

Incremental Type-Safe Structural Diffing

Jort van Gorkum

January 25, 2022

Todo list

Describe how hdiff compares 4

1 Introduction

- What is the problem? Illustrate with an example.

1.1 Research Questions

- What is/are your research questions/contributions?

2 Background

2.1 An Efficient Algorithm for Type-Safe Structural Diffing

The paper *An Efficient Algorithm for Type-Safe Structural Diffing* by Victor Cacciari Miraldo and Wouter Swierstra presents an efficient datatype-generic algorithm called *hdiff* to compute the difference between two values of any algebraic datatype. In particular, the algorithm readily works over the abstract syntax tree (AST) of a programming language[6].

The algorithm when implemented in Haskell contains two main functions the `diff` and `apply`. The `diff` function computes the difference between two values of type `a`, and the `apply` function attempts to transform one value according to the information stored in the `Patch`.

```
diff  :: a -> a -> Patch a
apply :: Patch a -> a -> Maybe a
```

These functions are expected to fulfill some properties. The first being *correctness*: the patch that `diff x y` computes can be used to faithfully reproduces `y` from `x`.

$$\forall x y . \text{apply}(\text{diff } x y) x \equiv \text{Just } y$$

The second being *preciseness*:

$$\forall x y . \text{apply}(\text{diff } x x) y \equiv \text{Just } y$$

The last being *computationally efficient*: both the `diff` and `apply` functions needs to be space and time efficient.

The most commonly used diffing algorithm by version control systems is the Hunt-McIlroy algorithm used by the UNIX `diff` utility[4]. The UNIX `diff` satisfies these previously stated properties for `a` \equiv `[String]` [6]. Several attempts have been made to generalize this algorithm for arbitrary datatypes, but the way the UNIX `diff` represents the `Patch` using only *insertions*, *deletions* and *copies of lines* has two weaknesses. Firstly, the non-deterministic nature of the design makes the algorithm inefficient, and secondly, there exists no canonical 'best' patch and the choice is arbitrary[6].

Miraldo's and Swierstra's algorithm improves this shortcoming by introducing more operations: *arbitrary reordering*, *duplication* and *contraction of subtrees*. This restricts non-determinism, making it easier to compute patches and increasing the opportunities for copying.

To make the `diff` algorithm work, an implementation of *which common subtree* needs to be defined. The `wcs` function is a function that when given two trees and a subtree, returns the position of the subtree inside the trees if both contain the subtree. Otherwise, the function returns nothing. An example of a naive implementation would be:

```
wcs :: Tree -> Tree -> Tree -> Maybe Int
wcs s d x = elemIndex x (subtrees s ∩ subtrees d)
```

The paper identifies two inefficiencies using this naive implementation. (A) Checking trees for equality is linear in the size of the tree; (B) Furthermore, enumerating all subtrees is exponential.

To improve the first inefficiency of the naive `wcs` implementation is to use cryptographic hash functions to compare the equality of the trees. To check the trees for equality in constant time the trees are decorated with a hash at every node in the tree. Then, using the precomputed hash and the root node of the given tree, the hash of a subtree is calculated in constant time.

The second inefficiency of the naive `wcs` implementation is improved by using a `Trie`[1] data-structure.

2.2 Sums of Products for Mutually Recursive Datatypes

The paper *Sums of Products for Mutually Recursive Datatypes* written by Victor Cacciari Miraldo and Alejandro Serrano[5] presents a new approach to generic programming using recursive positions to handle mutually recursive families and the *sum-of-products* structure. This work (`generics-msrop`) is later used by the paper *An Efficient Algorithm for Type-Safe Structural Diffing* by Victor Cacciari Miraldo and Wouter Swierstra[6] to define the generic version of their diffing algorithm. Compared to existing generic programming libraries, `generics-mrsop` has *deep explicit recursion*, *sums of products* and supports *mutually recursive datatypes*.

Explicit recursion There are two ways to represent values. One contains the information on what properties of a datatype are recursive. The other does not contain that information. If we do not know explicitly if the property is recursive, then only one layer of the value can be formed into a generic representation. This is called *shallow* encoding. If we explicitly keep track of the recursive property, then the entire value can be transformed into a generic representation. This is called *deep* encoding. Using the *deep* encoding more datatypes can be defined generically (e.g., a generic *map* or generic *Zipper* datatype).

Sums of Products The `generic-sop` library uses a list of lists of types. The outer list represents the sum and the inner list represents the product. The sum represents the choice between two constructors; the product represents a combination of two constructors. An example of a `Code` representation of a `BinTree` is

```
data BinTree a = Leaf a
               | Node (BinTree a) (BinTree a)

Code_BinTree(Bin a) = `[ `[a], `[Bin a, Bin a]]
```

Here the ``` sign in the code promotes the definition to the type-level instead of a run-time value. The use of *Sums of Products* makes it considerably easier to represent generic datatypes.

Mutually recursive datatypes Most of the generic programming libraries are restricted to only allowing recursion on the same datatype, which is the one being defined. Mutually recursive datatypes are recursively defined in each other's terms. This means that most generic programming libraries do not support mutually recursive datatypes. Which limits the ability to generically represent the syntax of many programming languages. Thus `generic-sop` introduces recursive positions on a type level, which can be used to define mutually recursive datatypes.

2.3 Concise, Type-Safe, and Efficient Structural Diffing

The paper *Concise, Type-Safe, and Efficient Structural Diffing* written by Erdweg, Sebastian and Szabó, Tamás and Pacak, André presents a structural diffing algorithm called *truediff*[2]. *truediff* ensures that the patches produces are concise and type safe, and with a performance by an order of magnitude higher than *Gumtree*[3] and the *hdiff*[6] algorithm.

To compute the difference between a source tree and a target tree, *truediff* operates in four steps: (1) prepare subtree equivalence relations; (2) find reusable candidates; (3) select reusable candidates; (4) and compute the edit script.

The equivalence relations used in step 1, exist out of two equivalence relations, both encoded through cryptographic hashes. The first equivalence relation is used to identify reusable candidates. The second equivalence relation is used to identify preferred reusable candidates. The paper found that using structural equivalence to identify candidates and literal equivalence to select preferred candidates yields very concise edit scripts.

Describe how *hdiff* compares

3 Preliminary Results

- What examples can you handle already?
- What prototype have I built?
- How can I generalize these results? What problems have I identified or do I expect?




Figure 1: Compute the result

```
merkle :: Merkelize f => Fix f -> Fix (f :: K Digest)
merkle = In . merkleIn . unFix

class (Functor f) => Merkelize f where
    merkleIn :: (Merkelize g)
              => f (Fix g) -> (f :: K Digest) (Fix (g :: K Digest))

data Tree a = Leaf a
            | Node (Tree a) a (Tree a)

type TreeG a = Fix (TreeF a)
type TreeF a = K a
              ::: ((I :: K a) ::: I)

cata :: Functor f => (f a -> a) -> Fix f -> a
cata alg t = alg (fmap (cata alg) (unFix t))

cataSum :: TreeG Int -> Int
```

```
cataSum = cata (\case
  Inl (K x)                -> x
  Inr (Pair (Pair (I l, K x), I r)) -> l + x + r)
```

4 Timetable and Planning

- What will I do with the remainder of my thesis?
- Give an approximate estimation/timetable for what you will do and when you will be done.

5 Appendix

A Definition Generic Datatypes

```
data I r      = I r
data K a r    = K a
data (+:) f g r = Inl (f r) | Inr (g r)
data (:*) f g r = Pair (f r, g r)
```

B Definition Fixpoint

```
data Fix f = In { unFix :: f (Fix f) }

instance Eq (f (Fix f)) => Eq (Fix f) where
  f == g = unFix f == unFix g

instance Show (f (Fix f)) => Show (Fix f) where
  show = show . unFix
```

C Implementation Merkelize

```
instance (Show a) => Merkelize (K a) where
  merkleIn (K x) = Pair (K x, K h)
  where
    h = digestConcat [digest "K", digest x]

instance Merkelize I where
  merkleIn (I x) = Pair (I prevX, K h)
  where
    prevX@(In (Pair (_, K ph))) = merkle x
    h = digestConcat [digest "I", ph]

instance (Merkelize f, Merkelize g) => Merkelize (f :+ g) where
  merkleIn (Inl x) = Pair (Inl prevX, K h)
  where
    (Pair (prevX, K ph)) = merkleIn x
```



```

    h = digestConcat [digest "Inl", ph]
merkleIn (Inr x) = Pair (Inr prevX, K h)
where
    (Pair (prevX, K ph)) = merkleIn x
    h = digestConcat [digest "Inr", ph]

instance (Merkelize f, Merkelize g) => Merkelize (f :+: g) where
merkleIn (Pair (x, y)) = Pair (Pair (prevX, prevY), K h)
where
    (Pair (prevX, K phx)) = merkleIn x
    (Pair (prevY, K phy)) = merkleIn y
    h = digestConcat [digest "Pair", phx, phy]

```

D Implementation Cata Sum with Intermediate Results

```

cataMerkleTree :: TreeG Int -> (M.Map String Int, Int)
cataMerkleTree t = cata sumTree merkleTree
where
    merkleTree :: Fix (TreeF a :+: K Digest)
    merkleTree = merkle t

sumTree :: (TreeG Int :+: K Digest) Int -> Int
sumTree (Pair (px, K h)) = case px of
    -- Leaf
    Inl (K x)
        -> (M.insert h x M.empty, x)
    -- Node
    Inr (Pair (Pair (I (xl, ml), K x), I (xr, mr)))
        -> let n = x + xl + xr
            in (M.insert h n (ml <> mr), n)

```

References

- [1] Peter Brass. *Advanced data structures*. Vol. 193. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 2008, pp. 336–356.
- [2] Sebastian Erdweg, Tamás Szabó, and André Pacak. “Concise, type-safe, and efficient structural diffing”. In: *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*. 2021, pp. 406–419.
- [3] Jean-Rémy Falleri et al. “Fine-grained and accurate source code differencing”. In: *Proceedings of the 29th ACM/IEEE international conference on Automated software engineering*. 2014, pp. 313–324.
- [4] James Wayne Hunt and M Douglas MacIlroy. *An algorithm for differential file comparison*. Bell Laboratories Murray Hill, 1976.
- [5] Victor Cacciari Miraldo and Alejandro Serrano. “Sums of products for mutually recursive datatypes: the appropriationist’s view on generic programming”. In: *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGPLAN International Workshop on Type-Driven Development*. 2018, pp. 65–77.
- [6] Victor Cacciari Miraldo and Wouter Swierstra. “An efficient algorithm for type-safe structural diffing”. In: *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 3.ICFP (2019), pp. 1–29.