## CS450

Structure of Higher Level Languages

Lecture 13: Reduction

Tiago Cogumbreiro

## Today we will learn...



- 1. Revise general recursion patterns
- 2. Implement general recursion patterns
- 3. Refactor code to reduce code repetition
- 4. Refactor code to improve performance

# Functional patterns: Reduction

## Appending two lists together



Implement function (append 11 12) that appends two lists together. Spec

```
(check-equal?
  (append (list 1 2) (list 3 4))
  (list 1 2 3 4))
```

## Appending two lists together



Implement function (append 11 12) that appends two lists together.

Spec

```
(check-equal?
  (append (list 1 2) (list 3 4))
  (list 1 2 3 4))
```

Solution

```
(define (append 11 12)
  (cond [(empty? 11) 12]
      [else (cons (first 11) (append (rest 11) 12))]))
```

Is it tail recursive?

## Appending two lists together



Implement function (append 11 12) that appends two lists together.

Spec

```
(check-equal?
  (append (list 1 2) (list 3 4))
  (list 1 2 3 4))
```

Solution

```
(define (append 11 12)
  (cond [(empty? 11) 12]
      [else (cons (first 11) (append (rest 11) 12))]))
```

Is it tail recursive? No!





```
; Example 1:
(define (map f 1)
  (cond [(empty? 1) empty]
        [else (cons (f (first 1))
                    (map f (rest 1)))))
; Example 2:
(define (filter to-keep? 1)
  (cond [(empty? 1) empty]
    else
      (cond [(to-keep? (first 1))
             (cons (first 1)
               (filter to-keep? (rest 1)))]
            [else (filter to-keep? (rest 1))])))
; Example 3:
(define (append 11 12)
  (cond [(empty? 11) 12]
        else
          (cons (first 11)
                (append (rest 11) 12)))))
```

## A pattern arises



```
; Example 1:
(define (map f 1)
  (cond [(empty? 1) empty]
        [else (cons (f (first 1))
                    (map f (rest 1))))))
; Example 2:
(define (filter to-keep? 1)
  (cond [(empty? 1) empty]
    Telse
      (cond [(to-keep? (first 1))
             (cons (first 1)
               (filter to-keep? (rest 1)))]
            [else (filter to-keep? (rest 1))])))
; Example 3:
(define (append 11 12)
  (cond [(empty? 11) 12]
        else
          (cons (first 11)
                (append (rest 11) 12))]))
```

#### General recursion pattern for lists

```
(define (rec 1)
   (cond
    (empty? 1) base-case
    [else (step (first 1) (rec (rest 1)))])
For instance,
 (cons (f (first 1)) (map f (rest 1)))
maps to
 (step (first 1) (rec (rest 1)))
```

## Implementing this recursion pattern



Recursive pattern for lists

Fold right reduction

## Implementing map with foldr



## Implementing map with foldr



#### Solution

```
(define (map f 1)
  (define (on-elem elem new-list)
    (cons (f elem) new-list))
  (foldr on-elem empty 1))
```

## Implementing append with foldr



## Implementing append with foldr



#### Solution

```
(define (append 11 12)
(foldr cons 12 11))
```

## Implementing filter with foldr



#### Solution

```
(define (filter to-keep? 1)
  (define (on-elem elem new-list)
      (cond [(to-keep? elem) (cons elem new-list)]
            [else new-list]))
  (foldr on-elem empty 1))
```





```
; Example 1:
(define (map f 1)
  (cond [(empty? 1) empty]
        [else (cons (f (first 1))
                    (map f (rest 1))))))
: Example 2:
(define (filter to-keep? 1)
  (cond
    [(empty? 1) empty]
    else
      (cond [(to-keep? (first 1))
             (cons (first 1)
               (filter to-keep? (rest 1)))]
            [else (filter to-keep? (rest 1))])))
; Example 3:
(define (append 11 12)
  (cond [(empty? 11) 12]
        [else
          (cons (first 11)
                (append (rest 11) 12))]))
```

## Contrasting the effect of using foldr



```
; Example 1:
(define (map f 1)
  (cond [(empty? 1) empty]
        [else (cons (f (first 1))
                    (map f (rest 1)))))
: Example 2:
(define (filter to-keep? 1)
  (cond
    [(empty? 1) empty]
    else
      (cond [(to-keep? (first 1))
             (cons (first 1)
               (filter to-keep? (rest 1)))]
            [else (filter to-keep? (rest 1))])])
: Example 3:
(define (append 11 12)
  (cond [(empty? 11) 12]
        else
          (cons (first 11)
                (append (rest 11) 12))]))
```

```
; Example 1:
(define (map f 1)
  (define (on-elem elem new-list)
    (cons (f elem) new-list))
  (foldr on-elem empty 1))
; Example 2:
(define (filter to-keep? 1)
  (define (on-elem elem new-list)
    (cond [(to-keep? elem) (cons elem new-list)]
          [else new-list]))
  (foldr on-elem empty 1))
; Example 3:
(define (append 1 r)
  (foldr cons r 1))
```

## What about the fold left reduction?

## Reversing a list



Implement function (reverse 1) that reverses a list.

#### Spec

```
(check-equal? (list 4 3 2 1) (reverse (list 1 2 3 4)))
```

## Reversing a list



Implement function (reverse 1) that reverses a list.

Spec

## Another pattern arises



```
; Example 1
(define (concat-nums 1)
  (define (f n)
    (string-append " " (number→string n)))
  (define (concat-nums-aux accum 1)
    (cond
      [(empty? 1) accum]
      else
        (concat-nums-aux
          (string-append accum (f (first 1)
          (rest 1))]))
  (concat-nums-aux ">" 1))
: Example 2
(define (reverse 1)
 (define (rev accum 1)
   (cond [(empty? 1) accum]
          [else (rev (cons (first 1) accum)
                     (rest 1))]))
 (rev empty 1))
```

A generalized recursion pattern for lists

```
(define (rec base-case 1)
   (cond
     (empty? 1) base-case]
     else
       (rec (step (first 1) base-case)
            (rest 1))]))
For instance,
 (cons (first 1) accum)
maps to
 (step (first 1) accum)
```

## Implementing this recursion pattern



#### Recursive pattern for lists

#### Fold left reduction

## Implementing concat-nums with foldl



#### Before

```
(define (concat-nums 1)
 (define (f n)
    (string-append " " (number→string n)))
  (define (concat-nums-aux accum 1)
    (cond
      [(empty? 1) accum]
      [else
        (concat-nums-aux
           (string-append accum (f (first 1)))
           (rest 1))]))
  (concat-nums-aux ">" 1))
```

## Implementing concat-nums with foldl



#### Before

```
(define (concat-nums 1)
 (define (f n)
    (string-append " " (number→string n)))
  (define (concat-nums-aux accum 1)
    (cond
      [(empty? 1) accum]
      else
        (concat-nums-aux
           (string-append accum (f (first 1)))
           (rest 1))]))
  (concat-nums-aux ">" 1))
```

#### After

## Implementing reverse with foldl



#### Original

## Implementing reverse with foldl



#### Original

#### Solution

```
(define (reverse 1)
  (foldl cons empty 1))
```

## Contrasting the effect of using foldl



#### Before

```
: Example 1
(define (concat-nums 1)
  (define (f n)
    (string-append " " (number→string n)))
  (define (concat-nums-aux accum 1)
    (cond
      [(empty? 1) accum]
      else
        (concat-nums-aux
          (string-append accum (f (first 1)))
          (rest 1))]))
  (concat-nums-aux ">" 1))
; Example 2
(define (reverse 1)
  (define (rev accum 1)
    (cond [(empty? 1) accum]
          [else (rev (cons (first 1) accum)
                     (rest 1))]))
  (rev empty 1))
```

## Contrasting the effect of using foldl



Before

```
: Example 1
(define (concat-nums 1)
  (define (f n)
    (string-append " " (number→string n)))
  (define (concat-nums-aux accum 1)
    (cond
      [(empty? 1) accum]
      else
        (concat-nums-aux
          (string-append accum (f (first 1)))
          (rest 1))]))
  (concat-nums-aux ">" 1))
; Example 2
(define (reverse 1)
  (define (rev accum 1)
    (cond [(empty? 1) accum]
          [else (rev (cons (first 1) accum)
                     (rest 1))]))
  (rev empty 1))
```

#### After

## What about tail-recursive optimization?

## What about tail-recursive optimization?



- We note that foldl is tail-recursive already
- However, our original implementation of foldr is not tail recursive

### Can't we implement the tail-recursive optimization pattern?

Unoptimized

```
(define (rec 1)
  (cond
    [(empty? 1) base-case]
    [else (step (first 1) (rec (rest 1)))])
```

Optimized

## Optimized foldr



#### Generalized pattern

#### Implementation

## Benchmark evaluation



- Unoptimized foldr
- Tail-recursive foldr

```
Processing a list of size: 1000000

Throughoutput (unopt): 7310 elems/ms

Mean (unopt): 136.8±7.56ms

Throughoutput (tailrec): 12349 elems/ms

Mean (tailrec): 80.98±1.49ms

Speed-up (tailrec): 1.7
```

A speed improvement of 1.7

What if we use fold! + reverse?

## What if we use fold! + reverse?



- Instead of creating nested functions,
- We reverse the list and apply fold!

```
(define (foldr step base-case 1)
  (foldl step base-case (reverse 1)))
```

## What if we use fold! + reverse?



- Instead of creating nested functions,
- We reverse the list and apply fold!

```
(define (foldr step base-case 1)
  (foldl step base-case (reverse 1)))
```

Simpler implementation!

But is it faster?





```
Processing a list of size: 1000000
Throughoutput (unopt): 7310 elems/ms
Mean (unopt): 136.8±7.56ms
Throughoutput (tailrec): 12349 elems/ms
Mean (tailrec): 80.98±1.49ms
Speed-up (tailrec): 1.7
Throughoutput (rev+foldl): 4846 elems/ms
Mean (rev+foldl): 206.34±3.33ms
Speed-up (rev+fold1): 0.7
```

### Conclusion



We learned to generalize two reduction patterns (foldl and foldr)

- Pro: generalizing code can lead to a central point to optimize code
- **Pro:** generalizing code can reduce our code base (less code means less code to maintain)
- Con: one level of indirection increases the cognitive code (more cognitive load, code harder to understand)

Easier to understand (self-contained)

Harder to understand (what is foldlr?)

```
(define (map f l)
  (define (on-elem elem new-list)
     (cons (f elem) new-list))
  (foldr on-elem empty l))
```