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Abstract

Our intention is to describe a parallel algorithm (using two processors) for evaluating the attribute instances of an attributed derivation tree.

In the first section, we present some basic notions (graphs, trees, context-free and attribute grammars).

The second section emphasizes two ways for representing the ordered oriented trees and the bidirectional traversal is also pointed out.

In the third section, we present a new approach for evaluating the attribute instances of an attributed derivation tree. We have called this strategy the bidirectional attribute evaluation.

In the last section, we formulate some conclusions and open problems.
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1 Basic Notions

An alphabet is a finite set $V$. $V^*$ is the set of all words over $V$. The empty word is denoted by $\lambda$.

Definition 1.1 We say that $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, E, s, d)$ is an oriented graph if $\mathcal{V}$ is the set of vertices, $E$ is the set of edges, $s : E \to \mathcal{V}$ (the source function), $d : E \to \mathcal{V}$ (the destination). If $s(e) = v$ and $d(e) = v'$, then the arc $e$ will be denoted $e : v \to v'$ or $v \xrightarrow{e} v'$, or simply $(v, v')$ if the name is not important (i.e. there exists at least one arc from $v$ to $v'$).

For any $v \in \mathcal{V}$, let $E(v) = \{e \mid s(e) = v\}$ and $S(v) = \{v' \mid \exists e \in E \text{ such that } v \xrightarrow{e} v'\}$.
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**Definition 1.2** For an oriented graph $G = (V, E, s, d)$, if $V$ and $E$ are finite, then $G$ is a finite oriented graph. If for any $v \in V$, $E(v)$ is a finite set, then $G$ is called a **locally oriented finite graph**.

For any $G = (V, E, s, d)$ a locally oriented finite graph, $E = \bigcup \limits_{v \in V} E(v)$ can be denoted in the following way:

$$E(v) = \{< v, 1 >, < v, 2 >, \ldots, < v, k_v >\}$$

That is, the set of all arcs having source $v$ (consequently the set of sons of $v$, i.e. $S(v)$) can be viewed as an ordered set. Such a locally oriented graph is called **ordered oriented graph**. From now on, we shall work only with finite ordered oriented graphs. The local ordering induces a total left-to-right order on leaves.

Other natural concept notions on graphs can be easily translated to an easier notation for finite ordered oriented graphs. For example, a **path** of length $n$ in $G$ from $v$ to $v'$ is a word $p \in E^*$, $p = e_1e_2\ldots e_n$, $n \geq 1$, where:

$$v = v_0 \xrightarrow{e_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{e_2} \ldots v_{n-1} \xrightarrow{e_n} v_n = v'$$

**Note.** We shall suppose that for any node there exists a path of length 0 denoted by $\lambda$. Other notions (connectivity, circuits, trees, etc.) can be defined by translation from their classical definitions. Furthermore, we suppose that the reader is familiar with notions concerning preorder traversal, depth first search, breadth search corresponding to trees and graphs ([CLR91]).

**Example 1.1** Let us consider the following ordered oriented tree

$T = \{1, 2, \ldots, 11\}, \{< 1, 1 >, < 1, 2 >, < 1, 3 >, < 3, 1 >, < 3, 2 >, < 4, 1 >, < 4, 2 >, < 4, 3 >, < 5, 1 >, < 5, 2 >\}, s, d$, where

$s(< 1, 1 >) = 1 \quad s(< 1, 2 >) = 1 \quad s(< 1, 3 >) = 1 \quad s(< 3, 1 >) = 3$

$s(< 3, 2 >) = 3 \quad s(< 4, 1 >) = 4 \quad s(< 4, 2 >) = 4 \quad s(< 4, 3 >) = 4$

$s(< 5, 1 >) = 5 \quad s(< 5, 2 >) = 5 \quad d(< 1, 1 >) = 2 \quad d(< 1, 2 >) = 3$

$d(< 1, 3 >) = 4 \quad d(< 3, 1 >) = 5 \quad d(< 3, 2 >) = 6 \quad d(< 4, 1 >) = 7$

$d(< 4, 2 >) = 8 \quad d(< 4, 3 >) = 9 \quad d(< 5, 1 >) = 10 \quad d(< 5, 2 >) = 11$

$T$ has the following graphic representation
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Figure 1.
and it has the preorder (depth first) traversal: 1,2,3,5,10,11,6,4,7,8,9.

We say that $G = (V_N, V_T, Z, P)$ is a context free grammar, if $V_N$ is the alphabet of nonterminal symbols, $V_T$ the alphabet of terminal symbols, and $V = V_N \cup V_T$ the set of symbols of $G$, $Z \in V_N$ the start symbol, $P \subseteq V_N \times V^*$ the set of productions. A pair $(A, \beta) \in P$ is called an $A$–production and it is denoted by $A \rightarrow \beta$. The productions $A \rightarrow \beta_1, A \rightarrow \beta_2, \ldots, A \rightarrow \beta_k$ will be denoted by $A \rightarrow \beta_1 \mid \beta_2 \mid \ldots \mid \beta_k$ (sometimes). The empty word will be denoted $\lambda$ (the word of length 0). A derivation in $G$ is denoted by $\alpha \Rightarrow \beta$ if $\exists A \in \alpha$ and $A \rightarrow r \in P$ such that $\alpha = \alpha_1 A \alpha_2$, $\beta = \beta_1 r \beta_2$; the transitive (reflexive) closure of the relation $\Rightarrow$ is denoted by $\Rightarrow^*$.

**Definition 1.3** A derivation tree $T = (V, E, s, d)$ for a context free grammar $G = (V_N, V_T, Z, P)$ is a node labelled finite ordered oriented tree. The labels of the nodes are given by a function $f : V \rightarrow V_N \cup V_T \cup \{\lambda\}$:

For any $v \in V$, with $S(v) = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k\}$, if $f(v) = X$, $f(v_1) = Y_1$, $f(v_2) = Y_2$, $\ldots$, $f(v_k) = Y_k$, then $G$ contains the production $X \rightarrow Y_1 Y_2 \ldots Y_k$.

If $f(v) = X$ (v being the root) and the word $w = v_1 v_2 \ldots v_n$ being the (ordered) labels of the leaves, we say that $T$ describes the word $w$ generated from $X$. If $X = Z$ and $w \in V_T$, then $T$ describes a word from $L(G)$.

**Definition 1.4** An attribute grammar ([Alb91a]) is a five-tuple

$$AG = (G, SD, AD, R, C),$$

defined as follows:

1. $G = (V_N, V_T, Z, P)$ is a (the underlying) context-free grammar. The grammar $G$ is assumed to be reduced in the sense that every nonterminal symbol is accessible from the start symbol and can generate a string that contains no nonterminal symbols.

1.1. $V_N$ and $V_T$ denote the alphabets of nonterminal and terminal symbols, respectively, and form the vocabulary $V = V_N \cup V_T$, $V_N \cap V_T = \emptyset$;

1.2. $P$ is the finite set of productions; a production $p \in P$ will be denoted as $p : X_p^0 \rightarrow X_p^1 \ldots X_p^{n_p}$, where $n_p \geq 0$, $X_p^0 \in V_N$ and $X_p^k \in V$ for $1 \leq k \leq n_p$;

1.3. $Z \in V_N$ is the start symbol, which does not appear on the right side of any production.

2. $SD = (TYPE – SET, FUNC – SET)$ is a semantic domain.

2.1. $TYPE – SET$ is a finite set of sets;

2.2. $FUNC – SET$ is a finite set of total functions of type

$$\text{type}_1 \times \ldots \times \text{type}_n \rightarrow \text{type}_c,$$

where $n \geq 0$ and $\text{type}_i \in TYPE – SET$ ($0 \leq i \leq n$).
(3) \( AD = (A, I, S, \text{TYPE}) \) is a description of attributes.

(3.1) For each symbol \( X \in V \) there exists a set \( A(X) \) of attributes which can be partitioned into two disjoint subsets \( I(X) \) and \( S(X) \) of inherited and synthesized attributes, respectively;

(3.2) The set of all attributes will be denoted by \( A \), i.e. \( A = \bigcup_{X \in V} A(X) \).

(3.3) Attributes associated with different symbols are considered as different, i.e. \( A(X) \cap A(Y) = \emptyset \) if \( X \neq Y \). If necessary an attribute \( a \) of symbol \( X \) will be denoted by \( X.a \);

(3.4) For \( a \in A \), \( \text{TYPE}(a) \in \text{TYPE} - \text{SET} \) is the set of possible values of \( a \).

(4) \( R(p) \) is a finite set of attribute evaluation rules (semantic rules) associated with the production \( p \in P \).

(4.1) Production \( p : X_p \rightarrow X_{pl} \ldots X_{pn} \) is said to have the attribute occurrence \( (a, p, k) \) if \( a \in A(X_{pk}) \);

(4.2) The set of all attribute occurrences of production \( p \) will be denoted by \( AO(p) \);

(4.3) The set \( AO(p) \) can be partitioned into two disjoint subsets of defined occurrences and used occurrences denoted by \( DO(p) \) and \( UO(p) \), respectively:

\[
DO(p) = \{ (s, p, 0) \mid s \in S(X_{pl}) \} \cup \{ (i, p, k) \mid i \in I(X_{pk}) \land 1 \leq k \leq n_p \} \\
UO(p) = \{ (i, p, 0) \mid s \in I(X_{pl}) \} \cup \{ (s, p, k) \mid i \in S(X_{pk}) \land 1 \leq k \leq n_p \}
\]

The attribute evaluation rules of \( R(p) \) specify how to compute the values of the attribute occurrences in \( DO(p) \) as a function of the values of certain other attribute occurrences in \( AO(p) \). The evaluation rule defining the attribute occurrence \( (a, p, k) \) has the form

\[
(a, p, k) := f((a_1, p, k_1), \ldots, (a_m, p, k_m))
\]

\( (a, p, k) \in DO(p) \), \( f : \text{TYPE}(a_1) \times \ldots \times \text{TYPE}(a_m) \rightarrow \text{TYPE}(a) \), \( f \in \text{FUNC} - \text{SET} \) and \( (a_i, p, k_i) \in AO(p) \) for \( 1 \leq k \leq m \). We say that \( (a, p, k) \) depends on \( (a_i, p, k_i) \), for \( 1 \leq i \leq m \).

(5) \( C(p) \) is a finite set of semantic conditions associated with the production \( p \). These conditions are predicates of the form

\[
\pi((a_1, p, k_1), \ldots, (a_m, p, k_m))
\]

\( \pi : \text{TYPE}(a_1) \times \ldots \times \text{TYPE}(a_m) \rightarrow \{ \text{true, false} \} \), \( \pi \in \text{FUNC} - \text{SET} \), and \( (a_i, p, k_i) \in AO(p) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq m \).
Semantic conditions allow the specification of a subset of the language defined by the underlying context-free grammar. A sentence that is generated by G is a sentence of the language specified by AG if the semantic conditions yield true. Traditionally, the definitions of attribute grammars require that both the start symbol and the terminal symbols to have no inherited attributes. We do not assume this restriction.

We have been so far concerned with the syntax of attribute grammars. Now let us discuss their semantics.

An unambiguous context-free grammar assigns a single derivation tree to each of its sentences. The nodes of a derivation tree are labelled with symbols from V. For each interior node there is a production \( X_{p_0} \to X_{p_1} \ldots X_{p_m} \), such that the node is labelled with \( X_{p_0} \) and its \( n_p \) sons are labelled with \( X_{p_1}, \ldots, X_{p_m} \), respectively. We say that \( p \) is the production \( \text{applied} \) at that node.

**Definition 1.5** A derivation tree is **complete** if it has only terminal symbols (or the empty string) as labels of its leaves and the start symbol as the label of its root.

Unless stated otherwise our derivation trees are assumed to be complete.

**Definition 1.6** Given a derivation tree in an attribute grammar 
\( AG = (G, SD, AD, R, C) \), instances of attributes are attached to the nodes in the following way: if node \( N \) is labelled with grammar symbol \( X \), then for each attribute \( "a" \in A(X) \) an instance of \( "a" \) is attached to node \( N \). We say that the derivation tree has the attribute instance \( N.a \). Let \( N_0 \) be a node, \( p \) a production at \( N_0 \) and \( N_1, \ldots, N_m \) the sons of \( N_0 \) in the given order (Definition 1.3). An attribute evaluation instruction

\[ N_k.a := f(N_{k_1}.a_1, \ldots, N_{k_m}.a_m) \]

is associated with attribute instance \( N_k.a \) if the attribute evaluation rule

\[ (a, p, k) := f((a_1, p, k_1), \ldots, (a_m, p, k_m)) \]

is associated with production \( p \). We say that attribute instance \( N_k.a \) depends on attribute instance \( N_{k_i}.a_i \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq m \). If all the values are known and satisfy all attribute evaluation rules then we say that the attributed derivation tree is **consistent**.

**Definition 1.7** A decorated (or attributed) derivation tree is a derivation tree in which all attribute instances have a value (which is not necessarily consistent). A **consistently decorated** (attributed) derivation tree is a derivation tree in which all attribute instances are defined according to their associated attribute evaluation instructions, i.e. the execution of any evaluation instruction does not change the values of the attribute associated with a tree node (as described below).
In this way, an attribute grammar assigns a (consistently) decorated derivation tree to each of its sentences. Some applications concentrate on the result of the semantic conditions which conclusively decide whether a sentence is semantically correct or not. Other applications are only interesting in a decorated derivation tree as an intermediate result in the compilation process. For these applications semantic conditions are not used.

**Definition 1.8** For each derivation tree \( T \) a dependency graph \( D(T) \) can be defined by taking the attribute instances of \( T \) as its vertices. The directed arc \((N_i, a, N_j, b)\) is contained in the graph if and only if attribute instance \( N_j, b \) depends on attribute instance \( N_i, a \). A path in a dependency graph will be called a dependency path. For \( n > 0 \), \( dp[N_1, a_1, N_2, a_2, \ldots, N_n, a_n] \) stands for a path with arcs \((N_1, a_1, N_2, a_2)\), \((N_2, a_2, N_3, a_3)\), \ldots, \((N_n, a_n, N_1, a_1)\). A path \( dp[N_1, a_1, N_2, a_2, \ldots, N_n, a_n, N_1, a_1] \) will be called a circular dependency path. An attribute grammar is circular if it includes a derivation tree whose dependency graph contains a circular dependency graph. An attribute grammar is called non-circular (well defined) if it is not circular. The class of all well defined grammars is denoted by WAG.

The task of an attribute evaluator is to compute the values of all attribute instances attached to the derivation tree, by executing the attribute evaluation instructions associated with these attribute instances. Generally, the order of the evaluation is free, with the only restriction that an attribute evaluation instruction cannot be executed before its arguments are available. An attribute instance is available if its value is defined, otherwise it is unavailable. Initially all attribute instances attached to the derivation tree are unavailable, with the exception of the inherited attribute instances attached to the root (containing information concerning the environment of the program) and the synthesized attribute instances attached to the leaves (determined by the parser). At each step an attribute instance whose value can be computed is chosen. The evaluation process continues until all attribute instances in the tree are defined or until none of the remaining attribute instances can be evaluated.

For a traditional attribute evaluator, as described above, it is impossible to evaluate attribute instances involved in a circular dependency path.

**Example 1.2** Let \( AG = (G_1, SD_1, AD_1, R_1, C_1) \) be the following attribute grammar:

1. \( G_1 = (\{Z, A\}, \{a, b\}, P_1, Z_1) \) the underlying context-free grammar and \( P_1 \) given below;

2. \( SD_1 = \{\text{integer}\}, \text{FUNC} = \text{SET}_1 \), where \( \text{FUNC} = \text{SET}_1 \) is described below (i.e. identity function, constant function, add function, etc.);

3. \( AD_1 = (A_1, I_1, S_1, \text{TYPE}_1) \), where

   3.1. \( A_1 = \{i, s\} \);

   3.2. \( I_1(Z) = I_1(A) = \{i\} \);
(3.3) $S_1(Z) = S_1(A) = \{s\}$;

(3.4) $\text{TYPE}_1(i) = \text{TYPE}_1(s) = \{\text{integer}\}$;

(4) the set $R_1$ of attribute evaluation rules is described below with the productions of $G_1$;

(5) the set $C_1$ is also presented below both with $P_1$ and $R_1$.

Because a production might contain an occurrence of the same nonterminal symbol $X$, in the attribute evaluation rule $X$, will have an index (starting from 1 to the last occurrence). The second production of $G_1$ is such a case.

Production 1:

$$Z \rightarrow A$$

Attribute evaluation rules:

$$Z.i := 1; \ Z.s := A.s \ A.i := Z.i$$

Production 2:

$$A \rightarrow a A$$

Attribute evaluation rules:

$$A_2.i := A_1.i + 1; \ A_1.s := A_2.s + 1;$$

Production 3:

$$A \rightarrow b$$

Attribute evaluation rule:

if $A.i > 10$ then $A.s := 0$ else $A.s := 1$

Let us consider the word $w = aab$. Figure 2 presents the corresponding derivation tree $T$ and the dependency graph $D(T)$.
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Figure 2.

In [Knu68] has been defined an important subclass of attribute grammars, the so called purely synthesized AG’s (SAG). In the same paper, was proven that SAG’s have the same power as Turing machines. We can conclude that the power of attribute grammars is the same as Turing machines.
2 Data Representations of the Trees and their Bidirectional Traversal

In this section, we shall present two methods for representing the ordered oriented trees. For the second one, a bidirectional traversal of an ordered oriented tree is also presented.

First method of representation of ordered oriented trees.

Given the ordered oriented tree $T = (\mathcal{V}, E, s, d)$, let $m$ be the maximal number of sons (counted for all vertices). For representing the sons $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ of father $v$, we use exactly $m$ locations (even if $n < m$). Consider now the array $t : \{1, 2, \ldots, p\} \rightarrow \mathcal{V} \cup \{null\}$, where $p$ is a natural number. The array $t$ (denoted by $t[\cdot]$) is defined in the following way:

$$t[1] = \text{root}, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n, \ldots, t[m] = \text{null}, \ldots, t[m] = \text{null},$$

constructed by structural induction:

- if the root of $T$ has the sons $v_1, \ldots, v_n$ then $t[1] = \text{root}, v_1, \ldots, v_n$, $t[2] = \text{null}, \ldots, t[m] = \text{null}$, where $null$ is a special symbol (character);
- let $v_{wk} \in V(T)$ have the sons $v_{wk1}, v_{wk2}, \ldots, v_{wkn}$ and $t[s] = v_{wk}$, where $w \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}^*$, $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$, then $t[s+(m-k)(m+1)+1] = v_{wk1}$, $t[s+(m-k)(m+1)+2] = v_{wk2}, \ldots, t[s+(m-k)(m+1)+n] = v_{wkn}$, and the “null” elements $t[s+(m-k)(m+1)+n+1] = \text{null}, \ldots, t[s+(m-k)(m+1)+m] = \text{null}$.

This representation of ordered oriented trees is useful for breadth first search visits. We don’t present in detail this method of traversing ordered oriented tree, because this representation has a disadvantage related to its size. That is, the number of elements of the array $t[\cdot]$ is exponential in $m$. In fact

$$p = 1 + m + m^2 + \ldots + m^m = \frac{m^{m+1} - 1}{m - 1} (m \neq 1).$$

Of course, the number of vertices of $T$ could be “very” smaller than this number.

Second method to represent ordered oriented trees.

Let $T = (\mathcal{V}, E, s, d)$ be the ordered oriented tree. For representing the sons $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ of father $v$, we use $n$ locations. Now, the number of locations of the corresponding vector will be the same as the cardinality of $\mathcal{V}$. Let $m$ be the maximum number of sons (for all vertices of $T$). Consider now the array $t : \{1, 2, \ldots, s\} \rightarrow (\mathcal{V}, \{1, 2, \ldots, m\})$, where $s = |\mathcal{V}|$. The informations contained in $t$ have the following meaning: $t[1] = (v, d)$ iff $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $d$ is the number of sons of $v$.

Example 2.1 For the tree presented in Example 1.1, we have:

$$t[1] = (1, 3) (2, 0) (3, 2) (5, 2) (10, 0) (11, 0) (6, 0) (4, 3) (7, 0) (8, 0) (9, 0)$$

According to the (possible) huge number of “free cells” from the array $t$, the first method for implementing ordered oriented trees, is not convenient for
deriving parallel algorithms. The second representation method (although it provides no direct access) allows us to use a bidirectional parsing according to the placement of leaves.

This representation of ordered oriented trees is useful for depth first search visits. As the input of the following bidirectional traversal is the array t[ ] which is the corresponding preorder representation of T (i.e. the second method for representing ordered oriented trees). In fact, we present a parallel combination of the two sequential strategies of traversal up and down for the tree. Furthermore, the down traversal coincides with the depth first search strategy. We consider two processors P1, P2 and two global variables i1, i2 (i.e. both processors can read these variables). We suppose that we have a procedure “halt(P)”, which stops the running of the processor P. We shall call this algorithm (BT) (i.e. bidirectional traversal).
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Figure 3. General SIMD Model for Bidirectional Traversal

We can say that our model is a SIMD (simple instruction stream and multiple data stream) computer ([Ak97]). This means that these two processors P1 and P2 operate synchronously. Furthermore, we can say that our model uses multiprocessors because the processors P1, P2 share a common memory.
procedure visit_down(P1);
begin
  if i1 <= i2 then begin
    (v1,d) := t[i1];
    {visit the vertex v1}
    write("we have visited ", v1);
    write(" and it has ", d, " sons");
    i1 := i1 + 1;
    visit_down(P1)
  end
  else halt(P1);
end;

The up traversal of the tree is quite similar.

procedure visit_up(P2);
begin
  if i2 > i1 then begin
    (v2,d) := t[i2];
    {visit the vertex v2}
    write("we have visited ", v2);
    write(" and it has ", d, " sons");
    i2 := i2 - 1;
    visit_up(P2)
  end
  else halt(P2);
end;

The main program is

begin
  read(t[]); {read the tree}
i1 := 1; i2 := n; {n being the number of vertices of T}
repeat in parallel
  visit_down(P1);
  visit_up(P2)
until (i1>i2);
end.

Example 2.2 Let us consider the tree from Example 1.1 (and 2.1). We shall simulate the “parallel running” of Algorithm (BT).

**Initial:** i1 = 1 and i2 = 2.

**Step 1:** P1 → “we have visited 1 and it has 3 sons”
P2 → “we have visited 9 and it has 0 sons”

**Step 2:** P1 → “we have visited 2 and it has 0 sons”
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\[ \text{P2} \rightarrow \text{"we have visited 8 and it has 0 sons"} \]

**Step 3:** \[ \text{P1} \rightarrow \text{"we have visited 3 and it has 2 sons"} \]

\[ \text{P2} \rightarrow \text{"we have visited 7 and it has 0 sons"} \]

**Step 4:** \[ \text{P1} \rightarrow \text{"we have visited 5 and it has 2 sons"} \]

\[ \text{P2} \rightarrow \text{"we have visited 4 and it has 3 sons"} \]

**Step 5:** \[ \text{P1} \rightarrow \text{"we have visited 10 and it has 0 sons"} \]

\[ \text{P2} \rightarrow \text{"we have visited 6 and it has 0 sons"} \]

**Step 6:** \[ \text{P1} \rightarrow \text{"we have visited 11 and it has 0 sons"} \]

\[ \text{P2} \rightarrow \text{halts} \]

Compared to the classical preorder visit (which needs 11 steps), our bidirectional traversal needs only 6 steps.

We saw in Example 2.2 that the processor P1 visits the tree in depth first search manner (the order of visiting the vertices is \( \{1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 11, 6, 4, 7, 8, 9\} \)) and P2 in the opposed manner to P1 (i.e. the order of visiting the vertices is \( \{9, 8, 7, 4, 6, 11, 10, 5, 3, 2, 1\} \)). In fact, P2 visits all the sons from right to left and finally their root.

**Theorem 2.1** (correctness and completeness) Let \( T = (V, E, s, d) \) be a ordered oriented tree represented by an array which contains its preorder representation as the input of Algorithm (BT). Then:

a) After the execution of Algorithm (BT), all the vertices of \( T \) have been visited.

b) Let us denote with \( T_1(n), T_2(n) \) the running time of the procedures visit\_down and visit\_up, where \( n = |V| \). Then the parallel running time \( t(n) \) satisfies the relation (we suppose that the routing time is zero):

\[
\frac{\min\{T_1(n), T_2(n)\}}{2} \leq t(n) \leq \max\{T_1(n), T_2(n)\}
\]

**Proof**

a) If \( i_1 < i_2 \) then each call of procedures visit\_down and visit\_up implies the visit of two new vertices (i.e. which has not yet been visited). We know that the array \( t \) contains in fact the preorder representation of \( T \). The procedures visit\_down and visit\_up read the array \( t \) cell by cell (because of the statements \( i_1 := i_1 + 1 \) and \( i_2 := i_2 - 1 \)). The cells \( t[i_1] \) and \( t[i_2] \) contain informations about the current vertices \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \), respectively. So, \( v_1, v_2 \) have been visited at this parallel step.

b) The inequality \( t(n) \leq \max\{T_1(n), T_2(n)\} \) can be obtaining by supposing that one processor stays. For instance, if \( P1 \) stays, then \( t(n) = T_2(n) \) (time routing is zero). The other inequality can be obtained by supposing that both processors work until \( i_1 = i_2 \). This implies a running time of \( \frac{\min\{T_1(n), T_2(n)\}}{2} \).

\[ \blacksquare \]
3 Bidirectional Attribute Evaluation

In [Alb91b], the flexible and the rigid tree-walking strategies for traversing the attributed decorated tree have been presented. A flexible strategy is completely determined by the attribute dependencies of the grammar concerned. Typical example of attribute grammar classes with a flexible tree traversal strategy are the absolute non-circular (ANC) and the ordered attribute grammars.

A rigid strategy is independent of the attributed dependencies. A typical example of a rigid strategy is to make a number of passes over the derivation tree, where a pass is defined to be a depth-first left-to-right or right-to-left traversal of the derivation tree. An example of a strategy somewhere in between the flexible and the rigid strategies is the performance of attribute evaluation during a sequence of sweeps over the derivation tree. A sweep, as defined in [EnF82], is a depth-first traversal of the derivation tree, without the restriction of a left-to-right or a right-to-left order of succession, i.e. the visiting order of the nodes is free with the only restriction that every tree node is visited exactly once.

Our approach refers to a rigid strategy which works for general non-circular attributed grammars. We called it bidirectional attribute grammars. Next, we present the attribute evaluation algorithm which works for a well-defined attribute grammar (WAG). We call it bidirectional attribute evaluation algorithm, and it will be denoted by (BAE). Each vertex \( v \) of the input attributed derivation tree has three components. The first component is the label, i.e. the terminal or non-terminal symbol \( X \), the other components being the set of instances of inherited and synthesized attributes of \( X \), respectively.

The Algorithm (BAE):

**Input:** A well-defined attribute grammar \( AG \) and an attributed derivation tree \( T = (\mathcal{V}, E) \) where only the inherited attribute instances of the start symbol and the synthesized attribute instances of the terminal symbols are defined.

**Output:** An attributed derivation tree where all attribute instances are defined.

**Method:** Like in Algorithm (BT), we shall present two procedures for each of the processors and a main program. Because each element of the array \( t[] \) stores two informations, the current vertex and the number of sons of the current vertex (i.e. the pair \( (v,d) \), we denote \( t[].one = v \) and \( t[].two = d \). Each of these procedures contain two calls of procedure \texttt{evaluate}(X.a). This procedure is in fact the corresponding attribute evaluation instruction to the current production according to Definition 1.6.

```plaintext
procedure visit_down(P1);
begin
  if \( i1 \leq |\mathcal{V}| \) then begin
    \( (v1,d) := t[i1]; \)
    \( (Xp0,I(Xp0),S(Xp0)) := v; \)
    for \( k := 1 \) to \( d \) do
      \( (Xpk,I(Xpk),S(Xpk)) := t[i1+k].one; \)
  end;
```

for k := 1 to d do
  for (all a ∈ I(Xpk)) do
    if (Xpk.a is undefined) and
        (all argument instances of the evaluation instruction
         for Xpk.a are defined)
      then evaluate(Xpk.a);
  for (all a ∈ S(Xp0)) do
    if (Xp0.a is undefined) and
        (all argument instances of the evaluation instruction
         for Xp0.a are defined)
      then evaluate(Xp0.a);
  i1 := i1 + 1;
  visit_down(P1)
end
else halt(P1);
end;

The up traversal of the tree is quite similar.

procedure visit_up(P2);
begin
  if i2 >= 1 then begin
    (v2,d) := t[i2];
    (Xp0,I(Xp0),S(Xp0)) := v;
    for k := 1 to d do
      (Xpk,I(Xpk),S(Xpk)) := t[i2+k].one;
    for k := 1 to d do
      for (all a ∈ I(Xpk)) do
        if (Xpk.a is undefined) and
            (all argument instances of the evaluation instruction
             for Xpk.a are defined)
          then evaluate(Xpk.a);
        for (all a ∈ S(Xp0)) do
          if (Xp0.a is undefined) and
              (all argument instances of the evaluation instruction
               for Xp0.a are defined)
            then evaluate(Xp0.a);
      i2 := i2 - 1;
    visit_up(P2)
  end
else halt(P2);
end;

The main program is

begin
  read(t[]); {read the attributed derivation tree}
  i1 := 1; i2 := n;
{n being the number of vertices of the input tree}
repeat in parallel
  visit_down(P1);
  visit_up(P2)
until (all attribute instances are evaluated);
write(t[]);
{the attributed derivation tree is consistently decorated}
end.

Remark 3.1 Every attribute instance is evaluated during the earliest possible pass and the different instances of the same attribute may be evaluated during different passes. In the classical model of evaluation the attributed instances of the attributed derivation tree depend in fact on the number of levels (depth) of the input derivation tree. For instance, the synthesized attributed instances of the root of $T$ will be defined after at least $m$ visits of the attributed derivation tree, where $m$ is the depth of it.

Using our bidirectional attribute evaluation algorithm, the synthesized attribute instances of the root of $T$ will be defined in one visit of the attributed derivation tree, for the synthesized attributed instances of the terminal symbols.

Compared to [Al91b], our bidirectional attribute evaluation algorithm has “half” time running than the classical attribute evaluation algorithm.

Example 3.1 Let us consider the attribute grammar (Example 2.1). It is easy to see that for $w = aab$, according to Algorithm (BAE), we need only one down visit and one up visit for evaluating all the attribute instances of the corresponding attributed derivation tree. On the other hand, using classical methods (down visits), for evaluating the attribute instances, we need to visit the attributed derivation tree three times (i.e. three down visits).

We can immediately generalize to the input word $w = a^m b$. In that case, Algorithm (BAE) needs the same one down visit and one up visit, instead of $m + 1$ down visits in the classical method.

Theorem 3.1 (correctness and complexity) If the input attributed grammar $AG$ is non-circular, then Algorithm (BAE) will compute the attribute instances of the input attributed derivation tree in a finite number of steps. That is, the output of the Algorithm (BAE) will be a consistently decorated attributed derivation tree.

Proof Let $AG$ be a non-circular (well defined) attribute grammar. This means that for any derivation tree $T$, the dependency graph $D(T)$ has no cycles. In $D(T)$, the directed arc $(N_i, a, N_j); b)$ is an arc if attribute instance $N_j.b$ depends on attribute instance $N_i.a$. Because $D(T)$ is acyclic, its arcs specify a partial ordering of the attribute instances. The existence of arc $(N_i.a, N_j,b)$ indicates that the value of attribute instance $N_i.a$ must be defined before attribute instance $N_j,b$ can be computed.
The procedures visit\textunderscore down(P1) and visit\textunderscore up(P2) use the procedure evaluate(X,a), which is in fact an attribute evaluation instruction. Because of the loop repeat \ldots until, from the main program, it follows that all attributed instances of T will be computed. Because D(T) has no cycles, it follows that the number of iterations of the above loop is finite.

4 Conclusions

The complexity of Algorithm (BAE) applied to an attributed derivation tree is related to the complexity of Algorithm (BT) applied to an ordinary tree. It is obvious that the number of visits for evaluating all the attribute instances of the attributed derivation tree made by Algorithm (BAE) is less than the classical algorithm ([Alb91b]). As we saw in Example 3.1, there exist situations for which our bidirectional evaluation strategy is independent of the size of the input attributed derivation tree (only two visits).

But, sometimes, due to the dependency graph, the processors have to wait one each other and only one processor works. In that case, the parallel attribute evaluation coincides with the classical one. One open problem could be: In which cases (for what kinds of attribute grammars) our bidirectional attribute evaluation is strictly (or two times) better than the classical one?

If the underlying context free grammar of the corresponding attribute grammar is in Chomsky normal form, then any derivation tree will be binary. In that case, the first method of representing ordered oriented trees is a convenient data structure for Algorithm (BAE), too. Furthermore, any node of the tree could be directly accessed (i.e. not sequential, like in the second method of representing ordered oriented trees).
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