You must type it three times

Bloomberg

Vittorio Romeo
https://vittorioromeo.info
vittorio.romeo@outlook.com

C++Now 2017
lightning talk

```
inline constexpr auto foo = [](auto&& x)
    noexcept(noexcept(bar(x)))
    → decltype(boop(x))
{
    // ...
}
```

- The user has a `foo` *function object* with complicated `noexcept` and *return type*.
- You are a **library developer**, and want to provide a generic `log_and_call` utility that must work properly with `foo`.

attempt #0

```
template <typename F, typename... Ts>
decltype(auto) log_and_call(F&& f, Ts&&... xs)
{
    log << "calling `f`\n";
    return std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...);
}
```

Any issues?

`noexcept` is missing.

```
noexcept(log_and_call(foo, /* ... */))
```

Will always evaluate to `false`.

attempt #1

```
template <typename F, typename... Ts>
decltype(auto) log_and_call(F&& f, Ts&&... xs)
    noexcept(noexcept(
        std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...)
    ))
{
    log << "calling `f`\n";
    return std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...);
}
```

Any issues?

SFINAE unfriendliness.

```
std::is_invocable<log_and_call, foo, /* ... */>
```

May produce a **compiler error** instead of getting *SFINAE-d away*!

It will also behave differently from:

```
std::is_invocable<foo, /* ... */>
```

attempt #2

```
template <typename F, typename... Ts>
auto log_and_call(F&& f, Ts&&... xs)
    noexcept(noexcept(
        std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...)
    ))
→ decltype(
    std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...)
)
{
    log << "calling `f`\n";
    return std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...);
}
```

Any issues?

`constexpr` unfriendliness.

attempt #3

```
template <typename F, typename... Ts>
constexpr auto log_and_call(F&& f, Ts&&... xs)
    noexcept(noexcept(
        std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)... )
    ))
→ decltype(
    std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)... )
)
{
    log << "calling `f`\n";
    return std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)... );
}
```

...ah, beatiful.

```
std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)... )
```

...had to be **manually repeated three times** in order to achieve:

- `noexcept` correctness.
- SFINAE-friendliness.

Why can't the compiler do this for us?

```
#define RETURNS( ... ) \
    noexcept(noexcept(__VA_ARGS__)) \
    -> decltype(__VA_ARGS__) \
{ \
    return __VA_ARGS__; \
}
```

```
template <typename F, typename... Ts>
constexpr auto log_and_call(F&& f, Ts&&... xs)
    RETURNS(
        log << "calling `f`\n",
        std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)... )
    )
```

```
template <typename F, typename... Ts>
constexpr auto log_and_call(F&& f, Ts&&... xs)
    RETURNS(
        log << "calling `f`\n",
        std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...)
    )
```

...compare to...

```
template <typename F, typename... Ts>
constexpr auto log_and_call(F&& f, Ts&&... xs)
    noexcept(noexcept(
        std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...)
    ))
→ decltype(
    std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...)
)
{
    log << "calling `f`\n";
    return std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...);
}
```

Advantages of `RETURNS`:

- Avoids code triplication.

Disadvantages of `RETURNS`:

- Macro, will be exposed to clients of the library.
- Assumes something will be returned.
  - Only works with *expressions*.
  - Doesn't play nicely with `void` return type.
  - The *comma operator* must be (ab)used to simulate *compound statements*.

Why can't the compiler do this for us?

Barry Rezvin proposed

"Abbreviated Lambdas for Fun and Profit" (P0573)

Part of the proposal was about a new `⇒ expr` syntax.

> That is, the lambda:

```
[](auto&& x) ⇒ test(x)
```

> shall be exactly equivalent to the lambda:

```
[](auto&& x) noexcept(noexcept(test(x)))
    → decltype(test(x)) { return test(x); }
```

Unfortunately most of the proposal was rejected.

Inspired by it, I think that `⇒` could be used as a new **generic function body definition syntax**, supporting *lambdas*, *functions*, and any kind of *expression* or *compound-statement*.

dream pseudocode

```
auto triple = [](auto x) ⇒ x * 3;

template <typename F>
void call_twice(F&& f) ⇒ {
    f();
    f();
}
```

Can we make this happen?

The biggest issue is that both:

- `noexcept(/* compound-statement */)`
- `decltype(/* compound-statement */)`

are currently **ill-formed**.

In the case of `noexcept(/* compound-statement */)`, it would be necessary to create some formal "splitting" rules for the compiler.

E.g.

```
noexcept({ a(); b(); })
```

...expands to...

```
noexcept(a()) && noexcept(b())
```

```
noexcept({ if(a()){ b(); } })
```

...expands to...

```
noexcept(a()) && noexcept(b())
```

...et cetera.

Similar ideas would apply to `decltype(/* compound-statement */)`.

E.g.

```
decltype({ a(); return b(); })
```

...expands to...

```
decltype(a(), b())
```

```
decltype({ if(a()){ return b(); } })
```

...expands to...

```
decltype(a(), b())
```

Some additional new features might be required. E.g.

```
decltype({
    if constexpr(a()){ return b(); }
    else { return c(); }
})
```

...might expand to...

```
//                      true case
//                          vvvv
conditional_decltype(a())(b())(c())
//                     ^^^^      ^^^^
//   constant-expression      ||
//                            ||
//                       false case
```

Maybe all of this is impossible due to implementation difficulties…

...but *one man can dream.*

```
template <typename F, typename... Ts>
constexpr auto log_and_call(F&& f, Ts&&... xs) ⇒
{
    log << "calling `f`\n";
    return std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...);
}
```

Until then...

...you must type it three times.

```
template <typename F, typename... Ts>
constexpr auto log_and_call(F&& f, Ts&&... xs)
    noexcept(noexcept(
        std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...)
    ))
→ decltype(
    std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...)
)
{
    log << "calling `f`\n";
    return std::forward<F>(f)(std::forward<Ts>(xs)...);
}
```

Thanks!

- vromeo5@bloomberg.net
- https://vittorioromeo.info
- vittorio.romeo@outlook.com
- @supahvee1234