```
U5GSY0G9J: thanks <@U3SJEDR96> <@U17B2R554> ill look into those issues
U3SJEDR96: There aren't really any valid use-cases for doing it, though, better to split off the logic into separate
functions and calling those when you need them :slightly_smiling_face:
U17B2R554: That is true
U3SJEDR96: (unless you're replaying history that you got from a remote source in order to restore a user session, but
that's an edge-case)
U3LUC6SNS: In `Main` I have the code```
TogglePublic ->
       togglePublic model
where `togglePublic: Model -> ( Model, Cmd Msg )` with `Cmd.none` in the cmd slot of the preceding tuple. After
`togglePublic model` runs, I would like to run
updateCurrentDocument: Model -> Document -> ( Model, Cmd Msg )
How do I do that?
U0FP80EKB: You could do something like```
let
   (updatedModel, _ ) = togglePublic model
in
  updateCurrentDocument updatedModel document
U0FP80EKB: Personally, I stick with the guidance of having the data structure being updated as the last parameter, so
I'd change `updateCurrentDocument` to```updatedCurrentDocument : Document -&qt; Model -&qt; (Model, Cmd Msq)```
U0FP80EKB: If you want to pipeline, you could then do"
togglePublic model
|> Tuple.first
|> updateCurrentDocument newDocument
U0FP80EKB: Although I tend to go for the first version with the `let` clause to be explicit that it is ignoring the returned
command
U3LUC6SNS: <@U0FP80EKB> Thanks so much! -- and also for the guidance on the position of `model`
U0FP80EKB: One thing is that you are also duplicating the knowledge that `togglePublic` returns `Cmd.none`, so I
probably would do this'
let
  (updatedModel, togglePublicCmd) = togglePublic model
  (updatedWithDocument, documentUpdateCmd) = updatedModel newDocument updatedModel
in
  (updatedWithDocument, Cmd.batch [ togglePublicCmd, documentUpdateCmd ] )
U0FP80EKB: (fixing the names a bit)
U3LUC6SNS: What is the reason for having the data structure being updated as the last param?
U0FP80EKB: Duplicating the knowledge about the `Cmd.none` can be a pain later down the line. I'm pretty aggressive
at eliminating duplication.
U0FP80EKB: It makes it better for pipelining, since `|>` passes as the last parameter
U3LUC6SNS: Got it! thanks!
U0FP80EKB: So, in general, the data structure being changed can be strung through
U3HQVHERX : is `type alias Thing = {...}` creating an "opaque type"?
U0RPQMZ9S: ^ no, but you're on the way to one
U0LPMPL2U: an opaque type is like: "
module Dollar exposing (Dollar)
type Dollar = Dollar Int
```

U0LPMPL2U : Elswhere in your code, you can import the `Dollar` \_type\_, but you don't have access to the `Dollar` \_constructor\_

U0LPMPL2U: that means you can't pattern match or otherwise reach into the internals U3HQVHERX: so `type Dollar = Dollar Int` not equivalent to `type alias Dollar = Int`?

U0LPMPL2U : correct

U0LPMPL2U: with the `type alias`, `Dollar` and `Int` are equivalent

U3HQVHERX: `Int` is the constructor for Dollar U3HQVHERX: in `type Dollar = Dollar Int`

U0LPMPL2U: `5` is both a `Dollar` \_and\_ an `Int` because they are aliases for each other (with the type alias) U3HQVHERX: How would I use the `Dollar` type in the `Dollar` module? And why are opaque types useful?