Typelist Meta-Algorithm Implementation Tricks

In the "Once, Weakly" of 9 September 2003 we looked at the concept of typelist metaalgorithms. These are algorithms for manipulating typelists at compile time in a manner reminiscent of STL generic algorithms. We also saw how to create meta-function objects (including meta-predicates and meta-comparitors), and meta-function adapters.

In this installment of "Once, Weakly" we'll examine a few more typelist meta-algorithms to motivate a few somewhat half-baked metaprogramming techniques used to implement them. (That's why I'm calling them "tricks" instead of something more pretentious, like "strategies.")

Straightforward Leveraging

Many new meta-algorithms can be implemented in a straightforward way from existing meta-algorithms. An obvious example is the implementation of Unique in terms of UniqueEquiv.

```
template <class TList, template <class,class> class BPred>
struct UniqueEquiv;
```

UniqueEquiv removes duplicate adjacent types in a typelist that compare equal according to the binary predicate BPred. Unique does the same thing but uses the type equality by default. It is trivially implemented by invoking UniqueEquiv with the appropriate predicate.

```
template <class TList>
struct Unique {
   typedef typename UniqueEquiv<TList,IsSame>::R R;
};
```

In the same way, we can implement Transform in terms of TransformIf through use of a very agreeable predicate:

```
template <typename>
struct IsTrue { enum { r = true }; };
...
template <class TList, template <typename> class Op>
struct Transform {
   typedef typename TransformIf<TList,IsTrue,Op>::R R;
};
```

Another example is the implementation of Find in terms of FindIf. However, Find is searching for a particular type, whereas FindIf requires a predicate. We simply generate the appropriate predicate using an adapter to bind one argument of the IsSame¹ binary predicate to produce a unary predicate:

```
template <class TList, typename T>
```

¹ IsSame is from Andrei Alexandrescu's *Modern* C++ Design.

```
struct Find {
    enum {r = FindIf<TList, Bind2nd<IsSame,T>::template Adapted>::r};
};
```

So Find is implemented in terms of FindIf, where the predicate asks if a type is the same as T.

Ad Hoc Meta-Functions

Consider implementing an EraseIf algorithm:

```
template <class TList, template <typename> class Pred>
struct EraseIf;
```

We'd like to apply a predicate to each element of the typelist, and produce a typelist that contains only the elements that did not satisfy the predicate. We could implement this functionality from scratch, but we have an existing TransformIf algorithm and an existing EraseAll algorithm.² We can leverage these two if we can map the elements to be removed to a particular type:

```
struct ToErase {};
```

The TransformIf algorithm requires a meta-function to apply to its typelist. A very simple ad hoc meta-function will do:

```
template <typename>
struct MakeToErase {
   typedef ToErase R;
};
```

This function maps any type to ToErase. Now the implementation of EraseIf is trivial; we use TransformIf to convert any element that satisfies the predicate into ToErase, then use EraseAll to remove all the ToErases.

```
template <class TList, template <typename> class Pred>
struct EraseIf {
  typedef typename TransformIf<TList,Pred,MakeToErase>::R Marked;
  typedef typename EraseAll<Marked,ToErase>::R R;
};
```

Ad Hoc Adapters

Consider the problem of implementing a set union of two typelists, where a "less-than" comparator is supplied explicitly:

² EraseAll is also Andrei's, and TransformIf was described in the Once, Weakly of 9 September 2003. Any unattributed meta-algorithms may be found there, or in the source code that accompanies this installment of "Once, Weakly." That source code may be found at http://www.semantics.org/code.html.

This would seem like a fairly easy task, if we're not too concerned about compile time efficiency.³ Using existing meta-algorithms from our toolkit,⁴ we can just paste the two typelists together, sort the result, and get rid of adjacent duplicates.⁵

The problem is that we've been supplied with a comparator, but we need an equivalence operation to instantiate UniqueEquiv. (Speaking somewhat inaccurately, we need an operator == of some sort, and all we have is an operator <.) Our existing meta-object adapters don't quite do what we need, although we can leverage them with a little ad hoc trickery. First we create an adapter that exchanges the order of arguments of a binary predicate:

```
template <template <class,class> class BPred>
struct ExchangeArgs {
   template <typename A, typename B>
   struct Adapted {
        enum { r = BPred<B,A>::r };
   };
};
```

Now we can produce an equivalence operation from a "less-than" operation as A = quiv B = ! (A < B) && ! (B < A). That is, A and B are equivalent if neither is less than the other.

³ Usually we aren't. However, if we were to deal with very long typelists, the asymptotic complexity of our meta-algorithms can be important. Also, see Scouting Out Optimizations. C/C++ Users Journal *Experts Forum*, 21, 4 (April 2003) for a number of techniques that can be used to improve compile time performance of metaprograms without changing their asymptotic complexity.

⁴ Append is Andrei's too.

⁵ Yes, this differs from the behavior of the STL set_union, and yes, I meant it to, and no, I am not going to change it to mimic the STL set_union. My way is better.

•••

It's not hard to understand how this sort of code can be irritating to maintainers. It's probably better to create a simpler ad hoc adapter that does the same thing, but more clearly:

```
template <template <typename,typename> class Comp>
struct GenEquivalence {
   template <typename A, typename B>
   struct Equivalence {
        enum { r = !Comp<A,B>::r && !Comp<B,A>::r };
   };
};
```

This special-purpose adapter takes a comparator and produces an equivalence operation. It's instantiated with a comparator and produces a conformant equivalence operation as a nested template. Invoking the nested template involves the usual syntactic contortions to inform the compiler that the nested name Equivalence is a template name:

```
...
typedef typename
UniqueEquiv<SRR,GenEquivalence<Comp>::template Equivalence>::R R;
...
```

Marking, Extracting, and Purging

Before we look at another user-level meta-algorithm, let's consider the implementation of some behind-the-scenes functionality.

Many meta-algorithms have a logical structure equivalent to selecting some subset of the elements of a typelist, and then doing something with that subset. We can reify that selection process with a marking algorithm:

```
template <class TList, template <typename> class Pred>
struct MarkList;
```

MarkList "marks" the elements of TList that satisfy Pred by constructing a parallel Boolean typelist that indicates which elements are "marked." Rather than come up with a compile-time Boolean list construct, however, we can employ a typelist of known structure. This implementation uses a typelist that contains types of the form char (*) [n], where n is in the range from 1 to some platform-specific upper bound. By convention, we'll interpret char (*) [1] as false, and other bounds as true.⁶

```
template <typename Head, class Tail, template <typename> class Pred>
struct MarkList<typelist<Head,Tail>,Pred> {
   typedef typelist<char(*)[Pred<Head>::r+1],
        typename MarkList<Tail,Pred>::R> R;
```

```
};
```

 $^{^{6}}$ This encoding can also serve as a compile-time list of positive integers through the use of sizeof on the dereferenced pointer.

```
template <template <typename> class Pred>
struct MarkList<null_typelist,Pred> {
   typedef null_typelist R;
};
```

Once we have a means of identifying the subset of interest, we can implement other operations. For instance, we can extract the marked items into a typelist:

```
template <class TList, class Marks>
   struct ExtractList;
   template <typename Head, class Tail, int bound, class MTail>
   struct ExtractList< typelist<Head,Tail>,
                        typelist<char(*)[bound],MTail> > {
      typedef typename ExtractList<Tail,MTail>::R ETail;
      typedef typename Select<
            !! (bound-1),
            typelist<Head,ETail>,
            ETail
      >::R R;
   };
   template <>
   struct ExtractList<null_typelist,null_typelist> {
      typedef null typelist R;
   };
... or purge the items from the typelist:
   template <class TList, class Marks>
   struct PurgeList;
   template <typename Head, class Tail, int bound, class MTail>
   struct PurgeList< typelist<Head,Tail>,typelist<char(*)[bound],MTail>
   > {
      typedef typename PurgeList<Tail,MTail>::R PTail;
      typedef typename Select<
            ! (bound-1),
            typelist<Head,PTail>,
            PTail
      >::R R;
   };
   template <>
   struct PurgeList<null typelist,null typelist> {
```

```
typedef null_typelist R;
};
```

... or apply a meta-function to the marked items, or whatever.

Set Union Redux

Earlier, we examined the implementation of a set union algorithm, SetUnionEquiv, that employed a user-supplied comparator. However, that implementation of set cannot (easily) be used to union two typelists based on the traditional notion of set union; that is, that the resultant set would have no duplicate types, but also that no unique type would be omitted from the union. However, because the set of C++ types is not ordered (implicitly, at compile time) it is not (easily) possible to construct an appropriate comparator for SetUnionEquiv. Instead, let's write a special-purpose version of set union. Recall the implementation of SetUnionEquiv:

The implementation of SetUnion should be similar:

```
template <class TList1, class TList2>
struct SetUnion {
  typedef typename Append<TList1,TList2>::R RR;
  typedef typename Sort<RR,???>::R SRR;
  typedef typename Unique<SRR>::R R;
};
```

However, we've run into a problem with Sort to which we alluded above. There is no well-defined ordering on C++ types, so we have to find some other mechanism to bring equivalent types into adjacency so that they can be eliminated with Unique.

One approach might be to abandon the notion of sorting the typelist, instead "clumping together" equivalent types based on an equivalence relation:

```
template <class TList, template <typename,typename> class Eq>
struct Clump;
```

We can implement the clumping functionality in a straightforward fashion by marking sets of equivalent types, extracting them from the typelist, purging them from the typelist, and continuing until there are no types left to mark.

```
Bind1st<Eq,Head>::template Adapted>::R HeadMarks;
typedef typename ExtractList<Orig,HeadMarks>::R HeadList;
typedef typename PurgeList<Orig,HeadMarks>::R TailPurged;
typedef typename Clump<TailPurged,Eq>::R TailList;
typedef typename Append<HeadList,TailList>::R R;
};
template <template <typename,typename> class Eq>
struct Clump<null_typelist,Eq> {
typedef null_typelist R;
};
```

Now that we have an implementation of Clump, we can rid ourselves of Sort in the implementation of SetUnion:

```
template <class TList1, class TList2>
struct SetUnion {
  typedef typename Append<TList1,TList2>::R RR;
  typedef typename Clump<RR,IsSame>::R SRR;
  typedef typename Unique<SRR>::R R;
};
```

Other Algorithms

Similar techniques are used to implement other meta-algorithms, and the implementations for the following are available at present on Semantics' code page.⁷ (They'll eventually find their way into the Tyr library.⁸)

```
template <class TList, typename T>
struct Find;
template <class TList, template <class> class Pred>
struct FindIf;
template <class Tlist, typename T>
struct Count;
template <class Tlist, template <class> class Pred>
struct CountIf;
template <class TList>
struct Unique;
template <class TList, template <class, class> class BPred>
struct UniqueEquiv;
template <class TList, template <typename> class Op>
struct Transform;
template <class TList1, class TList2,</pre>
```

⁷ http://www.semantics.org/code.html

⁸ http://www.semantics.org/tyr.html

```
template <typename,typename> class Op>
struct Transform2;
template <class TList, template <typename> class Pred,
        template <typename> class Op>
struct TransformIf;
template <class TList, template <typename> class Pred>
struct EraseIf;
template <class TList, template <class,class> class Comp>
class Sort;
template <class TList>
struct Rotate;
template <class TList, int n>
struct RotateN;
template <class TList, template <typename,typename> class Comp>
struct MinElement;
template <class TList, template <typename,typename> class Comp>
struct MaxElement;
template <class TList1, class TList2,</pre>
        template <typename, typename> class Comp>
struct EqualIf;
template <class TList1, class TList2>
struct EqualSame;
template <int n, typename T>
struct FillN;
template <class TList, typename S, typename T>
struct Replace;
template <class TList, template <typename> class Pred, typename T>
struct ReplaceIf;
template <class TList1, class TList2,</pre>
        template <typename, typename> class Comp>
struct Merge;
template <class TList1, class TList2,</pre>
        template <typename, typename> class Comp>
struct SetUnionEquiv;
template <class TList1, class TList2>
struct SetUnion;
template <class TList1, class TList2>
struct SetIntersection;
template <class TList1, class TList2>
struct SetDifference;
template <class TList1, class TList2>
struct SetSymmetricDifference;
```

Copyright © 2004 by Stephen C. Dewhurst