Document number:	P0338R0
Date:	2016-05-22
Project:	ISO/IEC JTC1 SC22 WG21 Programming Language C++
Audience:	Library Evolution Working Group
Reply-to:	Vicente J. Botet Escribá < vicente.botet@nokia.com>

# C++ generic factories

#### **Abstract**

This paper presents a proposal for a generic factory make<TC>(args...) that allows to make generic algorithms that need to create an instance of a wrapped class TC from the underlying types.

<u>P0091R0</u> extends template parameter deduction for functions to constructors of template classes. With this feature, it would seam clear that this proposal lost most of its added value but this is not the case.

### **Table of Contents**

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Motivation and scope
- 3. Proposal
- 4. Design rationale
- 5. Proposed wording
- 6. Implementability
- 7. Open points
- 8. Acknowledgements
- 9. References

## Introduction

This paper presents a proposal for a family of generic factories <code>make<TC>(args...)</code> that create an instance of a wrapping class from a *type constructor* and his underlying types as well as emplace factories <code>make<T>(args...)</code> that creates an instance of a wrapping class by emplace constructing the underlying type from the provided arguments.

<u>P0091R0</u> extends template parameter deduction for functions to constructors of template classes. With this feature, it would seam that this proposal has lost most of its added value but this is not the case, as <u>P0091R0</u> is a feature for the user that cannot be used in generic code.

# Motivation and scope

## Possible valued types

future<T>, have in common that all of them have an underlying type T.

There are two kind of factories:

· type constructor with the underlying types as parameter

```
back_insertermake_optionalmake_ready_futuremake_expected
```

• emplace construction of the underlying type given the constructor parameters

```
make_sharedmake_unique
```

When writing an application, the user knows if the function to write should return a specific type, as shared\_ptr<T>, unique\_ptr<T,D>, optional<T>, expected<T,E> or future<T>. E.g. when the user knows that the function must return an owned smart pointer it would use unique ptr<T>.

```
template <class T>
unique_ptr<T> f() {
    T a,
    ...
    return make_unique(a);
    //return unique_ptr(a); // this should be correct with [P0091R0]
}
```

If the user knows that the function must return a shared pointer

```
template <class T>
shared_ptr<T> f() {
    T a,
    ...
    return make_shared(a);
    //return shared_ptr(a); // this should be correct with [P0091R0]
}
```

However when writing a library, the author doesn't always know which type the user wants as a result. In these case the function library must take some kind of type constructor to let the user make the choice.

```
template <template <class> class TC, class T>
TC<T> f() {
    T a,
    ...
    return make<TC>(a);
    //return TC(a); // This should not work even with [P0091R0]
}
```

Another generic example: Possibly Valued types define

```
template <class Callable, class PossiblyValued>
// requires PossiblyValued
auto functor_map f(Callable&& c, PossiblyValued && f)
-> rebind_t<PossiblyValued, decltype(c(declval<value_type_t<PossiblyValued>>()))>
{
    using namespace possibly_valued;
    using namespace type_constructible;

    if (has_value(forward<PossiblyValued>(pv)))
        // This should not work even with [P0091R0]
        return make<type_constructor_t<PossiblyValued>>(c(value(forward<PossiblyValued>(pv))));
    else
        return none<type_constructor_t<PossiblyValued>>();
}
```

## Product types

In addition, we have factories for the *product types* such as pair and tuple

- make\_pair
- make\_tuple

### Comparaison

## WITHOUT proposal

```
int v=0;
auto x1 = make shared < int > (v);
auto x2 = make_unique<int>(v);
auto x3 = make_optional(v);
auto x4v = make_ready_future();
auto x4 = make ready future(v);
auto x5v = make ready future().share();
auto x5 = make ready future(v).share();
auto x6v = make expected();
auto x6 = make_expected(v);
auto x7 = make_pair(v, v);
auto x8 = make_tuple(v, v, 1u);
future<int&> x4r = make ready future(std::ref(v));
auto x1 = make shared < A > (v, v);
auto x2 = make_unique < A > (v, v);
auto x3 = make_optional < A > (v, v);
auto x4 = make_ready_future<A>(v,v);
auto x5 = make > (v, v);
auto x6 = make expected < A > (v, v);
```

#### WITH proposal

```
int v=0;
auto x1 = make < shared ptr > (v);
auto x2 = make<unique_ptr>(v);
auto x3 = make<optional>(v);
auto x4v = make<future>();
auto x4 = make < future > (v);
auto x5v = make<shared future>();
auto x5 = make < shared future > (v);
auto x6v = make<expected>();
auto x6 = make < expected > (v);
auto x7 = make < pair > (v, v);
auto x8 = make < tuple > (v, v, 1u);
future<int&> x4r = make<future>(std::ref(v));
auto x1 = make < shared ptr < A >> (v, v);
auto x2 = make<unique_ptr<A>>(v, v);
auto x3 = make < optional < A >> (v, v);
auto x4 = make < future < A >> (v, v);
auto x5 = make < shared future < A >> (v, v);
auto x6 = make < expected < A >> (v, v);
```

We can use the class template name as a type constructor

```
vector<int> vi1 = { 0, 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8 };
vector<int> vi2;
copy_n(vi1, 3, maker<back_insert_iterator>(vi2));

int v=0;
auto x1 = make<shared_ptr>(v);
auto x2 = make<unique_ptr>(v);
auto x3 = make<optional>(v);
auto x4v = make<future>();
auto x4v = make<future>(v);
auto x5v = make<shared_future>();
auto x5 = make<shared_future>(v);
auto x6v = make<expected>(v);
auto x6 = make<expected>(v);
auto x7 = make<pair>(v, v);
auto x8 = make<tuple>(v, v, 1u);
```

or making use of reference wrapper type deduction

```
int v=0;
future<int&> x4 = make<future>(std::ref(v));
```

or use the class name to build to support in place construction

```
auto x1 = make<shared_ptr<A>>(v, v);
auto x2 = make<unique_ptr<A>>(v, v);
auto x3 = make<optional<A>>(v,v);
auto x4 = make<future<A>>(v,v);
auto x5 = make<shared_future<A>>(v, v);
auto x6 = make<expected<A>>(v, v);
```

Note, with P0091R0, the following is already possible

```
int v=0;
auto x3 = optional(v);
auto x7 = pair(v, v);
auto x8 = tuple(v, v, 1u);
```

We can also make use of the class name to avoid the type deduction

```
int i;
auto x1 = make<future<long>>(i);
```

Sometimes the user wants that the underlying type be deduced from the parameter, but the type constructor needs more information. A type holder \_t can be used to mean any type T.

```
auto x2 = make<expected<_t, E>>(v);
auto x2 = make<unique_ptr<_t, MyDeleter>>(v);
```

# **Proposal**

## Type constructor factory

```
template <class TC>
  invoke<TC, int> safe_divide(int i, int j)
{
  if (j == 0)
    return {};
  else
    return make<TC>(i / j);
}
```

We can use this function with different type constructors as

```
auto x = safe_divide<optional<_t>>(1, 0);
```

#### How to define a class that wouldn't need customization?

For the make default constructor function, the class needs at least to have a default constructor

```
C();
```

For the make copy/move constructor function, the class needs at least to have a constructor from the underlying types.

```
C(Xs&&...);
```

## How to customize an existing class

When the existing class doesn't provide the needed constructor as e.g. future<T> , the user needs specialize the std::factory\_traits<T> class providing the needed overloads for make .

```
namespace experimental
  {
      template <class T>
      struct factory_traits<future<T>>> {
        template <class ...Xs>
        static //constexpr
        future<T> make(Xs&& ...xs)
          return make_ready_future<T>(forward<Xs>(xs)...);
      };
      template <>
      struct factory_traits<future<void>> {
        static //constexpr
        future<void> make()
          return make_ready_future();
     };
## How to define a type constructor?
The make function is already useful with the class template parameter. However, we need in some cases
The simple case is when the class has a single template parameter as is the case for
`future<T>`.
```C++
namespace boost
  struct future_tc {
    template <class T>
    using invoke = future<T>;
 };
}
```

When the class has two parameters and the underlying type is the first template parameter, as it is the case for expected,

```
namespace boost
{
  template <class E>
    struct expected_tc<E> {
     template <class T>
     using invoke = expected<T, E>;
  };
}
```

If the second template depends on the first one as it is the case of unique\_ptr<T, D>, the rebinding of the second parameter must be done explicitly.

```
namespace std {
    template <class D, class T>
    struct rebind;
    template <template <class...> class TC, class ...Ts, class ...Us>
    struct rebind<TC<Ts...>, Us...>> {
      using type = TC<Us...>;
    };
    template <class M, class ...Us>
    using rebind_t = typename rebind<M, Us...>>::type;
  struct default_delete_tc
    template<class T>
    using invoke = default_delete<T>;
  template <class D>
    struct unique_ptr_tc
    template<class T>
    using invoke = unique_ptr<T, detail::rebind_t<D, T>>;
  };
}
```

## Helper classes

}}

Defining these type constructors is cumbersome. This task can be simplified with some helper classes. <u>P0343R0</u> presents these helper classes.

The previous type constructors could be rewritten using these helper classes as follows:

```
namespace std {
  template <>
    struct future<experimental::_t> : experimental::meta::quote<future> {};
}

namespace std {
  namespace experimental {
   template <class E>
    struct expected<_t, E> : meta::bind_back<expected, E> {};
}
```

```
namespace std {
  template <>
    struct default_delete<experimental::_t> : experimental::meta::quote<default_delete> {};

template <class D>
    struct unique_ptr<experimental::_t, D>
  {
    template<class T>
    using invoke = unique_ptr<T, experimental::meta::rebind_t<D, T>>;
};
}
```

# **Design rationale**

### **Customization point**

This proposal uses a trait to customize the behavior.

```
namespace std {
namespace experimental {
inline namespace fundamental_v3 {
    template <class T>
    struct make_traits_default
    {
        template <class ...Xs>
        constexpr auto make(Xs&& xs)
        {
            return T{forward<Xs>(xs)...};
        }
    };
}
```

Alternatively, we could have used of overloading a make\_custom function found by ADL having an additional type<T>

```
template <class T, class ...Xs>
constexpr auto make(type<T>, Xs&& xs)
```

## Why the factory has 3 flavors?

The first make factory uses default constructor to build a C<void> .

The second make factory uses conversion constructor from the underlying type(s).

The third make factory is used to be able to do emplace construction given the specific type.

## reference\_wrapper<T> overload to deduce T&

As it is the case for make\_pair when the parameter is reference\_wrapper<T> , the type deduced for the underlying type

### **Product types factories**

This proposal takes into account also *product type* factories (as std::pair or std::tuple).

```
// make product factory overload: Deduce the resulting `Us`
template <template <class...> class TC, class ...Xs>
   TC<decay_unwrap_t<Xs>...> make(Xs&& ...xs);
// make product factory overload: Deduce the resulting `Us`
template <class TC, class ...Xs>
   invoke<TC, decay_unwrap_t<Xs>...> make(Xs&& ...xs);
auto x = make<pair>(1, 2u);
auto x = make<tuple>(1, 2u, string("a"));
```

### **High order factory**

It is simple to define a high order maker<TC> factory of factories that can be used in standard algorithms.

For example

```
std::vector<X> xs;
std::vector<Something<X>> ys;
std::transform(xs.begin(), xs.end(), std::back_inserter(ys), maker<Something>{});
```

where

```
template <template <class> class T>
struct maker {
  template <typename ...X>
  constexpr auto
  operator()(X&& ...x) const
  {
    return make<T>(forward<X>(x)...);
  }
};
```

The main problem defining function objects is that we cannot have the same class with different template parameters. The previous maker class template has a template class parameter. We need an additional class that takes a type constructor or a type.

```
template <template <class> class Tmpl>
struct maker_tmpl {
 template <typename ...X>
  constexpr auto
  operator()(X&& ...x) const
      return make<Tmpl>(forward<X>(x)...);
 }
};
template <class TC>
struct maker_tc {
 template <typename ...Args>
  constexpr auto
 operator()(Args&& ...args) const
      return make<TC>(forward<Args>(args)...);
};
template <class T>
struct maker_t
 template <class ...Args>
  constexpr auto
 operator()(Args&& ...args) const
    return make<T>(std::forward<Args>(args)...);
 }
};
```

Now we can define a maker factory for high-order make functions as follows

```
template <class T>
// requires not is_type_constructor<T>{}
maker_t<T> maker() { return maker_t<T>{}; }

template <class TC>
// requires is_type_constructor<TC>()
maker_tc<TC> maker() { return maker_tc<TC>{}; }

template <template <class ...> class TC>
maker_tmpl<TC> maker() { return maker_tmpl<TC>{}; }
```

The previous example would be instead

```
std::vector<X> xs;
std::vector<Something<X>> ys;
std::transform(xs.begin(), xs.end(), std::back_inserter(ys), maker<Something>());
```

Note the use of () instead of {}

# Impact on the standard

These changes are entirely based on library extensions and do not require any language features beyond what is available in C++14. There are however some classes in the standard that needs to be customized.

# **Proposed wording**

The proposed changes are expressed as edits to N4564 the Working Draft - C++ Extensions for Library Fundamentals V2.

The current wording make use of <code>decay\_unwrap\_t</code> as proposed in <u>P0318R0</u>, but if this is not accepted the wording can be changed without too much troubles.

The current wording make use of some meta-programming utilities defined in P0343R0.

### **General utilities library**

------ Insert a new section. ------

X.Y Factories [functional.factorires]

X.Y.1 In General

X.Y.2 Header synopsis

```
namespace std
namespace experimental
inline namespace fundamental_v3
  template <class T>
  struct factory_traits_default;
  template <class T>
  struct factory_traits : factory_traits_default<T> {};
  // make() overload
  template <template <class ...> class M>
    M<void> make();
  // requires a type constructor
  template <class TC>
    meta::invoke<TC, void> make();
  // make overload: requires a template class parameter, deduce the underlying type
  template <template <class ...> class Tmpl, class ...Xs>
    Tmpl<decay_unwrap<Xs>...> make(Xs&& ...xs);
  // make overload: requires a type constructor, deduce the underlying types
  template <class TC, class ...Xs>
    meta::invoke<TC, decay_unwrap<Xs>...> make(Xs&& ...xs);
  // make overload: don't deduce the underlying types,
```

```
// don't deduce the underlying type from Xs
  // requires M is not a type constructor
  template <class M, class ...Xs>
    M make(Xs&& ...xs);
  template <class TC>
  struct maker_tc;
  template <template <class> class T>
  struct maker_tmpl;
  template <class T>
  struct maker_t;
  // requires a type constructor
  template <class TC>
    maker_tc<TC> maker();
  // requires T is not a type constructor
  template <class T>
    maker_t<T> maker();
  template <template <class ...> class TC>
    maker_tmpl<TC> maker();
}
}
```

#### X.Y.3 Template function make

#### X.Y.4 template + void

```
template <template <class ...> class M>
M<void> make();
```

Effects: Forwards to the customization point. As if

```
return make<type_constructor_t<meta::quote<M>>>();
```

#### X.Y.5 template + deduced underlying type

```
template <template <class ...> class M, class ...Xs>
  M<decay_unwrap<Xs>...> make(Xs&& ...xs);
```

Effects: Forwards to the customization point. As if

```
return make<type_constructor_t<meta::quote<M>>>(std::forward<Xs>(xs)...);
```

#### X.Y.6 type constructor + deduced underlying type

```
template <class TC, class ...Xs>
  meta::invoke<TC, decay_unwrap<Xs>...> make(Xs&& ...xs);
```

Effects: Forwards to the customization point. As if

```
return factory_traits<meta::invoke<TC, deduced_type_t<Xs>...>>::make(std::forward<Xs>(xs)...);
```

Remark: This function shall not participate in overload resolution until meta::is\_callable<TC(deduced\_type\_t<Xs>...)>::value .

#### X.Y.7 type + non deduced underlying type

```
template <class M, class ...Xs>
M make(Xs&& ...xs);
```

Effects: Forwards to the customization point. As if

```
return factory_traits<M>::make(std::forward<Xs>(xs)...);
```

Remark: This function shall not participate in overload resolution if meta::is\_callable<TC(deduced\_type\_t<Xs>...)>::value .

#### X.Y.8 Class teemplate factory traits default

```
template <class T>
struct factory_traits_default
{
  template <class ...Xs>
  static constexpr
  auto make(Xs&& ...xs)
  -> decltype(T(std::forward<Xs>(xs)...))
  {
    return T(std::forward<Xs>(xs)...);
  }
};
```

Default customization point for classes defining the constructor.

Returns: A T constructed using the constructor T(std::forward<Xs>(xs)...)

Throws: Any exception thrown by the constructor.

Remark: factory\_traits\_default<T>::make function shall not participate in overload resolution until T(std::forward<Xs>(xs)...) is well formed.

# **Example of customizations**

Next follows some examples of customizations that could be included in the standard

## optional

Nothing to do.

### expected

Nothing to do.

## future / shared\_future

```
namespace std {
namespace experimental {
    template <class T>
        struct factory_traits<future<T>>>
            template <class ...Xs>
                static
                future<T> make(Xs&& ...xs)
                return make_ready_future<T>(forward<Xs>(xs)...);
        };
    template <>
        struct factory_traits<future<void>>
            static
                future<void> make()
                return make_ready_future();
        };
    template <class T>
        struct factory_traits<shared_future<T>>>
            template <class ...Xs>
                static
                shared_future<T> make(Xs&& ...xs)
                return make_ready_future<DX>(forward<Xs>(xs)...).share();
    };
    template <>
        struct factory_traits<shared_future<void>>
            static //constexpr
                shared_future<void> make()
                return make_ready_future().share();
        };
}
}
```

### unique ptr

```
namespace std {
namespace experimental {
   template <class T, class D>
        struct factory_traits<unique_ptr<T, D>>
        {
        template <class ...Xs>
        static
        unique_ptr<T, D> make(Xs&& ...xs)
        {
            return make_unique<T>(forward<Xs>(xs)...);
        }
        };
}
```

### shared\_ptr

### pair

Nothing to do.

## tuple

Nothing to do.

# **Implementability**

There is a partial implementation at <a href="https://github.com/viboes/std-make/include/experimental/make.hpp">https://github.com/viboes/std-make/include/experimental/make.hpp</a>.

# **Open points**

The authors would like to have an answer to the following points if there is at all an interest in this proposal:

- Is there an interest on the make factories?
- Should the customization be done with overloading or with traits?

The current proposal uses traits. The alternative is to use overloading.

- If overloading is preferred, should the customization function names be suffixed e.g. with custom?
- Should the high-order function factory maker be part of the proposal?
- Should the resulting *Callable* from the high-order function factory maker be implementation defined as it is the result of std::bind?
- Should the function factories make be high-order function objects?

N4381 proposes to use function objects as customized points, so that ADL is not involved.

This has the advantages to solve the function and the high order function at once.

The same technique is used a lot in other functional libraries as Range-V3, Fit and Pure.

The authors don't know how to manage with a single function object for the 3 kind of interfaces. An so there will be 3 function objects that should be named. The authors believe that the proposed high-order function factory maker is more appropriated.

## **Acknowledgements**

Many thanks to Agustín K-ballo Bergé from which I learn the trick to implement the different overloads. Scott Pager helped me to identify a minimal proposal, making optional the helper classes and of course the addition high order functional factory and the missing reference\_wrapper overload.

Thanks to Mike Spertus for its P0091R0 proposal that would even help to avoid the factories in the common cases.

## References

• N4381 - Suggested Design for Customization Points

http://open-std.org/JTC1/SC22/WG21/docs/papers/2015/n4381.html

• N4564 N4564 - Working Draft, C++ Extensions for Library Fundamentals, Version 2 PDTS

http://www.open-std.org/jtc1/sc22/wg21/docs/papers/2015/n4564.pdf

P0091R0 - Template parameter deduction for constructors (Rev. 3)

http://www.open-std.org/jtc1/sc22/wg21/docs/papers/2015/p0091r0.html

• <u>P0318R0</u> decay\_unwrap and unwrap\_reference

http://www.open-std.org/JTC1/SC22/WG21/docs/papers/2016/p0318r0.pdf

• <a href="P0319R0">P0319R0</a> - Adding Emplace functions for promise<T>/future<T>

http://www.open-std.org/JTC1/SC22/WG21/docs/papers/2016/p0319r0.pdf

• P0323R0 - A proposal to add a utility class to represent expected monad (Revision 2)

http://www.open-std.org/JTC1/SC22/WG21/docs/papers/2016/p0323r0.pdf

• P0343R0 - Meta-programming High-Order functions

http://www.open-std.org/JTC1/SC22/WG21/docs/papers/2016/p0343r0.pdf

• Range-V3

https://github.com/ericniebler/range-v3

• Meta

https://github.com/ericniebler/meta

• Boost.Hana

https://github.com/ldionne/hana

• Pure

https://github.com/splinterofchaos/Pure

• Fit

https://github.com/pfultz2/Fit