## Direct-coded scanners

- Meant to reduce cost associated with large lookup tables (which can cause issues with cache/paging performance)
- Increases code size to eliminate tables, and generates code that is language-specific
- Instead of a generic while loop to "read forward", each state has its own code segment to read/process characters and decide what next state should be, then performs direct branch to that state's code segment


## Our [A-Z][a-z]+ example

- Initialize token to "", stack to <BOTTOM>, and S to s0 (just like with the table-driven), each state gets labelled code:
- s0:
- read next char, append to token
- push s0
- if char is upperalpha goto $\mathbf{~} 1$
- else goto Final


## Example continued

- s 1 :
- read next char, append to token
- push s1
- if char is loweralpha goto S2
- else goto Final


## Example continued

- $\mathrm{s} 2:$
- read next char, append to token
- clear stack (since s2 is an accept state)
- push s2
- if char is loweralpha goto s2
- else goto final


## Example continued

- Final:
- while $S$ is not <BOTTOM> or s2 (the accept state)
- pop top state into S
- chop last char off token
- roll back input stream one char
- return token type based on $S$


## Note basic structure of segments

- state label:
- read next char and append to token
- if it's an accept state then clear stack
- push state
- for each available transition function add
- If char is RIGHTTYPE goto NEXTSTATE
- add default else case to to to Final


## Basic structure of Final

- while S not an accept state and not <BOTTOM>
- pop top state into S
- chop last char off token
- roll back input stream one char
- if $S$ is an accept state then return matching token type
- else reject


## Notes

- Sometimes character classification can be complex, and can actually be more expensive than table lookup
- Need to consider tradeoff: size/speed of table lookup vs size/speed of code, heavily dependent on the actual language being scanned

