

Applicatives

Sanchayan Maity

Agenda



- ► Recap of Functors
- Applicative

Functor¹²



class Functor f where

Functors Laws

Must preserve identity

Must preserve composition of morphism

$$fmap (f . g) == fmap f . fmap g$$

¹Category Design Pattern

²Functor Design Pattern

Higher order kinds³



► For something to be a functor, it has to be a first order kind.

³Haskell's Kind System

Applicative



```
class Functor f => Applicative (f :: TYPE -> TYPE) where
  pure :: a -> f a
  (<*>) :: f (a -> b) -> f a -> f b

(<$>) :: Functor f => (a -> b) -> f a -> f b

(<*>) :: Applicative f => f (a -> b) -> f a -> f b

fmap f x = pure f <*> x
```

Examples pure (+1) <*> [1..3] [2, 3, 4] [(*2), (*3)] <*> [4, 5] [8,10,12,15]

("Woo", (+1)) <*> (" Hoo!", 0)

(Sum 2, (+1)) <*> (Sum 0, 0)

(Product {getProduct = 6}, 17)

(,) <\$> [1, 2] <*> [3, 4] [(1,3),(1,4),(2,3),(2,4)]

(Product 3, (+9)) <*> (Product 2, 8)

 $(Sum \{getSum = 2\}, 1)$

("Woo Hoo!", 1)

Lifting



▶ Seeing Functor as unary lifting and Applicative as n-ary lifting

```
liftA1 :: Functor f => (a -> b) -> (f a -> f b)

liftA2 :: Applicative f => (a -> b -> c) -> (f a -> f b -> f c)

liftA3 :: Applicative f => (a -> b -> c -> d) -> (f a -> f b -> f c -> f d)

liftA4 :: Applicative f => ..
```

Where liftA0 = pure and liftA1 = fmap.

Monoidal functors



– Remember Monoid?

```
class Monoid m where
 mempty :: m
 mappend :: m \rightarrow m \rightarrow m
(\$) :: (a -> b) -> a -> b
(<\$>) :: (a -> b) -> f a -> f b
(<*>) :: f (a -> b) -> f a -> f b
mappend :: f f
(\$) :: (a -> b) -> a -> b
<*> :: f (a -> b) -> f a -> f b
instance Monoid a => Applicative ((,) a) where
  pure x = (mempty, x)
  (u, f) <*> (v, x) = (u \text{ `mappend} v, f x)
```

Function apply



Applying a function to an effectful argument

Contrasts with monad



- ▶ No data dependency between f a and f b
- ▶ Result of f a can't possibly influence the behaviour of f b
- ▶ That needs something like a -> f b

Applicative laws



```
-- Identity
pure id <*> v = v
-- Composition
pure (.) <*> u <*> v <*> w = u <*> (v <*> w)
-- Homomorphism
pure f <*> pure x = pure (f x)
-- Interchange
u <*> pure y = pure ($ y) <*> u
```

Applicative vs monads



- Applicative
 - Effects
 - Batching and aggregation
 - Concurrency/Independent
 - Parsing context free grammar
 - Exploring all branches of computation (see Alternative)
- Monads
 - Effects
 - Composition
 - Sequence/Dependent
 - ► Parsing context sensitive grammar
 - Branching on previous results

Weaker but better



- ▶ Weaker than monads but thus also more common
- Lends itself to optimisation (See Facebook's Haxl project)
- ▶ Always opt for the least powerful mechanism to get things done
- ▶ No dependency issues or branching? just use applicative

Questions



- Reach out on
 - ► Email: sanchayan@sanchayanmaity.net
 - ► Mastodon: sanchayanmaity.com
 - ► Telegram: t.me/SanchayanMaity
 - Blog: sanchayanmaity.net