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Abstract—Writing toString functions to display custom data values is straightforward, but building custom interfaces to manipulate such values is more difficult. Though tolerable in many scenarios, this difficulty is acute in emerging value-centric IDEs—such as those that provide programming by examples (PBE) or bidirectional transformation (BX) modalities, in which users manipulate output values to specify programs.

We present an approach that automatically generates custom GUIs from ordinary toString functions. By tracing the execution of the toString function on an input value, our technique overlays a tiny structure editor upon the output string: UI widgets for selecting, adding, removing, and modifying elements of the original value are displayed atop appropriate substrings.

We implement our technique—in a tool called TSE—for a simple functional language with custom algebraic data types (ADTs), and evaluate the tiny structure editors produced by TSE on a selection of existing and custom toString functions.

I. INTRODUCTION

Programmers often write toString functions to help interpret and debug code involving custom data types. For example, for a type of values describing numeric intervals, the string "(-\infty,10)" conveys the meaning “all numbers less than or equal to 10” more succinctly than the string "Interval(NegInf(), Before(10, True))", which might be a default serialization provided by the language.

Custom toString functions are usually straightforward to write, but what if the programmer needs not only to display the value but also edit the value as well? This need arises in emerging development environments such as bidirectional programming (discussed below) that rely on editing program values instead of code.

One idea is for the programming environment to enrich default string representations with automatically-generated, type-directed GUI widgets. For example, given the default representation "Interval(NegInf(), Before(10, True))", the system might render a slider for “scrubbing” 10 to different values ([1], [2]) and a widget to select NegInf() and toggle it to After(0, False).

Ideally, however, the domain-specific representation "(-\infty,10]" would be editable, not just the default representation. Unfortunately, creating an editable domain-specific representation of values is considerably more difficult than writing toString functions for display.

Potential Applications

TSE is currently a prototype, proof-of-concept tool. However, we believe our approach would benefit a number of emerging techniques that allow programmers to specify code via direct manipulation of program values.

Literals in a Structure Editor: In structure editors—such as the Cornell Program Synthesizer [4]—and block-based editors—such as Scratch [5]—tree transformations rather than raw text edits are used to manipulate the program. Structure editors can use domain-specific representations for display. For example, the Barista [6] editor for Java shows rich, custom, type-specific views for mathematical and logical expressions in code. For editing, however, Barista falls back to ordinary textual manipulation. TSE could instead provide custom mini structure editors within the main structure editor.

Programming by Examples (PBE). Given input-output examples, these systems (e.g. [7], [8]) synthesize a small program. Sometimes many examples are required: Myth [8] requires 20 examples to synthesize binary tree insertion. Providing so many examples in text form can be cumbersome.
Direct-Manipulation Programming. Several tools augment text-based coding with direct manipulation of output values.

Bidirectional programming (BX) systems allow users to edit numbers ([9], [10], [11], [12]), strings ([13], [14], [11], [12]), or lists ([12]) in the output of a program to thereby change appropriate literals in the original code.

Compared to these BX systems, output-directed programming (ODP) systems allow the user to make larger, structural changes to the program ([15], [16], [2], [17], [18]), performing refactorings or inserting chunks of new code. To date, ODP systems carefully implement bespoke, domain-specific interfaces to enable selection and manipulation of the output.

Related Work

Each of the programming interactions above would benefit from an easy way to create domain-specific interfaces for custom data types. How do programmers currently input and edit program values in such systems?

Parse Functions. Programming is largely a text-based activity; entering values via text is thus a natural interface, but requires a parser. Custom parsers can be integrated with a language pre-processor like Template Haskell [19] or typed literal macros [20]. But the difficulty of writing a parser may not be worth the gain in expressiveness over the language’s default value parser. TSE provides a structure editor on a domain-specific representation, without the labor of writing a parser.

Handcrafted GUIs. If interaction is important, the programmer may opt to manually craft a custom graphical user interface for their data type. Although this effort is justifiable for common types, e.g. colors or regular expressions [21], writing a custom UI may not be worth the trouble for one-off data types.

String Tracing. Some previous systems ([13], [14]) trace string operations, enabling developers to directly edit HTML output and thereby modify appropriate literal strings in the source PHP or Javascript. TSE also relies on tracing, but uses a more generic mechanism [3], allowing TSE to track how substrings relate to any value of interest, rather than just string literals.

II. Our Approach

Our approach, tiny structure editors (TSE), uses a custom program evaluator to instrument the execution of a programmer-provided toString function. TSE displays the string output and overlays UI widgets over appropriate substrings, allowing the user to modify the original value, but by interacting with the domain-specific representation generated by the toString function. Our TSE prototype supports toString functions over programmer-defined algebraic data types (ADTs) in an ordinary functional language similar to Elm (https://elm-lang.org/).

Algebraic Data Types (ADTs)

Somewhat analogous to inheritance in object-oriented languages, algebraic data types (ADTs) enumerate the variants of a type and the data associated with each variant [22]. Unlike an object, an ADT value is raw data, separate from the functions that operate on it. Because ADTs succinctly describe the variants of plain data, mainstream languages are adopting ADTs: “enums” in Swift and Rust are ADTs, as are “case classes” in Scala and “discriminated unions” in Typescript.

Figure 2 shows three ADT definitions comprising a custom interval data type. The lower bound of an interval (Begin) has two variants representing whether the bound is negative infinity (NegInf()) or finite (After(...)). If finite, the bound records the finite boundary number and a boolean indicating whether the boundary is or is not included in the interval (is or is not closed). The type describing upper boundaries (End) is similar. An interval (Interval) is a lower and upper boundary together. The first word of each variant (NegInf, After, Before, Inf, Interval) is a constructor which acts as a function to create a value of the ADT. The last line of Figure 2 uses these constructors to create an interval value representing (−∞, 10]. Data inside ADT values is extracted using “pattern matching” in case splits (i.e. switch statements) which define the handling of alternative variants, as shown in the toString functions in Figure 2.

Algorithm

Our automatic algorithm for generating tiny structure editors proceeds in three steps. The tracing evaluator relates substrings to portions of the original value, then 2D spatial regions over the rendered string are computed, and finally actions are assigned to the 2D regions.

1) Dependency Tracing: TSE utilizes a custom evaluator that traces dependency provenance, following Transparent ML (TML) [3]. The value of interest and its subvalues are first tagged with projection paths (e.g. 2.2.●) indicating their location within the value of interest:

```
Interval(NegInf() | After(Num, Bool) | Inf())
```

Based on the value’s type, the appropriate toString function is invoked on the value of interest and the tracing evaluator

![Fig. 2. ADT and toString definitions for a custom interval type.](image-url)
propagates the dependency tags. Additionally, in TSE, string concatenation operations (++) do not produce a new, flattened string. Instead, the concatenation is deferred, resulting in a binary tree of substrings when evaluation completes (Figure 3). Because of the tracing evaluator, each substring and each concatenation carries a set of projection paths, relating parts of the string to parts of the value of interest (Figure 3b).

2) Spatial Regions: In the final display, selection regions and UI widgets will be overlaid on top of the rendered string. To generate the selection regions, the string concatenation binary tree is translated into a binary tree of nested 2D polygons, with each polygon encompassing the spatial region of the associated substring (Figure 4a). Only regions associated with at least one path will ultimately be relevant (Figure 4b). Although nested, the regions are positioned flush without padding (Figure 4c), which can cause occlusion (discussed later). For a multiline string, the regions are shrunk to exclude whitespace, and each region may also exclude a portion of its first and last line (Figure 4d).

3) Selections and Actions: Once 2D regions of the displayed string are associated with corresponding locations in the value of interest, these 2D regions can be used to facilitate a number of interactions. Our TSE prototype explores three: (a) selection of subvalues; (b) base value editing of numbers and strings; and (c) structural transformations, namely item insertion, item removal, and constructor swapping.

Selection regions. When the user moves their cursor over the rendered string, the deepest (equivalently, smallest) region under their mouse is offered for selection/deselection. For the interval example, there are four possible selection regions, shown in Figure 1. Selection is currently inert, but the selection regions are the basis for positioning UI widgets. In the future, selection might facilitate cut-copy-paste operations, as in Vital [15], or might open a floating menu of possible code refactorings, as in Sketch-n-Sketch [18].

Editing base values. Literal numbers or strings from the value of interest may pass through to the output unchanged, for example the number 10 in the interval example. TSE lets the user manipulate these values. The user may click a number and drag up and down to scrub [1] the number to a different value. Both numbers and strings can be double-clicked to reveal a standard text box to text edit the value.

Structural transformations. Because an ADT definition describes the allowable structures for a value, TSE is able to infer possible transformations on the value of interest. For the interval example, the Begin, End, and Bool types each have an alternative constructor which can be toggled by clicking the change constructor button (□) drawn to the left of the appropriate subvalue (Figure 1). These buttons allow the user to, e.g., change the lower bound from $-\infty$ to a finite bound (0 by default), or to toggle the boolean thus changing a finite boundary from closed (‘]’) to open (‘)’). Which buttons to display are based on the selection region for the current mouse position—the deepest (smallest) region under the cursor. Since deepest regions may completely occlude some of their ancestors, TSE also displays the change constructor buttons for any such ancestor region that has no selectable area. For example, the End value "[10]" is completely occluded by the Num "10" and the Bool "1", so when the cursor is over the Num or Bool TSE shows the change constructor button for End (the □ over the comma in the right two cases in Figure 1).

For recursive ADTs such as lists or trees, TSE additionally draws buttons to insert (☐) or remove (☒) items from the data structure, as shown in Figure 5 for a list. Remove buttons are associated with item(s) to be removed. Insert buttons are trickier to position—TSE must predict where an item not currently in the data structure will appear. This prediction is occasionally imprecise, as evaluated below.

Finally, if multiple buttons would be rendered on top of each other, these overlapping buttons are coalesced into a single button that will open a menu with the different transformations.

Additional Tracing Details

To increase the chance that an unmodified toString function will generate a sensible structure editor, we made minor changes to TML [3], which we mention for completeness.

In ordinary TML, certain constant substrings, such as the opening "[" and closing "]" of a list, are not dependent on the list because they are always shown. To associate these constant delimiters with the appropriate value, TSE tags the entire result of any toString call as dependent on its argument. For similar scenarios that do not occur at toString boundaries, TSE also offers a basedOn(dep,x) primitive that the toString author may use to add dep to the dependencies of x. Only one of our case studies below utilized this basedOn primitive.

On the other hand, to avoid extraneous dependencies, prefix and suffix strings shared by all branches of a case split are pulled outside the case split—otherwise, these constant substrings would be marked as dependent on the the value being split on. This normalization happens transparently before every execution and is not displayed to the user. Our supplementary technical report [25] includes an example of this scenario.
III. CASE STUDIES

TSE’s goal is to provide low- to no-cost domain-specific value editors. We tested TSE on toString functions for a number of datatypes, measuring several properties of the generated editors as shown in Figure 6. Figure 6 reports the percentage of ADT subvalues that could be directly selected (i.e., were not occluded, missing, or sharing a selection region with other subvalues). For data types representing containers (e.g., lists or sets), Figure 6 reports the percentage of contained items that can be selected. To evaluate TSE’s heuristic for insert button positioning, Figure 6 also reports the percentage of insert transformations placed in reasonable locations. An insert transformation is considered unreasonably placed if either (a) the insert should be possible but is not assigned to any button in the UI, or (b) the insert shares a single button with other inserts, or (c) clicking the button inserts an item at a location other than the button’s position.

To provide evidence that TSE can operate on unmodified toString functions, we translated several toString functions from Haskell’s standard libraries to our Elm-like language, as shown in the bottom half of Figure 6. These translations were performed as literally as possible.

The case studies revealed a few issues to address in subsequent versions of TSE. Most notably, zero-width regions such as those from empty strings are ignored, which for some variants of list toString caused the final Nil() to be un-selectable. Additionally, selection region sharing and occlusion are sometimes troublesome. Two subvalues sharing the same selection region is a less of an issue—depending on the application, selecting a shared region could offer to operate on any of the associated items. Occlusion, however, results in certain subvalues being un-selectable. One solution might be to expand ancestor regions by a few pixels, resulting in regions more like Figure 4b rather than Figure 4c. Finally, insert buttons could be better placed for tree-like data structures, but, as discussed next, how best to handle actions is a domain-specific consideration.

IV. DISCUSSION

TSE generates structure editors based on the toString function for a value, with little to no further programmer effort required. We envision value-centric programming systems that offer editable, domain-specific representations for custom data types, thus affording the programmer a more natural interface for specifying changes on the operation of their program.

At present, we implemented our TSE prototype independent of any of these possible settings. Applying TSE to a particular application will require a number of further design decisions, particularly surrounding the handling of actions. For example, consider the set data structure in Figure 6. The reference implementation [24] is based on a tree and maintains a number of invariants such as balancing, ordering, and non-duplication. None of these invariants are expressible in a standard ADT definition alone, and the internal tree structure is not exposed in the toString output ("fromList [2,3,5,7]"). Therefore, only some of TSE’s selection regions are relevant—namely, the terminal items, as reported in Figure 6—and the structural transformations generated by TSE are not meaningful because they do not enforce the set invariants. TSE does not yet provide an interface for specifying custom insert and remove functions, instead such an interface might be part of a larger, future IDE.

Beyond action handling for data with complex invariants, our prototype has a number of minor limitations. First, systems that rely on string tracing ([13], [14]) provide custom implementations of string manipulation functions that correctly propagate dependencies. We currently only support string concatenation and string length—supplementing our language with additional string functions remains future work. Finally, our core language and TML do not support nested pattern matches. How dependency semantics should work for nested patterns is an open question—although a language’s compiler will unnest the patterns [26], different unnestings can result in different dependency traces. While not uncommon, such ambiguous cases did not occur in our examples.

Adapting TSE to the more common object-oriented setting will require different tracing semantics, because “variants” are handled by virtual method lookups rather than case splits.

Further details about TSE’s algorithm and heuristics are available in a supplementary technical report [25].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Structure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>%Selectable Items</th>
<th>%Reasonable Inserts</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>[10, 20]</td>
<td>80% (4/5)</td>
<td>100% (4/4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>&quot;May 9, 2020&quot;</td>
<td>33% (14/43)</td>
<td>81% (13/16)</td>
<td>based on used x3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSON (multiline)</td>
<td>w/arrays, objects, strings, nums</td>
<td>100% (6/7)</td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
<td>100% (4/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>&quot;[1,2,3]&quot;</td>
<td>71% (5/7)</td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
<td>100% (4/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List ([&quot;&quot;] in base case)</td>
<td>&quot;[1,2,3]&quot;</td>
<td>86% (6/7)</td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
<td>100% (4/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List (via join)</td>
<td>&quot;[1,2,3]&quot;</td>
<td>100% (7/7)</td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
<td>100% (4/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List (via different join)</td>
<td>&quot;[1,2,3]&quot;</td>
<td>100% (7/7)</td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
<td>100% (4/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree (S-exp)</td>
<td>&quot;(2 (1) (4 (3) (5)))&quot;</td>
<td>53% (10/19)</td>
<td>14% (2/14)</td>
<td>5 inserts missing; poor placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree (ndented hierarchy)</td>
<td>&quot;\n 1n \n 4n \n 3n 5n&quot;</td>
<td>21% (4/19)</td>
<td>100% (5/5)</td>
<td>21% (3/14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair [23]</td>
<td>&quot;(10, &quot;ten&quot;)&quot;</td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
<td>100% (4/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List [23]</td>
<td>&quot;[1,2,3]&quot;</td>
<td>100% (7/7)</td>
<td>100% (3/3)</td>
<td>100% (4/4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT (recursive) [23]</td>
<td>&quot;Ctor4 (Ctor3 True &quot;asdf&quot;)&quot;</td>
<td>100% (4/4)</td>
<td>50% (1/2)</td>
<td>Bool region too long; same insert 2x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record [23]</td>
<td>&quot;Record {field1 = ..., ...}&quot;</td>
<td>100% (9/9)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Not 1-to-1 w/ADT definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set [24]</td>
<td>&quot;fromList [2,3,5,7]&quot;</td>
<td>100% (4/4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. Case studies of hand-written and translated toString functions.
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