## Project 3

## Abhi Agarwal

## Notes

My first assumption is that there can't be more than 4 arguments. I have manually handled each argument to save time designing a register allocator for that portion. This also makes it simpler for us as designers because there are registers R0-R3 that are specifically as parameters, and so we didn't have to push things on and off the stack.

There are also limitations I want to offer because I couldn't figure them out or ran out of time:

- 1. The biggest flaws are the ideas that register allocation is not complete. I wasn't able to get this done as I ran out of time for this particular assignment. I managed to get register allocation done for variables and arguments, but sadly not for the expressions (1 \* 1). They get placed into a preset register that I've coded into there manually. It's not the most promising solution.
- 2. The next biggest flaw is that Expressions are not evaluated. I did not get enough time to be able to program them well, and so they are just simulating a pre-fixed condition that just does a branch from them to either True or False depending on how I programmed them. I also did not get time to complete this. There's a scheme (T) that takes in 3 arguments and just returns the branching variable.
- 3. Something more minor is that the function call parameters have to either be all variables or all integers. This was my mistake, and I took the easy way out. I made this a design decision because I didn't have enough time to complete a good design. However, the better way here would just be to have a better designed scheme that does a recursive call.
- 4. The operations in Expression (+,-, etc.) work, but they have pre-defined registers as I have mentioned above. This would have been simple to fix, but I just ran out of time (apologies again).

My register allocation was done by a simple NextRegister scheme, which I manually mapped out to provide for the next register. For the Argument scheme this was not too useful because I just set the next register manually (I knew how many registers there

were). This was only used when the user declared var because then we could just update the attribute.

I had 3 inherited attributes -  $\mathbf{e}$ ,  $\mathbf{r}$ ,  $\mathbf{nr}$ .  $\mathbf{e}$  was the environment,  $\mathbf{r}$  was just a mapping from the register and if it was being used or not, and  $\mathbf{nr}$  was the next register we used. The idea behind  $\mathbf{r}$  was just to help me clean up the garbage, and allow me to switch  $\mathbf{nr}$  more intelligently in the future, but I wasn't able to accomplish this in this given program. The idea for  $\mathbf{nr}$  is just a simple way to get the next register we need to allocate. The + as they key because I wanted to use the minus later as a lookahead for the next register if I ever needed to allocate 2 registers at the same time.

I did not have to push anything on the stack, but the initial configurations when a new function was loaded. I wanted to use this particular feature incase we ran out of registers, but I just made an assumption that we would never get to that point. The NextRegister scheme would just throw an error if we the next register was greater than R12.

Overall, I think I'm very proud of this particular assignment as it turned out and taught me much more about HACS than Pr2 did. I wish I had the knowledge I had for this particular assignment for the previous projects. I really enjoyed HACS, and I think it's one of the more incredible tools I've seen (after I understood it well).