# Chapter 11: Computations in a functor context III

## Monad transformers

Sergei Winitzki

Academy by the Bay

2019-01-05

## Computations within a functor context: Combining monads

Programs often need to combine monadic effects

- "Effect" $\equiv$ what else happens in $A \Rightarrow M^B$ besides computing $B$ from $A$
- Examples of effects for some standard monads:
  - `Option` – computation will have no result or a single result
  - `List` – computation will have zero, one, or multiple results
  - `Either` – computation may fail to obtain its result, reports error
  - `Reader` – computation needs to read an external context value
  - `Writer` – some value will be appended to a (monoidal) accumulator
  - `Future` – computation will be scheduled to run later
- How to combine several effects in the same functor block (`for`/`yield`)?

```
// This is not valid Scala!
val result = for { i ← 1 to n
   j ← Future { q(i) }
   k ← maybeError(j) : Try[Int]
} yield f(k)
// What should be the type of result??
```

```
// This is not valid Scala!
(1 to n).flatMap { i ⇒
   Future(q(i)).flatMap { j ⇒
     maybeError(j).map { k ⇒
       f(k)
         }}}
```

- The code will work if we "unify" all effects in a new, larger monad
- Need to compute the type of new monad that contains all given effects

# Combining monadic effects I. Trial and error

There are several ways of combining two monads into a new monad:

- If $M_1^A$ and $M_2^A$ are monads then $M_1^A \times M_2^A$ is also a monad
  - But $M_1^A \times M_2^A$ describes two separate values with two separate effects
- If $M_1^A$ and $M_2^A$ are monads then $M_1^A + M_2^A$ is usually not a monad
  - If it worked, it would be a choice between two different values / effects
- If $M_1^A$ and $M_2^A$ are monads then one of $M_1^{M_2^A}$ or $M_2^{M_1^A}$ is often a monad
- Examples and counterexamples for functor composition:
  - Combine $Z \Rightarrow A$ and $\text{List}^A$ as $Z \Rightarrow \text{List}^A$
  - Combine `Future[A]` and `Option[A]` as `Future[Option[A]]`
  - But `Either[Z, Future[A]]` and `Option[Z => A]` are not monads
  - Neither `Future[State[A]]` nor `State[Future[A]]` are monads
- The order of effects matters when composition works both ways:
  - Combine `Either` ($M_1^A = Z + A$) and `Writer` ($M_2^A = W \times A$)
    - as $Z + W \times A$ – either compute result and write a message, or all fails
    - as $(Z + A) \times W$ – message is always written, but computation may fail
- Find a general way of defining a new monad with combined effects
- Derive properties required for the new monad

# Combining monadic effects II. Lifting into a larger monad

If a "big monad" `BigM[A]` *somehow* combines all the needed effects:

```
// This could be valid Scala...
val result: BigM[Int] = for {
   i ← lift₁(1 to n)
   j ← lift₂(Future{ q(i) })
   k ← lift₃(maybeError(j))
} yield f(k)
```

```
// If we define the various
// required "lifting" functions:
def lift₁[A]: Seq[A] ⇒ BigM[A] = ???
def lift₂[A]: Future[A] ⇒ BigM[A] = ???
def lift₃[A]: Try[A] ⇒ BigM[A] = ???
```

- Example 1: combining as `BigM[A] = Future[Option[A]]` with liftings:

```
def lift₁[A]: Option[A] ⇒ Future[Option[A]] = Future.successful(_)
def lift₂[A]: Future[A] ⇒ Future[Option[A]] = _.map(x ⇒ Some(x))
```

- Example 2: combining as `BigM[A] = List[Try[A]]` with liftings:

```
def lift₁[A]: Try[A] ⇒ List[Try[A]] = x ⇒ List(x)
def lift₂[A]: List[A] ⇒ List[Try[A]] = _.map(x ⇒ Success(x))
```

Remains to be understood:

- Finding suitable laws for the liftings; checking that the laws hold
- Building a "big monad" out of "smaller" ones, with lawful liftings
  - Is this always possible? Unique? Are there alternative solutions?
- Ways of reducing the complexity of code; make liftings automatic

# Laws for monad liftings I. Identity laws

Whatever identities we expect to hold for monadic programs must continue to hold after lifting `M₁` or `M₂` values into the "big monad" `BigM`

- We assume that `M₁`, `M₂`, and `BigM` already satisfy all the monad laws

Consider the various functor block constructions containing the liftings:

- Left identity law after `lift₁`

```
// Anywhere inside a for/yield:
i ← lift₁(M₁.pure(x))
j ← bigM(i)  // Any BigM value.
```

```
// Must be equivalent to...
i = x
j ← bigM(x)
```

`lift₁(M₁.pure(x)).flatMap(b) = b(x)` — in terms of Kleisli composition ($\diamond$):
$\left(\text{pure}_{M_1} ; \text{lift}_1\right)^{:X\Rightarrow\text{BigM}^X} \diamond b^{:X\Rightarrow\text{BigM}^Y} = b$ with $f^{:X\Rightarrow M^Y} \diamond g^{:Y\Rightarrow M^Z} \equiv x \Rightarrow f(x).\text{flatMap}(g)$

- Right identity law after `lift₁`

```
// Anywhere inside a for/yield:
x ← bigM  // Any BigM value.
i ← lift₁(M₁.pure(x))
```

```
// Must be equivalent to...
x ← bigM
i = x
```

`b.flatMap(M₁.pure andThen lift₁) = b` — in terms of Kleisli composition:

$$b^{:X\Rightarrow\text{BigM}^Y} \diamond \left(\text{pure}_{M_1} ; \text{lift}_1\right)^{:Y\Rightarrow\text{BigM}^Y} = b$$

- The same identity laws must hold for `M₂` and `lift₂` as well

# Laws for monad liftings II. Simplifying the laws

$\left(\text{pure}_{M_1} ; \text{lift}_1\right)$ is a unit for the Kleisli composition $\diamond$ in the monad `BigM`

- But the monad `BigM` already has a unit element: $\text{pure}_{\text{BigM}}$
- The two-sided unit element is always unique: $\text{id} = \text{id} \diamond \text{id}' = \text{id}'$
- So the two identity laws for $\left(\text{pure}_{M_1} ; \text{lift}_1\right)$ can be reduced to one law:

$$\text{pure}_{M_1} ; \text{lift}_1 = \text{pure}_{\text{BigM}}$$

Refactoring a portion of a monadic program under `lift₁` gives another law:

```
// Anywhere inside a for/yield:
i ← lift₁(p) // Any M₁ value.
j ← lift₁(q(i)) // Any M₁ value.
```

```
// Must be equivalent to...
pq = p.flatMap(q) // In M₁.
j ← lift₁(pq) // Now lift it.
```

```
lift₁(p).flatMap(q andThen lift₁) = lift₁(p flatMap q)
```

- Rewritten equivalently through $\text{flm}_M : \left(A \Rightarrow M^B\right) \Rightarrow M^A \Rightarrow M^B$ as

$$\text{lift}_1 ; \text{flm}_{\text{BigM}} \left(q ; \text{lift}_1\right) = \text{flm}_{M_1} q ; \text{lift}_1$$

- Rewritten in terms of Kleisli composition:

$$\left(b^{:X \Rightarrow M_1^Y} ; \text{lift}_1\right) \diamond \left(c^{:Y \Rightarrow M_1^Z} ; \text{lift}_1\right) = \left(b \diamond c\right) ; \text{lift}_1$$

- Liftings $\text{lift}_1$ and $\text{lift}_2$ must obey an identity law and a composition law
- The laws say that the liftings **commute with** the monads' operations

# Laws for monad liftings III. The naturality law

$\text{lift}_1 : M_1^A \Rightarrow \text{BigM}^A$ is a natural transformation between monads

- It maps $\text{pure}_{M_1}$ to $\text{pure}_{\text{BigM}}$ and $\text{flm}_{M_1}$ to $\text{flm}_{\text{BigM}}$

The naturality law follows:

$$\text{lift}_1 ; \text{fmap}_B f^{:X\Rightarrow Y} = \text{fmap}_{M_1} f^{:X\Rightarrow Y} ; \text{lift}_1$$

$$\begin{tikzcd}
M_1^X \arrow[r, "\mathbf{lift_1}"] \arrow[d, "\text{fmap}_{M_\mathbf{1}}\ f^{:X\Rightarrow Y}"'] & \text{BigM}^X \arrow[d, "\text{fmap}_{\mathbf{BigM}}\ f^{:X\Rightarrow Y}"] \\
M_1^Y \arrow[r, "\mathbf{lift_1}"] & \text{BigM}^Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

Derivation:

- Express fmap as $\text{fmap}_M f = \text{flm}_M (f ; \text{pure}_M)$ for both monads
- Given $f^{:X\Rightarrow Y}$, use the law $\text{flm}_{M_\mathbf{1}} q ; \text{lift}_1 = \text{lift}_1 ; \text{flm}_{\text{BigM}} (q ; \text{lift}_1)$ to compute $\text{flm}_{M_\mathbf{1}} \left(f ; \text{pure}_{M_\mathbf{1}}\right) ; \text{lift}_1 = \text{lift}_1 ; \text{flm} \left(f ; \text{pure}_{M_\mathbf{1}} ; \text{lift}_1\right) = \text{lift}_1 ; \text{flm} \left(f ; \text{pure}_{\text{BigM}}\right) =$ $\text{lift}_1 ; \text{fmap}_{\text{BigM}} f$

# Exercises

1. Show that the method `pure`: $A \Rightarrow M^A$ is a monad morphism between monads $\text{Id}^A \equiv A$ and $M^A$.
2. Show that $M_1^A + M_2^A$ is *not* a monad when $M_1^A \equiv 1 + A$ and $M_2^A \equiv Z \Rightarrow A$.