Subject: In some cases CParser can be out of buffer
Posted by gridem on Sat, 21 Mar 2009 20:38:52 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

The corresponding patch is attached.

```
File Attachments
1) upp2.patch, downloaded 239 times
```

Subject: Re: In some cases CParser can be out of buffer
Posted by mirek on Sat, 21 Mar 2009 23:07:52 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

gridem wrote on Sat, 21 March 2009 16:38The corresponding patch is attached.

I am perhaps missing something. Which cases? Do you have any testcase demostrating the problem?

(Note that you should not call GetChar when IsEof...)

Mirek

Subject: Re: In some cases CParser can be out of buffer
Posted by gridem on Sun, 22 Mar 2009 08:06:53 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

luzr wrote on Sun, 22 March 2009 02:07

I am perhaps missing something. Which cases? Do you have any testcase demostrating the problem?

(Note that you should not call GetChar when IsEof...)

Mirek

Yes, in case of calling GetChar twice without check on IsEof() (it can be treated as error of using CParser yet). But the function SkipTerm already has this check: two subsequent calls of SkipTerm work fine.

There is another issue: when CParser::term == '\n' and the function CParser::SkipTerm() is called than CParser::line will not be increased.

Subject: Re: In some cases CParser can be out of buffer

Posted by mirek on Sun, 22 Mar 2009 08:27:14 GMT

gridem wrote on Sun, 22 March 2009 04:06luzr wrote on Sun, 22 March 2009 02:07

I am perhaps missing something. Which cases? Do you have any testcase demostrating the problem?

(Note that you should not call GetChar when IsEof...)

Mirek

Yes, in case of calling GetChar twice without check on IsEof() (it can be treated as error of using CParser yet). But the function SkipTerm already has this check: two subsequent calls of SkipTerm work fine.

There is another issue: when CParser::term == '\n' and the function CParser::SkipTerm() is called than CParser::line will not be increased.

Well, one thing to understand: GetChar is "special" operation that is supposed to be used only in very special cases.

In "normal" operation, CParser::term == '\n' can never be true. If you are using GetChar to handle special cases, you must make sure that at the end, term points to non-space (simple way is to call Spaces when you are done with GetChar).

And one more thing to understand:) Some of these issues are that way are because of performance.

Especially, CParser normally never stops at "space" (e.g. term == '\n'). Look at the code, after each "term eating" operation, there is a call to DoSpaces. This is to make e.g. Char operation fast.

Of course, in "other" special cases, you might want to deal with spaces yourself, then you activate NoSkipSpaces and you have to call Spaces after each accepted term yourself.

Is there a hole in this logic?

Mirek

P.S.: While a very unlikely case, I think you are right about SkipTerm and line number. I have added a fix there.

Subject: Re: In some cases CParser can be out of buffer
Posted by gridem on Tue, 24 Mar 2009 07:32:07 GMT

luzr wrote on Sun, 22 March 2009 11:27

Especially, CParser normally never stops at "space" (e.g. term == '\n'). Look at the code, after each "term eating" operation, there is a call to DoSpaces. This is to make e.g. Char operation fast.

Of course, in "other" special cases, you might want to deal with spaces yourself, then you activate NoSkipSpaces and you have to call Spaces after each accepted term yourself.

Is there a hole in this logic?

Mirek

P.S.: While a very unlikely case, I think you are right about SkipTerm and line number. I have added a fix there.

So, I used the CParser in mixed mode. And I found that in some cases CParser shows wrong line number. Applied patch will solve such kind of issue.

I used the NoSkipSpaces because I need not to skip spaces after the last bracket but inside brackets I used SkipSpaces.

I notices that CParser works very fast and it's really useful and easy to use. It's amazing!

Subject: Re: In some cases CParser can be out of buffer
Posted by mirek on Tue, 24 Mar 2009 10:02:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Actually, from the last reply, I am not sure whether there are some remaining issues from your point of view:)

Mirek