we define the syntactic patterns for detecting non-idiomatic code for each pythonic idiom. Finally, we devise atomic AST-rewriting operations and refactoring steps to refactor non-idiomatic code into idiomatic code. We test and review over 4,115 refactorings applied to 1,065 Python projects from GitHub, and submit 90 pull requests for the 90 randomly sampled refactorings to 84 projects. These evaluations confirm the high-accuracy, practicality and usefulness of our refactoring tool on real-world Python code. Our refactoring tool can be accessed at 47.242.131.128:5000.
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1 INTRODUCTION

 Programming (or code) idioms are widely present in programming languages [17]. They represent notable programming styles and features of a programming language. Python is well known for its pythonic idioms [46, 61]. Many books and online materials [29, 41, 44, 46, 54, 58] promote the use of pythonic idioms for not only concise coding styles but also improved performance (see Table 1 for examples). In spite of the benefits of pythonic idioms and the availability of many online materials, our investigation of some highly viewed Python questions on Stack Overflow suggests that developers are often unaware of pythonic idioms or do not know when and how to use pythonic idioms properly (see the examples in Table 4 and the analysis in Section 2.2).

Due to these challenges in using pythonic idioms, developers may implement a functionality in a non-idiomatic way without using pythonic idioms. Table 1 shows some examples. We study 7,638 Python projects on GitHub (see Section 2.2) and find that non-idiomatic code that can be implemented with pythonic idioms is widely present at the repository, file, method and statement level (see Table 2). Non-idiomatic code and idiomatic code co-exist in many repositories, files or even methods. As seen in Table 1, non-idiomatic code syntax is similar to those of other mainstream programming languages (e.g., Java). In contrast, pythonic idioms have “uncommon” syntax. Developers, even those with little Python programming experience, can still write non-idiomatic code. However, to use pythonic idioms, they would need to learn new syntax or need some tool supports.

Although online documentation of pythonic idioms provide rich learning materials, they cannot directly support programming with pythonic idioms. To the best of our knowledge, only two tools provide limited support for using pythonic idioms. Among the nine pythonic idioms in Table 1, Pylint [1] can detect two types of non-idiomatic code which can be refactored into chain-comparison and truth-value-test respectively. However, it offers only a simple refactoring suggestion which may not be intuitive to developers. For example, for the code “a < 0 and b > 1 and c < 1 and d > 2”, Pylint suggests “Simplify chained comparison between the operands”\(^1\). Unfortunately, the developer did not understand this suggestion initially. When Pylint developer further explained that the code can be refactored into “a < 0 and b > 1 > c and d > 2”, the developer understood what to do and left a comment “Would it be an idea for Pylint to output the suggested refactoer to the user?” which received thumbs up by other developers. Teddy [51] collects 58 non-idiomatic code fragments and corresponding 55 idiomatic code (three pythonic idioms list-comprehension, set-comprehension and truth-value-test overlap with 9 idioms in Table 1). It detects non-idiomatic code similar to the collected 58 examples and recommends corresponding idiomatic code examples. Developers still have to manually refactor the non-idiomatic code.

\(^1\)https://github.com/PyCQA/pylint/issues/5800
In this paper, we develop the first automatic refactoring tool that detects 9 types of non-idiomatic code (referred to as anti-idiom code smells) and rewriters these anti-idiom code smells into idiomatic code implementing the same functionalities. Existing work [30, 31, 36, 46, 57] mines recurring code idioms from source code or relies on books that include many idioms that are not unique to Python. To identify unique pythonic idioms, we contrast the language syntax of Python and the other mainstream programming language (Java in this work). This is inspired by the observation that non-idiomatic code syntax is similar to those of other languages but idiomatic code has unique syntax. Our analysis identifies 9 types of pythonic idioms (see Table 1). We confirm the validity of these pythonic idioms through the Python language specification and online materials [41, 44, 58]. For each pythonic idiom, we define syntactic patterns for detecting non-idiomatic code fragments that implement the same functionality as the pythonic idiom. Following the refactoring principle (one small step at a time) [37], we formulate four atomic AST rewriting operations and compose these atomic operations for each pythonic idiom for refactoring anti-idiom code with the corresponding pythonic idiom.

To evaluate the code smell detection and refactoring accuracy of our approach, we apply our tool to 7,638 Python projects which detects and reractors over 2,252,022 anti-idiom code smells. We verify the refactoring results by both testing and code review. Our approach achieves 100% smell detection accuracy for six idioms and 100% refactoring accuracy for eight idioms. It makes only a few rare detection errors and only one refactoring error due to the limitation of Python static analysis and the complex program logic. To explore the usefulness of our code refactoring tool in practice, we randomly sample 10 refactorings respectively for each pythonic idiom for refactoring anti-idiom code with the corresponding pythonic idiom.

In summary, this paper makes the following contributions:

- To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to automatically detect non-idiomatic code and refactor it into idiomatic code for 9 widely used pythonic idioms.
- Through the evaluation on a large number of real-world Python projects, we confirm the high accuracy, practicality and usefulness of our refactoring tool.
- Our work creates the first large-scale dataset of anti-idiom code smells and corresponding idiomatic code for studying and validating the claims and concerns about pythonic idioms.

## 2 FORMATIVE STUDY AND Motivation

We conduct an empirical study of pythonic coding practices to answer the following three research questions:

### RQ1: What are the benefits of pythonic idioms?

### RQ2: What are the coding practices concerning pythonic idioms and anti-idiom code smells?

### RQ3: What are the challenges for writing idiomatic code?

#### 2.1 RQ1: The Benefits of Pythonic Idioms

Compared with other mainstream programming languages, Python supports more idioms which are highly valued by Python developers [29]. By referring to several resources (i.e., books, presentations and websites) about pythonic idioms [13, 21, 29, 41, 44, 46, 54, 58], we summarize the key benefits of pythonic idioms: conciseness (i.e., fewer lines or fewer tokens) and performance. To help readers understand these two benefits, we summarize in Table 1 the code examples of idiomatic code and the corresponding non-idiomatic code (i.e., anti-idiom code smell) for each pythonic idiom excerpted from the reference resources. We also excerpt relevant performance descriptions. We omit conciseness related descriptions as code conciseness can be observed intuitively from code examples.

To confirm the performance benefit, we use the timeit package [23] to record the execution time of idiomatic and non-idiomatic code snippets shown in Table 1. We execute each code snippet three times repeatedly and take the average execution time. We divide the execution time of non-idiomatic code by that of corresponding idiomatic code which indicates how much speedup idiomatic code has compared with non-idiomatic code. As shown in the fifth column of Table 1, idiomatic code has about 1.09–2.07x speedup. We acknowledge this is only an anecdotal experiment. Many online resources [10, 29] argue pythonic idioms (e.g., list comprehension) may achieve significant performance advantages over non-idiomatic code, but they generally do not provide specific empirical evidences. This calls for more systematic investigation of such performance claims which is beyond the scope of this work.

#### Table 1: Pythonic idioms: conciseness and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idiom Target</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Anti-idiom code smell</th>
<th>Idiomatic code</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Compre-</td>
<td>performance benefits to using a list comprehension [11, 29, 44]</td>
<td>t = [1 for i in range(10000)] append(k)</td>
<td>t = [1 for i in range(10000)]</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Compre-</td>
<td>simpsons.set(set) for word in chars: simpsons.set.add(word)</td>
<td>b = {v: k for k, v in a.items()}</td>
<td>b = {v: k for k, v in a.items()}</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dict Compre-</td>
<td>use a dict comprehension to build a dict clearly and efficiently [7, 29, 44]</td>
<td>a = b =&gt; c and d =&gt; f</td>
<td>a = b =&gt; c and d =&gt; f</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Compa-</td>
<td>can have a positive effect on performance [5, 6, 44]</td>
<td>a = b =&gt; c and d =&gt; f</td>
<td>a = b =&gt; c and d =&gt; f</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth Value</td>
<td>can make your code more efficient... [24, 25, 28]</td>
<td>as if [!pass]</td>
<td>as if [!pass]</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Else</td>
<td>an efficient for loop implementation [12, 41]</td>
<td>finishedForLoop = True for x in range(2, n): finishForLoop = False else: pass</td>
<td>for x in range(2, n): finishedForLoop = True for x in range(2, n): finishForLoop = False else: pass</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign Multi-</td>
<td>speed up and shorten your code is to assign the variables in your program at the same time [2–4]</td>
<td>a = 2 b = 3 c = 5 d = 7</td>
<td>a, b, c, d = 2, 3, 5, 7</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ple Targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star in Func</td>
<td>unpacking is faster than accessing by index [3, 22]</td>
<td>s = sum(values[0], values[1])</td>
<td>s = sum(“values”)</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Multiple</td>
<td>accessing by index slow things down compared to for loop item unpacking [8, 5]</td>
<td>for item in sales: for i in range(10000): t = [i for i in range(10000)]</td>
<td>for item in sales: for i in range(10000): t = [i for i in range(10000)]</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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We then detect the occurrence of idiomatic code and the anti-idiom code smells. Table 2: Python coding practices with respect to pythonic idioms and anti-idiom code smells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idiom</th>
<th>Repository</th>
<th>File</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Comprehension</td>
<td>8514</td>
<td>5198</td>
<td>1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Comprehension</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4939</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dict Comprehension</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Comprehension</td>
<td>4344</td>
<td>2090</td>
<td>2522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth-Val Test</td>
<td>5888</td>
<td>8590</td>
<td>3728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Else</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign Multi Targets</td>
<td>2721</td>
<td>4074</td>
<td>4088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star in Func Call</td>
<td>2336</td>
<td>4185</td>
<td>1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Multi</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3392</td>
<td>1832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Statistics of pythonic idioms and anti-idiom code smells at the statement level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idiom</th>
<th>Non-idiomatic</th>
<th>Idiomatic</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Comprehension</td>
<td>15096</td>
<td>19016</td>
<td>34112</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Comprehension</td>
<td>10595</td>
<td>9719</td>
<td>20314</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dict Comprehension</td>
<td>58311</td>
<td>26913</td>
<td>85224</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Comparison</td>
<td>197603</td>
<td>1293359</td>
<td>149108</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth-Val Test</td>
<td>104893</td>
<td>129706</td>
<td>234600</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Else</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>5552</td>
<td>7196</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign Multi Targets</td>
<td>1984165</td>
<td>50700</td>
<td>203165</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star in Func Call</td>
<td>17448</td>
<td>90293</td>
<td>107741</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Multi Targets</td>
<td>8490</td>
<td>127906</td>
<td>136396</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: The usage of pythonic idioms and anti-idiom code smells in repositories, files and methods.

2.2 RQ2: Python Coding Practices

2.2.1 Data Preparation. To understand the coding practices with respect to pythonic idioms and anti-idiom code smells, we crawl the top 10,000 repositories using Python by the number of stars from GitHub. 7,638 repositories can be successfully parsed using Python 3. We collect 506,765 Python source files from these repositories. We then detect the occurrence of idiomatic code and the anti-idiom code that can be refactored with pythonic idioms in these Python source files. All nine pythonic idioms can be detected by analyzing abstract syntax trees (ASTs). List/set/dict-comprehension and loop-less idioms directly correspond to AST nodes, we can detect such idiom code instances. For star-in-function-call, we extract the returned top 30 questions and summarize the challenges in writing idiomatic code. For instance, developers are surprised when they see Python can make comparison for more than two operands.2

2.3 RQ3: Challenges in Writing Idiomatic Code

We examine Stack Overflow questions to understand the challenges in writing idiomatic code. We search the questions for each pythonic idiom using the “python” tag and the pythonic idiom name. We examine the returned top 30 questions and summarize the challenges in using pythonic idioms in the discussions. We summarize

---

2https://stackoverflow.com/questions/26592775/simplify-chained-comparison
three key challenges. Table 4 shows some representative examples. Many questions have very high view counts which indicate common information needs. The #C column lists the challenge index as discussed below. One question may involve several challenges. However, we observe that the three challenges have a progressive relationship. For example, when developers do not know the meaning of an idiom, they would also further ask how to use the idiom correctly. Therefore, we list only the most fundamental challenge.

(1) Developers do not know certain pythonic idioms. For example, for the dict-comprehension idiom (the 4th row in Table 4), the developer knows list comprehension but he/she does not know whether he/she can initialize dictionary in a similar way. The question has been viewed about 1,000,000 times. Although it was asked 12 years ago, it was still actively discussed about 1 month ago (as of this paper writing). Idioms in Python are more than those in other mainstream languages [29], which brings challenges for developers to learn and write idiomatic Python code.

(2) Developers know certain pythonic idioms but they do not understand what the idioms can do. Consider the question for using asterisk operator “*” in the function call (the second last row in Table 4) which has been viewed about 234,000 times. The developer notices a single asterisk (zip(*)x) can be used before a parameter in function calls, but he/she does not know what this means and what it can be used for. Actually, the “*” is to unpack x into multiple arguments. Knowing what an idiom can be used for is the pre-requisite for using it in practice.

(3) Developers know what a pythonic idiom can do but they do not know how to use them properly. The 2nd row of Table 4 shows such an example. The developer wants to refactor a list initialization using list comprehension. Unfortunately, he/she does not know whether and how if-else statement can be used in the list-comprehension idiom. The question has been viewed about 165,000 times. In fact, list-comprehension has complex syntax and it may nest multiple loops and multiple if statements. Developers have to read and understand this complex syntax in order to use the list-comprehension idiom properly.

It has been generally accepted that pythonic idioms result in concise code and improve runtime performance. However, non-idiomatic code that can be refactored with pythonic idioms is widely present in real world projects and is often mix-used with idiomatic code. This could be caused by the fact that developers are often unaware of pythonic idioms or do not know when and how to use pythonic idioms properly. Although there are rich learning materials about pythonic idioms, there are no effective tools to assist developers in writing idiomatic code and to enforce the consistent use of pythonic idioms in practice.

3 OUR APPROACH

We now present our refactoring tool for improving idiomatic coding practices. Figure 2 shows the three steps for designing and implementing our refactoring tool. These three steps answer three technical questions respectively: 1) how to identify programming idioms unique to Python; 2) how to detect anti-idiom code that can be implemented in pythonic idioms; 3) how to refactor non-idiomatic code with pythonic idioms in a systematic and extensible way. Rather than relying on mining code patterns or personal programming experience, our solution is built on the effective analysis of Python language syntax and specification.

3.1 Identifying Unique Pythonic Idioms

A programming idiom can be regarded as a micro-level code pattern. Mining programming idioms in code [30, 31, 46, 57] may identify a wide range of code patterns, including not only pythonic idioms but also many generic code patterns and API usage patterns. As online materials [29, 41, 44, 46, 54, 58] about idiomatic code usually mention only some popular pythonic idioms (e.g., list-comprehension,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Challenges in writing idiomatic Python code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idiom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dict Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth Value Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign Multiple Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star in Func Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Multiple Targets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Approach overview
truth-value-test and enumerate function) repeatedly based on personal programming experience, collecting pythonic idioms from online materials is ad-hoc and may miss important pythonic idioms.

In this work, our goal is to not only identify pythonic idioms but also analyze these idioms to design the methods for detecting and refactoring non-idiomatic code in a systematic manner. Therefore, we resort to Python language syntax and specification. We observe that non-idiomatic code share the common or similar syntax as other mainstream programming languages, while pythonic idioms have unique syntax. Based on this observation, we identify unique pythonic idioms by contrasting Python syntax and the syntax of the other programming language. In this work, we choose Java due to its popularity and syntactic similarity to Python.

We examine each syntactic construct of Python in Python language specification [18], and check whether there is some similar syntactic construct(s) in Java. For similar syntactic constructs, we further compare and analyze the differences of the syntax grammars between Python and Java. We consider the following four cases as candidate pythonic idioms:

1. **Python supports new syntactic constructs which do not exist in Java.** This includes four syntactic constructs: ListComp, SetComp, DictComp and Starred which correspond to four idioms, list comprehension, set comprehension, dictionary comprehension and single asterisk operator. The list/set/dict-comprehension create iterable object with one line of code [14, 15]. The single asterisk operator is usually used to unpack the an iterable into positional arguments inside a function call (star-in-func-call) [16]. We also identify several other new constructs, such as Yield, With and GeneratorExp. However, it is very inconvenient to implement the same functionality as these new constructs in a non-idiomatic way. As such, the Yield-, With- or GeneratorExp-equivalent non-idiomatic code is too complex to safely refactor. Therefore, we do not consider Yield, With and GeneratorExp in this work.

2. **Python syntax adds new nodes.** Python and Java have the same syntactic construct, but Python syntax adds new nodes to extend its functionality. This includes the Loop construct which consists of the For and While statement. For example, the For statement of Python adds orelse node (i.e., the loop-else idiom). The orelse node is executed after the loop iterator is exhausted, unless the loop ends prematurely due to a break statement [44].

3. **Python syntax adds new elements.** Python and Java have the same syntactic construct, but Python syntax supports more elements [18]. This includes the Assign statement with multiple targets (the assign-multi-targets idiom), the ChainComp with multiple operators (the chain-comparison idiom), and the For statement with multiple targets (the for-multi-targets idiom). For example, the assignment statement of Python allows multiple variables to be assigned simultaneously. A useful scenario for assign-multi-targets is to swap variables without creating temporary variables.

4. **Python syntax supports more comprehensive data type.** Python and Java have the same syntactic construct, but Python supports objects of more data types. This includes the truth-value-testing idiom [26, 44]. In Python, any object (e.g., string, numeric type and sequences) can be directly tested for truth value. For example, we can directly check if a variable “a” of list data type is empty with “if not a” instead of “if a == []”.

Table 1 lists the nine pythonic idioms we identify and the code examples of idiomatic code and corresponding non-idiomatic code. For each identified pythonic idiom, we read Python language specification to confirm its validity. We also search online materials with the idiom names to support our analysis. Searching with specific idiom names can find relevant supporting documentation. However, searching “python idiom” generally return many materials which do not cover all nine types of pythonic idioms.

### 3.2 Detecting Anti-idiom Code Smells

For each pythonic idiom, we define syntactic patterns for implementing the pythonic idioms in a non-idiomatic way. Contrasting Python and Java syntax provides the basis for defining such patterns. In a sense, we try to implement a pythonic idiom in a Java-style Python code pattern. The defined syntactic patterns can detect anti-idiom code smells that can be refactored with pythonic idioms. Table 5 lists our detection rules and illustrative examples.

#### 3.2.1 List/Set/Dict Comprehension

The list-comprehension idiom is used for the list initialization (2nd row in Table 5). The rule first finds an empty assignment statement stmt1 (e.g., “dblist = [ ]”). Then, it finds a for statement stmt2 which iteratively adds elements to the target (”dblist”) of stmt1. There cannot be other statements using the target “dblist” of stmt1 between stmt1 and stmt2 to list the “dblist” is modified (i.e., isNotUse(stmt1, target, stmt1, stmt2)). Since the stmt2 corresponds to the comp node of the ListComp construct which only supports for clause and if clause, the rule checks whether stmt2 satisfies the MatchCompre condition, i.e., if the stmt2 corresponds to the syntax grammar of Comprehension. The detect rule for the non-idiomatic code of the set-comprehension and the dict-comprehension idiom are the same.

#### 3.2.2 Chain Comparison

The chain-comparison “a op1 b op2 c ... y opn z” is equivalent to “a op1 b and b op2 c and ... y opn z” [19]. The non-idiomatic code of the chain comparison must be a BoolOp and expression which contains at least two compare nodes. Moreover, the two compare nodes have the same operands. For example, for the expression “cp >= 178208 and cp <= 183983” (3rd row in Table 5), the cp is the common operand of the two compare nodes, and the expression can be refactored as “183983 <= cp <= 178208”.

#### 3.2.3 Truth Value Test

The truth-value-test idiom is used for checking the “truthiness” of an object. Generally, when developers want to compare whether an object is equal or is not equal to a value, many programming languages use “==” or “!” operator to achieve the functionality. In Python, any object can be directly tested for truth value, so developers do not need to use “==” or “!” operator to test truth value. Python documentation specify the built-in objects in EmptySet (e.g., [] and set()) are considered as false value. Therefore, if a statement directly compares an object to the element of EmptySet, it will be regarded as a non-idiomatic code of the truth value test. However, not all compare nodes are refactorable with truth value test. For example, “a!=[ ]” in “return a!=[]” cannot be refactored because “return a” changes the code semantic. According to Python syntax, the non-idiomatic code of truth value test corresponds to a test-type node. Therefore, our rule checks whether a compare node is the child of a test-type node, for example, the “runs([ ]) == []” is the child of an if-node “if runs([ ]) == []” (4th row...
Table 5: Examples of detection and refactoring of anti-idiom code smells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idiom</th>
<th>Detection Rules and Examples of Code Pairs</th>
<th>Refactoring Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| List/ Set/ Dict Comprehension | $P = \{ \text{stmt} \mid \text{stmts} \}$ where $\text{stmt} = \text{Assign} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ or $\text{dict} = \{ \}$ | 1: $\text{comp}=\text{Create}(\text{ListComp} \mid \text{SetComp} \mid \text{DictComp})$
| | $\text{stmts}.\text{body} = \text{Expr}(\text{expr}) \land \text{stmt} = \text{If}$ | 2: $\text{IfStmt}(\text{stmt}, \text{stmts})$
| | $\text{stmts} = \{ \} \land \text{stmt} = \text{If}$ | 3: $\text{IfStmt}(\text{stmts}, \text{stmt})$
| | $\text{stmts} = \{ \} \land \text{stmt} = \text{Assign}$ | 4: $\text{Assign}(\text{stmt}, \text{stmts})$
| | $\text{stmts} = \{ \} \land \text{stmt} = \text{If}$ | 5: $\text{Assign}(\text{stmt}, \text{stmts}, \text{comp})$
| | $\text{stmts} = \{ \} \land \text{stmt} = \text{Assign}$ | Else |
| | $\text{stmts} = \{ \} \land \text{stmt} = \text{If}$ | 7: $\text{Replace}([\text{stmt}, \text{stmts}], \text{comp})$
| | $\text{stmts} = \{ \} \land \text{stmt} = \text{Assign}$ | 8: $\text{Remove}(\text{stmts})$
| | $\text{stmts} = \{ \} \land \text{stmt} = \text{If}$ | Else |
| | $\text{stmts} = \{ \} \land \text{stmt} = \text{Assign}$ | 9: $\text{Replace}(\text{P}, \text{comp})$
| | $\text{stmts} = \{ \} \land \text{stmt} = \text{If}$ | Get empty node which belongs to EmptySet from $\{\text{p.left}, \text{p.comparators[0]}\}$ |
| Truth Value Test | | 10: $\text{Copy}(\text{empty node}, \text{index(node.operand)})$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{And} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | Else |
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Or} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 12: $\text{Remove}(\text{stmts})$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Not} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | Else |
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 14: $\text{Else if} \text{c then}$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 15: $\text{Copy}([\text{stmt}, \text{stmts}], \text{index(stmts)})$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | Else if $\text{c then}$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 17: $\text{Copy}([\text{stmt}, \text{stmts}], \text{index(stmts)})$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 18: $\text{Else}$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 19: $\text{Copy}([\text{stmt}, \text{stmts}], \text{index(stmts)})$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 20: $\text{Copy}([\text{stmt}, \text{stmts}], \text{index(stmts)})$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 21: $\text{Remove}(\text{stmts})$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 22: $\text{value} = \text{Create}(\text{Tuple})$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 23: $\text{Traversing P to copy its children to out}
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 24: $\text{Replace}(\text{stmts}, \text{value})$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 25: $\text{targets} = \text{Create}(\text{Tuple})$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 26: $\text{Traversing P to copy its children to targets}$
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 27: Replace([stmts, targets], targets)
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | For i from 2 to n do
| | $\text{stmt} = \text{Eq} \land \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 29: $\text{Remove}(\text{stmts})$
| | Star in Func Call | | 30: $\text{value} = \text{Create}(\text{Tuple})$
| | $P = \{ \text{stmt} \mid \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 31: $\text{Traversing P to copy its children to out}
| | | 32: $\text{Replace}(\text{stmts}, \text{value})$
| | | 33: $\text{targets} = \text{Create}(\text{Tuple})$
| | | 34: $\text{Traversing P to copy its children to targets}$
| | | 35: Replace([stmts, targets], targets)
| | | For i from 2 to n do
| | | 36: $\text{Remove}(\text{stmts})$
| | For Multiple Targets | | 37: Getting a variable mapping pair Map, where each element consists of a original variable and a new variable
| | $P = \{ \text{stmt} \mid \text{stmts} = \{ \}$ | 38: $\text{target} = \text{Create}(\text{Tuple})$
| | | 39: $\text{Map}(\text{P})$
| | | 40: $\text{Map}(\text{P})$

P represents non-idiomatic code, other variables representations come from Python documentation of abstract syntax grammar [16], e.g., Assign represents the Assign statement; $\text{EmptySet} = \{ \text{None, False, 0, 0.0, 0j, Decimal(0), Fraction(0, 1), \{\}, [\]], self()\text{, range(0)}\}$; $\text{MatchComp}re(\text{stmt})$ returns true if stmt corresponding to syntax grammar of Comprehension; $\text{IsUseStmt}(\text{stmts}, \text{target}, \text{stmts}, \text{stmts})$ returns true if the targets of the stmts in stmt is not used between stmts and stmts, Num(s) returns the number of elements in s; c1, c2, c3, c4 represent four different conditions; SameStmts(stmt, stmts) returns stmt and stmts have the same semantic; OppositeSemantic(stmts, stmt) represents stmt and stmts have the opposite semantic; DiffStmts(stmt, stmts) represents stmt and stmts have the different semantic; IsDependent(stmt, stmts) represents stmt is dependant on the result of stmt, IsAsyncOp(stmt, stmts) returns true if the sequence consisting of slice of all elements of P is an arithmetic sequence; MatchSubstring(s, t) represents t uses s with the Subscript (i.e., "[*"]), and the subscript of s is a constant Orange, red, strikethrough and blue underlined text represent Copy, Create, Remove and Replace operations respectively; Green line numbers shows the steps that are performed to refactor the examples of non-idiomatic code on the left into the idiomatic code on the right in the 2nd column.
in Table 5). Since the if-node is a test-type node, the compare node “runs([]) == []” is refactorable to a truth-value-test.

3.2.4 Loop Else. The else clause of the loop statement is executed after the iterator is exhausted, unless the loop was ended prematurely due to a break statement. The non-idiomatic way of implementing a loop-else generally has an assignment statement \( stmnt_i \) to flag current state, a for statement \( stmnt_n \) which contains a statement \( s \) to change the current state and a break statement \( stmnt_j \) to end the loop, and an if statement \( stmnt_{n+1} \) after the for statement \( stmnt_n \) to check the current state to execute different operations. There are four circumstances: \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) complement each other, and \( c_3 \) and \( c_4 \) complement each other.

The \( c_1 \) satisfies the following semantic conditions: the semantic of the assignment statement \( stmnt_1 \) is the same as the semantic of the test node of the if statement \( stmnt_{n+1}.test \), and the semantic of assignment statement \( s \) is different from the semantic of \( stmnt_1 \) where \( s \) and the break statement \( stmnt_j \) are at the same scope. These semantic conditions are designed because the non-idiomatic code of loop-else implies two execution paths (5th row in Table 5):

\[ stmnt_1 \Rightarrow s \text{ and } stmnt_1 \Rightarrow stmnt_{n+1} \text{ or } stmnt_1 \Rightarrow s \text{ and } stmnt_1 \Rightarrow stmnt_{n+1}. \]

The \( c_2 \) satisfies the following semantic conditions: the semantic of the assignment statement \( stmnt_1 \) is the opposite of the semantic of the test node of the if statement \( stmnt_{n+1}.test \), the if-statement \( stmnt_{n+1} \) has an else clause, and the semantic of the assignment statement \( s \) is the opposite of the semantic of \( stmnt_1 \) where \( s \) and the break statement \( stmnt_j \) are at the same scope. The \( c_2 \) condition is a complement to the \( c_1 \) condition. If \( stmnt_{n+1} \) has an else clause and \( stmnt_{n+1}.test \) has the opposite semantic with \( stmnt_1 \), it indicates that the else clause has the same semantic as \( stmnt_1 \). Therefore, the code satisfying the \( c_2 \) condition is also refactorable to a loop-else. For example (5th row in Table 5), if we change \( stmnt_{n+1}.test "good\_partition" \) into "not good\_partition" and add an else clause to the if-statement, the code satisfies the \( c_2 \) condition.

The \( c_3 \) satisfies the following semantic conditions: the semantic of the assignment statement \( stmnt_1 \) is the same as the semantic of test node of the if-statement \( stmnt_{n+1}.test \), and the semantic of the if-statement \( s \) in the body of the loop statement \( stmnt_n \) is different from the semantic of \( stmnt_1 \), and the body of the if-statement \( s \) contains the break statement \( stmnt_j \). The \( c_3 \) is a variant of \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \). The \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) requires an assignment \( s \) to change the current state, but \( c_3 \) uses an if statement \( s \) to detect the change of the current state and break the loop, such as "if not good\_partition: break".

The \( c_4 \) satisfies the following semantic conditions: the semantic of the the assignment \( stmnt_1 \) is the opposite of the semantic of test node of the if-statement \( stmnt_{n+1}.test \), the if-statement \( stmnt_{n+1} \) has an else clause, and the semantic of the test node of if statement \( s.test \) in the body of the loop-statement \( stmnt_n \) is the opposite of the semantic of \( stmnt_1 \) and the body of the if-statement \( s \) contains the break statement \( stmnt_j \). The \( c_4 \) complements \( c_3 \), in the same vein as \( c_2 \) complements \( c_1 \).

3.2.5 Assign Multiple Targets. The assign-multiple-targets idiom is to assign multiple values at the same time in one assignment statement. For several consecutive assignment statements, if an assignment statement \( stmnt_k \) does not use the result of an assignment statement \( stmnt_l \) before it, these assignment statements are refactorable to assign-multiple-targets. When an assignment statement \( stmnt_k \) uses the result of the an assignment statement \( stmnt_l \) before \( stmnt_k \), the code usually is to swap variables by creating temporary variables. For such non-idiomatic code, it requires that the target of a statement \( stmnt_j \) between the \( stmnt_l \) and the \( stmnt_k \) is the same as the value of \( stmnt_l \). For example (6th row in Table 5), \( stmnt_l "d[e] = f" \) uses the target “f” of \( stmnt_l "f = d[0]\)”, and the target “d[0]” of the \( stmnt_j "d[0] = d[e]\)” is the same as the value “d[0]” of the \( stmnt_l "f = d[0]\)”. This sequence of assignments via a temporary variable can also be refactored with the assign-multiple-targets idiom.

3.2.6 Star in Function Calls. The star-in-function-call idiom is usually used to unpack an iterable to the positional arguments in a function call [16]. The non-idiomatic way of passing a sequence of arguments is that the subscript sequence of multiple consecutive parameters of a function call is an arithmetic sequence of the same variable. For example, “1, 2, 3” is an arithmetic sequence where the common difference is 1 for accessing the first, second and third element of “sys.argv” (second-to-last row in Table 5). It can be refactored into “sys.argv[1:4:1]”.

3.2.7 For Multiple Targets. The non-idiomatic code of the for-multiple-targets idiom only contains one variable as the target of for statement \( p \). The body of \( p \) uses the subscript expression to get elements of the variable. For example (the last row of Table 5), the code uses “interval[0]” and “interval[1]” to get the elements of the variable “interval” inside the body of for loop. Instead, the elements of “interval” can be accessed using a for-multiple-targets idiom.

3.3 Refactoring with Pythonic Idioms

According to [37], a refactoring is a series of small behavior preserving transformations. Based on this principle, we analyze the AST transformations required to transform a piece of anti-idiom code into an idiomatic code. We identify four atomic AST-rewriting operations across all idioms, and then compose these atomic operations into the refactoring steps for each pythonic idiom. The four atomic operations are as follows:

1. (Copy, (s, i)) copies the node \( s \) of non-idiomatic code to the position \( i \) of a node of idiomatic code. If the node at the position \( i \) is empty, we copy \( s \) into the position \( i \). Otherwise, we insert \( s \) into the position \( i \). Since a refactoring does not change the code semantics, many parts of non-idiomatic code can be copied to the resulting idiomatic code. For example, for the list-comprehension idiom (2nd row in Table 5), both the target node item and the iter node emplist of non-idiomatic code are copied to the corresponding target and iter position of the comprehension node respectively. For another example, for the chain-comparison idiom (3rd row in Table 5) we copy operands of compare node of non-idiomatic code into the position of operands of a new compare node.

2. (Create(s, *info) builds the node of type \( s \) with information *info where * represents any amount of information. To refactor non-idiomatic code into pythonic idioms, it is sometimes necessary to create some new AST nodes or elements which do not have the corresponding parts in the non-idiomatic code. For example, for the truth-value-test idiom (4th row in Table 5), we need to create a "Not" node. For another example, for the star-in-function-call idiom
We apply our refactoring tool to these Python source files to detect nine types of anti-idiom code statements and refactor these statements with pythonic idioms. We use both testing and code review to verify the correctness of refactorings.

**Testing based verification.** To determine the test cases that cover the detected non-idiomatic code fragments, we first collect the fully qualified names of all methods called by a test method using the DLocater tool [62]. If the method that contains a non-idiomatic code fragment belongs to the list of the methods called by the test method, we consider this test method as a test case for the non-idiomatic code fragment. Note that one test case may test one or more methods, and one method may undergo one or more different types of refactorings. Then, to execute the test cases successfully, we install the packages that the project depends on by reading its requirements.txt. Note that not all test cases can be executed successfully because of several problems, such as requiring other non-python packages or to manually configure some parameters. We filter out such fail-to-execute test cases.

In the work, we use Pytest [42], a popular Python unit testing frame which also supports the Python’s default unittest tool [27]. We run the test cases on the original methods with non-idiomatic code fragments to ensure they pass successfully. Then we run the test cases again on the refactored methods. If the refactored methods pass the test cases, we consider the detection of anti-idiom, non-idiomatic code fragments and the corresponding code refactorings are correct. For the refactorings that fail the test cases, the two authors independently analyze the failure causes. Two authors have more than three years of Python development experience. They examine the detected non-idiomatic code fragments and the idiom code obtained by the refactoring, and determine if the failures are caused by non-idiomatic code smell detection or pythonic idiom transformation. A detection failure means a detected non-idiomatic code fragment is not refactorable, e.g, it cannot be safely refactored into semantic-equivalent idiom code. If the failure is caused by non-idiomatic code detection, we do not double count it as the failure of pythonic idiom transformation. The two authors discuss to resolve their disagreement and reach the consensus. Finally, we compute the accuracy of anti-idiom code smell detection and idiomatic code refactoring for each pythonic idiom.

**Code review based verification.** We randomly sample 100 pairs of non-idiomatic code fragments and the corresponding idiom code fragments for each pythonic idiom. Then the two authors independently review these code pairs, and determine if the non-idiomatic code fragments are detected correctly and if the idiom code fragments are refactored correctly. They discuss to resolve their disagreement and reach the consensus. Based on their code review results, we compute the accuracy of anti-idiom code smell detection and idiomatic code refactoring for each pythonic idiom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ1: Correctness of Refactorings</strong></td>
<td>How accurate is our approach when refactoring real-world anti-idiom Python code with pythonic idioms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ2: Do code refactorings performed by our approach have practical value for real-world projects?</strong></td>
<td>Do code refactorings performed by our approach have practical value for real-world projects?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.1 RQ1: Correctness of Refactorings

#### 4.1.1 Motivation
Refactorings involve complex logic for detecting anti-idiom code smells and applying code transformation. We would like to confirm the design and implementation of our approach is robust and correct on real-world Python code.

#### 4.1.2 Method
As described in Section 2.2.1, we collect 7,638 repositories from GitHub which can be successfully parsed using Python 3, and collect 506,765 Python source files from these repositories. We apply our refactoring tool to these Python source files to detect
approach is very robust on real-world code. It achieves 100% accuracy of detection and refactoring for five pythonic idioms, i.e., list-comprehension, set-comprehension, dict-comprehension, loop-else and for-multi-targets. It achieves 100% detection accuracy for chain-comparison, and 100% refactoring accuracy for truth-value-test, assign-multi-targets and star-in-func-call.

**Detection failure analysis.** Our verification identifies 15 detected non-idiomatic code fragments which are not refactorable, including 9 for truth-value-test, 2 for assign-multi-targets and 4 for star-in-func-call. For example, for the truth-value-test "if xpath_results == []", if "xpath_results" is an empty string, the if-condition is false. However, the idiom "if not xpath_results" will be true if "xpath_results" is an empty string. Therefore, "if xpath_results == []"

## 4.2 RQ2: Usefulness of Refactorings

### 4.2.1 Motivation
Our tool is the first refactoring tool for pythonic idioms. We would like to know how well Python developers accept the refactorings our tool makes and what opinions they have towards pythonic idiom refactoring in practice.

### 4.2.2 Method
We randomly sample 10 refactorings (including the original non-idiomatic code fragments and the resulting idiomatic code after refactoring) for each type of pythonic idiom. The sampled refactorings come from 84 repositories. We fork the repository corresponding to the non-idiomatic code fragment and commit a pull request with the resulting idiomatic code. Readers can find the list of the 90 pull requests in our replication package. We collect the developers’ responses to our pull requests, and count how many pull requests have been accepted or rejected by developers. Among the accepted pull requests, we further count how many pull requests have been merged into the repositories.

### 4.2.3 Result
Table 7 presents our experiment results. Among 90 pull requests, we received 57 responses, including 34 accepted and 23 rejected. 28 of the accepted pull requests have been merged into the repositories. The six pull requests that are not merged as they are not yet tested. The 63% (57/90) response rate indicates that Python developers pay attention to the pythonic idiom refactorings. The 60% acceptance rate and the 50% merge rate among the responses provide the initial evidence of our refactoring tool’s practicality and usefulness.

## Table 6: Accuracy of anti-idiom code smell detection (d-acc) and idiomatic code transformation (r-acc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idiom</th>
<th>Testing #Refs</th>
<th>#TCs</th>
<th>d-acc</th>
<th>r-acc</th>
<th>Code Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Comprehension</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Comprehension</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dict Comprehension</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Comparison</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100 0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth Value Test</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Else</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign Multi Targets</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>4565</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star in Func Call</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100 0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Multi Targets</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td>7216</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>900 0.988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7: Results of our refactoring pull requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idiom Category</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
<th>Merged</th>
<th>#Repo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Comprehension</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Comprehension</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dict Comprehension</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Comparison</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth Value Test</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Else</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign Multi Targets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star in Func Call</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Multi Targets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our refactoring tool is robust and correct on real-world Python code. The limitation of Python static parsing and the complex program logic may result in a few rare detection and refactoring errors.
Readability. 13 out of 23 reject responses are concerned that the pythonic idioms make the code less readable. For example, the developer comments on a suggested star-in-func-call refactoring (“clip.size([2:4:1])”): “While your change is indeed feasible, I believe the original style is more readable”. Even with the readability concern, some developers express that they learn something from the suggested refactorings. For example, the developer comments on the chain-comparison refactoring (“sessions is None is metrics”): “... Interesting, ... I learned something today though, thanks.” As another example, the developer worries that refactoring may lose specific information for the truth-value-test. For example, a developer replied “I feel like asserting it to empty dict is more explicit and readable” if “assert deepdiff.DeepDiff(...) == {}” is refactored into “assert not deepdiff.DeepDiff(...)”.

Performance. 3 reject responses are concerned about the performance or memory usage. For example, for the list-comprehension refactoring, the developers reject the pull request because they are not sure that the performance improvement would be significant in their project. For the star-in-func-call refactoring which refactors “ss[0], ss[1], ss[2], ss[3], ss[4], ss[5], ss[6]” into “ss[0:7:1]”, the developer believes the refactoring can cause memory fragmentation.

Systematic refactoring. 3 reject responses indicates that developers do not want to refactor the project in an ad-hoc way. Two responses are discouraged to refactor only one code fragment of the project. For example, although the developers reject our pull request for a set-comprehension refactoring, they propose that such refactorings should be applied to the whole project rather than by a single pull request to just one place. In another reject response, the developer replies that “Waf is just a tool for us. We don’t need style patches for it.” for a list-comprehension refactoring. In fact, we believe these responses confirm the need for systematic pythonic idiom refactoring tool like ours. Our tool can scan and refactor the whole project and dependent packages. It was just we submitted only some randomly sampled refactorings to the projects.

Inertia. 4 rejects are because the developers prefer the original code. For example, a developer replies “Thanks for the suggestion, I prefer the existing code” for a star-in-func-call refactoring. And some developers would like to accept pull requests to fix bugs instead of code refactoring, e.g., the developer replies to a for-multiple-targets refactoring: “I think it’s better to leave the RUBI code alone for now unless there is work to fix it.”.

Our pythonic idiom refactorings have been well received by the developers. The developers also raise concerns about readability and performance of pythonic idioms which deserve further study.

5 RELATED WORK
5.1 Pythonic Idioms
How to write pythonic code has been a popular topic [29, 41, 44, 46, 58]. Several studies identify some Python idioms to help developers write more idiomatic code (commonly referred to as more pythonic [46, 61]). Alexandru et al. [29] identify 19 pythonic idioms (list-comprehension and dict-comprehension overlap with our work) from several books. Merchant et al. [46] identify the usage of pythonic idioms in GitHub. Kula et al. [55] visualize the usage of the with-open idiom over time, and find that projects are accustomed to using the with-open idiom instead of non-idiomatic counterpart. Phan-udom et al. [51] develop a tool to recommend pythonic code examples by searching similar code examples from 113 code snippets of three repositories. Different from these related works, our work identifies unique pythonic idioms from the language syntax and find 4 idioms (star-in-func-call, for-multi-targets, assign-multi-targets, loop-else) that have not been identified before. Furthermore, we not only identify pythonic idioms but also develop an automatic tool to refactor anti-idiom code into idiomatic code.

5.2 Code refactoring
Martin Fowler proposes code refactoring [37] about 30 years ago. An active line of research is to recover refactorings made in the code [33, 34, 40, 43, 48, 52, 56, 59, 63, 64]. Prete et al. [43, 52] detect the largest number of refactoring types based on the Fowler’s catalog. Tsantalis et. al. [59] identify 15 Java refactoring types by statement matching algorithm and refactoring detection rules. Dhillara et. al. [35] identify 18 Python refactoring kinds (e.g., rename, move, pull up methods), which do not overlap with our refactoring type. Another active line of research is to refactor code [1, 32, 38, 45, 47, 49, 53, 60]. Ouni et al. [49] propose a multi-objective search-based approach for finding the optimal sequence of refactorings. Köhler et al. [45] develop a tool to automatically convert asynchronous code to reactive programming. Pylint [1] is a static code analysis tool, which could give refactoring suggestions for chain-comparison and truth-value-test, but it does not support automatic refactorings. To the best of our knowledge, our tool is the first automatic refactoring tool which covers 9 types of pythonic idioms.

6 DISCUSSION
6.1 Pythonic Coding Practices
Refactoring is a widely adopted practice to improve code quality. A wide range of refactorings have been proposed to address code smells such as code clones, feature envy, shotgun surgery. Our work introduces a new type of code smell, i.e., non-idiomatic code that can be refactored with pythonic idioms. Our empirical study on GitHub repositories and Stack Overflow questions calls for the tool support for assisting developers in using pythonic idioms consistently. Our refactoring tool is the first tool of this kind. The evaluation on a large number of Python projects provides positive and encouraging feedback on the prototype. Some developer feedback raises concerns about the readability and performance of pythonic idioms. This calls for the careful validation of the conciseness and performance of pythonic idioms. However, existing online materials are anecdotal and mostly based on personal programming experience. Our work produces a large dataset of non-idiomatic versus idiomatic code from real-world projects, which serves as an excellent testbed to empirically investigate the general claims and concerns about pythonic idioms.

6.2 Threats to Validity
Threats to internal validity relate to two aspects in our work: (1) the errors in the implementation of code refactoring tool and (2) personal bias in evaluating accuracy of code refactoring. For the aspect (1), we have double-checked the code and verified the accuracy of our tool implementation by manually examining a...
We release our tool and data in Zenodo and will integrate our refactoring tool into the open-source linting tool (e.g., Pylint). We will systematically investigate the readability and performance concerns about Pythonic idioms based on the large-scale refactoring dataset our tool produces. The number of pull requests to project members to review. The number of pull requests is larger than existing user studies in previous works [39, 50, 65]. We release our tool and data in Zenodo for public evaluation.

7 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper designs and implements the first automatic refactoring tool for nine types of Pythonic idioms. Our tool is motivated by the empirical observation of the challenges in writing Pythonic code from the Stack Overflow discussions and of the wide presence of non-idiomatic code in thousands of real-world Python projects. Rather than relying on idiom mining, literature review or personal programming experience, our approach identifies Pythonic idioms and define non-idiomatic syntactic patterns and idiomatic code transformation steps through the systematic analysis of Python abstract syntax grammar. Our tool is robust and correct in detecting anti-idiom code smells and refactoring these smells in real-world Python projects. The refactorings made by our tool have been well received and praised by the Python developers. In the future, we will integrate our refactoring tool into the open-source linting tool (e.g., Pylint). We will systematically investigate the readability and performance concerns about Pythonic idioms based on the large-scale refactoring dataset our tool produces.
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