

Harmonizing the definitions of total order for pointers

Document #: D1961R0
Date: 2019-11-05
Project: Programming Language C++
Library (LWG)
Reply-to: Gašper Ažman
<gasper.azman@gmail.com>

Contents

1 Abstract	1
2 Proposed Wording	1

1 Abstract

This paper addresses NB comments [US220](#) and [US176](#).

The comments point out that we provide a total order for pointers 3 times:

- 17.11.06 [cmp.object]
- 20.14.7 [comparisons]
- 20.14.8 [range.cmp]

We also do not require that they produce the same results. This paper unifies the wording and clarifies that they do produce the same results.

It is the intention of this paper to not introduce any change in behaviour. It merely clarifies that there is only one implementation-defined total order over pointers, and all parts of the library use the same one.

2 Proposed Wording

In section 16.3, insert a subclause:

16.3.28: **implementation-defined strict total order over pointers**

There is an implementation-defined strict total ordering over all pointer values of a given type. This total ordering is consistent with the partial order imposed by the builtin operators `<`, `>`, `<=`, `>=`, and `<=`.

In section 17.11.6, change the reference:

- (4.1) – If the expression `std::forward<T>(t) <=> std::forward<U>(u)` results in a call to a built-in operator `<=` comparing pointers of type `P`, returns `strong_ordering::less` if (the converted value of) `t` precedes `u` in the implementation-defined strict total order [\(16.3.28\)](#)~~(20.14.8)~~ over pointers of type `P`, `strong_ordering::greater` if `u` precedes `t`, and otherwise `strong_ordering::equal`.

In section 20.14.7:

- ² For templates `less`, `greater`, `less_equal`, and `greater_equal`, the specializations for any pointer type yield a result consistent with the implementation-defined strict total order over pointers (16.3.28)~~a strict total order that is consistent among those specializations and is also consistent with the partial order imposed by the built-in operators `<`, `>`, `<=`, `>=`.~~ [Note: When `a < b` is well-defined for pointers `a` and `b` of type `P`, this implies `(a < b) == less<P>()(a, b)`, `(a > b) == greater<P>()(a, b)`, and so forth.— end note] For template specializations

`less<void>`, `greater<void>`, `less_equal<void>`, and `greater_equal<void>`, if the call operator calls a built-in operator comparing pointers, the call operator yields a result consistent with the implementation-defined strict total order over pointers. ~~that is consistent among those specializations and is also consistent with the partial order imposed by those built-in operators.~~

In section 20.14.8, remove:

- ² ~~There is an implementation-defined strict total ordering over all pointer values of a given type. This total ordering is consistent with the partial order imposed by the builtin operators `<`, `>`, `<=`, `>=`, and `<=>`.~~