Where [e] is equivalent to the empty set, or epsilon.

```
1. <expr>
         ::= <a> <t>
2. <t>
         ::= <expr>
3.
         | [e]
4. <a>
         ::= <b> <u>
5. <u>
         ::= <binop> <a>
         | [e]
6.
7. <b>
         ::= <incrop> <b>
8.
         | <c>
         ::= <d> <v>
9. <c>
10 <v>
         ::= <incrop> <v>
11
         | [e]
12 <d>
         ::= $<b>
13
         | <e>
14 <e>
         ::= (<expr>)
          | <num>
15
<incrop> ::= ++ | --
::= 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9
<num>
Nullable(expr) = False
Nullable(t)
             = True
             = False
Nullable(a)
            = True
Nullable(u)
Nullable(b)
            = False
Nullable(c)
             = False
Nullable(v)
             = True
Nullable(d)
             = False
            = False
Nullable(e)
Nullable(incrop) = False
Nullable(binop) = False
Nullable(num)
             = False
FIRST(expr) = {incrop, F, (, num}
FIRST(t)
           = {incrop, F, (, num, [e]}
          = {incrop, F, (, num}
FIRST(a)
FIRST(u)
         = {binop, [e]}
          = {incrop, F, (, num}
FIRST(b)
FIRST(c)
          = {F, (, num}
FIRST(v)
           = {incrop}
           = {F, (, num}
FIRST(d)
           = {(, num}
FIRST(e)
FIRST(incrop) = {incrop}
FIRST(binop) = {binop}
FIRST(num)
           = \{num\}
FOLLOW(expr) = {), $}
FOLLOW(t)
           = {), $}
FOLLOW(a)
           = \{num, ), \$\}
           = {num, ), $}
FOLLOW(u)
           = {incrop, binop, num, ), $}
FOLLOW(b)
```

```
FOLLOW(c) = {incrop, binop, num, ), $}
FOLLOW(v) = {incrop, binop, num, ), $}
FOLLOW(d) = {incrop, binop, num, ), $}
FOLLOW(e) = {incrop, binop, num, ), $}
FOLLOW(incrop) = {incrop, F, (, num, ), $}
FOLLOW(binop) = {incrop, F, (, num}
FOLLOW(num) = {incrop, binop, num, ), $}
```

	Input Symbols						
	()	num	incro	p binop	F	\$
expr	r1		r1	r1		r1	
t	r2	r3	r2	r2		r2	r3
a	r4		r4	r4		r4	
u		r6	r6		r5		r6
b	r8		r8	r7		r8	
С	r9		r9			r9	
V		r11	r11	r10	r11		r11
d	r13		r13			r12	
e	r14		r14				

Is our grammar a LL(1) grammar?

[–] Yes. For each set of productions for each symbol, their FIRST() definitions are pairwise disjoint. Also, for each symbol, A, having a nullable RHS as a production, each other non-nullable FIRST(RHS) $/\setminus$ FOLLOW(A) is disjoint. These fulfill the rules of LL(1) grammars. Furthermore, there is no left-recursion or ambiguity.