Improving the Return Value of Erase-Like Algorithms II: Free erase/erase_if

Document $\#$:	R1115R3
Date:	November 25, 2019
Project:	Programming Language C++
	Library Working Group
Reply-to:	Marc Mutz <marc.mutz@kdab.com></marc.mutz@kdab.com>

Abstract

We propose to change the return type of erase() and erase_if() free functions from void to <container>::size_type, returning the number of elements removed. This restores consistency with long-established API, such as map/set::erase(key_type), as well as the recent changes to forward_/list::remove().

Contents

0	Change History		
	0.1 Changes from P1115R2	2	
	0.2 Changes from P1115R1	2	
	0.3 Changes from P1115R0	2	
	0.4 Changes from P0646R0	2	
1	Motivation and Scope	2	
	1.1 [[nodiscard]] Useful Information	3	
	1.2 Consistency	3	
2	Impact on the Standard	3	
3	Proposed Wording	4	
	3.1 Feature Test Macro	5	
4	Design Decisions	5	
	4.1 size_t vs. size_type	5	
	4.2 Performance Considerations	5	
5	Acknowledgements	5	

0 Change History

This is a spin-off and revision of P0646R0 at the request of LWG in Rapperswil to work around the problem of LFv3 not having opened shop in Rapperswil, yet.

0.1 Changes from P1115R2

- 1. Fixed erase() wording (was missing value).
- 2. Fixed an IS section reference in Section 3.
- 3. Rebased onto [N4835].

0.2 Changes from P1115R1

- 1. Fixed erase() wording (contained pred, but shouldn't).
- 2. Changed associative containers' algorithm from incrementing a running count to subtracting original and new sizes.

0.3 Changes from P1115R0

- 1. Fixed an IS section reference in Section 3.
- 2. Rebased onto N4830.

0.4 Changes from P0646R0

- 1. Removed changes to the IS draft, as these continued as P0646R1 (which has since been adopted in Rapperswil).
- 2. Changed the return type from size_t to <container>::size_type, as requestd by LEWG in Toronto.
- 3. Rebased on IS draft, as the target of this proposal has since been merged into it from the LFv2 TS.
- 4. Added feature test macro.

1 Motivation and Scope

This section is copied from P0646R1, so readers familiar with that paper can skip these paragraphs.

1.1 [[nodiscard]] Useful Information

Alexander Stepanov, in his A9 courses [A9], teaches us not to throw away useful information, but instead return it from the algorithm.

With that in mind, look at the following example:

```
std::forward_list<std::shared_ptr<T>> fl = ...;
erase(fl, nullptr);
```

Did erase() erase anything? We don't know. The only way we *can* learn whether the algorithm removed something is to check the size of the list before and after the algorithm run. For most containers, that is a valid option, and fast. All size() methods of STL containers are O(1) these days.

But std::forward_list has no size()...

We therefore propose to make the algorithms return the number of removed elements. While it is only really necessary for forward_list, we believe that consistency here is more important than minimalism.

Returning the number of elements also enables convenient one-line checks:

```
if (erase(fl, nullptr)) {
    // erased some
}
```

1.2 Consistency

In Rapperswil, the committee accepted P0646R1, which changed the list and forward_list member algorithms remove/_if and unique to return the number of elements erased. This paper applies the same logic to the non-member versions of these algorithms.

We note that the associative containers have returned the number of erased elements from their erase(key_type) member functions since at least [SGI STL]. This proposal therefore also restores lost consistency with existing practice.

2 Impact on the Standard

Minimal. We propose to change the return value of library functions from void to size_type. Existing users of the LFv2 versions expecting no return value can continue to ignore it. In particular, this is one of the changes explicitly mentioned in [P0921R2].

Strictly speaking, the change is source-incompatible: Existing code which assumes that the algorithms return void might fail to compile. This can e.g. come up in situations where the C++ user explicitly specialized these algorithms. However, all such code will so far have used the LFv2 versions of these algorithms, which are in a different namespace.

For the same reason, there is no binary-compatibility issue here: the algorithms in LFv2 were specified in namespace std::experimental, while the changed algorithms will be in std directly.

3 Proposed Wording

The following changes are relative to [N4835]:

- In [version.syn], adjust the value of the "__cpp_lib_erase_if" macro to match the date of application of this paper to the IS draft.
- In each of [string.syn], [string.erasure], [deque.syn], [forward.list.syn], [list.syn], [vector.syn], [deque.erasure], [forward.list.erasure], [list.erasure], [vector.erasure], [associative.map.syn], [associative.set.syn], [unord.map.syn], [unord.set.syn], [map.erasure], [multimap.erasure], [set.erasure], [multiset.erasure], [unord.map.erasure], [unord.multimap.erasure], [unord.set.erasure], [unord.multiset.erasure]:

For each erase(<container>& c, ...) and erase_if(<container>& c, ...) function, change the return type from void to typename <container>::size_type.

• In each of [string.erasure], [deque.erasure], [vector.erasure], change paragraphs 1 as follows:

```
- Effects: Equivalent to: c.erase(remove(c.begin(), c.end(), value), c.end());
+ Effects: Equivalent to:
+ auto it = remove(c.begin(), c.end(), value);
+ auto r = distance(it, c.end());
+ c.erase(it, c.end());
+ return r;
```

• In each of [string.erasure], [deque.erasure], [vector.erasure], change paragraphs 2 as follows:

```
- Effects: Equivalent to: c.erase(remove_if(c.begin(), c.end(), pred), c.end());
+ Effects: Equivalent to:
+ auto it = remove_if(c.begin(), c.end(), pred);
+ auto r = distance(it, c.end());
+ c.erase(it, c.end());
+ return r;
```

- In each of [forward.list.erasure], [list.erasure], in paragraphs 1 and 2, add "return" between "Equivalent to:" and the start of the code.
- In each of [map.erasure], [multimap.erasure], [set.erasure], [multiset.erasure], [unord.map.erasure], [unord.multimap.erasure], [unord.multiset.erasure];

Change paragraphs 1 as indicated:

```
+ auto original_size = c.size();
for (auto i = c.begin(), last = c.end(); i != last; ) {
```

```
if (pred(*i)) {
    i = c.erase(i);
    } else {
        ++i;
    }
    }
+ return original_size - c.size();
```

3.1 Feature Test Macro

No new macro is necessary.

4 Design Decisions

4.1 size_t vs. size_type

Should we return *<container>*::size_type or std::size_t from these functions? P0646R0 chose size_t, for brevity, but LEWG in Toronto favoured size_type, so this is what's proposed now.

4.2 Performance Considerations

Please refer to P0646R0 for a detailed analysis. TL;DR: We believe that returning the number of elements removed does not pessimise callers that don't need it.

5 Acknowledgements

We thank the reviewers of draft versions of the original proposal and the participants of the associated discussion on std-proposals@isocpp.org and LWG in Rapperswil for their input: Sean Parent, Arthur O'Dwyer, Nicol Bolas, Ville Voutilainen, Casey Carter, Milian Wolff, André Somers, Jonathan Wakely, Walter E. Brown. All remaining errors are ours.

References

[A9] Alexander Stepanov et al. Four Algorithmic Journeys / Efficient Programming With Components / Programming Conversations https://www.youtube.com/user/A9Videos/playlists?view=1

[SGI STL] Alexander Stepanov et al. Associative Container in: Standard Template Library Programmer's Guide https://www.sgi.com/tech/stl/AssociativeContainer.html (accessed 2017-06-01) [N4835] Richard Smith (editor) Working Draft: Standard for Programming Language C++ http://wg21.link/N4835

[P0921R2] Titus Winters

Standard Library Compatibility http://www.open-std.org/jtc1/sc22/wg21/docs/papers/2018/p0921r2.pdf