Structs for order

Andrey Chernykh

CBL Berlin 2018

Me: quick facts

C# 5 years |> Ruby 4 years |> Elixir since 2016

Number of services (not all of them are micro) in production.

https://github.com/madeinussr

- exop
- express

https://medium.com/@andreichernykh

Currently: Elixir developer at Coingaming Group 🌔

"Container" data types

List, Tuple, Keywords list, Map, <mark>Struct</mark>

"Structs are extensions built on top of maps that provide compile-time checks and default values"

"Container" data types

"Structs are data structures built on top of maps that conform predefined public contract"

Contract

Contract is about expectations

No contract - no confidence

Maps are for "here and now"

Structs are for reading code months (days?) later

Structs are for **long-term** maintenance

Contract

```
# 1
%{} = %{a: 1, b: 2, c: 3}
{a: 1} = {a: 1, b: 2, c: 3}
# 2
defmodule Triangle do
  defstruct [:a, b: 2, c: 3]
end
%{} = %Triangle{}
```

%{a: 1, b: 2} = %Triangle{a: 1}

```
# what else the map contains?
def do_smth(map), do: :smth
def do_smth(%{a: _, b: _, c: _} = map), do: :smth
```

```
# I know Triangle contains :a, :b, :c keys in any case
def do_smth(%Triangle{} = struct), do: :smth
```

Responsibility

A Struct module a <mark>self-consistent</mark> unit

Takes care of its own data

Self-documented: attributes/schema, doctests, types, typespecs

Responsibility

```
defmodule Triangle do
```

end

```
defstruct [:a, :b, :c, :area, :perimeter]
```

```
adoc """
Constructs a triangle structure. Expects a map as an argument.
Calculates area & perimeter if they aren't provided.
11 11 11
@spec new(map()) :: %_MODULE_{}
def new(params) when is_map(params) do
  params = params > coerce() > validate() > perimeter() > area()
  case params do
    {:ok, params} → struct(__MODULE__, params)
    error \rightarrow error
  end
end
# ...
```

triangle = Triangle.new(%{a: 3, b: 4, c: 5})
#> %Triangle{a: 3, b: 4, c: 5, area: 6, perimeter: 12}
triangle.area
#> 6
triangle = Triangle.new(%{a: 3, b: -4, c: 5})

#> {:error, :validation_failed}

Ecto's embedded schema

Known schema declaration

Arguments casting (schema mapping)

Types check + custom types

Built-in and custom validations

Relations + complex nested structs

And all this you get for out-of-the-box,
tested and proved in production*

```
defmodule Triangle do
use Ecto.Schema
import Ecto.Changeset
@primary_key false
```

```
embedded_schema do
field(:a, :integer)
field(:b, :integer)
# ...
```

```
end
```

defp try_to_apply(%{valid?: true} = changeset), do: apply_changes(changeset)
 defp try_to_apply(%{valid?: false, errors: errors}), do: {:error, errors}
end

More practical example

```
def create(%Conn{} = conn, %{"user" ⇒ customer_id,
                                 "timestamp" \Rightarrow date time,
                                 "campaign" \Rightarrow discount,
                                 "currency" \Rightarrow currency,
                                 "quantity" \Rightarrow amount,
                                 "taxes" \Rightarrow tax,
                                 "taxCode" \Rightarrow tax code} = params)
    when is_integer(customer_id) and is_binary(date_time) and
         is_float(discount) and is_binary(currency) and
         is_float(amount) and is_float(tax) and is_binary(tax_code)
do
  # further validation, errors handling and creation itself
end
```

end

Later...

How it could be

• defmodule SuperApp.Invoice.Create.Request do

defstruct or embedded_schema

end

```
defmodule SuperApp.Invoice.Create.Response do
  # defstruct or embedded_schema
end
2
defmodule SuperApp.Controllers.RequestBuilder do
  # ...
def call(%Conn{params: params, assigns: %{req_req}
  case req_module.new(params) do
   %{} = request struct → assign(conn, :request)
```

1 scope "/invoice" do
 alias SuperApp.Invoice.{Create, Update}
 post("/create", Invoice, :create, assigns: %{
 req_module: Create.Request,
 resp_module: Create.Response
 })
 post("/update", Invoice, :update, assigns: %{
 req_module: Update.Request,
 resp_module: Update.Response
 })

end

```
definedute superApp.controtters.kequestBuilder do

# ...

def call(%Conn{params: params, assigns: %{req_module: req_module}} = conn, _opts) do

case req_module.new(params) do

%{} = request_struct → assign(conn, :request_struct, request_struct)

{:error, error} → {:error, error}

_ → {:error, :unhandled_error}
end
# ...
```

end

How it could be

```
3 action_fallback(FallbackController)
```

```
plug(RequestBuilder)
```

```
def create(%Conn{assigns: %{request_struct: req_struct, resp_module: resp_mod}} = conn, params) do
    with {:ok, action_result} ← CreateOperation.run(req_struct) do
        render(conn, "create.json", action_result: action_result, resp_mod: resp_mod)
    end
end
```

No, not only for controllers

Do not delegate everything to a struct module

Ecto brings some overhead

Protobuf can be an alternative, but...

Ecto's schema vs plain struct

```
Requirements:
coerce (atomify) given params map keys if needed
check required params presence
check given params types
```

```
available memory: "16 GB", cpu_speed: "2.70GHz",
elixir: "1.7.3", erlang: "20.3.2", num_cores: 8
```

tool: Benchee

Name	ips	average	deviation	median	99th %
Plain Struct	424.44 K	2.36 µs	±940.79%	2 µs	7 µs
Ecto Schema	156.11 K	6.41 µs	±277.71%	6 µs	16 µs
Comparison:					
Plain Struct	424.44 K				
Ecto Schema	156.11 K -	<mark>2.72x slower</mark>			

https://github.com/madeinussr/struct_vs_ecto

Thank |> you