

# CS 310, Assignment 5

## Answers

1. Consider the following context-free grammar with start symbol  $S$ , nonterminals  $\{S, X, C, B\}$ , and terminals  $\{a, b\}$ :

$$S \rightarrow Xb \quad X \rightarrow C \quad X \rightarrow Ba \quad C \rightarrow a \quad C \rightarrow \epsilon \quad B \rightarrow b$$

- (a) Compute *all* the sets FIRST and FOLLOW necessary to implement a recursive decent parser for this grammar.

---

ANSWER: We do not need to compute any sets for  $S$  (there is a single rule for that symbol).

$X$  has two rules and it is also the case that  $X \Rightarrow \epsilon$  so we need:

$$\text{FIRST}(C) = \{a, \text{EOS}\} \quad \text{FIRST}(Ba) = \{b\} \quad \text{FOLLOW}(X) = \{b\}$$

$C$  also has two rules, one of them an  $\epsilon$ -rule, so we need:

$$\text{FIRST}(a) = \{a\} \quad \text{FOLLOW}(C) = \{b\}$$

- 
- (b) Is this grammar suitable for recursive descent parsing? Justify your answers formally based on the sets computed in the previous question.

---

ANSWER: The grammar is not suitable for recursive descent parsing since  $\text{FIRST}(Ba) \cap \text{FOLLOW}(X) = \{b\} \neq \emptyset$ .

---

2. What should the pre-condition  $P$  be in each of the following correctness statements for the statement to be an instance of Hoare's assignment axiom scheme? All variables are of type `int`.

(a)  $P \{ x = 1; \} x \leq 2$

(b)  $P \{ x = 2; \} x \leq 1$

(c)  $P \{ x = x + y; \} x * x > 5$

(d)  $P \{ x = x + y; \} \text{ForAll } (y=0; y<10) x*y > 0$

(e)  $P \{ x = x + y; \} \text{Exists } (x=0; x<100) x*y \geq x+y-z$

(f)  $P \{ x = x + y; \} \text{Exists } (y=0; y < x) \ z+y \geq x$

---

ANSWER:

- (a)  $1 \leq 2$  or true
  - (b)  $2 \leq 1$  or false
  - (c)  $(x+y)*(x+y) > 5$  (note the parentheses)
  - (d)  $\text{ForAll } (k=0; k < 10) \ (x+y)*k > 0$  (we need to rename the bound variable  $y$  because its name clashes with the  $y$  introduced by the assignment)
  - (e)  $\text{Exists } (x=0; x < 100) \ x*y \geq x+y-z$  (no change, since all the occurrences of  $x$  refer to the bound variable; this can be verified by renaming the bound variable  $x$ )
  - (f)  $\text{Exists } (k=0; k < x) \ z+k \geq x+y$  (the bound variable  $y$  was renamed again because a free variable with the same name is introduced by the substitution)
- 

3. Consider the following correctness statements where  $S$  is any terminating code. In each case give the least restrictive conditions that the code  $S$  has to satisfy in order to make the correctness statement valid.

- (a)  $\text{ASSERT}(\text{false})$   
 $S$   
 $\text{ASSERT}(\text{true})$
- 

ANSWER: The statement is valid for any terminating code  $S$  since the post-condition holds no matter what.

---

- (b)  $\text{ASSERT}(\text{false})$   
 $S$   
 $\text{ASSERT}(\text{false})$
- 

ANSWER: The statement is valid for any terminating code  $S$ .

Indeed, the statement says that when the code is started in a state satisfying assertion **false**, then when the code terminates it will be in a state satisfying assertion **false**. Since no state can satisfy the pre-condition, the implication holds vacuously.

---