

8h. Gotchas for Type Stability

[Martin Alfaro](#)

PhD in Economics

INTRODUCTION

This section considers scenarios where type instabilities aren't immediately obvious. For this reason, we dub them as "gotchas". We also provide recommendations for addressing them. To make the section self-contained, we revisit some examples of type instability that were covered previously.

GOTCHA 1: INTEGERS AND FLOATS

When working with numeric scalars, it's essential to remember that `Int64` and `Float64` are distinct types. Mixing them can inadvertently introduce type instability.

To illustrate this case and how to handle it, consider a function `foo`. This takes a numeric variable `x` as its argument and performs two tasks. Firstly, it defines a variable `y` by transforming `x` in a way that all negative values are replaced with zero. Secondly, it executes an operation based on the resulting `y`.

The following example illustrates two implementations of `foo`. The first one suffers from type instability, while the second provides a revised implementation that addresses this issue.

```
function foo(x)
    y = (x < 0) ? 0 : x

    return [y * i for i in 1:100]
end

@code_warntype foo(1)          # type stable
@code_warntype foo(1.)        # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo(x)
    y = (x < 0) ? zero(x) : x

    return [y * i for i in 1:100]
end

@code_warntype foo(1)          # type stable
@code_warntype foo(1.)        # type stable
```

The first implementation uses the literal `0`, which has type `Int64`. If `x` is also `Int64`, no type instability arises. However, if `x` is `Float64`, the compiler must consider that `y` could be either `Int64` or `Float64`, thus causing type instability.¹

Julia can handle combinations of `Int64` and `Float64` quite effectively. Therefore, the latter type instability wouldn't be a significant issue if the operation involving `y` calls `y` only once. Indeed, `@code_warntype` would only issue a yellow warning that therefore could be safely ignored. However, `foo` in our example repeatedly performs an operation that involves `y`, incurring the cost of type instability multiple times. As a result, `@code_warntype` issues a red warning, indicating a more serious performance issue.

The second tab proposes a **solution** based on a function that returns the zero element corresponding to the type of `x`. This approach can be extended to other values by using either the function `convert(typeof(x), <value>)` or `oftype(x, <value>)`. Both convert `<value>` to the same type as `x`. For instance, below we reimplement `foo`, but using the value `5` instead of `0`.

```
function foo(x)
    y = (x < 0) ? 5 : x

    return [y * i for i in 1:100]
end

@code_warntype foo(1)          # type stable
@code_warntype foo(1.)        # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo(x)
    y = (x < 0) ? convert(typeof(x), 5) : x

    return [y * i for i in 1:100]
end

@code_warntype foo(1)          # type stable
@code_warntype foo(1.)        # type stable
```

```
function foo(x)
    y = (x < 0) ? oftype(x, 5) : x

    return [y * i for i in 1:100]
end

@code_warntype foo(1)          # type stable
@code_warntype foo(1.)        # type stable
```

GOTCHA 2: COLLECTIONS OF COLLECTIONS

When working in data analysis, collections of collections emerge naturally. An example of this data structure is given by the `DataFrames` package, which defines a table with each column representing a different variable. As we haven't introduced this package, we'll consider a more basic scenario involving a vector of vectors, represented by the type `Vector{Vector}`. This exhibits a similar structure, and also the same potential issues regarding type stability.

Essentially, the issue arises because, by not constraining the types of its inner vectors, a collection of collections like `Vector{Vector}` offers a high degree of flexibility. This flexibility is particularly valuable in data analysis, where datasets often comprise diverse columns that may contain disparate data types (e.g., `String`, `Float64`, `Int64`). However, it also comes at a cost: the type `Vector{Vector}` only guarantees that its elements are vectors, without providing any information about the concrete types they contain. As a result, when a function operates on one of these inner vectors, the type system is unable to infer the concrete type of the data, leading to type instability.

To illustrate this scenario, suppose a vector `data` comprising multiple inner vectors. Moreover, consider a function `foo` that takes `data` as its argument, and operates on one of its inner vectors `vec2`. The first tab below shows that this case leads to type instability. The simplest **solution** is presented in the second tab, and consists of including a barrier function that takes the inner vector `vec2` as its argument. The technique rectifies the type instability, as the barrier function attempts to identify a concrete type for `vec2`. Note that the barrier function is defined [in-place](#). This implies that the value of `vec2`, and hence of `data`, is updated when `foo` is executed.

```
vec1 = ["a", "b", "c"] ; vec2 = [1, 2, 3]
data = [vec1, vec2]

function foo(data)
    for i in eachindex(data[2])
        data[2][i] = 2 * i
    end
end

@code_warntype foo(data)           # type UNSTABLE
```

```
vec1 = ["a", "b", "c"] ; vec2 = [1, 2, 3]
data = [vec1, vec2]

foo(data) = operation!(data[2])

function operation!(x)
    for i in eachindex(x)
        x[i] = 2 * i
    end
end

@code_warntype foo(data)           # barrier-function solution
```

GOTCHA 3: BARRIER FUNCTIONS

Barrier functions are an effective technique to mitigate type instabilities. However, it's essential to remember that **the parent function may remain type unstable**. When this is the case, if we fail to resolve the type instability before executing a repeated operation, the performance cost of the type instability will be incurred multiple times.

To illustrate this point, let's revisit the last example involving a vector of vectors. Below, we present two incorrect approaches to using a barrier function, followed by a demonstration of its proper application.

```
vec1 = ["a", "b", "c"] ; vec2 = [1, 2, 3]
data = [vec1, vec2]

operation(i) = (2 * i)

function foo(data)
    for i in eachindex(data[2])
        data[2][i] = operation(i)
    end
end

@code_warntype foo(data)           # type UNSTABLE
```

```
vec1 = ["a", "b", "c"] ; vec2 = [1, 2, 3]
data = [vec1, vec2]

operation!(x,i) = (x[i] = 2 * i)

function foo(data)
    for i in eachindex(data[2])
        operation!(data[2], i)
    end
end

@code_warntype foo(data)           # type UNSTABLE
```

```
vec1 = ["a", "b", "c"] ; vec2 = [1, 2, 3]
data = [vec1, vec2]

function operation!(x)
    for i in eachindex(x)
        x[i] = 2 * i
    end
end

foo(data) = operation!(data[2])

@code_warntype foo(data)           # barrier-function solution
```

GOTCHA 4: INFERENCE IS BY TYPE, NOT BY VALUE

Julia's compiler generates method instances solely based on types, without considering the actual values. To demonstrate this, let's consider the following concrete example.

```
function foo(condition)
    y = condition ? 2.5 : 1

    return [y * i for i in 1:100]
end

@code_warntype foo(true)           # type UNSTABLE
@code_warntype foo(false)          # type UNSTABLE
```

At first glance, we might erroneously conclude that `foo(true)` is type stable: the value of `condition` is `true`, so that `y = 2.5` and therefore `y` will have type `Float64`. However, values don't participate in multiple dispatch, meaning that Julia's compiler ignores the value of `condition` when inferring `y`'s type. Ultimately, `y` is treated as potentially being either `Int64` or `Float64`, leading to type instability.

The issue in this case can be easily resolved by replacing `1` by `1.`, thus ensuring that `y` is always `Float64`. More generally, we could employ similar techniques to the [first "gotcha"](#), where values are converted to a specific concrete type.

An alternative solution relies on dispatching by value, a technique we already [explored and implemented for tuples](#). This technique makes it possible to pass information about values to the compiler. It's based on the type `Val`, along with the keyword `where` introduced [here](#).

Specifically, for any function `foo` and value `a` that you seek the compiler to know, you need to include `::Val{a}` as an argument. In this way, `a` is interpreted as a type parameter, which you can identify by including the keyword `where`. Finally, we need to call `foo` by passing `Val(a)` as its input.

Applied to our example, type instability in `foo` emerges because the value of `condition` isn't known by the compiler. Dispatching by `a` enables us to pass the value of `condition` to the compiler.

```
function foo(condition)
    y = condition ? 2.5 : 1

    return [y * i for i in 1:100]
end

@code_warntype foo(true)           # type UNSTABLE
@code_warntype foo(false)          # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo(::Val{condition}) where condition
    y = condition ? 2.5 : 1

    return [y * i for i in 1:100]
end

@code_warntype foo(Val(true))      # type stable
@code_warntype foo(Val(false))     # type stable
```

GOTCHA 5: VARIABLES AS DEFAULT VALUES OF KEYWORD ARGUMENTS

Functions accept [positional and keyword arguments](#). In the particular case that functions are defined with keyword arguments, it's possible to assign default values. However, when these default values are specified through variables rather than literal values, a type instability is introduced. The reason is that the variable is then treated as a global variable.

```
foo(; x) = x

β = 1
@code_warntype foo(x=β)      #type stable
```

```
foo(; x = 1) = x

@code_warntype foo()        #type stable
```

```
foo(; x = β) = x

β = 1
@code_warntype foo()        #type UNSTABLE
```

When setting a variable as a default value is unavoidable, there are still a few strategies you could follow to restore type stability.

One set of solutions leverages the [techniques we introduced for global variables](#). These include type-annotating the global variable (*Solution 1a*) or defining it as a constant (*Solution 1b*).

Another strategy involves defining a function that stores the default value. By doing so, you can take advantage of type inference, where the function attempts to infer a concrete type for the default value (*Solution 2*).

You can also adopt a local approach, by adding type annotations to either the keyword argument (*Solution 3a*) or the default value itself (*Solution 3b*). Finally, type instability does not arise when positional arguments are used as default values of keyword arguments (*Solution 4*).

All these cases are stated below.

```
foo(; x = β) = x

const β = 1
@code_warntype foo()           #type stable
```

```
foo(; x = β) = x

β::Int64 = 1
@code_warntype foo()           #type stable
```

```
foo(; x = β()) = x

β() = 1
@code_warntype foo()           #type stable
```

```
foo(; x::Int64 = β) = x

β = 1
@code_warntype foo()           #type stable
```

```
foo(; x = β::Int64) = x

β = 1
@code_warntype foo()           #type stable
```

```
foo(β; x = β) = x

β = 1
@code_warntype foo(β)          #type stable
```

GOTCHA 6: CLOSURES CAN EASILY INTRODUCE TYPE INSTABILITIES

Closures are a fundamental concept in programming. A typical situation where they arise is when **a function is defined inside another function**, granting the inner function access to the outer function's scope. In Julia, closures explicitly show up when defining functions within a function, but also implicitly when using anonymous functions within a function.

While closures offer a convenient way to write self-contained code, they can easily introduce type instabilities. Furthermore, although there have been some improvements in this area, their surrounding issues have been around for several years. This is why it's crucial to be aware of its subtle consequences and how to address them.

CLOSURES ARE COMMON IN CODING

There are several scenarios where nesting functions emerges naturally. One such scenario is when you aim to keep a task within a single self-contained unit of code. For instance, this approach is particularly useful if a function needs to perform multiple interdependent steps, such as data preparation (e.g., setting parameters or initializing variables) and subsequent computations based on that data. By nesting a function within another, you can keep related code organized and contained within the same logical block, promoting code readability and maintainability.

To illustrate the patterns involved with and without closures, we'll use generic code. This isn't intended to be executed, but rather to demonstrate the underlying structure of the code. We also suppose a task that lends itself to nested functions.

```
function task()
  # <here, you define parameters and initialize variables>

  function output()
    # <here, you do some computations with the variables and parameters>
  end

  return output()
end

task()
```

```
function task()
  # <here, you define parameters and initialize variables>

  return output(<variables>, <parameters>)
end

function output(<variables>, <parameters>)
  # <here, you do some computations with the variables and parameters>
end

task()
```

Although the approach using closures may seem more intuitive, it can easily introduce type instability. This occurs under certain conditions, such as:

- Redefining variables or arguments (e.g., when updating a variable in an output)
- Altering the order in which functions are defined
- Utilizing anonymous functions

Each of these cases is explored below, where we refer to the containing function as the *outer function* and the closure as the *inner function*.

WHEN THE ISSUE ARISES

Let's start examining three examples. They cover all the possible situations where closures could result in type instability, allowing us to identify real-world scenarios where they could emerge.

The first examples reveal that the placement of the inner function could matter for type stability.

```
function foo()
    x          = 1
    bar()      = x

    return bar()
end

@code_warntype foo()      # type stable
```

```
function foo()
    bar(x)     = x
    x          = 1

    return bar(x)
end

@code_warntype foo()      # type stable
```

```
function foo()
    bar()      = x
    x          = 1

    return bar()
end

@code_warntype foo()      # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo()
    bar()::Int64 = x::Int64
    x::Int64     = 1

    return bar()
end

@code_warntype foo()      # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo()
    x = 1

    return bar(x)
end

bar(x) = x

@code_warntype foo()      # type stable
```

The second example establishes that type instability arises when closures are combined with reassignments of variables or arguments. This issue even persists when you reassign the same object to the variable, including trivial expressions such as `x = x`. The example also reveals that type annotating the redefined variable or the closure doesn't resolve the problem.

```
function foo()
    x = 1
    x = 1          # or 'x = x', or 'x = 2'

    return x
end

@code_warntype foo()      # type stable
```

```
function foo()
    x = 1
    x = 1          # or 'x = x', or 'x = 2'
    bar(x) = x

    return bar(x)
end

@code_warntype foo()      # type stable
```

```
function foo()
    x = 1
    x = 1          # or 'x = x', or 'x = 2'
    bar() = x

    return bar()
end

@code_warntype foo()      # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo()
    x::Int64 = 1
    x = 1
    bar()::Int64 = x::Int64

    return bar()
end

@code_warntype foo()      # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo()
    x::Int64 = 1
    bar()::Int64 = x::Int64
    x = 1

    return bar()
end

@code_warntype foo()           # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo()
    bar()::Int64 = x::Int64
    x::Int64 = 1
    x = 1

    return bar()
end

@code_warntype foo()           # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo()
    x = 1
    x = 1           # or 'x = x', or 'x = 2'

    return bar(x)
end

bar(x) = x

@code_warntype foo()           # type stable
```

Finally, the last example deals with situations involving multiple closures. It highlights that the order in which you define them could matter for type stability. The third tab in particular demonstrates that passing subsequent closures as arguments can sidestep the issue. However, such an approach is at odds with how code is generally written in Julia.

```
function foo(x)
    closure1(x) = x
    closure2(x) = closure1(x)

    return closure2(x)
end

@code_warntype foo(1)           # type stable
```

```
function foo(x)
    closure2(x) = closure1(x)
    closure1(x) = x

    return closure2(x)
end

@code_warntype foo(1)           # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo(x)
    closure2(x, closure1) = closure1(x)
    closure1(x)           = x

    return closure2(x, closure1)
end

@code_warntype foo(1)           # type stable
```

```
function foo(x)
    closure2(x) = closure1(x)

    return closure2(x)
end

closure1(x) = x

@code_warntype foo(1)           # type stable
```

In the following, we'll examine specific scenarios where these patterns emerge. The examples reveal that the issue can occur more frequently than we might expect. For each scenario, we'll also provide a solution that enables the use of a closure approach. Nonetheless, if the function captures a performance critical part of your code, it's probably wise to avoid closures.

"BUT NO ONE WRITES CODE LIKE THAT"

i) Transforming Variables through Conditionals

```
x = [1,2]; β = 1

function foo(x, β)
    (β < 0) && (β = -β)           # transform 'β' to use its absolute value

    bar(x) = x * β

    return bar(x)
end

@code_warntype foo(x, β)       # type UNSTABLE
```

```

x = [1,2];  $\beta$  = 1

function foo(x,  $\beta$ )
    ( $\beta$  < 0) && ( $\beta$  = - $\beta$ )          # transform ' $\beta$ ' to use its absolute value

    bar(x, $\beta$ ) = x *  $\beta$ 

    return bar(x, $\beta$ )
end

@code_warntype foo(x,  $\beta$ )      # type stable

```

```

x = [1,2];  $\beta$  = 1

function foo(x,  $\beta$ )
     $\delta$  = ( $\beta$  < 0) ? - $\beta$  :  $\beta$     # transform ' $\beta$ ' to use its absolute value

    bar(x) = x *  $\delta$ 

    return bar(x)
end

@code_warntype foo(x,  $\beta$ )      # type stable

```

```

x = [1,2];  $\beta$  = 1

function foo(x,  $\beta$ )
     $\beta$  = abs( $\beta$ )                # ' $\delta$  = abs( $\beta$ )' is preferable (you should avoid redefining
    variables)

    bar(x) = x *  $\delta$ 

    return bar(x)
end

@code_warntype foo(x,  $\beta$ )      # type stable

```

Recall that the compiler doesn't dispatch by value, and so whether the condition holds is irrelevant. For instance, the type instability would still hold if we wrote `1 < 0` instead of `β < 0`. Moreover, the value used to redefine `β` is also unimportant, with the same conclusion holding if you write `β = β` .

ii) Anonymous Functions inside a Function

Using an anonymous function inside a function is another common form of closure. Considering this, type instability also arises in the example above if we replace the inner function `bar` for an anonymous function. To demonstrate this, we apply `filter` with an anonymous function that keeps all the values in `x` that are greater than `β` .

```

x = [1,2];  $\beta$  = 1

function foo(x,  $\beta$ )
    ( $\beta$  < 0) && ( $\beta$  = - $\beta$ )           # transform ' $\beta$ ' to use its absolute value

    filter(x -> x >  $\beta$ , x)         # keep elements greater than ' $\beta$ '
end

@code_warntype foo(x,  $\beta$ )        # type UNSTABLE

```

```

x = [1,2];  $\beta$  = 1

function foo(x,  $\beta$ )
     $\delta$  = ( $\beta$  < 0) ? - $\beta$  :  $\beta$       # define ' $\delta$ ' as the absolute value of ' $\beta$ '

    filter(x -> x >  $\delta$ , x)        # keep elements greater than ' $\delta$ '
end

@code_warntype foo(x,  $\beta$ )        # type stable

```

```

x = [1,2];  $\beta$  = 1

function foo(x,  $\beta$ )
     $\beta$  = abs( $\beta$ )                  # ' $\delta$  = abs( $\beta$ )' is preferable (you should avoid redefining
    variables)

    filter(x -> x >  $\beta$ , x)        # keep elements greater than  $\beta$ 
end

@code_warntype foo(x,  $\beta$ )        # type stable

```

iii) Variable Updates

```

function foo(x)
     $\beta$  = 0                        # or ' $\beta::Int64 = 0$ '
    for i in 1:10
         $\beta$  =  $\beta$  + i           # equivalent to ' $\beta += i$ '
    end

    bar() = x +  $\beta$               # or ' $bar(x) = x + \beta$ '

    return bar()
end

@code_warntype foo(1)            # type UNSTABLE

```

```
function foo(x)
    β = 0
    for i in 1:10
        β = β + i
    end

    bar(x, β) = x + β

    return bar(x, β)
end

@code_warntype foo(1)           # type stable
```

```
x = [1, 2]; β = 1

function foo(x, β)
    (1 < 0) && (β = β)

    bar(x) = x * β

    return bar(x)
end

@code_warntype foo(x, β)       # type UNSTABLE
```

iv) The Order in Which you Define Functions Could Matter Inside a Function

To illustrate this claim, suppose you want to define a variable x that depends on a parameter β . However, β is measured in one unit (e.g., meters), while x requires β to be expressed in a different unit (e.g., centimeters). This implies that, before defining x , we must rescale β to the appropriate unit.

Depending on how we implement the operation, a type instability could emerge.

```
function foo(β)
    x(β) = 2 * rescale_parameter(β)
    rescale_parameter(β) = β / 10

    return x(β)
end

@code_warntype foo(1)           # type UNSTABLE
```

```
function foo( $\beta$ )  
  rescale_parameter( $\beta$ ) =  $\beta$  / 10  
  x( $\beta$ ) = 2 * rescale_parameter( $\beta$ )  
  
  return x( $\beta$ )  
end  
  
@code_warntype foo(1)      # type stable
```

FOOTNOTES

- ¹. A similar problem would occur if we replaced `0` by `0.` and `x` is an integer.