

Reduction of Lists

Reduction of Lists

Another common operation on lists is to combine the elements of a list using a given operator.

For example:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sum}(\text{List}(x_1, \dots, x_n)) &= 0 + x_1 + \dots + x_n \\ \text{product}(\text{List}(x_1, \dots, x_n)) &= 1 * x_1 * \dots * x_n \end{aligned}$$

We can implement this with the usual recursive schema:

```
def sum(xs: List[Int]): Int = xs match {  
  case Nil      => 0  
  case y :: ys => y + sum(ys)  
}
```

ReduceLeft

This pattern can be abstracted out using the generic method `reduceLeft`:

`reduceLeft` inserts a given binary operator between adjacent elements of a list:

$$\text{List}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \text{ reduceLeft } \text{op} = (\dots(x_1 \text{ op } x_2) \text{ op } \dots) \text{ op } x_n$$

Using `reduceLeft`, we can simplify:

```
def sum(xs: List[Int])      = (0 :: xs) reduceLeft ((x, y) => x + y)
def product(xs: List[Int]) = (1 :: xs) reduceLeft ((x, y) => x * y)
```

A Shorter Way to Write Functions

Instead of `((x, y) => x * y)`, one can also write shorter:

```
(_ * _)
```

Every `_` represents a new parameter, going from left to right.

The parameters are defined at the next outer pair of parentheses (or the whole expression if there are no enclosing parentheses).

So, `sum` and `product` can also be expressed like this:

```
def sum(xs: List[Int])      = (0 :: xs) reduceLeft (_ + _)
def product(xs: List[Int]) = (1 :: xs) reduceLeft (_ * _)
```

FoldLeft

The function `reduceLeft` is defined in terms of a more general function, `foldLeft`.

`foldLeft` is like `reduceLeft` but takes an *accumulator*, `z`, as an additional parameter, which is returned when `foldLeft` is called on an empty list.

$$(\text{List}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \text{ foldLeft } z)(\text{op}) = (\dots(z \text{ op } x_1) \text{ op } \dots) \text{ op } x_n$$

So, `sum` and `product` can also be defined as follows:

```
def sum(xs: List[Int])      = (xs foldLeft 0) (_ + _)
def product(xs: List[Int]) = (xs foldLeft 1) (_ * _)
```

Implementations of ReduceLeft and FoldLeft

foldLeft and reduceLeft can be implemented in class List as follows.

```
abstract class List[T] { ...
  def reduceLeft(op: (T, T) => T): T = this match {
    case Nil      => throw new Error("Nil.reduceLeft")
    case x :: xs => (xs foldLeft x)(op)
  }
  def foldLeft[U](z: U)(op: (U, T) => U): U = this match {
    case Nil      => z
    case x :: xs => (xs foldLeft op(z, x))(op)
  }
}
```

FoldRight and ReduceRight

Applications of `foldLeft` and `reduceLeft` unfold on trees that lean to the left.

They have two dual functions, `foldRight` and `reduceRight`, which produce trees which lean to the right, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{List}(x_1, \dots, x_{\{n-1\}}, x_n) \text{ reduceRight } op &= x_1 \text{ op } (\dots (x_{\{n-1\}} \text{ op } x_n) \dots) \\ (\text{List}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \text{ foldRight } acc)(op) &= x_1 \text{ op } (\dots (x_n \text{ op } acc) \dots) \end{aligned}$$

Implementation of FoldRight and ReduceRight

They are defined as follows

```
def reduceRight(op: (T, T) => T): T = this match {  
  case Nil => throw new Error("Nil.reduceRight")  
  case x :: Nil => x  
  case x :: xs => op(x, xs.reduceRight(op))  
}  
def foldRight[](z: U)(op: (T, U) => U): U = this match {  
  case Nil => z  
  case x :: xs => op(x, (xs foldRight z)(op))  
}
```

Difference between FoldLeft and FoldRight

For operators that are associative and commutative, `foldLeft` and `foldRight` are equivalent (even though there may be a difference in efficiency).

But sometimes, only one of the two operators is appropriate.

Exercise

Here is another formulation of concat:

```
def concat[T](xs: List[T], ys: List[T]): List[T] =  
  (xs foldRight ys) (_ :: _)
```

Here, it isn't possible to replace foldRight by foldLeft. Why?

- The types would not work out
- The resulting function would not terminate
- The result would be reversed

Back to Reversing Lists

We now develop a function for reversing lists which has a linear cost.

The idea is to use the operation `foldLeft`:

```
def reverse[T](xs: List[T]): List[T] = (xs foldLeft z?)(op?)
```

All that remains is to replace the parts `z?` and `op?`.

Let's try to *compute* them from examples.

Deduction of Reverse (1)

To start computing z ?, let's consider $\text{reverse}(\text{Nil})$.

We know $\text{reverse}(\text{Nil}) == \text{Nil}$, so we can compute as follows:

`Nil`

Deduction of Reverse (1)

To start computing z ?, let's consider $\text{reverse}(\text{Nil})$.

We know $\text{reverse}(\text{Nil}) == \text{Nil}$, so we can compute as follows:

Nil

$= \text{reverse}(\text{Nil})$

Deduction of Reverse (1)

To start computing $z?$, let's consider $\text{reverse}(\text{Nil})$.

We know $\text{reverse}(\text{Nil}) == \text{Nil}$, so we can compute as follows:

`Nil`

`= reverse(Nil)`

`= (Nil foldLeft z?)(op)`

Deduction of Reverse (1)

To start computing $z?$, let's consider $\text{reverse}(\text{Nil})$.

We know $\text{reverse}(\text{Nil}) == \text{Nil}$, so we can compute as follows:

`Nil`

`= reverse(Nil)`

`= (Nil foldLeft z?)(op)`

`= z?`

Consequently, $z? = \text{List}()$

Deduction of Reverse (2)

We still need to compute $op?$. To do that let's plug in the next simplest list after `Nil` into our equation for reverse:

`List(x)`

Deduction of Reverse (2)

We still need to compute $op?$. To do that let's plug in the next simplest list after `Nil` into our equation for `reverse`:

`List(x)`

`= reverse(List(x))`

Deduction of Reverse (2)

We still need to compute `op?`. To do that let's plug in the next simplest list after `Nil` into our equation for `reverse`:

`List(x)`

`= reverse(List(x))`

`= (List(x) foldLeft Nil)(op?)`

Deduction of Reverse (2)

We still need to compute $op?$. To do that let's plug in the next simplest list after `Nil` into our equation for `reverse`:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{List}(x) \\ &= \text{reverse}(\text{List}(x)) \\ &= (\text{List}(x) \text{ foldLeft Nil})(op?) \\ &= op?(Nil, x) \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $op?(Nil, x) = \text{List}(x) = x :: \text{List}()$.

This suggests to take for $op?$ the operator `::` but with its operands swapped.

Deduction of Reverse(3)

We thus arrive at the following implementation of reverse.

```
def reverse[a](xs: List[T]): List[T] =  
  (xs foldLeft List[T]())((xs, x) => x :: xs)
```

Remark: the type parameter in List[T]() is necessary for type inference.

Question: What is the complexity of this implementation of reverse ?

Exercise

Complete the following definitions of the basic functions `map` and `length` on lists, such that their implementation uses `foldRight`:

```
def mapFun[T, U](xs: List[T], f: T => U): List[U] =  
  (xs foldRight List[U]())( ??? )
```

```
def lengthFun[T](xs: List[T]): Int =  
  (xs foldRight 0)( ??? )
```