OCaml Modules Part 1: Simple Structures

Speaker: David Walker COS 326 Princeton University



slides copyright 2020 David Walker and Andre v Appel permission granted to reuse these slides for non-commercial educational purposes

The Reality of Development

We rarely know the *right* algorithms or the *right* data structures when we start a design project.

– When implementing a search engine, what data structures and algorithms should you use to build the index? To build the query evaluator?

Reality is that we often have to go back and change our code, once we've built a prototype.

- Often, we don't even know what the *user wants* (requirements) until they see a prototype.
- Often, we don't know where the *performance problems* are until we can run the software on realistic test cases.
- Sometimes we just want to change the design -- come up with simpler algorithms, architecture later in the design process



Engineering for Change

Given that we know the software will change, how can we write the code so that doing the changes will be easier?

The primary trick: use *data and algorithm abstraction*.

- Don't code in terms of concrete representations that the language provides.
- Do code with high-level abstractions in mind that fit the problem domain.
- Implement the abstractions using a *well-defined interface*.
- Swap in *different implementations* for the abstractions.
- *Parallelize* the development process.



Example

Goal: Implement a query engine.

Requirements: Need a scalable *dictionary* (a.k.a. index)

- maps words to set of URLs for the pages on which words appear.
- want the index so that we can efficiently satisfy queries
 - e.g., all links to pages that contain "Dave" and "Jill".

Wrong way to think about this:

- Aha! A *list* of pairs of a word and a *list* of URLs.
- We can look up "Dave" and "Jill" in the *list* to get back a *list* of URLs.



Example



Example

```
type query =
```

```
Word of string
```

```
| And of query * query
```

```
| Or of query * query
```

```
type index = string (url list) hashtable
```

I find out there's a better data structure to use

A Better Way

```
The problem domain
                                                     talked about an
type query =
                                                     abstract type of
  Word of string
                                                  dictionari
| And of query * query
                                                      Once we've written the
| Or of query * query
                                                       client, we know what
                                                      operations we need on
type index = (string, Url.t Set.t) Dict.t
                                                       these abstract types.
let rec eval(q:query)(d:index) : Url.t Set.t
  match q with
  | Word x -> Dict.lookup d x
  | And (q1,q2) -> Set.intersect (eval q1 h) (eval q2 h)
    Or (q1,q2) \rightarrow Set.union (eval q1 h) (eval q2 h)
                                               So we can define an
    Later on, when we find
                                             interface, and send a pal
   out linked lists aren't so
                                               off to implement the
    good for sets, we can
                                             abstract types dictionary
```

balanced trees.

replace them with

and set.

Abstract Data Types





Barbara Liskov Assistant Professor, MIT 1973 Barbara Liskov Professor, MIT Turing Award 2008

Invented CLU language that enforced data abstraction

"For contributions to practical and theoretical foundations of programming language and system design, especially related to data abstraction, fault tolerance, and distributed computing."

ADTS IN OCAML



Building Abstract Types in OCaml

OCaml has mechanisms for building new abstract data types:

- *signature*: an interface.
 - specifies the abstract type(s) without specifying their implementation
 - specifies the set of operations on the abstract types
- *structure*: an implementation.
 - a collection of type and value definitions
 - notion of an implementation matching or satisfying an interface
 - gives rise to a notion of subtyping
- *functor*: a parameterized module
 - really, a function from modules to modules
 - allows us to factor out and re-use modules



The Abstraction Barrier

Rule of thumb: Use the language to enforce the abstraction barrier.

- Reveal little information about *how* something is implemented
- Provide maximum flexibility for change moving forward.
- Murphy's Law: What is not enforced, will be broken

But rules are meant to broken: Exercise judgement.

- may want to reveal more information for debugging purposes
 - eg: conversion to string so you can print things out

ML gives you precise control over how much of the type is left abstract

- different amounts of information can be revealed in different contexts
- type checker helps you detect violations of the abstraction barrier



Recall assigment #2:

query.ml

type movie = { ... }

```
let sort_by_studio = ...
let sort_by_year = ...
```

main.ml

open lo open Query

let main () = ... sort_by_studio ...

let _ = main ()



Recall assigment #2:

```
query.ml
type movie = { ... }
let sort_by_studio = ...
let sort_by_year = ...
```

```
main.ml
open lo
open Query
let main () = ... sort_by_studio ...
let _ = main ()
```

Each .ml file actually defines an ML module.

Convention: the file foo.ml or Foo.ml defines the module named Foo.







Recall assigment #2:

query.ml

type movie = { ... }

```
let sort_by_studio = ...
let sort_by_year = ...
```



Can refer to module components using dot notation



query.mli

type movie

val sort_by_studio : movie list -> movie list
val sort_by_year : movie list -> movie list

You can add interface files (.mli) (also called *signatures* in ML)

These interfaces can hide module components or render types abstract.



query.mli

type movie

val sort_by_studio : movie list -> movie list
val sort_by_year : movie list -> movie list

If you have no signature file, then the default signature is used: all components are fully visible to clients.



Simple summary:

- file Name.ml is a *structure* implementing a module named Name
- file Name.mli is a *signature* for the module named Name
 - if there is no file Name.mli, OCaml infers the default signature



At first glance: OCaml modules = C modules?

C has:

- .h files (signatures) similar to .mli files?
- .c files (structures) similar to .ml files?

But ML also has:

- tighter control over type abstraction
 - define abstract, transparent or translucent types in signatures
 - i.e.: give none, all or some of the type information to clients
- more structure
 - modules can be defined within modules
 - i.e.: signatures and structures can be defined inside files
- more reuse
 - multiple modules can satisfy the same interface
 - the same module can satisfy multiple interfaces
 - modules take other modules as arguments (functors)
- fancy features: dynamic, first class modules

```
module type INT STACK =
  sig
    type stack
    val empty : unit -> stack
    val push : int -> stack -> stack
    val is empty : stack -> bool
    val pop : stack -> stack
    val top : stack -> int option
  end
```







```
module type INT STACK =
  sig
    type stack
    val empty : unit -> stack
    val push : int -> stack -> stack
    val is empty : stack -> bool
    val pop : stack -> stack
    val top : stack
                                is empty is an
                               observer – useful
  end
                               for determining
                               properties of the
                                   ADT.
```



```
module type INT STACK =
  sig
    type stack
    val empty : unit -> stack
    val push : int -> stack -> stack
    val is empty : stack -> bool
    val pop : stack -> stack
    val top . stack -> int option
  end
                      pop is sometimes
                      called a mutator
                      (though it doesn't
                      really change the
                         input)
```

```
module type INT STACK =
  sig
     type stack
     val empty : unit -> stack
    val push : int -> stack -> stack
    val is empty : stack -> bool
    val pop : stack -> stack
    val top : stack -> int option
  end
                                      top is also an
                                     observer, in this
                                     functional setting
                                      since it doesn't
                                     change the stack.
```

Put comments in your signature!

```
module type INT STACK =
  siq
    type stack
    (* create an empty stack *)
    val empty : unit -> stack
    (* push an element on the top of the stack *)
    val push : int -> stack -> stack
    (* returns true iff the stack is empty *)
    val is empty : stack -> bool
    (* pops top element off the stack;
       returns empty stack if the stack is empty *)
    val pop : stack -> stack
    (* returns the top element of the stack; returns
       None if the stack is empty *)
    val top : stack -> int option
  end
```



Signature Comments

Signature comments are for clients of the module

- explain what each function should do
 - how it manipulates abstract values (stacks)
- **not** how it manipulates concrete values
- don't reveal implementation details that should be hidden behind the abstraction

Don't copy signature comments into your structures

- your comments will get out of date in one place or the other
- an extension of the general rule: don't copy code

Place implementation comments inside your structure

- comments about implementation invariants hidden from client
- comments about helper functions



Example Structure Inside a File

```
module ListIntStack : INT STACK =
  struct
    type stack = int list
    let empty () : stack = []
    let push (i:int) (s:stack) : stack = i::s
    let is empty (s:stack) =
      match s with
       | [] -> true
       | :: -> false
    let pop (s:stack) : stack =
      match s with
       | [] -> []
       | ::t -> t
    let top (s:stack) : int option =
      match s with
       | [] -> None
       | h:: -> Some h
  end
```



Example Structure Inside a File



Example Structure Inside a File

```
module ListIntStack : INT STACK =
  struct
    type stack = int list
    let empty () : stack = []
                                              But by giving the
    let push (i:int) (s:stack)
                                            module the INT STACK
    let is empty (s:stack) =
                                             interface, which does
      match s with
                                             not reveal how stacks
          [] -> true
                                            are being represented,
        | :: -> false
                                              we prevent code
    let pop (s:stack) : stack =
                                             outside the module
      match s with
                                             from knowing stacks
                                                 are lists.
         [] -> []
        | ::t -> t
    let top (s:stack) : int option =
      match s with
        | [] -> None
        | h:: -> Some h
  end
```

An Example Client





An Example Client



An Example Client

```
module type INT STACK =
  siq
    type stack
    val push : int -> stack -> stack
    ...
  end
                                              Notice that the
module ListIntStack : INT STACK
                                               client is not
                                              allowed to know
let s0 = ListIntStack.empty ()
                                             that the stack is a
                                                  list.
let s1 = ListIntStack.push 3 s0
let s2 = ListIntStack.pusb
let = List.rev s2
Error: This expression has type stack but an
expression was expected of type 'a list.
```

Example Structure

```
module ListIntStack (* : INT STACK *) =
  struct
    type stack = int list
    let empty () : stack = []
    let push (i:int) (s:stack) = i::s
    let is empty (s:stack) =
      match s with
       | [ ] -> true
       | :: -> false
    exception EmptyStack
    let pop (s:stack) =
      match s with
       | [] -> []
       | ::t -> t
    let top (s:stack) =
      match s with
       | [] -> None
       | h:: -> Some h
```

end





Example Structure

```
module type INT STACK =
  sig
    type stack
     . . .
    val inspect : stack -> int list
    val run unit tests : unit -> unit
                                                  Another technique:
  end
                                               Add testing components to
                                                    your signature.
module ListIntStack : INT STACK =
  struct
                                                Or have 2 signatures, one
    type stack = int list
                                               for testing and one for the
                                                   rest of the code)
     . . .
    let inspect (s:stack) : int list = s
    let run_unit_tests () : unit = ...
  end
```

Summary

ML modules support development of abstract data types

- client programs help define the operations needed
 - it is often useful to write them first
- signatures (ie, interfaces, .mli files) specify:
 - abstract types
 - names of operations and their types
 - names of abstract values
- structures (ie, implementations, .ml files) provide:
 - the concrete implementation types
 - the function implementations
 - the values to implement signatures
- when a signature is omitted, OCaml assumes the *default signature*, which allows clients to see all implementation details
 - over time, clients are going to depend upon details you don't want them to, making it hard to change ADT implementations