



**Utrecht
University**

Computing Science MSc Thesis

Incremental Computation for Algebraic Datatypes in Haskell

Author

Jort van Gorkum (6142834)

Supervisors

Wouter Swierstra

Trevor McDonell

Faculty of Science

Department of Information and Computing Sciences

Programming Technology

April 28, 2022

Write abstract

Contents

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Motivation	5
1.2	Contributions	5
1.3	Research Questions	5
2	Specific Implementation	6
2.1	Merkle Tree (TreeH)	8
2.2	Zipper	9
2.2.1	Zipper TreeH	10
3	Datatype-Generic Programming	11
3.1	Introduction	11
3.1.1	Deep vs Shallow recursion	13
3.2	Comparison Generic Libraries	13
3.2.1	Pattern Functors vs Sums of products	13
3.2.2	Mutually recursive datatypes	13
4	Prototype Implementation	14
4.1	Prototype language	14
4.1.1	Zipper	15
4.2	HashMap vs Trie	16
5	Generic Implementation	17
5.1	Regular	17
5.2	Complexity	17
5.3	Memory Strategies	18
5.4	Pattern Synonyms	18
6	Experiments	19
6.1	Execution Time	19
6.2	Memory Usage	21
6.3	Comparison Memory Strategies	23
7	Conclusion and Future Work	24
7.1	Conclusion	24
A	Implementation Memo Cata	25
A.1	Definition Generic Datatypes	25
A.2	Implementation Hashable	25
A.3	Implementation Merkle	26

A.4	Implementation Cata Merkle	26
A.5	Implementation Zipper Merkle	27
B	Regular	28
B.1	Zipper	28

Todo list

Write abstract	1
Write a motivation	5
Write the contributions	5
Write the research questions	5
Add an example of hash collision probability for popular hash function	7
Maybe add the more efficient implementation of merging maps?	7
Introduce generic programming and how it works	11
Maybe remove the results?	12
Describe the differences between defining generic data types	13
Describe what mutually recursive datatypes are and why do we need to know about it	13
Describe the use of the Zipper and how the hashes are updated	15
Write a piece about the comparison of storing it in a HashMap or a Trie datastructure	16
Write about Hdiff and the use of Trie datastructure	16
Write about why Regular is chosen	17
Write about the implementation of Regular and what had to change compared to the prototype language	17
Describe for every function used the complexity and what leads to the complete complexity	17
Describe multiple memory strategies for keeping memory usage and execution time low	18
Write about paper selective memoization	18
Explain Pattern Synonyms	18

1

Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Write a motivation

1.2 Contributions

Write the contributions

1.3 Research Questions

Write the research questions

2

Specific Implementation

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

sumTree :: Tree Int -> Int
sumTree (Leaf x)      = x
sumTree (Node l x r) = x + (sumTree l) + (sumTree r)
```

Computing a value of a data structure can easily be defined in Haskell, but every time there is a small change in the `Tree`, the entire `Tree` needs to be recomputed. This is inefficient, because most of the computations have already been performed in the previous computation.

To prevent recomputation of already computed values, the technique memoization is introduced. Memoization is a technique where the results of computational intensive tasks are stored and when the same input occurs, the result is reused.

The comparison of two values in Haskell is done with the `Eq` typeclass, which implements the equality operator `(==)` :: `a -> a -> Bool`. So, an example implementation of the `Eq` typeclass for the `Tree` datatype would be:

```
instance Eq a => Eq (Tree a) where
    Leaf x1      == Leaf x2      = x1 == x2
    Node l1 x1 r1 == Node l2 x2 r2 = x1 == x2 && l1 == l2 && r1 == r2
    _            == _            = False
```

The problem with using this implementation of the `Eq` typeclass for Memoization is that for every comparison of the `Tree` datatype the equality is computed. This is inefficient because the equality implementation has to traverse the complete `Tree` data structure to know if the `Tree`'s are equal.

To efficiently compare the `Tree` datatypes, we need to represent the structure in a manner which does not lead to traversing to the complete `Tree` data structure. This can be accomplished using a `hash` function. A hash function is a process of transforming a data structure into an arbitrary fixed-size value, where the same input always generates the same output.

One of the disadvantages of using hashes is *hash collisions*. Hash collisions happen when two different pieces of data have the same hash. This is because a hash function has a limited amount of bits to represent every possible combination of data. However, common hash functions have such a low chance of getting a hash collision, it is negligible.

Add an example of hash collision probability for popular hash function

```
class Hashable a where
    hash :: a -> Hash

instance Hashable a => Hashable (Tree a) where
    hash (Leaf x)      = concatHash [hash "Leaf", hash x]
    hash (Node l x r) = concatHash [hash "Node", hash x, hash l, hash r]
```

The hashes can then be used to efficiently compare two `Tree` data structures, without having to traverse the entire `Tree` data structure. To keep track of the intermediate results of the computation, we store the results in a `Map`. A `Map`, also known as a dictionary, is an implementation of mapping a key to a value. In our next example the `Hash` is the key and the value is the intermediate result.

```
sumTreeInc :: Tree Int -> (Int, Map Hash Int)
sumTreeInc l@(Leaf x)      = (x, insert (hash l) x empty)
sumTreeInc n@(Node l x r) = (y, insert (hash n) y (ml <> mr))
    where
        y = x + xl + xr
        (xl, ml) = sumTreeInc l
        (xr, mr) = sumTreeInc r
```

Then after the first computation over the entire `Tree`, we can recompute the `Tree` using the previously created `Map`. Thus, when we recompute the `Tree`, we first look in the `Map` if the computation has already been performed then return the result. Otherwise, compute the result and store it in the `Map`.

Maybe add the more efficient implementation of merging maps?

```
sumTreeIncMap :: Map Hash Int -> Tree Int -> (Int, Map Hash Int)
sumTreeIncMap m l@(Leaf x) = case lookup (hash l) m of
    Just x  -> (x, m)
    Nothing -> (x, insert (hash l) x empty)
sumTreeIncMap m n@(Node l x r) = case lookup (hash n) m of
    Just x  -> (x, m)
    Nothing -> (y, insert (hash n) y (ml <> mr))
    where
        y = x + xl + xr
```



```

(xl, ml) = sumTreeIncMap m l
(xr, mr) = sumTreeIncMap m r

```

Generating a hash for every computation over the data structure is time-consuming and unnecessary, because most of the `Tree` data structure stays the same. The work of Miraldo and Swierstra[3] inspired the use of the Merkle Tree. A Merkle Tree is a data structure which integrates the hashes within the data structure.

2.1 Merkle Tree (TreeH)

First we introduce a new datatype `TreeH`, which contains a `Hash` for every constructor in `Tree`. Then to convert the `Tree` datatype into the `TreeH` datatype, the structure of the `Tree` is hashed and stored into the datatype using the `merkle` function.

```

data TreeH a = LeafH Hash a
              | NodeH Hash (Leaf a) a (Leaf a)

merkle :: Tree Int -> TreeH Int
merkle l@(Leaf x) = LeafH (hash l) x
merkle (Node l x r) = NodeH h l' x r'
  where
    h = hash ["Node", x, getHash l', getHash r']
    l' = merkle l
    r' = merkle r

```

The precomputed hashes can then be used to easily create a `Map`, without computing the hashes every time the `sumTreeIncH` function is called.

```

sumTreeIncH :: TreeH Int -> (Int, Map Hash Int)
sumTreeIncH (LeafH h x) = (x, insert h x empty)
sumTreeIncH (NodeH h l x r) = (y, insert h y (ml <> mr))
  where
    y = x + xl + xr
    (xl, ml) = sumTreeInc l
    (xr, mr) = sumTreeInc r

```

The problem with this implementation is, that when the `Tree` datatype is updated, the entire `Tree` needs to be converted into a `TreeH`, which is linear in time. This can be done more efficiently, by only updating the hashes which are impacted by the changes. Which means that only the hashes of the change and the parents need to be updated.

The first intuition to fixing this would be using a pointer to the value that needs to be changed. But because Haskell is a functional programming language, there are no pointers. Luckily, there is a data structure which can be used to efficiently update the data structure, namely the Zipper[2].

2.2 Zipper

The Zipper is a technique of representing a data structure by keeping track of how the data structure is being traversed through. The Zipper was first described by Huet[2] and is a solution for efficiently updating pure recursive data structures in a purely functional programming language (e.g., Haskell). This is accomplished by keeping track of the downward current subtree and the upward path, also known as the *location*.

To keep track of the upward path, we need to store the path we traverse to the current subtree. The traversed path is stored in the `Cxt` datatype. The `Cxt` datatype represents three options the path could be at: the `Top`, the path has traversed to the left (`L`), or the path has traversed to the right (`R`).

```
data Cxt a = Top
          | L (Cxt a) (Tree a) a
          | R (Cxt a) (Tree a) a
```

```
type Loc a = (Tree a, Cxt a)
```

```
enter :: Tree a -> Loc a
enter t = (t, Top)
```

Using the `Loc`, we can define multiple functions on how to traverse through the `Tree`. Then, when we get to the desired location in the `Tree`, we can call the `modify` function to change the `Tree` at the current location.

```
left :: Loc a -> Loc a
left (Node l x r, c) = (l, L c r x)
```

```
right :: Loc a -> Loc a
right (Node l x r, c) = (r, R c l x)
```

```
up :: Loc a -> Loc a
up (t, L c r x) = (Node t x r, c)
up (t, R c l x) = (Node l x t, c)
```

```
modify :: (Tree a -> Tree a) -> Loc a -> Loc a
modify f (t, c) = (f t, c)
```

Eventually, when every value in the `Tree` has been changed, the entire `Tree` can then be rebuilt using the `Cxt`. By recursively calling the `up` function until the top is reached, the current subtree gets rebuilt. And when the top is reached, the entire tree is then returned.

```
leave :: Loc a -> Loc a
```

```

leave l@(t, Top) = l
leave l = top (up l)

```

2.2.1 Zipper TreeH

The implementation of the Zipper for the `TreeH` datatype is the same as for the `Tree` datatype. However, the `TreeH` also contains the hash of the current and underlying data structure. Therefore, when a value is modified in the `TreeH`, all the parent nodes of the modified value needs to be updated.

The `updateLoc` function modifies the value at the current location, then checks if the location has any parents. If the location has any parents, go up to that parent, update the hash of that parent and recursively update the parents hashes until we are at the top of the data structure. Otherwise, return the modified locations, because all the other hashes are not affected by the change.

```

updateLoc :: (TreeH a -> TreeH a) -> Loc a -> Loc a
updateLoc f l = if top l' then l' else updateParents (up l')
  where
    l' = modify f l

    updateParents :: Loc a -> Loc a
    updateParents (Loc x Top) = Loc (updateHash x) Top
    updateParents (Loc x cs)  = updateParents $ up (Loc (updateHash x) cs)

```

Then, the `update` function can be defined using the `updateLoc` function, by first traversing through the data structure with the given directions. Then modifying the location using the `updateLoc` function and then leave the location and the function results in the updated data structure.

```

update :: (TreeH a -> TreeH a) -> [Loc a -> Loc a] -> TreeH a -> TreeH a
update f dirs t = leave $ updateLoc f l'
  where
    l' = applyDirs dirs (enter t)

```

3

Datatype-Generic Programming

The implementation in Chapter 2 is an efficient implementation for incrementally computing the summation over a `Tree` datatype. However, when we want to implement this functionality for a different datatype, a lot of code needs to be copied while the process remains the same. This results in poor maintainability, is error-prone and in general just boring.

An example of reducing manual implementations for datatypes is the *deriving* mechanism in Haskell. The built-in classes of Haskell, such as `Show`, `Ord`, `Read`, can be derived for a large class of datatypes. However, deriving is not supported for custom classes. Therefore, we use *Datatype-Generic Programming*[1] to define functionality for a large class of datatypes.

In this chapter, we introduce Datatype-Generic Programming, also known as *generic programming* or *generics* in Haskell, as a technique that allows defining functions which can operate on a large class of datatypes. This prevents the need to write the previously defined functionality for every datatype.

3.1 Introduction

The `regular` Haskell library is an implementation of generic programming. Here the generic representation of a datatype is called a *pattern functor*. A pattern functor is a stripped-down version of a data type, by only containing the constructor but not the recursive structure. The recursive structure is done explicitly by using a fixed-point operator.

First, the pattern functors defined in `regular` are 5 core pattern functors and 2 meta information pattern functors. The core pattern functors describe the datatypes.

Introduce generic programming and how it works

```
data U r      = U                -- Empty constructors
data I r      = I r              -- Recursive call
data K a r    = K a              -- Constants
data (+::) f g r = Inl (f r) | Inr (g r) -- Sums (Choice)
data (*:) f g r = Pair (f r, g r)  -- Products (Combine)
```

The conversion from regular datatypes into pattern functors is done by the `Regular` type class. The `Regular` type class has two functions. The `from` function converts the datatype into a pattern functor and the `to` function converts the pattern functor back into a datatype. In `regular`, the pattern functor is represented by a type family. Then using the `Regular` conversion to a pattern functor, we can write for example the `Tree` datatype from Chapter 2 as:

```
type family PF a :: * -> *

class Regular a where
  from :: a -> PF a a
  to   :: PF a a -> a

type instance PF (Tree a) = K a           -- Leaf
                        :+: (I :+: K a :+: I) -- Node

class GSize f where
  gsize :: (a -> Int) -> f a -> Int

instance GSize I where
  gsize f (I x) = f x

instance GSize (K a) where
  gsize _ _ = 0

instance (GSize f, GSize g) => GSize (f :+: g) where
  gsize f (Inl x) = gsize f x
  gsize f (Inr x) = gsize f x

instance (GSize f, GSize g) => GSize (f :+: g) where
  gsize f (Pair (x, y)) = gsize f x + gsize f y

size :: (Generic a, GSize (PF a)) => a -> Int
size = 1 + gsize size (from x)
```

Maybe remove the results?

```
t :: Tree Int
t = Node (Leaf 1) 2 (Leaf 3)

pt :: PFTree Int
pt = (Inr (Pair (Pair (I (Inl (K 1))), K 2), I (Inl (K 3))))

size t ≡ 2
```

3.1.1 Deep vs Shallow recursion

As described earlier, the `regular` library uses a fixed-point operator to explicitly define recursion. This is done, by ...

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

from' :: (Generic a, Functor (PF a)) => a -> Fix (PF a)
from' = In . fmap from' . from

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

size' :: (Generic a, GSize (PF a), Functor (PF a), Foldable (PF a))
      => a -> Int
size' = cata ((1+) . sum) . from'
```

3.2 Comparison Generic Libraries

3.2.1 Pattern Functors vs Sums of products

Describe the differences between defining generic data types

3.2.2 Mutually recursive datatypes

Describe what mutually recursive datatypes are and why do we need to know about it

4

Prototype Implementation

4.1 Prototype language

```
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)
```

The definition of the pattern functor only leads to shallow recursion. Meaning that pattern functor can only be used to observe a single layer of recursion. To apply a function over the complete data structure, deep recursion is used. To implement deep recursion, the fix point is introduced.

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

The fix point is then used to describe the recursion of the datatype on a type-level basis. Using pattern functors and fix point most of the Haskell datatypes can be represented. For example:

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

type TreeG a = Fix (TreeF a)
type TreeF a = K a                -- Leaf
           :+: ((I :+: K a) :+: I) -- Node
```

Because the generic representation of the Haskell datatypes can be represented using pattern functors, we can use Functors. Using the Functor class a `cata` function can be defined, which is a generic fold function.

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

cataSum :: TreeG Int -> Int
cataSum = cata f
  where
```

```

f (Inl (K x))                = x
f (Inr (Pair (Pair (I l, K x), I r))) = x + l + r

```

To store the intermediate results of `cata`, we want the structure of the data to be hashed. This way we can easily compare if the data structure has changed over time, without completely recomputing the resulting digests. To do this, first a fix point is introduced which additionally stores the digest.

```

type Merkle f = Fix (f :: K Digest)

```

Then to convert the fix point to a fix point containing the structural digest, the `Merkelize` class is introduced.

```

class Hashable f where
    hash :: Hashable g => f (Fix g) -> (f :: K Digest) (Fix (g :: K Digest))

merkleG :: Hashable f
    => f (Fix (g :: K Digest)) -> (f :: K Digest) (Fix (g :: K Digest))
merkleG f = f :: K (hash f)

merkle :: Hashable f => Fix f -> Merkle f
merkle = In . merkleG . fmap merkle . from

```

Using the new fix point with its structural digest, a new `cata` function can be defined which can store its intermediate values in a `Map Digest a`.

```

cataMerkleState :: (Functor f, Traversable f, Container c, Show (c a), Show a)
    => (f a -> a) -> Merkle f -> State (c a) a
cataMerkleState alg (In (Pair (x, K h))) = do m <- get
    case lookup h m of
        Just a -> return a
        Nothing -> do y <- mapM (cataMerkleState alg) x
            let r = alg y
            modify (insert h r) >> return r

cataMerkle :: (Traversable f, Container c, Show (c a), Show a)
    => (f a -> a) -> Merkle f -> (a, c a)
cataMerkle alg t = runState (cataMerkleState alg t) empty

```

4.1.1 Zipper

Describe the use of the Zipper and how the hashes are updated

4.2 HashMap vs Trie

Write a piece about the comparison of storing it in a HashMap or a Trie datastructure

Write about Hdiff and the use of Trie datastructure

5

Generic Implementation

5.1 Regular

Write about why Regular is chosen

Write about the implementation of Regular and what had to change compared to the prototype language

```
newtype K a r      = K { unK :: a }      -- Constant value
newtype I r        = I { unI :: r }      -- Recursive value
data U r           = U                  -- Empty Constructor
data (f :+: g) r   = L (f r) | R (g r)  -- Alternatives
data (f **: g) r   = f r **: g r         -- Combine
data C c f r       = C { unC :: f r }    -- Name of a constructor
data S l f r       = S { unS :: f r }    -- Name of a record selector

merkle :: (Regular a, Hashable (PF a), Functor (PF a))
      => a -> Merkle (PF a)
merkle = In . merkleG . fmap merkle . from

cataSum :: Merkle (PF (Tree Int)) -> (Int, M.Map Digest Int)
cataSum = cataMerkle
  (\case
    L (C (K x))          -> x
    R (C (I l **: K x **: I r)) -> l + x + r
  )
```

5.2 Complexity

Describe for every function used the complexity and what leads to the complete complexity

5.3 Memory Strategies

Describe multiple memory strategies for keeping memory usage and execution time low

Write about paper selective memoization

5.4 Pattern Synonyms

Explain Pattern Synonyms

```
{-# COMPLETE Leaf_, Node_ #-}

pattern Leaf_ :: a -> PF (Tree a) r
pattern Leaf_ x <- L (C (K x)) where
  Leaf_ x = L (C (K x))

pattern Node_ :: r -> a -> r -> PF (Tree a) r
pattern Node_ l x r <- R (C (I l :: K x :: I r)) where
  Node_ l x r = R (C (I l :: K x :: I r))

cataSum :: MerklePF (Tree Int) -> (Int, M.Map Digest Int)
cataSum = cataMerkle
  (\case
    Leaf_ x      -> x
    Node_ l x r -> l + x + r
  )
```

6

Experiments

6.1 Execution Time




Figure 6.1: Overview execution time




Figure 6.2: Execution time for Cata Sum




Figure 6.3: Execution time for Generic Cata Sum




Figure 6.4: Execution time for Incremental Cata Sum

6.2 Memory Usage




Figure 6.5: Overview memory usage




Figure 6.6: Memory usage for Cata Sum




Figure 6.7: Memory usage for Generic Cata Sum




Figure 6.8: Memory usage for Incremental Cata Sum

6.3 Comparison Memory Strategies




Figure 6.9: Comparison Memory Strategy

7

Conclusion and Future Work

7.1 Conclusion



Implementation Memo Cata

A.1 Definition Generic Datatypes

```
data U r      = U
data I r      = I r
data K a r    = K a
data (:+:) f g r = L (f r) | R (g r)
data (:*) f g r = (f r) :* (g r)
data C c f r  = C (f r)

newtype Fix f = In { out :: f (Fix f) }
```

A.2 Implementation Hashable

```
class Hashable f where
  hash :: f (Fix (g :* K Digest)) -> Digest

instance Hashable U where
  hash _ = digest "U"

instance (Show a) => Hashable (K a) where
  hash (K x) = digestConcat [digest "K", digest x]

instance Hashable I where
  hash (I x) = digestConcat [digest "I", getDigest x]
  where
    getDigest :: Fix (f :* K Digest) -> Digest
    getDigest (In (_ :* K h)) = h

instance (Hashable f, Hashable g) => Hashable (f :+: g) where
```

```

hash (L x) = digestConcat [digest "L", hash x]
hash (R x) = digestConcat [digest "R", hash x]

instance (Hashable f, Hashable g) => Hashable (f :+: g) where
  hash (x :+: y) = digestConcat [digest "P", hash x, hash y]

instance (Hashable f) => Hashable (C c f) where
  hash (C x) = digestConcat [digest "C", hash x]

```

A.3 Implementation Merkle

```

type Merkle f = Fix (f :+: K Digest)

merkleG :: Hashable f
=> f (Fix (g :+: K Digest))
-> (f :+: K Digest) (Fix (g :+: K Digest))
merkleG f = f :+: K (hash f)

merkle :: (Regular a, Hashable (PF a), Functor (PF a))
=> a -> Merkle (PF a)
merkle = In . merkleG . fmap merkle . from

```

A.4 Implementation Cata Merkle

```

cataMerkleState :: (Functor f, Traversable f)
=> (f a -> a) -> Fix (f :+: K Digest)
-> State (M.Map Digest a) a
cataMerkleState alg (In (x :+: K h)) = do m <- get
case M.lookup h m of
  Just a -> return a
  Nothing -> do y <- mapM (cataMerkleState alg) x
    let r = alg y
    modify (M.insert h r) >> return r

cataMerkle :: (Functor f, Traversable f)
=> (f a -> a) -> Fix (f :+: K Digest) -> (a, M.Map Digest a)
cataMerkle alg t = runState (cataMerkleState alg t) M.empty

```

A.5 Implementation Zipper Merkle

```
data Loc :: * -> * where
  Loc :: (Zipper a) => Merkle a
      -> [Ctx (a :: K Digest) (Merkle a)]
      -> Loc (Merkle a)

modify :: (a -> a) -> Loc a -> Loc a
modify f (Loc x cs) = Loc (f x) cs

updateDigest :: Hashable a => Merkle a -> Merkle a
updateDigest (In (x :: _) ) = In (merkleG x)

updateParents :: Hashable a => Loc (Merkle a) -> Loc (Merkle a)
updateParents (Loc x []) = Loc (updateDigest x) []
updateParents (Loc x cs) = updateParents
    $ expectJust "Exception: Cannot go up"
    $ up (Loc (updateDigest x) cs)

updateLoc :: Hashable a => (Merkle a -> Merkle a)
    -> Loc (Merkle a) -> Loc (Merkle a)
updateLoc f loc = if top loc'
    then loc'
    else updateParents
    $ expectJust "Exception: Cannot go up" (up loc')

where
  loc' = modify f loc
```

B

Regular

B.1 Zipper

```
data instance Ctx (K a) r
data instance Ctx U r
data instance Ctx (f :+: g) r = CL (Ctx f r) | CR (Ctx g r)
data instance Ctx (f :*: g) r = C1 (Ctx f r) (g r) | C2 (f r) (Ctx g r)
data instance Ctx I r = CId
data instance Ctx (C c f) r = CC (Ctx f r)
data instance Ctx (S s f) r = CS (Ctx f r)
```

Bibliography

- [1] Jeremy Gibbons. “Datatype-generic programming”. In: *International Spring School on Datatype-Generic Programming*. Springer. 2006, pp. 1–71.
- [2] Gérard Huet. “The zipper”. In: *Journal of functional programming* 7.5 (1997), pp. 549–554.
- [3] 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.