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## Nested patterns

- We can nest patterns as deep as we want
- Just like we can nest expressions as deep as we want
- Often avoids hard-to-read, wordy nested case expressions
- So the full meaning of pattern-matching is to compare a pattern against a value for the "same shape" and bind variables to the "right parts"
- More precise recursive definition coming after examples


## Useful example: zip/unzip 3 lists

```
fun zip3 lists =
    case lists of
        ([],[],[]) => []
        | (hd1::tl1,hd2::tl2,hd3::tl3) =>
        (hd1,hd2,hd3)::zip3(tl1,tl2,tl3)
        | _ => raise ListLengthMismatch
fun unzip3 triples =
    case triples of
    [] => ([],[],[])
    | (a,b,c)::tl =>
        let val (11, l2, 13) = unzip3 tl
        in
            (a::l1,b::12,c::13)
        end
```

More examples in . sml files

## Style

- Nested patterns can lead to very elegant, concise code
- Avoid nested case expressions if nested patterns are simpler and avoid unnecessary branches or let-expressions
- Example: unzip3 and nondecreasing
- A common idiom is matching against a tuple of datatypes to compare them
- Examples: zip3 and multsign
- Wildcards are good style: use them instead of variables when you do not need the data
- Examples: len and multsign


## (Most of) the full definition

The semantics for pattern-matching takes a pattern $p$ and a value $v$ and decides (1) does it match and (2) if so, what variable bindings are introduced.

Since patterns can nest, the definition is elegantly recursive, with a separate rule for each kind of pattern. Some of the rules:

- If $p$ is a variable $x$, the match succeeds and $x$ is bound to $v$
- If $p$ is _, the match succeeds and no bindings are introduced
- If $p$ is ( $p 1, \ldots, p n$ ) and $v$ is $(v 1, \ldots, v n)$, the match succeeds if and only if $p 1$ matches $v 1, \ldots, p n$ matches $v n$. The bindings are the union of all bindings from the submatches
- If $p$ is $C p 1$, the match succeeds if $v$ is $C v 1$ (i.e., the same constructor) and $p 1$ matches $v 1$. The bindings are the bindings from the submatch.
- ... (there are several other similar forms of patterns)


## Examples

- Pattern $\mathrm{a}:: \mathrm{b}:: \mathrm{c}:$ : d matches all lists with >= 3 elements
- Pattern a::b::c: [] matches all lists with 3 elements
- Pattern ( $(a, b),(c, d)):$ :e matches all non-empty lists of pairs of pairs


## Exceptions

An exception binding introduces a new kind of exception

```
exception MyUndesirableCondition
exception MyOtherException of int * int
```

The raise primitive raises (a.k.a. throws) an exception

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { raise MyUndesirableException } \\
& \text { raise (MyOtherException }(7,9) \text { ) }
\end{aligned}
$$

A handle expression can handle (a.k.a. catch) an exception

- If doesn't match, exception continues to propagate
e1 handle MyUndesirableException $=>$ e2
e1 handle MyOtherException ( $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}$ ) $=>\mathrm{e} 2$


## Actually...

Exceptions are a lot like datatype constructors...

- Declaring an exception adds a constructor for type exn
- Can pass values of exn anywhere (e.g., function arguments)
- Not too common to do this but can be useful
- handle can have multiple branches with patterns for type exn


## Recursion

Should now be comfortable with recursion:

- No harder than using a loop (whatever that is - )
- Often much easier than a loop
- When processing a tree (e.g., evaluate an arithmetic expression)
- Examples like appending lists
- Avoids mutation even for local variables
- Now:
- How to reason about efficiency of recursion
- The importance of tail recursion
- Using an accumulator to achieve tail recursion
- [No new language features here]


## Call-stacks

While a program runs, there is a call stack of function calls that have started but not yet returned

- Calling a function $f$ pushes an instance of $f$ on the stack
- When a call to $f$ finishes, it is popped from the stack

These stack-frames store information like the value of local variables and "what is left to do" in the function

Due to recursion, multiple stack-frames may be calls to the same function

## Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { fun fact } n=\text { if } n=0 \text { then } 1 \text { else } n * \text { fact }(n-1) \\
& \text { val } x=\text { fact } 3
\end{aligned}
$$

| fact 3 | fact 3: 3*_ | fact 3: 3*_ | fact 3: 3* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | fact 2 | fact 2: 2* | fact 2: 2* |
|  | fact 1 | fact 1: 1* |  |
|  |  | fact 0 |  |


| fact 3: 3* | fact 3: 3* | fact 3: 3* | fact 3: 3*2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fact 2: $2 *$ | fact 2: $2 *$ | fact 2: 2 *1 |  |
| fact 1: 1* | fact 1: 1*1 |  |  |
| fact 0: 1 | CSE341: Progr | ming Languages | 11 |

## Example Revised

```
fun fact n =
    let fun aux(n,acc) =
        if n=0
        then acc
        else aux(n-1,acc*n)
    in
        aux (n,1)
    end
val x = fact 3
```

Still recursive, more complicated, but the result of recursive calls is the result for the caller (no remaining multiplication)

## The call-stacks

| fact 3 | fact 3: | fact 3: | fact 3: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | aux (3,1) | aux ( 3,1 ) : | aux (3,1) :_ |
|  |  | aux ( 2,3 ) | aux ( 2,3 ) : |
|  |  |  | aux (1,6) |


| fact 3: | fact 3: | fact 3: | fact 3: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| aux (3,1) : | aux (3,1) : | aux (3,1) : | aux (3,1) : |
| aux (2,3) : | aux (2,3) : | aux (2,3) : | aux (2, 3) : 6 |
| aux (1,6) : | aux (1,6) : | aux (1,6): 6 |  |
| aux (0,6) | aux (0,6): 6 |  |  |

## An optimization

It is unnecessary to keep around a stack-frame just so it can get a callee's result and return it without any further evaluation

ML recognizes these tail calls in the compiler and treats them differently:

- Pop the caller before the call, allowing callee to reuse the same stack space
- (Along with other optimizations,) as efficient as a loop

Reasonable to assume all functional-language implementations do tail-call optimization

## What really happens

```
fun fact n =
    let fun aux(n,acc) =
        if n=0
        then acc
        else aux(n-1,acc*n)
    in
        aux (n,1)
    end
val x = fact 3
```

fact 3 aux $(3,1) \operatorname{aux}(2,3) \operatorname{aux}(1,6) \operatorname{aux}(0,6)$

## Moral of tail recursion

- Where reasonably elegant, feasible, and important, rewriting functions to be tail-recursive can be much more efficient
- Tail-recursive: recursive calls are tail-calls
- There is a methodology that can often guide this transformation:
- Create a helper function that takes an accumulator
- Old base case becomes initial accumulator
- New base case becomes final accumulator


## Methodology already seen

```
fun fact n =
    let fun aux(n,acc) =
        if n=0
        then acc
        else aux(n-1,acc*n)
    in
        aux (n,1)
    end
val x = fact 3
```

fact 3 aux $(3,1) \operatorname{aux}(2,3) \operatorname{aux}(1,6) \operatorname{aux}(0,6)$

## Another example

```
fun sum xs =
    case xs of
        [] => 0
        | x::xs' => x + sum xs'
```

```
fun sum xs =
    let fun aux(xs,acc) =
        case xs of
            [] => acc
            x::xs' => aux(xs',x+acc)
    in
        aux (xs,0)
    end
```


## And another

```
fun rev xs =
    case xs of
        [] => []
        | x::xs' => (rev xs') @ [x]
```

```
fun rev xs =
```

fun rev xs =
let fun aux(xs,acc) =
let fun aux(xs,acc) =
case xs of
case xs of
[] => acc
[] => acc
x::xs' => aux(xs',x::acc)
x::xs' => aux(xs',x::acc)
in
in
aux(xs, [])
aux(xs, [])
end

```
    end
```


## Actually much better

```
fun rev xs =
    case xs of
        [] => []
        | x::xs' => (rev xs') @ [x]
```

- For fact and sum, tail-recursion is faster but both ways linear time
- Non-tail recursive rev is quadratic because each recursive call uses append, which must traverse the first list
- And 1+2+...+(length-1) is almost length*length/2
- Moral: beware list-append, especially within outer recursion
- Cons constant-time (and fast), so accumulator version much better


## Always tail-recursive?

There are certainly cases where recursive functions cannot be evaluated in a constant amount of space

Most obvious examples are functions that process trees

In these cases, the natural recursive approach is the way to go

- You could get one recursive call to be a tail call, but rarely worth the complication

Also beware the wrath of premature optimization

- Favor clear, concise code
- But do use less space if inputs may be large


## What is a tail-call?

The "nothing left for caller to do" intuition usually suffices

- If the result of $\mathbf{f} \mathbf{x}$ is the "immediate result" for the enclosing function body, then $\mathbf{x}$ is a tail call

But we can define "tail position" recursively

- Then a "tail call" is a function call in "tail position"


## Precise definition

A tail call is a function call in tail position

- If an expression is not in tail position, then no subexpressions are
- In fun $f p=e$, the body $e$ is in tail position
- If if e1 then e2 else e3 is in tail position, then e2 and e3 are in tail position (but e1 is not). (Similar for case-expressions)
- If let b1 ... bn in e end is in tail position, then e is in tail position (but no binding expressions are)
- Function-call arguments e1 e2 are not in tail position
- ...

