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Multiple functions: Doing different things to the same object
Sub-functions: Breaking up big jobs into small ones
Example: Back to resource allocation

Absolutely Essential Reading for Friday: Sec. 4.2 of the textbook
Merely Useful Reading: Chapter 3
Code from this lecture: At class website, with comments
Why You Have to Write More Than One Function

Meta-problems:

1. You’ve got more than one problem
2. Your problem is too hard to solve in one step
3. You keep solving the same problems

Meta-solutions:

1. Write multiple functions, which rely on each other
2. Split your problem, and write functions for the pieces
3. Solve the recurring problems once, and re-use the solutions
Writing Multiple Related Functions

Statisticians want to do lots of things with their models: estimate, predict, visualize, test, compare, simulate, uncertainty, . . .
Write multiple functions to do these things
Make the model one object; assume it has certain components

Consistent interfaces:

1. Functions for the same kind of object should use the same arguments, and presume the same structure
2. Functions for the same kind of task should use the same arguments, and return the same sort of value

(to the extent possible)
Keep related things together: Put all the related functions in a single file; source them together; use comments to note dependencies
Example: Predicting from a Fitted Model

**Exercise:** Modify the estimation code from last time so it returns a list, with components a and y0 (among others)
Predict values from the power-law model:

```r
# Predict response values from a power-law scaling model
# Inputs: fitted power-law model (object), vector of values at which to make
# predictions at (newdata)
# Outputs: vector of predicted response values
predict.plm <- function(object, newdata) {
  # Check that object has the right components
  stopifnot("a" %in% names(object), "y0" %in% names(object))
  a <- object$a
  y0 <- object$y0
  # Sanity check the inputs
  stopifnot(is.numeric(a), length(a)==1)
  stopifnot(is.numeric(y0), length(y0)==1)
  stopifnot(is.numeric(newdata))
  return(y0*newdata^a)  # Actual calculation and return
}
```
Example cont’d: plotting

# Plot fitted curve from power law model over specified range
# Inputs: list containing parameters (plm), start and end of range (from, to)
# Outputs: TRUE, silently, if successful
# Side-effect: Makes the plot

plot.plm.1 <- function(plm, from, to) {
  y0 <- plm$y0 # Extract parameters
  a <- plm$a
  f <- function(x) {return(y0*x^a)}
  curve(f(x), from=from, to=to)
  # Return with no visible value on the terminal
  invisible(TRUE)
}
When one function calls another, use ... as a meta-argument, to pass along unspecified inputs to the called function:

```r
plot.plm.2 <- function(plm, from, to, ...) {
  y0 <- plm$y0
  a <- plm$a
  f <- function(x) {return(y0*x^a)}
  curve(f(x), from=from, to=to, ...)
  invisible(TRUE)
}
```
Solve big problems by dividing them into a few smaller sub-problems

- Easier to understand: get the big picture at a glance
- Easier to fix, improve and modify: tinker with sub-problems at leisure
- Easier to design: for future lecture
- Easier to re-use solutions to recurring sub-problems

Rule of thumb: If your function takes more than a page, it’s probably too long
Sub-Functions or Separate Functions?

Saw a sub-function (defined inside another function) last time
Pros: Simpler code, access to local variables, doesn’t clutter workspace
Cons: Gets re-declared each time, can’t access in global environment (or in other functions)
Alternative: Declare the function in the same file, source them together
Rule of thumb: If you find yourself writing the same code in multiple places, make it a separate function
Example: Plotting a Power-Law Model

Our old plotting function calculated the fitted values
But so does our prediction function

\[
\text{plot.plm.3} \leftarrow \text{function(plm,from,to,n=101,...) \{}
\text{  x} \leftarrow \text{seq(from=from,to=to,length.out=n)}
\text{  y} \leftarrow \text{predict.plm(object=plm,newdata=x)}
\text{  plot(x,y,...)}
\text{  invisible(TRUE)}
\}\]


Recursion

Reduce the problem to an easier one of the same form:

```r
my.factorial <- function(n) {
    if (n == 1) {
        return(1)
    } else {
        return(n*my.factorial(n-1))
    }
}
```
or multiple calls:

```r
fib <- function(n) {
  if ( (n==1) || (n==0) ) {
    return(1)
  } else {
    return (fib(n-1) + fib(n-2))
  }
}
```

**Exercise**: Convince yourself that any loop can be replaced by recursion; can you always replace recursion with a loop?
plan.needs <- function(output, factory) {
  factory %*% output
}

adjust.plan <- function(output, needed, available, tweak) {
  if (all(needed >= available)) {
    return(output*(1-tweak))
  }
  if (all(needed < available)) {
    return((1+tweak))
  }
  return(output*runif(n=length(output), min=1-tweak, max=1+tweak))
}

planner <- function(output, factory, available, slack, tweak=0.1) {
  needed <- plan.needs(output, factory)
  if (all(needed <= available) && all(available-needed <= slack)) {
    return(list(output=output, needed=needed))
  }
  else {
    output <- adjust.plan(output, needed, available, tweak)
    return(planner(output, factory, available, slack))
  }
}
Summary

1. **Multiple functions** let do multiple related jobs, either on the same object or on similar ones.

2. **Sub-functions** let us break big problems into smaller ones, and re-use the solutions to the smaller ones.

3. **Recursion** is a powerful way of making hard problems simpler.

Next time: Designing functions from the top down.