

# Promoting Non-Strict Programming

---

## Introducing StrictCheck

Olaf Chitil

University of Kent, UK

6th September 2006

# Why Non-Strictness / Laziness Matters

John Hughes:

```
evaluate = max . maximise' . highfirst . maptree static .  
           prune 8 . gametree
```

Intermediate data structures as glue enable modular program structure

- without space costs
- online: part of output already for part of input

# Strict vs. Non-Strict

**Space leak:** unexpectedly large space consumption

**Claim:** overly strict functions cause space leaks

```
evaluate = max . maximise' . highfirst . maptree static .  
           prune 8 . gametree
```

**Aim:** **StrictCheck**, a tool for testing whether a Haskell function is too strict

# An Example

```
unzip :: [(a,b)] -> ([a],[b])
unzip [] = ([],[b])
unzip ((x,y):zs) = (x:xs,y:ys)
  where
    (xs,ys) = unzip zs
```

```
unzip2 :: [(a,b)] -> ([a],[b])
unzip2 = foldr (\(x,y) (xs,ys) -> (x:xs,y:ys)) ([],[b])
```

# An Example

```
unzip :: [(a,b)] -> ([a],[b])
unzip [] = ([],[b])
unzip ((x,y):zs) = (x:xs,y:ys)
  where
    (xs,ys) = unzip zs
```

```
unzip2 :: [(a,b)] -> ([a],[b])
unzip2 = foldr (\(x,y) (xs,ys) -> (x:xs,y:ys)) ([],[b])
```

```
unzip ((0,0):⊥) = (0:⊥,0:⊥)    but
unzip2 ((0,0):⊥) = ⊥
```

# Least Strictness

## Distinguish

- function results for total arguments
- function results for partial arguments

The first do not uniquely determine the later.

Because of monotonicity and continuity:

$$f v \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup \{f v' \mid v \sqsubseteq v'\} \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup \{f v' \mid v \sqsubseteq v', v' \text{ is total}\}$$

Function  $f$  **least-strict** iff

$$f v = \bigsqcup \{f v' \mid v \sqsubseteq v', v' \text{ is total}\}$$

# How to Test for Least-Strictness

$f$  not least-strict if **there exists** partial argument  $v$  such that

$$f v \sqsubset \bigsqcup \{f v' \mid v \sqsubseteq v', v' \text{ is total}\}$$

$f$  **probably** not least-strict if

$$f v \sqsubset \bigsqcup \{f v'_1, f v'_2, \dots, f v'_n\}$$

where  $v'_1, \dots, v'_n$  are total with  $v \sqsubseteq v'_1, \dots, v \sqsubseteq v'_n$ .

# Implementation

Example test data:

```
 $\perp$           [], [(0,0)], [(1,1)], [(0,0),(0,0)], ...  
[ $\perp$ ]       [(0,0)], [(1,1)], [(0,0),(0,0)], ...  
(0,0): $\perp$   [(0,0)], [(0,0),(0,0)], [(0,0),(1,1)], ...  
...
```

Systematically generate all arguments with one  $\perp$  up to given depth.

Use

- Scrap-your-boilerplate generics of Glasgow Haskell Compiler
- Chasing Bottoms library: (non-pure) `isBottom`, ...



# Using StrictCheck

```
*Main> test1 5 (unzip2 :: [(Int,Int)] -> ([Int],[Int]))
```

Function seems not to be least strict.

```
Input(s): _|_
```

```
Current output: _|_
```

```
Proposed output: (_|_, _|_)
```

```
Continue? y
```

Function seems not to be least strict.

```
Input(s): [(0, 0)]_|_
```

```
Current output: _|_
```

```
Proposed output: ([0_|_, [0_|_])
```

Detects spine-strictness of `unzip2`.

# Using StrictCheck

```
*Main> test1 5 (True:)
```

```
Completed 36 test(s).
```

```
Function seems to be least strict.
```

Some functions are clearly least-strict.

# Using StrictCheck

```
*Main> test2 10 (&&)
```

```
Function seems not to be least strict.
```

```
Input(s): (_|_, False)
```

```
Current output: _|_
```

```
Proposed output: False
```

```
Continue? y
```

```
Completed 4 test(s).
```

Proposes a function that is not sequential, hence undefinable in Haskell.

# Using StrictCheck

```
*Main> test2 5 ((++) :: [Int] -> [Int] -> [Int])
```

Function seems not to be least strict.

```
Input(s): (_|_, [0])
```

```
Current output: _|_
```

```
Proposed output: [_|__|_
```

```
Continue? y
```

Function seems not to be least strict.

```
Input(s): (_|_, [0, 0])
```

```
Current output: _|_
```

```
Proposed output: [_|_, _|__|_
```

Not sequential.

# Using StrictCheck

```
*Main> test1 5 (reverse :: [Int] -> [Int])
```

Function seems not to be least strict.

```
Input(s): [0|_|_
```

```
Current output: |_|_
```

```
Proposed output: [|_|_|_
```

Continue?

Function seems not to be least strict.

```
Input(s): [0, 0|_|_
```

```
Current output: |_|_
```

```
Proposed output: [|_|_, |_|_|_|_
```

Continue?

Achievable, but inefficient.

# Using StrictCheck

```
*Main> test1 5 (bfNum :: Tree Int -> Tree Int)
```

```
Function seems not to be least strict.
```

```
Input(s): T E 0 _|_
```

```
Current output: _|_
```

```
Proposed output: T E 1 _|_
```

```
Continue? y
```

```
Function seems not to be least strict.
```

```
Input(s): T E 0 (T E 0 _|_)
```

```
Current output: _|_
```

```
Proposed output: T E 1 (T E 2 _|_)
```

That is the information we want.

# Problems Observed in Practice

- proposes non-sequential functions (`&&`)
- proposes undesirably inefficient functions (`reverse`)
- abstract data types:
  - distinguishes equal elements of product types  
`⊥ = Queue ⊥ ⊥ = Queue ⊥ [] = Queue [] ⊥`
  - generates illegal elements
  - generated elements that are hard to read (internal representation)
- cannot exclude a class of counter examples

# Summary

## StrictCheck

- tests whether a function is least-strict
- proposes less strict variant

```
*Main> test1 5 (bfNum :: Tree Int -> Tree Int)
Function seems not to be least strict.
Input(s): T E 0 _|_
Current output: _|_
Proposed output: T E 1 _|_
```

## To Do:

- solve problems
- apply to more examples