In grammars, capital letters represent nonterminals, lower case letters represent terminals. One sentence answers are sufficient for the “essay” questions.

1. (6 points) Compiler front end.
   
   (a) What is the primary function of the scanner and what computational mechanism is used to accomplish it?
   
   (b) What is the primary function of the parser and what computational mechanism is used to accomplish it?
   
   (c) How do you decide what should be handled by the scanner versus the parser? (Hint: think of the complexity of languages)

2. (20 points) Scanner construction.

   (a) Construct a regular expression for recognizing all non-empty strings composed of the letters a and b that do not end in b.
   
   (b) Convert the regular expression to an NFA using Thompson’s construction algorithm.
   
   (c) Convert the NFA to a DFA (show the sets of NFA states for each DFA state).
   
   (d) Minimize the DFA (show the sets of DFA states for each minimized DFA state).

3. (16 points) Consider the following grammar:

   \[ E \rightarrow E + E \mid a \]

   (a) When is a grammar ambiguous?
   
   (b) Show that the grammar is ambiguous for the string \(a + a + a\)
   
   (c) What happens if you write a recursive-descent parser for this grammar?
   
   (d) Fix the grammar to avoid this problem.

4. (16 points) Consider the following grammar:

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   S & \rightarrow AB \\
   A & \rightarrow a \mid \epsilon \\
   B & \rightarrow b \mid \epsilon
   \end{align*}
   \]

   (a) Calculate FIRST for S, A, B:
   
   (b) Calculate FOLLOW for S, A, B:

5. (6 points) Consider the following ACTION/GOTO tables:

   \[
   \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|}
   \hline
   \text{State} & \text{Action} & \text{Goto} \\
   \hline
   0 & \text{shift 1} & \text{reduce} \text{E} \rightarrow \epsilon & 2 & 3 \\
   1 & \text{shift 3} & \text{reduce} \text{A} \rightarrow a & 0 \\
   2 & \text{accept} & \text{reduced} & 3 & 0 \\
   3 & \text{shift 1} & \text{accept} & 1 \\
   \hline
   \end{array}
   \]

   Show the contents of the stack and input buffer for the shift-reduce parse of "a", assuming State 0 is the start state:

6. (20 points) Consider the following augmented grammar:

   \[
   \begin{align*}
   P1 & \rightarrow S \\
   P2 & \rightarrow E \rightarrow E + E \\
   P3 & \rightarrow a
   \end{align*}
   \]

   (a) Derive the canonical sets of LR(0) items
   
   (b) Derive the canonical sets of LR(1) items
   
   (c) Build the LR(1) parse table
   
   (d) For each shift/reduce or reduce/reduce conflict you find (if any), describe what would happen for the different ways to resolve the conflict(s).

7. (16 points) Consider the following sets of LR(1) items in the states of a LR(1) parser:

   \[
   \begin{array}{|c|}
   \hline
   \text{State 0:} & \text{State 2:} \\
   \hline
   [A \rightarrow \bullet a, b] & [A \rightarrow \bullet a, c] \\
   [A \rightarrow a \bullet, c] & [A \rightarrow a \bullet, b] \\
   [B \rightarrow a \bullet, b] & [B \rightarrow a \bullet, a] \\
   \hline
   \end{array}
   \]

   \[
   \begin{array}{|c|}
   \hline
   \text{State 1:} & \text{State 3:} \\
   \hline
   [A \rightarrow \bullet a, a] & [A \rightarrow \bullet a, b] \\
   [A \rightarrow \bullet a, b] & [B \rightarrow \bullet a, b] \\
   [B \rightarrow a \bullet, b] & \\
   \hline
   \end{array}
   \]

   (a) Find all conflicts, listing state, pair of LR(1) items, and lookahead(s) causing conflict.
   
   (b) List states that would be merged in a LALR(1) parser.
   
   (c) List additional conflicts in the LALR(1) parser, if any.
   
   (d) What are the advantages of LALR over LR parsers?