Functional Programming (In an oops culture)

What is functional programming (FP)

- It is a programming paradigm and not a programming technique
- Broadly speaking it's the philosophy of programming which dictates that the building blocks of code should be "pure functions"
- The idea is to model computational problems in terms of mathematical formulation.
- This usually means writing code with functions which excel at doing one thing and doing it great.
- ▶ The data structures in functional programming are usually immutable

Pure functions (Functions with no sideeffects)

- T square(T x) { return x*x; }
- bool find(Container<T> items, T item) { for (auto x : items) if (x == item)
 return true; return false; }
- void WillDoSomething(T *value) { *value = DidSomething(); }
- std::sort(T start, T end);
- T WillDoSomething() { return DidSomething(); }
 (Functions in black font are "pure" while those in orange are not pure. Why?)
- Data structures in FP based code are mostly immutable.
- Immutable data structures + pure functions = Highly parallelizable code

Making containers parallelizable? Iterators

Expose an iterator interface.

```
For eg all typical stl containers support iterator pattern.

bool Find(const Container<Type> &list, const Type &t) noexcept

{
    for(const auto &x : list) { if (x==t) return true;}
    return false;
}

Notice this find is actually a "pure" function.
```





Generators

- Generators are like iterators except that the items are generated on demand.
- (Python demo)
- A relatively good example in c++ of generators would be input iterators

```
while(cin >> value)
{
    // Do something
}
```

Although this does explains what generators are supposed to do, it doesn't do justice to the power of generators.

The true power of generators

Problem: write a function that returns the sum of all primes <= N. A trivial implementation would be:

```
int sumOfPrime(int N){
    if ( N <= 1) return 0;
    int sm = 2;
    for (int i = 3;i <= N;i+=2) {
        if (isPrime(i)){
            sm += i;
        }
    }
    return sm;
}</pre>
```

The Problem with this approach is that for each number i s.t. $0 \le i \le N$ one will necessarily have to make sqrt(i) iterations taking the worst case to $O(N^*sqrt(N))$

```
void primeSieve(int N, function doOnPrimes){
  vector<bool> sieve(N + 1, 1);
  sieve[2] = true;
  doOnPrimes(2);
  for (int i = 3; i \le N; i+=2){
       if(sieve[i]){
                doOnPrimes(i);
             for(j=3*i; j \le N; j+=2*i) sieive[j] = false;
int sumOfPrimes(int N){
   if (N <=1) return 1;
    int sm = 0;
    primeSieve(N, [&sm](int prime){ sm+= prime; });
    return sm;
```

Using the sieve the asymptotic complexity remains the same but fewer iterations are made

But....

- Still not a good example of generator
- sumOfPrime needs to keep a state which sort of violates the principles of FP
- That is an important limitation for scalability

Yield keyword

```
generator<int> primeSieve(int N){
  yield 2;
  vector<bool> sieve(N + 1, 1);
   for (int i = 3; i \le N; i+=2){
       if(sieve[i]){
              yield i;
              for(j=3*i; j \le N; j+=2*i) sieve[j] = false;
  yield break;
```

```
int sumOfPrimes(int N)
{
   int sm = 0;
   for (auto var : primeSieve(N)) sm += var;
   return sm;
}
```

(Code shared here: https://github.com/bashrc-real/Codearchive/tree/master/YeildTry)



EL AMINGTERY CAN

Lambdas and closures

- Lambdas are anonymous functions
- Used for returning from higher order functions* or to be passed to higher order functions
- Closures are lambdas with state

```
auto square = [](int x) { return x*x; } -> Lambda
auto squareAndSum = [value](int x) { return (x*x) + value; } -> Closure
```

MapReduce

- Map: Given a list map each value to another value. The mapping function must not depend on the state of the list
- reduce : given a list transform the value to a single value
- For eg

```
Problem: Find the sum of all squares of [0,b]

List -> {0, 1, 2, 3......b} [equivalent of vector<int> l(b); iota(l.begin(), l.end(), 0); }

Map-> [](int x) { return x*x; }

Reduce -> [](list values) { return accumulate(values.begin(), values.end(), 0); }

Combining the two:

transform(input.begin(), input.end(), output.begin(), [](int x) { return x*x; })

accumulate(output.begin(), output.end(), 0)
```

MapReduce(contd.)

Notice that the steps of map reduce can be concatenated

Problem: Find whether a word exists among all words on the internet

Word: "Chewbacca"

MapReduce solution:

- 1. Define a map function such that [](string x) { int sm = 0; for(auto var:x) sm+=var; return {x, sm%MOD;} }
- 2. After running the map on all strings the result will look something like [DarthVader,7] [Yoda, 0] [Luke,5] [anakinSkyWalker,0].....

Now we define a reduce function which returns a list of list of the form:

- [0->{AnakinSkyWalker, Yoda}, 1->{HanSolo, ...}, 2->{...},....]
- 3. We know the value of Chewbacca = 1 from the map function

- 4. We take the list with "key value" as 1

 [0->{AnakinSkyWalker, Yoda}, 1->{HanSolo, ...}, 2->{...},....]
- 5. We can now apply steps 1-4 each time with probably a new hash function and at each step after reduce the size of the list will keep getting smaller
- 6. Eventually the list will be so small that we can iterate through the list and match the strings character by character to our search string
- 7. Chewbacca does exist in star wars universe ©

Conclusion

- Small stateless functions = testability, easier debugging, less bugs, such amaze much wow.
- Easy to scale and expand the program to take advantage of multi-cores without changing the logic
- More power to the compiler

References

- https://wiki.haskell.org/Functional_programming
- http://stackoverflow.com/questions/715758/coroutine-vs-continuation-vs-generator
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Higher-order_function