

Zabir Raihan  
32353057

---

## 1. Design of the Code

### High-Level Description of Approach

The parser is constructed using a bottom-up approach, defining the smallest possible parsers first and then combining them to create larger, more complex parsers. The parser combinators allow parsers to be combined in a modular and declarative way.

### High-Level Structure of Code

The code is structured into several sections, each dealing with a specific part of the JavaScript syntax. The first section defines a series of basic parsers and combinators, including parsers for specific characters and tokens, and combinators for sequences and alternatives. The following sections define parsers for different types of expressions and statements.

Finally there is a section dedicated to pretty printing the various parsed parts.

### Code Architecture Choices

The use of small, modular functions in combination with parser combinators allows for a clean and readable codebase. The code is highly modular, with each parser encapsulated in its own function. This makes it easy to extend the parser with new features or modify existing ones. For example, if we want to add integer division arithmetic expression, we will just have to add the parsing function specifically for it and add it to the end of the data types, unified comparison parser and pretty printer without affecting anything else. The same applies if lets say we want to add support for lambda expressions (which was done as a bonus attempt)

---

## 2. Parsing

### BNF Grammar

The BNF grammar for the JavaScript subset is implicitly defined by the structure of the parsers and combinators. For example, the ``expr`` parser, which parses expressions, is defined as a choice between different types of expressions, each parsed by its own parser.

### Usage of Parser Combinators

Parser combinators are used extensively to construct complex parsers from simpler ones. For instance, the `sepBy` combinator is used to parse comma-separated lists of values, and the binary operators are parsed using a generic `binaryOp` combinator.

### Choices Made in Creating Parsers

The choice to use parser combinators was motivated by their expressive power and modularity. They provide a declarative way to describe the grammar of the language and can be easily composed to create more complex parsers. Monadic parser combinators, in particular, offer a high level of abstraction and make it possible to define parsers in a way that closely resembles the structure of the language being parsed.

### Construction Using Functor, Applicative, and Monad Typeclasses

Parsers in this design heavily leverage the `Functor`, `Applicative`, and `Monad` typeclasses. For instance, the use of `<*>` (an applicative operation) in `sepBy1` and `<$>` (`fmap`) in various parsers indicates how these typeclasses provide the necessary operations to combine and sequence parsers effectively.

The `Functor` typeclass is used to define how to apply a function to the result of a parser (`fmap`). The `Applicative` typeclass is used to define how to apply a parsed function to a parsed argument (`<*>`), and how to construct a parser that always succeeds with a given value (`pure`). The `Monad` typeclass is used to define how to feed the result of one parser into another parser (`>=>`).

---

## 3. Functional Programming

The code is written in a declarative style, with small, modular functions that are composed together to create more complex functions. This style of programming is characteristic of functional programming and is well-suited to the task of parsing. All functions used for parsing are pure. Declarative style has been used throughout to make the parser easy to read and reason about. For instance, the definition of `arithExpr` simply expresses that an arithmetic expression can be any one of addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, or power operation, without detailing the steps to parse each one.

---

## 4. Haskell Language Features Used

**Typeclasses, Custom Types and pattern matching**

The Haskell typeclass system is used to define the behavior of the `Parser` type. Custom types are used for almost everything to represent different kinds of expressions and statements, allowing for a type-safe way of dealing with the different elements of the JavaScript syntax. Haskell's pattern matching has been used extensively too. The type of input was observed and depending on the input, specific functions were binded to the input. This enhanced readability and potential of extending

### Higher-Order Functions

The code frequently uses higher-order functions like `binaryOp` which takes functions as arguments. The pervasive usage of operators from the `Functor` (`<$>`) and `Applicative` (`<*>`) typeclasses, as seen in `sepBy1`, demonstrates how these abstractions simplify complex operations.

### Function Composition

A hallmark of Haskell, function composition, is evident throughout. By chaining together small operations, we build up more complex behaviors without nested calls or verbose interim variables. This is particularly evident in parsers such as `ternaryExpr`, which sequences multiple parsers, or in the `conditional` parser which also does something similar

—

## Bonus Features

### Evaluating Arithmetic, Comparative and Logical Expressions:

When any of these expressions are detected, functions for evaluating them have been implemented. The evaluation is not too complex at the moment; it is not able to evaluate combination of the different types of expressions. But within the same type of expression, it can complete complex calculation such as a long chain of arithmetic operations or a chain of boolean logic.

An `ExerciseD` was created in `Assignment.hs` to showcase this. The inputs and outputs were placed in `javascript/inputs/D` and `javascript/output/D`.

### Parsing Lambda expressions:

The code was updated to be able to handle lambda expressions. It was possible to integrate into a constant declaration as well. Much of this is fairly simple and not very complex but that was possible due to the modular nature of the existing code. All that was needed was to add specific logic for lambdas and the rest was just adding it to the data types. Several of the helper functions in conjunction with the power of `Applicative` to achieve this.

An `ExerciseE` was created in `Assignment.hs` to showcase this. The inputs and outputs were placed in `javascript/inputs/E` and `javascript/output/E`. Note that the structures of

exercise D and exercise C are fundamentally the same but was separated for clarity and differentiating.

The outputs for both Exercise D and Exercise E were generated using `stack test`, ie it is possible to add more inputs and the program will parse and pretty print accordingly.

For both the bonus features, Spec.hs was edited to add Exercise D and Exercise E.

*\*The style.css was edited to increase size of boxes to better display the pretty printed outputs*