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Abstract
Although the API of a software framework should stay stable, in practice it often changes during maintenance. When deploying a new framework version such changes may invalidate plugins—modules that used one of its previous versions. While manual plugin adaptation is expensive and error-prone, automatic adaptation demands cumbersome specifications, which the developers are reluctant to write and maintain. Basing on the history of structural framework changes (refactorings), in our previous work we formally defined how to automatically derive an adaptation layer that shields plugins from framework changes. In this paper we make our approach practical. Two case studies of unconstrained API evolution show that our approach scales in a large number of adaptation scenarios and comparing to other adaptation techniques. The evaluation of our logic-based tool ComeBack! demonstrates that it can adapt efficiently most of the problem-causing API refactorings.
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1. Introduction
A software framework is a software component that embodies a skeleton solution for a family of related software products and is instantiated by modules containing custom code (plugins) [23]. Frameworks are software artifacts, which evolve considerably due to new or changed requirements, bug fixing, or quality improvement. If changes affect framework’s Application Programming Interface (API), they may be backward-incompatible and invalidate existing plugins; that is, plugin sources cannot be recompiled or plugin binaries cannot be linked and run with a new framework release. When upgrading to a new framework version, developers are forced to either manually adapt plugins or write update patches. Both tasks are usually error-prone and expensive, the costs often becoming unacceptable in case of large and complex frameworks.

To reduce the costs of component upgrade, a number of techniques propose to, at least partially, automate component adaptation [11, 13, 24, 30, 31, 41]. Most of them rely on and require additional adaptation specifications or annotations, which are used to intrusively update components’ sources or binaries. In reality, developers are reluctant to write such specifications. Moreover, component evolution unavoidably demands to maintain these specifications, because evolutionary changes may alter component parts on which existing specifications rely, rendering the latter useless. In such cases, specifications must be updated correspondingly along with the change of the involved components, which raises the complexity and costs of component adaptation. Finally, intrusive upgrade of components may be impossible at all if their sources are unavailable or software licenses forbid their change.

Instead of directly upgrading plugins, we suggest to protect them from framework API changes by providing binary adapter layers that translate between the plugin and the latest framework version. The adapters [21] mimic the public types of the old framework version, while delegating to the types of the latest version. Our approach is based on the fact that, according to the case studies of Dig and Johnson [16], more than 80% of the application-breaking backward-incompatible changes in evolving frameworks are refactorings—behavior-preserving source transformations [29]. Common examples of refactorings include renaming classes and members to better reflect their meaning, moving members to decrease coupling and increase cohesion, adding new and removing unused members. Figure 1 shows the application of the Extract-Subclass refactoring to a framework class modeling network nodes.1 If an existing plugin class LAN calling the method broadcast on an instance of Node is not available for update, it will fail to both recompile and link with the new Node version.

We treat refactorings as formal specifications of syntactic changes and use their traces to automatically derive adapters be-

---

1 Our examples are inspired by the LAN simulation lab [7].
fore upgrading a framework (Fig. 2). The refactoring information required can be logged automatically (e.g., as Command objects in Eclipse [5]), or harvested semi-automatically [17, 39] and thus does not require additional specifications for most of the problems causing changes [16] from developers. Our adaptation technology is not limited to consecutive framework versions: adapters can be generated for any of the previous framework versions. Moreover, the adapted plugins of different versions may co-exist and simultaneously use the latest framework version (side-by-side execution [10]), because each of them is provided with its version-specific adapter layer. In addition, adapters are optimized in that they are not stacked on top of each other; each adaptation layer delegates directly to the latest framework version reducing the performance penalties implied by delegation.

To ensure the soundness of our adaptation (no potentially breaking changes propagate to plugins), in our previous work [32] we proposed a rigorous plugin adaptation. We achieved soundness by formally defining the process of refactoring-based adapter derivation and proving that the resulting adapters do not change visible framework behavior, while compensating for API refactorings.

This paper discusses how we make our rigorous adaptation also practical by supporting refactoring-based binary-compatible upgrade of Java and .NET frameworks. Its main contributions are:

- **Re-exploration of plugin-breaking API changes.** To assess the feasibility and foresee the frontiers of refactoring-based adaptation we perform two case studies, in which developers are not restricted in how they evolve frameworks. Although in general such development may decrease the probability of refactorings, we show that when developers intend to improve the framework, most of API changes can be seen as refactorings. As another result of the case studies, we classify problem-causing API refactorings by the mechanics of the problems introduced.

- **Technology realization and delimitation.** We realize our technology in a rule-based tool ComeBack! designed to be platform-independent and easily combinable with other tools (e.g., for acquiring refactoring information). We support adaptation of both black- and white-box frameworks, also in the presence of callbacks typical for the latter. Our adapters are fairly efficient (at most 6.5% performance overhead implied by delegation) and preserve object identity. To support side-by-side plugin execution we developed dedicated linking policies in Java and .NET. Finally, we delimit the applicability of our approach by discussing the cases, when we either cannot adapt or require additional means for adaptation.

We discuss the case studies in Sect. 2, continue with the background of our rigorous refactoring-based adaptation in Sect. 3, elaborate on technology realization and limitations in Sect. 4 and Sect. 5, overview related work in Sect. 6, conclude the paper and outline future work in Sect. 7.

### 2. Re-Exploring Plugin-Breaking API Changes

The applicability of refactoring-based adaptation depends directly on the ratio of refactorings in the API evolution. To estimate the impact of framework refactorings on existing applications, Dig and Johnson [16] investigated the evolution of five big frameworks (e.g., Eclipse [5]). They discovered that most (from 81% up to 97%) plugin-breaking changes were refactorings. Since plugins are usually developed by third-party companies, they are not available for analysis and update at the time of framework refactoring.

Could one expect the change pattern discovered by Dig and Johnson to be similar in case of other evolving frameworks and thus anticipate the general feasibility of refactoring-based adaptation? To an extent, Dig attempts to answer this question, stipulating that “most API breaking changes are small structural changes […] because large scale changes lead to clients abandoning the component. For a component to stay alive, it should change through a series of rather small steps, mostly refactorings.” [15, pp. 33–34] In other words, if the framework developers are concerned with backward compatibility (and usually they are), they are likely to evolve the framework API through small changes, especially refactorings.

However, as an evolutionary activity, maintenance often conflicts with preserving backward compatibility. Framework developers usually face a tradeoff between updating the framework’s API and not breaking existing plugins. The degree to which backward compatibility must be preserved dictates the range of allowed API changes and varies depending on the development policies. To which extent can maintenance changes by themselves (not restricted by compatibility preservation) be modeled as refactorings? By answering this question we should be able to reason about the general feasibility of refactoring-based adaptation. Should unrestricted maintenance resemble the change pattern reported by Dig and Johnson, we could stipulate its occurrence in a large number of frameworks. We address this question by performing two critical case studies.

According to Yin [42, p. 38], a case study is critical if its unique conditions permit its results to be generalized (with a certain degree of probability) to a larger number of cases. The conditions are either in favor of or against the occurrence of a certain phenomenon under investigation. In the former case, the study results may be used to disprove the stipulated research statement: if it does not hold in favorable circumstances, it will not hold in general. In the latter case, the results are used to validate the statement: if it holds in unfavorable circumstances, it will hold in general. Arguably, framework maintenance that ignores backward compatibility implies unfavorable circumstances for refactorings to occur. Not being afraid of “clients abandoning the component,” framework developers might not refrain from changing the framework API in a more drastic way.

---

2 According to Lehman [26] we consider software maintenance a form of evolution.
If the results of such case study are similar to the ones reported by [16], we could expect the broad applicability of refactoring-based adaptation. Otherwise, we should at least be able to reason about the circumstances in which refactorings are less probable.

**Study setup.** We chose two open source Java frameworks with at least three major versions released (Table 1). The developers of both frameworks were never restricted in changing the framework API and performed all intended changes. For the first case study we used JHotDraw [6]—a well-known white-box framework for developing 2D structured editors. We used its three framework versions 5.2, 6.0 and 7.0 that JHotDraw developers confirmed to be evolved without preserving backward compatibility.1 For the second case study we used SalesPoint [8] (versions 1.0, 2.0 and 3.1) developed at our department for teaching framework technologies. The framework models a purchase-selling business model with associated concepts, such as customer, shop, and catalog. Because one of the investigators has been directly involved in the development of SalesPoint, we can affirm that backward compatibility was never considered.

Because the change log of JHotDraw was too coarse-grained (most of the changes were undocumented) and there was no change log for SalesPoint, we had to perform application-driven change discovery. That is, we gradually reconstructed the change history of the framework by manually adapting the plugins of applications developed with the first major framework version to compile and run with the second and third framework versions. Whenever possible, such adaptation was performed by refactoring. For JHotDraw we used four sample clients (JavaDraw, Pert, Net and Nothing) delivered with the framework version 5.2. For SalesPoint we used two applications (student exercises) developed with the framework version 1.0 and another one developed with version 2.0.

For each breaking change detected we analyzed why it was applied by developers. In such a way we discovered exactly the backward-incompatible framework changes affecting the chosen applications and, if possible, modeled those changes as refactorings. Admittedly, we could not detect all breaking changes of the framework, because each application only used a subset of the framework API. Moreover, the same framework change could be detected repeatedly in different applications. However, our aim was not to find the total number of changes, but rather to understand why and how problem-causing changes occurred and to which extent they could be modeled as refactorings.

**Results.** We were not able to adapt JHotDraw sample applications to use the framework version 7.0. According to the documentation of JHotDraw (packed together with release 7.0.9), this version “is a major departure from previous versions of JHotDraw—only the cornerstones of the original architecture remain. The API and almost every part of the implementation have been reworked to take advantage of the Java SE 5.0 platform.” Even for the smallest sample application of 63 LOC its recompilation produced more than 60 errors, most of which could not be adapted manually.

---

### Table 1. Frameworks selected for the case studies. Coverage reflects the usage of API classes (in parentheses, of methods) by the most advanced application selected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Versions</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JHotDraw</td>
<td>5.2, 6.0, 7.0</td>
<td>4 (sample)</td>
<td>36% (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SalesPoint</td>
<td>1.0, 2.0, 3.1</td>
<td>3 (student labs)</td>
<td>18% (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Types of plugin-breaking API changes by their intent. For each type the overall number of changes detected (in parentheses, of refactorings) is specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change intent</th>
<th>JHotDraw</th>
<th>SalesPoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift of responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept addition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept refinement</td>
<td>8 (4)</td>
<td>94 (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminating duplicated function</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refactoring to patterns</td>
<td>29 (29)</td>
<td>5 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language evolution</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


2 The protocol of case studies including detailed statistics is available at [http://comeback.sourceforge.net/protocol.pdf](http://comeback.sourceforge.net/protocol.pdf)
explicitly model a state machine with states (Gate) and transitions (Transition). Adaptation required “dissecting” Transaction to make its states and transitions explicit for the new state machine and involved a number of refactorings and non-trivial protocol changes.

- Eliminating duplicated functionality. In SalesPoint 2.0 the class User serves authentication and authorization, while its subclass Customer mimics the real presence of a customer in a shop at a given point of sale. In the next framework release, since its developers realized that almost all functionality of Customer exists in class SalesPoint, they removed Customer. All changes involved in adapting plugins but one could be modeled as refactoring to call the (semantically equivalent) methods in SalesPoint; the exception was a protocol change to call a sequence of three methods instead of one initial method.

- Refactoring to patterns. Class MenuSheet of SalesPoint 2.0 was restructured to follow the Composite pattern—a refactoring to pattern [25] that involved a set of refactorings to participating types, such as class and method addition, method rename and generalization of argument types.

- Language evolution. In SalesPoint 2.0 the parameter type of the FormSheet constructor changed from Panel of AWT to JComponent of Swing. This change was visible in the API and could not be considered refactoring. Contrary, changing Catalog to collect its items in a Map (JDK 1.2) instead of a Dictionary (JDK 1.0) was encapsulated and reflected in the API as two refactorings of Catalog’s methods (e.g., from keys() to keySet()).

Discussion. Although backward compatibility was not considered, our pattern of changes discovered (about 85% consisting of refactorings) repeated the pattern reported by Dig and Johnson for more conventional framework evolution. Maintaining a framework means restructuring it in the first place, and it is this restructuring that often affects existing applications. Most of the other changes are usually additive and do not break existing plugins. Even if considerably changing framework’s API (e.g., replacing Transaction by SalesProcess), developers first analyze existing implementation. Consciously or unconsciously they perform a mental restructuring of the old design and reuse existing design decisions. Whether the new implementation partially reuses existing code or is written from scratch, this mental restructuring boils down to code that can often be modeled as the refactored old implementation. In other words, because software maintenance requires good understanding of existing systems, developers think in terms of restructuring and extending existing concepts, even when applying complex changes.

The transition of JHotDraw from 6.0 to 7.0 does not contradict our statement, because it is a case of system replacement and not of system maintenance [35, pp. 6–7]. Arguably, although developers possess knowledge about the framework being replaced, they develop the concepts and the whole architecture of the replacement system from scratch without mentally restructuring existing design. For such situations refactoring-based adaptation is not feasible.

One could argue that the ratio of refactorings applied depends on how the system architecture is affected: the more of it is changed the less is the probability of refactorings. However, Tokuda and Batory [38] show that even large architectural changes can be achieved by applying a sequence of refactorings. More important is the driving force of the change: if developers want to improve the system (and not replace it, for example), their changes are likely to be refactorings.

We must admit that our results are not ripe to stronger postulate a general feasibility of refactoring-based adaptation. Possibly, there is a number of frameworks for which their maintenance does not require the pattern of refactorings discovered. For example, compared to a mature framework, a “young” framework in an early phase of development may evolve in a more drastic way. The APIs of certain frameworks (e.g., Web frameworks) typically expose many built-in types, the changes of which (when upgrading the implementation language) are not encapsulated and cannot be modeled as refactorings. Because we did not know the details of the development process (e.g., how Eclipse was used to evolve the frameworks), we could not estimate the impact of using an IDE’s refactoring engine on the ratio of refactorings discovered.

However, what makes us optimistic is the fact that our results were obtained in critical case studies. Preserving backward compatibility will furthermore increase the probability of refactoring. Breaking changes applied otherwise in unrestricted API maintenance will be avoided to the greatest extent possible. Even more important, maintaining backward compatibility dictates a certain, “smooth” way of API evolution, when the transition between framework releases (e.g., in Eclipse) is supported by adapters to translate from the old to the new API. In such cases, most API changes are small enabling refactoring-based adaptation.

Classification of Plugin-Breaking API Refactorings

While performing the case studies we noticed that plugin-breaking API refactorings differed in the mechanics of the problem they introduced. In general, after refactoring the framework’s API, certain functionality cannot be found by a caller (i.e., the framework in case of callback types, or plugins otherwise) because of:

- Misplaced functionality. Required functionality exists, but cannot be located by the compiler or the linker or both. Examples are changing method signatures, moving methods, and renaming classes. Such changes lead to the syntactic mismatch [12] between the framework and plugins.

- Missing functionality. Required functionality does not exist; either it was removed (e.g., deleting a framework method) or has not been introduced yet (e.g., adding an abstract hook method for which no implementation in plugins exists). The latter case is also known as Unimplemented Method [37].

- Unintended functionality. Found functionality is not the one intended. In the presence of dynamic linking, new methods added to framework classes may be overridden accidentally by existing methods of plugin subclasses—the so-called Method Capture problem [37]. Consider class SecureNode of plugin version 1 that subclasses Node of the framework (Fig. 2) and encrypts/decrypts messages. Its method getDescription() returns the details of the encryption strategy used. The LAN class of the plugin uses the framework’s Utils class to debug node info. In the next framework version (Fig. 2), developers add a hook method to Node allowing its subclasses to include node-specific
information in the description. By default, this hook method (accidentally called getDescription()) delegates to getName(), that is, the two are semantically equivalent. In addition, framework developers refactor Utilities to call getDescription(). Now the LAN’s call to Utilities.debug() with the instance of SecureNode will produce unexpected behavior, logging the description of the encryption algorithm and not of the node.

In general, any refactoring introducing new or changing existing classes and methods (e.g., adding and extracting methods, changing method signatures, moving methods) may lead to the well-known Fragile Base Class Problem (FBCP) [28], by which apparently safe modifications to a base API class in a white-box system may cause the derived classes to malfunction.

3. Background on Rigorous Refactoring-Based Adaptation

To automatically construct adapters compensating for API refactorings and ensure their soundness, in [32] we formally define our refactoring-based adaptation. Effectively, we roll back the changes introduced by framework refactorings by executing their inverses. We cannot invoke directly on framework types, because we want plugins to use the latest, improved framework. Instead, we create adapters (one for each framework API type) and then invoke refactorings on adapters. We call these inverses comebacks.

Technically, a comeback is realized in terms of refactoring operators executed on adapters. It is defined as a template solution and instantiated to an executable specification by re-using parameters of the corresponding refactoring. For some refactorings, the corresponding comebacks are simple and implemented using a single refactoring. For example, the comeback that corresponds to the refactoring RenameClass(name, newName) renames the adapter to the old name. As another example, the comeback of AddClass is defined by RemoveClass removing the adapter. The comebacks of other refactorings consist of sequences of refactorings. For instance, the comeback of PushDownMethod is defined by the DeleteMethod and AddMethod refactorings, the sequential execution of which effectively moves (pushes up) the method between adapters. Moreover, complex comebacks may be defined by composing other, more primitive comebacks. For example, the comeback of ExtractSubclass is defined by combining the comebacks of PushDownMethod and AddClass.

In practice, we focus on the adaptation of user-defined API types (e.g., Node). Figure 5 shows the workflow of refactoring-based plugin adaptation performed before upgrading a framework to the version $F_n$. First, we create the adaptation layer $AL_n$, (the right part of the figure). For each user-defined API class of the latest framework version we provide an adapter class with exactly the same name and set of method signatures. Each adapter deleges to its corresponding framework class, which becomes the adapter’s delegate. Once the adapters of $AL_n$ are created, the actual adaptation is performed by executing comebacks derived using the description of the corresponding refactorings. The comebacks are executed backwards, that is, starting with the one for the last refactoring and continuing in the reverse order of the initial refactoring execution. When all comebacks for the refactorings recorded between the last and the previous framework version $F_{n-1}$ are executed, the produced adaptation layer $AL_{n-1}$ reconstructs the API of $F_{n-1}$, while delegating to the newest framework version. The framework versions need not be consecutive: given version number $F_{n-2}$ and the refactoring history between $F_{n-2}$ and $F_n$, the adapter layer $AL_{n-2}$ delegating to $F_n$ will be derived in the same manner.

4. Practical Refactoring-Based Adaptation

We are implementing our adaptation tool ComeBack! [3] using a Prolog logic programming engine. For a number of common refactorings we provide a comeback library consisting of the corresponding comeback transformations specified as Prolog rules. Given the latest framework binaries, the information about the API types (type and method names, method signatures, inheritance relations) is parsed into a Prolog fact base. To support Java and .NET binaries we developed the corresponding Prolog/Java and Prolog/CIL parsers. After examining the history of framework refactorings, the corresponding comebacks are loaded into the engine and executed on the fact base as described in Sect. 3. Once all comebacks have been executed, the fact base contains the information necessary for generating adapters (it describes the adapters) and is serialized to the adapter binaries using reflection in .NET and the ASM code generation library [1] in Java. Thereby we extract and transform the information about the program and not the program itself; the adapter generation using this information is the final step.

4.1 Insights into Binary Adapters

To ensure type safeness in the presence of adapters, we perform exhaustive adaptation, that is, every (user-defined) API type of the latest framework version is wrapped into its corresponding adapter and there is no standard way for a plugin to bypass the adaptation layer. An important implication is that at run-time plugins cannot observe any framework type (e.g., returned by a method call) and the framework cannot observe any plugin type (e.g., a callback): in their communication both parties use only adapter and built-in types. This is achieved by wrapping and unwrapping of framework types inside adapters. For method calls on ordinary (non-

![Figure 4. After Method Capture. Instead of node info, for SecureNode its encryption description is unintentionally retrieved.](image-url)
comeback) types, adapters internally wrap (adapt) all user-defined method return values before sending them to plugins and unwrap (adapted) method arguments before sending them to the framework. For callbacks and extended framework classes, the opposite way of wrapping/unwrapping is performed. Since exception types also represent a (possible) return type, they are wrapped similarly.

The pseudocode of Listing 1 summarizes the (simplified) algorithm used for wrapping and unwrapping of types. The full algorithm coping with collections, arrays and exception chaining is available on the tool’s homepage [3]. The helper functions used are:

- `isAdapter(Object)` checks whether the given object is an adapter. The type information needed is added as annotations (calling Class.isAnnotationPresent(Class) in Java or adding attributes in .NET) when generating adapters.
- `isUserDefined(Class)` checks whether the given class is defined in the framework. If not, it is considered to be a built-in type. A special handling is required for third-party libraries not subject to adaptation (currently not supported).
- `wrap(Object)` replaces the given object with an instance of its corresponding adapter. It retrieves the corresponding adapter, if any, from the adapter cache, or creates a new one otherwise.
- `unwrap(Adapter)` is a placeholder for an access (either via a method call or via direct field access) to the adapter’s delegation variable.

Listing 1 Anatomy of a delegating adapter method.

```java
<AccessModifier> <ReturnType> Name(Parameters) {
  // (un-)wrap the arguments
  foreach (argument in Parameters) {
    if (argument != null) {
      if (isAdapter(argument)) {
        // (un-)unwrap the exception object
        t = (TargetType)delegatee.Name(arguments);
        t = unwrap(t);
        throw t;
      } else if (isUserDefined(argument)) {
        throw t;
      }
    }
  }
  try {
    // cast to issue non-virtual call (.NET)
    value = ((TargetType)delegatee).Name(arguments);
    catch(Throwable t) {
      // (un-)unwrap the return value
      if (value != null) {
        if (isAdapter(value)) {
          value = unwrap(value);
        } else if (isUserDefined(value)) {
          value = wrap(value);
        }
      }
      return value;
    }
  }
}
```

Adapter structure is influenced by the way framework types are reused. In black-box reuse, class adapters are merely reconstructed old classes that forward methods to new framework classes (Fig. 6). In white-box reuse, class adapters must also access the plugins’ overriding implementation, while avoiding FBCP problems discussed on page 5. Figure 7 shows the adapter for the framework’s Node class of our running LAN example. The adapter consists of two classes: public Node to serve as the superclass for plugin subclasses and internal NodeDispatcher to dynamically dispatch on plugin’s overriding methods called from the framework. Whenever an instance of a Node’s subclass (e.g., SecureNode) is passed to the framework, it is wrapped into NodeDispatcher. The latter investigates the plugin and, depending on what methods are intentionally overridden by the plugin, dispatches method calls either to the plugin or to the framework. Method Capture (Fig. 2) is solved by the comeback of AddMethod deleting the getDescription() method from Node adapter; the method is no longer dynamically dispatched to SecureNode. Since intentionally overridden hook methods appear in plugins after they appear in the framework’s API, no corresponding entry exists in the refactoring log (hence, no comeback is executed and these methods are found dynamically).

A similar adaptation strategy applies to reconstructing refactored API interfaces. If a black-box framework instantiates a type
implementing the interface (e.g., in a factory method) and returns it to the plugin, the adapter wraps up the (new) framework implementation and “hides” it behind the reconstructed old interface (Fig. 8). If, however, plugins implement the interface provided and used by the framework (callback type), then the adapter reuses the plugin’s implementation of the old interface and presents it to the framework as an implementation of the actual interface (Fig. 9). As in general we cannot derive from the API the type of use (e.g., how a public framework class is used or which party implements an interface), we generate adapters for both black- and white-box cases—appropriate adapters are instantiated at run-time automatically in the adapter layer depending on the call direction.

### 4.2 Custom Linking Policies

In our approach, all adapter layers are deployed as binary components with exactly the same name as the framework they delegate to. Although the framework type names are embedded in the plugin binaries, because the names of the (old) framework and the adapter components are the same, the dynamic linking mechanism of both Java and .NET still works. From the point of view of a single plugin, the framework upgrade is replacing one component by another component with the same name: an old version of either the framework, the framework upgrade is replacing one component by another.

In .NET the system looks for each program’s component in a default location called the global assembly cache (GAC), where components intended to be shared are installed. We rely on the fact that the system is able to distinguish different versions of the same component in the GAC, if to each component’s deployment unit (assembly) a strong name is assigned—an encrypted label of its four-part version number. For linking plugins it is enough to sign the adapter and to direct the binding of its plugins in an application-specific XML configuration file that contains the version number of the adapter assembly to be used. For linking adapters the names of the framework types to be created inside adapters are prepended (in CIL, at adapter generation time) the strong name of the framework assembly.

In Java our solution is based on generating custom classloaders and uses the fact that, since classes are identified in the Java virtual machine by their names and the classloader that loaded them, classes with the same names loaded by separate classloaders can be distinguished effectively. For linking plugins the old framework JAR file is replaced by the generated adapter JAR file, so that the plugin’s class path does not need to be adjusted. For linking adapters each adapter gets a custom classloader locating the latest framework version and uses this classloader whenever an instance of a framework type needs to be created reflectively.

### 4.3 Tool Evaluation

**Functionality.** The following refactorings are currently supported by our tool: AddPackage, RenamePackage, MovePackage, AddClass, RenameClass, ExtractSuperclass, ExtractSubclass, ExtractClass, ExtractInterface.
This comeback library can adapt all refactorings discovered by Dig and Johnson [16] (reported in detail in Dig’s dissertation [15, p. 21]), except for moving and renaming fields. It can also adapt all refactorings discovered in our case studies, because all API fields of JHotDraw and SalesPoint are encapsulated.

In our case studies, we made the most advanced sample application of JHotDraw execute with version 6.0 of the framework and one of the student applications of SalesPoint execute with the latest framework version. Since after our application-based change discovery we knew exactly how the adaptation code for all changes should look like, we used this knowledge to manually adapt changes beyond refactorings. First, we executed all comebacks and got the adapter fact base. Then, we augmented it with additional facts describing how to compensate for remaining changes. For example, the FigureEnumerator of JHotDraw 6.0 was wrapped into an implementation of the standard Enumerator used in JHotDraw 5.2. We discuss how to automate this currently manual adaptation in the conclusion (Sect. 7).

Efficiency. The delegation used in our approach inevitably implies performance penalties of at least one message redirection call per method. The penalties increase when user-defined types are present in method signatures and, hence, need to be wrapped and unwrapped as described in Sect. 4.1. In such cases, in addition to constructor calls and cache lookups (for wrapping) and accessor calls (for unwrapping), time is also consumed for type investigation (i.e., isAdapter and isUserDefined). For collection types this is especially important, because each element of a collection needs to be investigated and possibly wrapped/unwrapped.

However, we are able to considerably reduce the performance penalties by generation- and run-time optimizations. At generation-time, since all final (e.g., java.lang.String) and value (e.g., int) built-in types in the method signatures need no wrapping and unwrapping, the checking code of Listing 1 for them is not emitted decreasing the overhead. At runtime, we provide a fast adapter cache (implemented as a hash map) to speed up the dynamic adapter lookup when wrapping (and to avoid object schizophrenia, as discussed in Sect. 5). Since strong references in the adapter cache may hinder garbage collection, we use weak references to the framework objects cached and avoid thus memory leakage (i.e., unused objects remaining in memory). Whenever a framework object and its adapter are not used anymore they get collected automatically.

For the cache to work correctly, it is required that the methods hash-Code() and equals() are overridden according to the rules in the Java class documentation.

We performed the performance benchmarking under Windows Vista 32bit on an Athlon Turion TL60 (dual core with 2GHz each, 64bit) and 2GB RAM. The measurements were obtained by simple manual code instrumentation (to print the elapsed time). For the adapters generated in the JHotDraw case study, the overhead reached 6.5%, because of the collection types commonly present in method signatures. At the same time, the SalesPoint adapters implied less then 4.5% of overhead. Comparing to Java, the overhead of adapters we generated for the .NET version of SalesPoint was 10–15% less because of the more efficient way the linking policy is implemented (Sect. 4.2).

5. Delimiting the Technology

For certain refactorings, comebacks cannot be defined because of limitations of their execution context (i.e., adapters). For instance, one cannot define comebacks for field refactorings, because fields are not accessible in the adapters. In our approach, we require that all API fields are encapsulated (accessed by get/set methods), so that support for field refactorings is implied by the adaptation of the corresponding accessor methods. We also cannot implement comebacks for InlineMethod and InlineClass, which require adaptation means (e.g., to access this) beyond the adapters’ message forwarding. However, adapters suffice for the reverse refactorings ExtractMethod and ExtractClass.

Delegation as a reuse mechanism introduces object schizophrenia [36] due to the dichotomy of the adapter and adaptee objects: what should appear as a single object is actually broken up into two or more, each possessing its own identity, state, and behavior.

In our case, if not handled properly, adapters may expose their own object identity different from the corresponding framework objects (i.e., adaptees). As mentioned in the description of the wrap function on page 6, an adapter cache guarantees that there is at most one adapter instance for a given framework object, ensuring that a framework object possibly referred to from multiple contexts will always be wrapped in exactly the same adapter. So far we did not evaluate this approach in the presence of object serialization.

Some problems may be caused by differences in the structure of adapters containing adaptation-specific members (e.g., the delegation field) and of original framework types. Assume an instance of a framework class is serialized and then in a new framework version the class is adapted. The default serialization mechanism of both .NET (System.Runtime.Serialization namespace) and Java (java.io.Serializable) fail to restore the serialized instance due to the structural mismatch between the adapter and the original class. Therefore, whenever serialization is needed, a custom serialization process has to be provided to properly initialize the adapter. In .NET this is achieved by implementing the interface ISerializable and in Java by providing the private instance methods readObject() and writeObject()

These structural differences may also lead to run-time problems, in case developers misuse reflective method calls to the framework API types (e.g., by relying on the relative order of methods).

Since adapters introduce new methods (e.g., adapter constructors) and may change the initial method order, a wrong method may get called. In [34] we identify several cases that may potentially invalidate our adaptation approach and suggest appropriate solutions.

The main requirement of our approach is the availability of the totally ordered refactoring history. For Java it comes “for free” in Eclipse and JBuilder. We developed a query facility that reads in and serializes the Eclipse log into a set of corresponding Prolog facts to be re-used in ComeBack!. Since there is no similar tool for .NET, we developed a prototypic annotation language [40] to demarcate applied refactorings in the C# code. The task of manual annotation is alleviated by a version control system that silently assigns unique identifiers to API types and signatures and is able to detect some refactorings automatically (e.g., class and method rename, method move). For other refactorings (e.g., method extraction, addition of method parameters) it prompts developers for additional information. In case of framework branching, the total order of the refactoring trace is achieved by merging separately recorded refactorings [15, p. 76].

6. Related Work

In general, three main groups of approaches cope with component change in case depending applications are not available for analysis and update.
Prescription. Often the way developers should change a component is prescribed either implicitly (e.g., implied by the programming practice in general, or by some shared knowledge in a certain developer community) or in the form of best practice tutorials and handbooks. For instance, des Rivières enumerates which changes of Java components will not break applications and under which conditions [14]. Mikhailov and Sekerinski [28] formally define conditions and prescribe a set of requirements to avoid the Fragile Base Class Problem. However, some of these requirements (e.g., never start or stop calling a new method from an existing base class) are too restrictive for framework evolution.

Prevention. A group of approaches relies on the use of a legacy middleware [2, 4] or, at least, a specific communication protocol [20, 27] to interconnect components. The middleware prevents applications from observing component changes, often in a transparent manner. However, most of the compensated changes are trivial (additive changes), with more complex ones being prohibited by the middleware. Moreover, such approaches imply a middleware-dependent application development; that is, developers must use an interface definition language and data types of the middleware and obey its communication protocols.

Facilitation. The third group consists of approaches to distribute the change information and facilitate the remote component update. In most of the cases, component developers have to manually provide such information either as different annotations within the component’s source code [11, 13, 31] or in a separate specification [24, 30, 41]. Annotations are then used by a transformation engine to adapt the old application code. The main advantage of these approaches, also comparing to our approach, is their power: given the required specifications, potentially any kind of change can be adapted. However, in case of large and complex legacy applications the cumbersome task of writing specifications and adaptation rules is expensive and error-prone. Moreover, once written, specifications need to be maintained along the component evolution.

The idea of recording the refactorings applied to a software component for their later application to the client code is the basis of CatchUp! [22] that is able to listen for, capture and record refactorings applied in Eclipse. The recorded refactorings are then “replayed” on the application code to synchronize it with the changed component. However, the tool fails when a refactoring cannot be played back in the application context (e.g., if the renaming of a component method introduces conflicts with some application-defined method). Furthermore, this intrusive way of update requires available application sources and implies a new application version for each component upgrade.

Instead of adapting clients, in [18] Dig et al. adapt the framework (or software library). For each breaking refactoring they define a compensating refactoring that *inlines* the corresponding code directly in the library. For example, for Rename-Method(oldMd, newMd) inserting the method that delegates to newMd. Given an old library and a refactoring trace, they execute the compensating refactorings in the same order as the original refactorings. Effectively, instead of putting a wrapper around the library, they give it two (the old and the new) interfaces. Similarly to our approach, object identities are preserved and the side-by-side execution is supported. Performance penalties are reported to be less than 1%. Moreover, having access to the old implementation they can recover deleted methods. However, their adaptation does not handle refactorings contradicting each other in the scope of a class (e.g. deleting a method M and then renaming another one to M). Moreover, their implementation is Java-centric, cannot be re-used for other languages and supports only several refactorings (e.g., no interface refactorings). In addition, the tool cannot cope with the FBCP (Sect. 2). Finally, the compensating refactorings are defined ad hoc, implementation-specific, and not formally validated.

7. Conclusions and Future Work

We stipulate that treating refactoring as a specification of syntactic changes it is possible to support sound and practical adaptation of most of the problem-causing API changes. In this paper we discuss how our refactoring-based adaptation scales. In two case studies of unconstrained API evolution we show that, when developers want to improve the framework, most of their changes are refactorings. For certain API changes breaking plugins of white-box frameworks with dynamic linking we argue that our adapter-based approach is a more appropriate short-term solution than invasive adaptation. On the long run, if it is possible to carefully analyze, update, and test plugins, one could switch to invasive adaptation.

The binary adaptation performed by our tool ComeBack! is efficient and unobtrusive for existing plugins: they need neither manual adaptation nor recompilation. It is also undemanding by alleviating the process of writing and maintaining adaptation specifications. Moreover, the refactoring-based adaptation not only reduces the costs and improves the quality of framework upgrade but also relaxes the constraints on the permitted API changes allowing for more appropriate framework evolution.

We will extend our tool by combining it with protocol adaptation [33]; given a valid protocol adaptation specification, it is converted into corresponding facts and rules inside ComeBack! that generate the adaptation code.
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