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Understanding the space complexity of functional programs

- At least two interesting components:
  - the amount of *live space* at any instant in time
  - the *rate of allocation*
    - a function call may not change the amount of live space by much but may allocate at a substantial rate
    - because functional programs act by generating new data structures and discarding old ones, they often allocate a lot
      » OCaml garbage collector is optimized with this in mind
      » **interesting fact:** at the assembly level, the number of writes by a functional program is roughly the same as the number of writes by an imperative program
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  – *What takes up space?*
    • conventional first-order data: tuples, lists, strings, datatypes
    • function representations (closures)
    • the call stack
CONVENTIONAL DATA
OCaml Representations for Data Structures

Type:

type triple = int * char * int

Representation:

(3, 'a', 17)
OCaml Representations for Data Structures

Type:

```ocaml
type mylist = int list
```

Representation:

```
[ ]           [3; 4; 5]
0             3   4   5   0
```
Type:

```
type tree = Leaf | Node of int * tree * tree
```

Representation:

Leaf

0

Node(3, left, right)

Actually like this in Ocaml:

```
Node 3 left right
Node 0
```
Allocating space

In C, you allocate when you call “malloc”

In Java, you allocate when you call “new”

What about ML?
Whenever you *use a constructor*, space is allocated:

```ocaml
let rec insert (t:tree) (i:int) =
  match t with
  Leaf -> Node (i, Leaf, Leaf)
| Node (j, left, right) ->
  if i <= j then
    Node (j, insert left i, right)
  else
    Node (j, left, insert right i)
```
Whenever you use a constructor, space is allocated:

```ocaml
let rec insert (t:tree) (i:int) =  
  match t with 
  | Leaf  -> Node (i, Leaf, Leaf) 
  | Node (j, left, right) ->  
    if i <= j then 
      Node (j, insert left i, right) 
    else 
      Node (j, left, insert right i)
```

Consider:

```
insert t 21
```
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Consider:
insert t 21
```
Whenever you use a constructor, space is allocated:

```ocaml
let rec insert (t:tree) (i:int) =  
  match t with  
  Leaf -> Node (i, Leaf, Leaf)  
| Node (j, left, right) ->  
    if i <= j then  
      Node (j, insert left i, right)  
    else  
      Node (j, left, insert right i)
```

Consider:

`insert t 21`
Whenever you use a constructor, space is allocated:

```
let rec insert (t:tree) (i:int) =
    match t with
    | Leaf -> Node (i, Leaf, Leaf)
    | Node (j, left, right) ->
        if i <= j then
            Node (j, insert left i, right)
        else
            Node (j, left, insert right i)
```

Total space allocated is proportional to the height of the tree.

\[ \sim \log n, \text{ if tree with } n \text{ nodes is balanced} \]
The garbage collector reclaims unreachable data structures on the heap.

```
let fiddle (t: tree) =
    insert t 21
```
The garbage collector reclaims unreachable data structures on the heap.

```
let fiddle (t: tree) = insert t 21
```

If t is dead (unreachable),
The garbage collector reclaims unreachable data structures on the heap.

```ints
let fiddle (t: tree) = insert t 21
```

If t is dead (unreachable), then all these nodes will be reclaimed!
Net space allocated

The garbage collector reclaims unreachable data structures on the heap.

let fiddle (t: tree) = insert t 21

Net new space allocated: 1 node

(just like “imperative” version of binary search trees)
But what if you want to keep the old tree?

let faddle (t: tree) = (t, insert t 21)
Net space allocated

But what if you want to keep the old tree?

let faddle (t: tree) = (t, insert t 21)

Net new space allocated: log(N) nodes

but note: “imperative” version would have to copy the old tree, space cost N new nodes!
let check_option (o:int option) : int option = 
  match o with
  | Some _ -> o
  | None -> failwith "found none"

let check_option (o:int option) : int option = 
  match o with
  | Some j -> Some j
  | None -> failwith "found none"
let check_option (o:int option) : int option =
  match o with
  | Some _ -> o
  | None -> failwith "found none"

let check_option (o:int option) : int option =
  match o with
  | Some j -> Some j
  | None -> failwith "found none"

allocates nothing when arg is Some i

allocates an option when arg is Some i
let cadd (c1:int*int) (c2:int*int) : int*int =
    let (x1,y1) = c1 in
    let (x2,y2) = c2 in
    (x1+x2, y1+y2)

let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
    let c2 = c1 in
    cadd c1 c2

let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
    cadd c1 c1
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    cadd (x1,y1) (x1,y1)
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```ocaml
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let double (c1:int*int) : int*int = 
  let c2 = c1 in 
  cadd c1 c2

let double (c1:int*int) : int*int = 
  cadd c1 c1

let double (c1:int*int) : int*int = 
  let (x1,y1) = c1 in 
  cadd (x1,y1) (x1,y1)
```
Compare

```ocaml
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  let c2 = c1 in
  cadd c1 c2

let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
  cadd c1 c1
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  cadd (x1,y1) (x1,y1)
```
Compare

```
let cadd (c1:int*int) (c2:int*int) : int*int =
  let (x1,y1) = c1 in
  let (x2,y2) = c2 in
  (x1+x2, y1+y2)
```
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let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
  let c2 = c1 in
  cadd c1 c2
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
  cadd c1 c1
```

```
let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
  let (x1,y1) = c1 in
  cadd (x1,y1) (x1,y1)
```

- no allocation here
  (1 pair allocated in cadd)
- no allocation here
  (1 pair allocated in cadd)
- allocates 2 pairs here
  (unless the compiler happens to optimize...)
let cadd (c1:int*int) (c2:int*int) : int*int =
let (x1,y1) = c1 in
let (x2,y2) = c2 in
(x1+x2, y1+y2)

double does not allocate

let double (c1:int*int) : int*int =
let (x1,y1) = c1 in
cadd c1 c1

extracts components: it is a read
FUNCTION CLOSURES
Nested functions like bar often contain free variables:

let foo y = let bar x = x + y in bar

Here's bar on its own:

let bar x = x + y

y is free in the definition of bar

To implement bar, the compiler creates a closure, which is a pair of code for the function plus an environment holding the free variables.
But what about nested, higher-order functions?

bar again:

```
let bar x = x + y
```

bar's representation:

```
let f2 (n, env) = n + env.y
{y = 1}
```

code

environment

closure
But what about nested, higher-order functions?

To estimate the (heap) space used by a program, we often need to estimate the (heap) space used by its closures.

Our estimate will include the cost of the pair:

• two pointers = 2 words  (8 bytes each, or 4 bytes each on some machines)
• the cost of the environment (1 word in this case).
• but not: the cost of the code (because the same code is reused in every closure of this function)
Understanding space consumption in FP involves:

- understanding the difference between
  - live space
  - rate of allocation
- understanding where allocation occurs
  - any time a constructor is used
  - whenever closures are created
- understanding the costs of
  - data types (fairly similar to Java)
  - costs of closures (pair + environment)
A remark about homework 4

WHY IT’S IMPORTANT TO PRUNE CLOSURE ENVIRONMENTS
let zeros i = if i=0 then [] else 0 :: s(i-1)

let h (n: int) : int =
  let f x =
    let k = List.length x in
    fun () -> k
  in
  let rec g i : (unit->int) list =
    if i=0 then [] else f (zeros n) :: g (i-1)
  in let bigdata = g n
  in List.fold_left (fun s u -> u()+s) 0 bigdata

let a = h 1000
Pruning environments

let zeros i = if i=0 then [] else 0 :: s(i-1)

let h (n: int) : int =
  let f x =
    let k = List.length x in
    fun () -> k
  in
  let rec g i : (unit->int) list =
    if i=0 then [] else f (zeros n) :: g (i-1)
  in let bigdata = g n
  in List.fold_left (fun s u -> u()+s) 0 bigdata

let a = h 1000

You could build a closure environment with all the variables currently in scope.
let zeros i = if i=0 then [] else 0 :: s(i-1)

let h (n: int) : int =
  let f x =
    let k = List.length x in
    fun () -> k
  in
  let rec g i : (unit->int) list =
    if i=0 then [] else f (zeros n) :: g (i-1)
  in let bigdata = g n
  in List.fold_left (fun s u -> u()+s) 0 bigdata

let a = h 1000

What are the free variables of this function?

fun()->k
n x k

5 words of memory versus 3 words, what’s the big deal?
let zeros i = if i=0 then [] else 0 :: s(i-1)

let h (n: int) : int =
    let f x =
        let k = List.length x in
        fun () -> k
    in
    let rec g i : (unit->int) list =
        if i=0 then [] else f (zeros n) :: g (i-1)
    in let bigdata = g n
    in List.fold_left (fun s u -> u()+s) 0 bigdata

let a = h 1000

Run the program to here, and what is in memory?

n bigdata
Pruning environments

let zeros i = if i=0 then [] else 0 :: s(i-1)

let h (n: int) : int = 
  let f x = 
    let k = List.length x in 
    fun () -> k 
  in 
  let rec g i : (unit->int) list = 
    if i=0 then [] else f (zeros n) :: g (i-1) 
  in let bigdata = g n 
  in List.fold_left (fun s u -> u()+s) 0 bigdata 

let a = h 1000

What variables are in scope at this point?

n closures for (fun()\rightarrow k),
each is a list of length n,
total space usage \( n^2 \)
let zeros i = if i=0 then [] else 0 :: s(i-1)

let h (n: int) : int =
  let f x =
    let k = List.length x in
    fun () -> k
  in
  let rec g i : (unit->int) list =
    if i=0 then [] else f (zeros n) :: g (i-1)
  in let bigdata = g n
  in List.fold_left (fun s u -> u()+s) 0 bigdata

let a = h 1000

What are the free variables of this function?

n closures for (fun() -> k), each is just a number k,
total space usage O(n)
Therefore

Closures should represent *only* the free variables of a function (not *all the variables currently in scope*),

otherwise the compiled program may use *asymptotically more space*,

such as $O(n^2)$ instead of $O(n)$