

# Using `?:` to reduce the scope of `constexpr-if`

Document #: P2068R0  
Date: January 13, 2020  
Project: Programming Language C++  
EWG Incubator  
Reply-to: Marc Mutz <[marc.mutz@kdab.com](mailto:marc.mutz@kdab.com)>

## Abstract

D's *static if*, unlike C++17's *constexpr if*, does not introduce scoping. Andrei Alexandrescu has repeatedly highlighted this as a major enabler of *static if* over *constexpr if*.

In many cases, this feature of *static if* is used to conditionally select a type. Since the *static if* scoping rules are very alien to C++, we propose to allow the conditional operator (which would be implicitly `constexpr`) on the right-hand-side of a *using-declaration*.

```
template <bool B, typename T, typename F>
using conditional_t = B ? T : F ;

template <bool B, typename T, typename F>
struct conditional { using type = conditional_t<B,T,F>; };
```

This greatly reduces the need to revert to template argument pattern matching (or library wrappers around it) to use conditionals in template meta programming, and therefore the need for a *static if* with D's semantics.

## 1 Motivation and Scope

### 1.1 Efficient Type Selection

Vittorio Romeo started his 2016 CppCon talk<sup>[1]</sup> with the following example from D:

```
template INT(int i) {
    static if (i == 32)
        alias INT = int;
    static if (i == 16)
        alias INT = short;
    else
        static assert(0);
}
```

The best we can do in C++20 is

```
template <int i>
using INT = std::conditional_t<i == 32, int,
    std::conditional_t<i == 16, short, std::experimental::nonesuch>;
```

This proposal suggests to allow the following instead:

```
template <int i>
using INT = i == 32 ? int :
           i == 16 ? short :
           /*else*/ static_assert(dependent_false_v<i>, "no_such_type") ;
```

Andrei Alexandrescu showed the following code in this 2018 Meeting C++ Keynote[2], slightly edited for brevity:

```
template <class K, class V, size_t maxLength>
struct RobinHashTable {
    static if (maxLength < 0xFFFFE) {
        using CellIdx = uint16_t;
    } else {
        using CellIdx = uint32_t;
    }

    static if (sizeof(K) % 8 < 7) {
        struct KV {
            K k;
            uint8_t cellData;
            V v;
        };
    } else {
        struct KV {
            K k;
            V v;
            uint8_t cellData;
        };
    }
};
```

In C++20, one would have to define both `struct KV1` and `struct KV2` and then alias `KV` to one of them, using `std::conditional_t`. Instead of this, we simply present what this proposal suggests to allow:

```
template <class K, class V, size_t maxLength>
struct RobinHashTable {
    using CellIdx = maxLength < 0xFFFFE ? uint16_t : uint32_t;
    using KV = sizeof(K) % 8 < 7 ? struct { K k; uint8_t cellData; V v; } :
              /* else */          struct { K k; V v; uint8_t cellData; } ;
};
```

The discarded branch would have the same semantics as those of discarded *constexpr if* branches.

## 2 Impact on the Standard

Minimal. The syntax we propose to make valid was ill-formed before.

### 3 Proposed Wording

The following is just a quick sketch. More detailed wording can be provided if the EWG Incubator finds value in this proposal.

It seems that the changes necessary are local to *using-declarator*. The “normal” ternary operator wording in [expr.cond] is unaffected.

For the first example, we’d need to allow `static_assert` in *declarator-list*.

Something like this:

*using-declarator*:

*typename*<sub>opt</sub> *nested-name-specifier* *unqualified-id*

*static-assert-declaration* (mod semicolon)

*logical-or-expression* ? *using-declarator* : *using-declarator*

where the *logical-or-expression* must meet “the value of the condition shall be a contextually converted constant expression of type `bool`;”

#### 3.1 Feature Macro

We propose to use a new macro, `__cpp_using_conditional_operator`, to indicate an implementation’s support for this feature.

### 4 References

- [1] Vittorio Romeo  
CppCon 2016: “Implementing ‘static’ control flow in C++14”  
<https://youtu.be/aXSsUqVSe2k?t=128>
- [2] Andrei Alexandrescu  
Meeting C++ 2018: “The next big Thing “  
<https://youtu.be/tcyb1lpEHm0?t=2716>
- [N4820] Richard Smith (editor)  
*Working Draft: Standard for Programming Language C++*  
<http://wg21.link/N4820>