Task 1 - 3: 19th

Task 4 - 6: 24th / 26th

Task 7 - 9: 27th / 31st

Parser

- Task 1: Finalize AST Node Structures
 - Create the data structures for every node type the AST will have (e.g., IfNode, AssignNode, PlusNode).
- Task 2: Check LL1 Grammar Conversion
- Ensure:
 - Ambiguity Eliminated: "dangling-else" ambiguity:
 - BRANCH ::= if TERM { ALGO }
 - BRANCH ::= if TERM { ALGO } else { ALGO }
 - Left-Factorization Performed: Factor out the common prefix if TERM { ALGO
 } to make the choice deterministic for an LL1 parser
 - Left-Recursion Eliminated: Check for any remaining left-recursion (though the SPL grammar seems to favor right-recursion, which is good for LL1).
- Task 3: Implement the Recursive Descent Parser
 - Compute First, Follow, Lookahead and closure algorithmically
 - Write one parsing function for each non terminal in the new LL1 grammar (e.g., parse_algo(), parse_term()).
 - Inside each function, use the next token (lookahead) to decide which production rule to follow.
 - As the parser executes, it should build and return the corresponding AST node.

Semantic Analysis: scopes and types

traverses AST to check for context sensitive errors and gather information for the code generator.

- Scoping Rules
 - Static Scoping. Spec says static, all name resolution can be done at compile time.
- Task 4: Implement the Symbol Table
 - Data Structure: Since SPL has nested scopes (global, main, proc/func locals), a
 hash map of stacks implementation seems plausible. Pushing a new map on
 scope entry and popping it on exit naturally handles static scoping.
 - Information to Store: For each identifier, the symbol table should store its type (numeric, boolean, string, or type-less for procedures) and its scope level.
 We'll also need to store a unique, generated name for use in the IR phase (mapping user-defined x to a unique vx).

• Task 5: Implement the Scope Checker

- Create a tree crawling algorithm (recursive visits) that traverses the AST.
- This crawler will use the symbol table to enforce the rules from Phase 2:
 SPL_Scopes.pdf:
 - No duplicate declarations within the same scope (e.g., in VARIABLES or MAXTHREE).
 - No shadowing of parameters by local variables .
 - No name clashes between variables, procedures, and functions in the global scope 4.
 - Verify that every variable used has been declared in a valid scope (local
 -> parameter -> global).

Task 6: Implement the Type Checker

- Create another tree-crawling pass (or combine it with the scope checker). This
 pass implements the rules from Phase 3: SPL_Types.pdf.
- It uses the (now validated) information in the symbol table to check types. The
 output of this phase is an annotated AST, where each expression node is
 decorated with its type (numeric or boolean).
- Key checks include:
 - The condition (TERM) of if, while, and until must be of type boolean.
 - The operands of plus, minus, mult, div must be numeric, and the result is numeric.
 - The operands of and, or must be boolean, and the result is boolean.
 - The variable on the left side of an assignment must be numeric.

Intermediate Code Generation

Translate validated and annotated AST into a ir representation

- Decision: IR Format
 - Choice: Three-Address Code. As per the project specs, use a format where each instruction has at most one operator (e.g., t1 = v1 + v2).
- Task 7: Implement Translation Functions
 - Write a recursive tree-crawling code generator (translate(node)) that emits IR instructions for each AST node.
 - Translate Expressions (TERM, ATOM): Flatten expression trees into a sequence
 of instructions, using temporary variables (newvar()) for intermediate results.
 - Translate Control Flow (if, while, do-until):
 - Implement the custom logic from Phase 4: code-gen.pdf. Remember:
 - Use REM L name for labels.

- The if-then-else structure must be translated without an ELSE keyword in the target code, using a GOTO to jump over the else block's code.
- Translate Logical Operators (and, or, not):
 - Implement the "cascading" (short-circuiting) logic using conditional jumps, as specified in the instructions13.
 - For not(TERM), translate it as if it were TERM, but swap the true and false branches/labels.
- Translate Function/Procedure Calls
 - For now, simply generate a placeholder CALL instruction. The spec states that these will be handled by **inlining** later.
 - Example for x = myfunc(y): $t1 = CALL myfunc(v_y)$, then $v_x = t1$.

IR to BASIC

Convert simple IR into executable BASIC code.

- Task 8: Implement Function Inlining
 - Before emitting BASIC, process the IR to handle the CALL instructions.
 - For each CALL to a non-recursive function/procedure, replace it by:
 - Generating assignment instructions to pass parameters.
 - Copying the translated body of the called function/procedure into the call site.
 - For functions, replace the return ATOM instruction inside the copied body with an assignment to the target variable of the CALL.
 - o In lining process from slides .
- Task 9: Implement the BASIC Emitter
 - Two passes over the inlined IR.
 - First Pass (Label Mapping): Iterate through the IR without generating code. Create a map that associates every symbolic label (L0, L1, etc.) with a future line number (e.g., L0 -> 140, L1 -> 180).
 - Second Pass (Code Emission):
 - Iterate through the IR again, this time generating the final BASIC code.
 - Prepend a line number to each instruction, incrementing by 10 (e.g., 10, 20, 30...).
 - For GOTO Lx or IF ... THEN Lx, look up Lx in the label map and emit the corresponding line number.
 - All other instructions are likely a direct mapping.
 - Write the final numbered lines to a .txt output file.

<u> </u>	<u> </u>
;;	;;
[[]]	[]
;;	;;
;;	;;
;;	;;
;;	;;
;;	;;
;;	;;
;;	;;
	;;;;;;
	;;;;;
;;;;;	;;;;;
;;;; ;;;	;;;;;
;;;; ;;;	;;;;;
;;;; ;;;	;;;;;
;;;;; ;;;	;;;;;
;;;;;	;;;;;
	II