```
(ns map-filter-reduce.core
  (:gen-class))
(defn -main
  "I don't do a whole lot ... yet."
  [& args]
  (println "Hello, World!"))
#'map-filter-reduce.core/-main
; Given a list of numbers.
(range 10)
(0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9)
; We can quickly map over all of them and add one to
each element.
(map inc (range 10))
(1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10)
; Mappings work great for when all elements in a
list can be transformed independently.
; Here we can transform all numbers between 97 and
122 to their ascii related characters.
(map char (range 97 122))
(\a \b \c \d \e \f \g \h \i \j \k \l \m \n \o \p \q \r
\s \t \u \v \w \x \y)
; But something seems off there. I really like the
little quotes around strings.
; Maybe we will just map str over the last line.
(map str (map char (range 97 122)))
("a" "b" "c" "d" "e" "f" "g" "h" "i" "j" "k" "l" "m"
"n" "o" "p" "q" "r" "s" "t" "u" "v" "w" "x" "y")
```

```
iterating over the list twice.
; Once to pass all the elements of (range 97 122) to
char and again for str.
; Why not iterate just once?
(map #(str (char %)) (range 97 122))
("a" "b" "c" "d" "e" "f" "g" "h" "i" "j" "k" "l" "m"
"n" "o" "p" "q" "r" "s" "t" "u" "v" "w" "x" "y")
; So what just happened up there? What is this hash
nonsense and why is there a percent sign?
; What we just saw was an anonymous function or
"lambda" and they are what make programming in
clojure pleasant!
; The "#" is a macro that declares whatever is
within the following paranthesis to be a function.
; The "%" represents that anonymous function or
lamba's input.
; Try to figure out what the mapping below will
evaluate to before you evaluate it.
(map #(= % %) (range 10))
; Now try writing your own anonymous lambda using
the "#" macro and "%" below!
; Try writing another one here!
; Okay now that you may have the hang of how basic
mappings work. Let's quickly go over filter and
reduce.
; Filter is a function that take a conditional
function that returns true or false and a list or
vector as arguments.
; Filter then returns everything in the list where
the conditional function is true.
(filter even? (range 10))
(0\ 2\ 4\ 6\ 8)
```

; The above does the job but it feels messy. We are

```
; Filter can also take an anonymous function as its
first argument.
(filter #(= (mod % 2) 0) (range 10))
(0\ 2\ 4\ 6\ 8)
(filter #(= (mod % 2) 1) (range 10))
(1 3 5 7 9)
; Remove is exactly like filter except that it
returns everything is the list where the conditional
function is false.
(remove #(= (mod % 2) 0) (range 10))
(1 3 5 7 9)
(remove #(= (mod % 2) 1) (range 10))
(0\ 2\ 4\ 6\ 8)
; Reduce is a function that takes a function and a
list as arguments and returns a single value.
; Here we can sum all numbers from 0 - 10 using
reduce.
(reduce + (range 11))
55
; Here we can use reduce to calculate the product of
a series of numbers.
(reduce * (range 1 10))
362880
```

```
; Reduce works by taking the first two elements in a list % \left( 1\right) =\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) +\left( 1\right) \left( 1\right) 
 (reduce #(* (+ %1 %1) %2) (range 2 5))
    96
 ; I hope this has been enough of a crash course for
everyone.
 ; I strongly suggest checking out chapters 3 & 4 of
 ; "Clojure for the Brave and True"
 ; For a couple of great explanations of map and
reduce with diagrams.
 ; Now I know I said that I would show you all how to
write a multithreaded program in clojure so here it
 is!
 (time (remove number? (doall (pmap #(reduce + %))
 (repeatedly 100000 #(vec (range 11))))))
 "Elapsed time: 272.72425 msecs"
    ()
 ; The above function is almost exactly the same as
the function except for one letter.
 ; The letter "p" in pmap signifies that it is a
parallel mapping function in clojure.
 ; All it takes to add a little parralelism in
clojure to most of your code is the letter "p"!
 ; Below is the same function as above without the p.
There are calls here that many of you may have not
seen.
 ; (doall) forces eager evaluation.
   ; time is a macro the prints how long it takes a
 function to return.
 (time (remove number? (doall (map #(reduce + %))
 (repeatedly 100000 #(vec (range 11))))))
 "Elapsed time: 76.508963 msecs"
    ()
```

- ; Now you may have noticed that the multithreaded pmap call took longer to return in this instance than the map call.
- ; Why is that? Shouldn't more threads be faster?
- ; More threads can be faster.
- ; However there is an initial overhead cost in segmenting parts of the list to be evaluated in different threads.
- ; pmap should only be really used for titanic jobs on many cored computers.
- ; If you run into computational time problems that can not be solved with optimization remember that Hampshire has a cluster for Evo Comp.
- ; Just ask Lee if you can run your code on the cluster and make sure to use pmap to get the most out of one cluster node!