

Parallel Generation of LR Parsers

by

Manuel E. Bermudez

George Logothetis

Richard Newman-Wolfe

University of Florida

Gainesville, FL 32611

Generation of LR Parsers.

- 1) Generate LR(0) Parser.
- 2) Add Lookahead Information.
- 3) Encode into Parse Table.

ACTION Table:

	t_1	t_2	$\dots$	t_n
p_1	S/q			
$\dots$				
p_m			R/A $\rightarrow \omega$	

Four types of entries:

- “S/q”: Shift to state q.
- “R/A $\rightarrow \omega$ ”: Reduce using $A \rightarrow \omega$.
- Accept the input.
- Error.

	t_1	t_2	$\dots$	t_n
p_1	S/q			
$\dots$				
p_m			R/A $\rightarrow \omega$	

Criteria for filling table:

- ACTION(p,t) = “S/q” if $p \xrightarrow{t} q$.
- ACTION(p,t) = “R/A $\rightarrow \omega$ ” if $t \in \text{Follow}(A)$, in the SLR(1) technique.
- $\text{Follow}(A) = \{t \mid S \Rightarrow^* \alpha A t x\}$.
- LALR(1) similar; different Follow sets.

Critical Observations:

- Follow sets are not independent.
- Rows in ACTION table are not independent.
- Can fill table **by column**, not by row.
- Each column is **completely** independent.
- Can assign one processor to each column.
- Speedup factor: min (processors, terminals).

Decomposition of Follow sets:

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Follow}(A) &= \text{IFollow}(A) \cup \text{DFollow}(A), \\ \text{IFollow}(A) &= \cup \{ \text{Follow}(B) \mid B \rightarrow \alpha A \gamma, \gamma \Rightarrow^* \varepsilon \}, \\ \text{DFollow}(A) &= \cup \{ \text{First}(X) \mid B \rightarrow \alpha A \gamma X \delta, \gamma \Rightarrow^* \varepsilon \}, \\ \text{First}(A) &= \cup \{ \text{First}(X) \mid A \rightarrow \gamma X \delta, \gamma \Rightarrow^* \varepsilon \}, \\ \text{First}(t) &= \{t\}.\end{aligned}$$

In relational form,

- $X \text{ ff } A$ if $A \rightarrow \gamma X \delta$ and $\gamma \Rightarrow^* \varepsilon$.
- $X \text{ fF } A$ if $B \rightarrow \alpha A \gamma X \delta$ and $\gamma \Rightarrow^* \varepsilon$.
- $B \text{ FF } A$ if $B \rightarrow \alpha A \gamma$ and $\gamma \Rightarrow^* \varepsilon$.

Theorem: $t \in \text{Follow}(A)$ iff $t (\text{ff}^* \circ \text{fF} \circ \text{FF}^*) A$.

Algorithm Compute_SLR_Action_Table(t):

Input: LR(0) automaton, ff, fF, FF;

Output: ACTION: vector indexed by states;

var t_in_First: bit vector indexed by symbols;

t_in_Follow: bit vector indexed by nonterminals;

procedure Follow_to_Follow(A):

begin

if t_in_Follow[A] **then return;**

set t_in_Follow[A];

for each (q, $A \rightarrow \omega$) **do**

Add “Reduce/ $A \rightarrow \omega$ ” **to** ACTION[q];

for each B **such that** A FF B **do**

Follow_to_Follow(B);

end;

procedure First_to_First(X):

begin

if t_in_First[X] **then return;**

set t_in_First[X];

for each A **such that** X fF A **do**

Follow_to_Follow(A);

for each Y **such that** X ff Y **do**

First_to_First(Y);

end;

begin

clear t_in_First[X], **for each** symbol X;

clear t_in_Follow[A], **for each** nonterminal A;

First_to_First(t); {ff* ◦ fF ◦ FF*}.

end;

Conclusions.

- SLR(1) parsers can be generated in a totally parallel fashion.
- LALR(1) can be similarly generated.
- A fairly large number of processors can be productively used.
- Speedup factor: $\min(\text{processors}, \text{terminals})$.
- The storage requirements of each parallel processor are reasonable.