Haskell Assignment 1

Philip Rajani Lassen (vgh804) Nicolas Ringsmose Larsen (vgn209)

September 2018

1 evalExpr

For the resubmission, we worked on using monadic style more, and finishing up evalExpr. We ended up with a working implementation for nearly all cases. The most troublesome cases, aside from the list comprehensions that we did not implement properly (more on this in the assessment section), was when we were given an array of expressions. This is done in expressions of type

Array [Expr] and Call FunName [Expr]

The simplest way for us to evalute a list of expressions seemed to be to map evalExpr over the list. However, this returns a [SubsM Value]. For both our original submission and our resubmission, we spent a lot of time figuring out how to take each SubsM Value and append the inner values on to each other.

Enter our helper function concatSubsM:

```
concatSubsM :: [SubsM Value] -> SubsM [Value]
```

The function works by folding the liftM2 function (with the const function inside) over the [SubsM Value] list. Thus creating a list of the values inside each SubsM, and returning them inside a single SubsM [Value].

For the array comprehensions, we had some issues with the finer points. Again, these will be addressed in the assessment section, this section will go over our design choices instead.

For ACFor we used a strategy similar to the Array and Call case earlier. This time, we mapped a helper function over the list contained in the Expr part of ACFor Ident Expr ArrayCompr. The helper function esentially binds the Ident to a value (each value in the list) and then evaluates the ArrayCompr with this binding.

For ACIf we simply evaluated the expression and moved on to evaluating the following array comprehension if the first evaluation returned true. However, if it returned false, we decided to return an UndefinedVal, even though we really just wanted to return nothing. This would make for a slight problem, as we will see later.

2 Process

In order to implement the code we spent a large portion of the time reading about Monads. We hoped that this would help speed our ability to produce the code, however we still lacked some understanding. When we wrote the code we had difficulties getting our implementations to pass the type-checker. This was due to our lack of understanding of why functions and types were chosen to be what they were.

3 Assessment

Our implementation seems to work for most cases, and we feel like we have gotten a better grasp on monads for the resubmission. However, there are still three issues with the list comprehensions.

The first one happened if an ACFor had an ACIf inside. Since our implementation of ACIf returns an UndefinedVal if the test is false, the resulting array would contain such values instead of just throwing them away.

We were able to put a bandaid on this problem by filtering out UndefinedVal in the ACFor case. However, this means that there can never be an UndefinedVal in the resulting array. We are not sure if this matters for list comprehensions, since we already have the Array(e) function.

The second problem is that we do not know how to "reset" the context after evaluating the list comprehensions. Thus, all bindings made inside a list comprehensions persists outside it as well.

Lastly, for nested ACFor expressions, we return an ArrayVal [ArrayVal [Value]], which was not the intention of the nested for loops. However, we could not come up with a good way of handling this problem.

Overall, we feel more comfortable using monads, but confusions still arise for these special cases.

4 Testing

We were able to pass all but two of the twenty nine tests of the online TA (27/29) were passed). We discussed why our implementation was unable to pass these two tests earlier. For our own testing we used the Tasty Testing framework, and built our Test Suite in Test.hs. We tried to cover some edge cases. We wrote 8 tests. In some of the cases a test may be comparing a list to another list, which means that there are more than 8 tests. The tests can be run by running the command

stack test

The results should look something like

Progress 1/2: subscript-interpreter-0.0.0Tests

Boolean Tests: OK
Number Tests: OK
String Tests: OK
Undefined Tests: OK
Array Tests: OK
Comma Tests: OK
Functions calls: OK
Other Tests: OK

All 8 tests passed