Push-Pull Signal-Function Functional Reactive Programming

Edward Amsden

Rochester Institute of Technology

IFL 2012 August 29, 2012





Functional Reactive Programming (FRP)

- Functional First-class and higher-order functions.
- Reactive Behavior changes in response to temporal inputs.
- Basic abstractions:
 - Signals Functions of time¹.
 - Events Sequences of temporally ordered and labeled discrete values.

¹Often also called behaviors.

Signal-Function FRP

- Signal functions are transformers of events and signals.
- Signal functions are first class in Signal-Function FRP.
- Signals and events are not first-class in Signal Function FRP.
- This approach is more composable than first-class signals and events (since input may be transformed)².

²Courtney and Elliott, "Genuinely functional user interfaces".

Push vs. Pull Evaluation

- When to evaluate what?
- Pull evaluation ("demand-driven"):
 Evaluate when output is needed.
- Push evaluation ("data-driven"):
 Evaluate when input is available.
- Ideally, an FRP system uses push for events and pull for signals³.

³Elliott, "Push-pull functional reactive programming".



Separating Events and Signals

```
class (Category a) => Arrow a where
arr :: (b -> c) -> a b c
...
```

 Traditional Signal-Function FRP encodes signal functions as a Haskell Arrow.

```
data SF a b = \dots
```

```
instance Arrow SF where
```

Separating Events and Signals

- Necessary to lift any function to a corresponding signal function, without input/output type annotation
- Events encoded as optional signals:type Event a = Maybe a
- Combined signals and events encoded as one signal with pair type:

Separating Events and Signals



Type Signal Functions with Signal Vectors

- Described by Sculthorpe⁴
- Describe separation of individual signals and events
- In Haskell (with -XEmptyDataDecls): data SVEmpty data SVSignal a data SVEvent a data SVAppend svl svr type : : svl svr = SVAppend svl svr
- Would like to use -XDataKinds but it's not working well yet.

⁴Schulthorpe, "Towards Safe and Efficient Functional Reactive Programming".

Type Signal Functions with Signal Vectors

- Two combinator examples:
- Lifting a pure function to transform a signal:

Passing through input on the right:

```
first :: SF svIn svOut
     -> SF (svIn :^: svRight) (svOut :^: svRight)
```

Composing these leads to:

Partial Representations of Signal Vectors

- To evaluate signals and events differently we must represent them separately.
- Signal vectors enable this by distinguishing them in the types.
- We can construct several representations of a signal vector.
 - Represent signal leaves, event leaves, or both.
 - Represent one leaf, a subset of leaves, or all applicable leaves.
 - Transform the type at the leaf, or don't.



Signal Representation

Signal Representation

Event Representation

Represent an event occurrence:

```
data SVOccurrence where
```

SVOccurrence :: a -> SVOccurrence (SVEvent a)

SVOccLeft :: SVOccurrence svLeft

-> SVOccurrence

(svLeft : ^: svRight)

SVOccRight :: SVOccurrence svRight

-> SVOccurrence

(svLeft : ^: svRight)

data Initialized

Signal Function Representation

 Separate continuations for time advancement and event occurrences:

Signal Function Representation

 Separate continuations for time advancement and event occurrences.

Evaluation

- Yampa/AFRP: Supply SF and input/output actions to an evaluation loop (reactimate).
- Here: initialize an evaluation state with:
 - A signal function.
 - Initial values for all input signals.
 - Handlers for all outputs.
- Then, the evaluation monad carries this state and provides the actions:
 - push Push an event (which will be immediately reacted to).
 - update Update the value of an input signal (with no immediate effect).
 - step Update the time and evaluate new values of signals.



Further Work

- Dynamic collections: Dynamically switch between collections of signal functions.
- Semantics/correctness proof (especially for event merging).
- Time-independence optimization.

Push-Pull Signal-Function Functional Reactive Programming Conclusion

Questions?



Time-independence optimization

- Inefficiency: running every time continuation every sample step.
- This happens even if the signal delta is empty (no change)
- Currently this is necessary because the *time* delta might cause some output.
- Optimization:
 - Mark time-independent SFs using a separate constructor.
 - "Smart" composition-routing to make a composite SF time-independent if all of its components are.
 - Time-independent time continuation has no time input, only delta.
 - Only called if non-empty delta.

Event Merging (Semantics Idea)

- Push-based events are not tied to samples.
- We thus know only what the last sample time was for an event, not the actual time.
- Can we hide event merging in this loss of precision?