
CSCI 275: Programming Abstractions

Lecture 9: apply & fold right

Fall 2024



Another tool: apply

Motivation

Imagine you have a list of numbers and you want to multiply them all together

We know (* 3 5 7 -2 8 10) works but how do we make that into a function if we don't know how many numbers we have ahead of time?

```
(define (product lst)
  ???)
```

We could write a recursive procedure but it'd be great if we could just use the elements in lst as the arguments to *

Applying a procedure to a list of arguments

(apply proc lst)

Applies proc to the arguments in 1st and returns a single value

```
(define (maximum lst)
  (apply max lst))
(maximum '(1 3 4 2)) => (apply max '(1 3 4 2))
                       => (max 1 3 4 2)
                       => 4
                                          + in Racket can
(define sum
                                          take any number
                                           of arguments
  (lambda (lst)
    (apply + lst))
(sum '(1 2 3)) => (apply + '(1 2 3)) =>
             (+ 1 2 3) => 6
```

Applying with some fixed arguments

```
(apply proc v... lst)
```

apply takes a variable number of arguments where the final one is a list and applies proc to all of those arguments

```
(apply proc 1 2 3 ' (4 5 6)) => (proc 1 2 3 4 5 6)
```

```
You're working with 3-d vectors stored is 3-element
lists—e.g. \(\( \) (-5 \ 8 \ 6.2). You have a function
(vector-len x y z) which gives the length of the
vector and a list of vectors
(define vecs '((-5 8 6.2) (1 -2 3) ...))
How do you get a list of the lengths of the vectors?
A. (map vector-len vecs)
```

- B.(apply vector-len vecs)
 C.(map (λ (v) (apply vector-len v)) vecs)
- D. (apply (λ (ν) (map vector-len ν)) vecs)

Even *more* abstractions, and thus tools in our toolbox

Lots of similarities between functions

```
(sum lst)
```

(length lst)

(map proc 1st)

Even for functions that don't immediately look like they fall into the pattern...

```
(remove* x lst)
```

Even for functions that don't immediately look like they fall into the pattern...

(remove* x lst)

We can rewrite them to look more like the others

Some similarities

Basic structure is the same!

Function	base-case	(combine head result)
sum	0	(+ head result)
length	0	(+ 1 result)
map	empty	(cons (proc head) result)
remove*	empty	(if (equal? x head) result (cons head result))

(input type to output type)

A.combine: $\alpha \times \beta \rightarrow \alpha$ B.combine: $\alpha \times \beta \rightarrow \beta$ C.combine: $\beta \times \alpha \rightarrow \alpha$ D.combine: $\beta \times \alpha \rightarrow \beta$

```
(define (fun lst)
   (cond [(empty? lst) base-case]
          [else (let ([head (first lst)]
                         [result (fun (rest lst))])
                    (combine head result))))
1st: list of \alpha
base-case: \beta
combine: \alpha \times \beta \rightarrow \beta
If \alpha = \text{boolean and } \beta = \text{string},
what type is (fun '(#t #f #f))?
                                    A.Boolean
                                    B. String
                                    C.Boolean → String
                                    D.String → Boolean
```

Next Up

Readings continue, see the course schedule!

Homework 1 is due tonight at 11:59pm via Github

Commit/Push is free, do it often!

Weekly Reflection due Monday

HW2 released today – first commit Monday

Summary Problems posted before Monday

Elise's Computational Skills Hours: 7 to 9pm on Sunday in King 225