Abstract Type of Maps

Robert Harper

October 13, 2017

We will make use of a class of ordered types:

```
data order = LSS | EQL | GTR
signature ORD = sig
type t
val compare : t × t → order
val = : t × t → bool
val ≤ : t × t → bool
end
```

The class of monoids on a type of generators:

```
signature MONOID = sig
type g
type t
val e : t
val * : t × t → t
val i : g → t
end
```

These are understood to satisfy the monoid laws (associativity and unit laws), with \star as multiplication and e as unit element.

We will need the data type

data α inf = $-\infty$ | i of α | ∞ ,

which extends an argument type with points at infinity. If the type t is an ordered type, then the type t inf may be ordered such that $-\infty$ is smaller than any value i(v), all of which values are themselves smaller than ∞ , and $-\infty$ is smaller than ∞ .

The abstract type of maps from keys to elements, with reduced values, is specified by the following signature:

```
signature MAP = sig
  structure Key : ORD
  type key = Key.t
  type elt
  type entry = key × elt
  structure RVal : MONOID with g=entry
  type rval = RVal.t
  type map
  val emp : map
  val \text{ sing }: \text{ entry } \to \text{ map}
  (* keys in left must be strictly smaller than those in right *)
  val join : map \times map \rightarrow map
  (* split at a key, return associated element, present *)
  val split : map \rightarrow key \rightarrow map \times elt option \times map
  type \alpha \mod = \alpha \times (\texttt{entry} \rightarrow \alpha) \times (\alpha \times \alpha \rightarrow \alpha)
  val mapred : \alpha \mod \rightarrow \max \rightarrow \alpha
  (* generic reduced value *)
  val rval : map \rightarrow rval
  (* constant-time computations *)
  val size : map \rightarrow int
  val minkey : map \rightarrow key inf
  val maxkey : map \rightarrow key inf
end
```

The type map is to be thought of as the free monoid on values of type entry as generators. That is to say, we have the following structures:

```
structure Map :> MAP = ...
structure MapAsMonoid : MONOID = struct
type g = Map.entry
type t = Map.map
```

val e = Map.emp val i = Map.sing val * = Map.join end

Moreover, Map.emp and Map.join satisfy the monoid laws. Consequently, the first argument to mapred must itself satisfy the monoid laws in order for the result to be well-defined.

The semantics of mapred(e, i, \star) is specified by the equations in the context of an open Map structure:

```
mapred (e,i,*) emp = e
mapred (e,i,*) (sing p) = i(p)
mapred (e,i,*) (join (m1, m2)) =
  (mapred (e,i,*) m1) * (mapred (e,i,*) m2)
```

In particular we may define size to be

```
mapred (0, \text{const } 1, +),
```

which computes the number of entries in a map. Similarly, we may define minkey to be

```
mapred (\infty, \lambda(k, _) \Rightarrow k, max)
```

and maxkey to be

 $mapred(-\infty, \lambda(k, _) \Rightarrow k, min).$

Here min and max are to be taken in the sense of the extended ordering with points at infinity.

The mapred operation may be used to implement

filter : (entry \rightarrow bool) \rightarrow map \rightarrow map

as folows:

filter p = mapred (emp, $\lambda x \Rightarrow if p x$ then sing x else emp, join).

That is, each entry is replaced by either the empty or the singleton map, according to whether the predicate holds of it or not, and these are joined to obtain the filtered map.

The split operation behaves according to the following equations:

```
split (emp, k) = (emp, Nothing, emp)
split (sing (k,v), k') =
if k=k' then
  (emp, Just v, emp)
```

else if k<k' then
 (sing (k,v), Nothing, emp)
else
 (emp, Nothing, sing (k,v))

split (join (m1,m2),k) =
 if k ≤ maxkey m1 then
 let (m11, o, m12) = split (m1, k) in (m11, o, join (m12, m2))
else
 let (m21, o, m22) = split (m2, k) in (join (m1, m21), o, m22)
We may define
</pre>

We may define

find : Map.map \star Map.key \rightarrow Map.elt option

in terms of split as follows:

 $find(m,k) = let (_, o, _) = split (m, k) in o.$

As an exercise, you may use the foregoing equations governing split to derive equations that specify the behavior of find to be as expected.

Reduced values are a way to maintain the result of mapred for a particular monoid during the construction of the map so that the result may be computed in constant time. The key equation is that if the reduced value computation is given by (e, i, *), in such a way that it obeys the monoid laws, then

rval m = mapred (e,i,*) m

That is, the reduced value is the reduction of the map according to the specified monoid! For example, we may maintain the size of a map as a reduced value using the monoid structure specified earlier so that it may be determined in constant time. Similarly, the largest and smallest keys in a map may be maintained as reduced values using the same method.

Reduced values are implemented using *augmentation*: the underlying tree structure is enriched with an additional construct that holds the augmented values associated with each tree. In the present case we associate a generic augmented value of type rval, as well as the size of type int and the minimum and maximum keys, both of type key inf.

data tree = Tree of bst * rval * int * key inf * key inf
and bst = Empty | Node of tree * entry * tree

Notice that the augmented values are intertwined among the nodes of the binary search tree, and surround each empty binary search tree. The "entry point" is the type tree; the type bst is an "auxiliary" used to represent the internal structure of the tree.

The augmented values may be maintained using *smart constructors*, which create empty and non-empty trees, respectively.

```
val empty = Tree of (Empty, RVal.e, 0, \infty, -\infty)
val node =
\lambda(lt as Tree (lb, lr, ls, li, la), kv,
rt as Tree (rb, rr, rs, ri, ra)) \Rightarrow
Tree
(Node (lb, kv, rb),
RVal.* (lr, rr),
ls+rs,
min (li, ri),
max (la, ra))
```

The smart constructors, empty and node, maintain the reduced values according to their definitions in terms of mapred.

Finally, it often helps to structure the implementation using an expose operation of type tree \rightarrow bst that "exposes" the underlying structure of the tree for pattern-matching purposes. Doing so provides only one level deep of pattern matching, but this is sufficient for nearly all situations.