`constexpr std::shared_ptr`

Document #:	P3037R0
Date:	2023-11-06
Project:	Programming Language C++
Audience:	SG7 Compile-time programming, LEWG Library Evolution
Reply-to:	Paul Keir <graham.keir@gmail.com>

Contents

1 Introduction

Since the adoption of [P0784R7] in C++20, constant expressions can include dynamic memory allocation; yet support for smart pointers extends only to `std::unique_ptr` (since [P2273R3] in C++23). As at runtime, smart pointers can encourage hygienic memory management during constant evaluation; and with no remaining technical obstacles, parity between runtime and compile-time support for smart pointers should duly and intuitively reflect the increased maturity of language support for constant expression evaluation. We therefore propose that `std::shared_ptr` and associated class templates from 20.3 [smartptr] permit `constexpr` evaluation.

2 Motivation and Scope

Two proposals adopted for C++26 and C++23 can facilitate a straightforward implementation of comprehensive `constexpr` support for `std::shared_ptr`: [P2738R1] and [P2448R2]. The former allows the `get_deleter` member function to operate, given the type erasure required within the `std::shared_ptr` unary class template. The latter can allow even minor associated classes such as `std::bad_weak_ptr` to receive `constexpr` qualification, while inheriting from the currently non-`constexpr` class: `std::exception`. We furthermore propose that the relational operators of `std::unique_ptr`, which can legally operate on pointers originating from a single allocation during constant evaluation, should also adopt the `constexpr` specifier.

As with C++23 `constexpr` support for `std::unique_ptr`, bumping the value `__cpp_lib_constexpr_memory` is our requested feature macro change; yet in the discussion and implementation presented here, we adopt the macro `__cpp_lib_constexpr_shared_ptr`. We also use the `_GLIBCXX26_CONSTEXPR` macro in place of the literal `constexpr` keyword to ensure the specifier only applies when the `-std=c++26` flag is enabled.

We below elaborate on points which go beyond the simple addition of the `constexpr` specifier to the relevant member functions.

2.1 Atomic Operations

`std::shared_ptr` can operate within a multithreaded runtime environment; and a number of its member functions use atomic functions to ensure that shared state is updated correctly. Constant expressions must currently be evaluated by a single thread. A `constexpr` `std::shared_ptr` implementation can engage with the `constexpr`-friendly support for single-threaded evaluation available in atomic function definitions within standard library implementations. For example, in libstdc++'s interface to atomic functions, the `__is_single_threaded` function, which controls execution of both `__exchange_and_add_dispatch` and `__atomic_add_dispatch` within the `ext/atomicity.h` header file, can be changed to start as follows:

```
_GLIBCXX26_CONSTEXPR
__attribute__((__always_inline__))
inline bool
__is_single_threaded() _GLIBCXX_NOTHROW
{
#ifdef __cpp_lib_constexpr_shared_ptr
  if (std::is_constant_evaluated())
    return true;
#endif
  // ... 7 more lines here
}
```

Built-in GCC atomic functions such as `__atomic_load_n` are also used within libstdc++'s implementation of `std::shared_ptr`. These could similarly be updated to account for a `constexpr` single-threaded execution environment within the compiler. The approach taken within our own implementation is a local one; eliding the call to the atomic function through the predication of `std::is_constant_evaluated` (or `if consteval`). For example, here is an updated function from `bits/shared_ptr_base.h`, used by `std::shared_ptr::use_count()` and elsewhere:

```
_GLIBCXX26_CONSTEXPR
long
_M_get_use_count() const noexcept
{
#ifdef __cpp_lib_constexpr_shared_ptr
  return std::is_constant_evaluated()
           ? _M_use_count
           : __atomic_load_n(&_M_use_count, __ATOMIC_RELAXED);
#else
  return __atomic_load_n(&_M_use_count, __ATOMIC_RELAXED);
#endif
}
```

2.2 Two Memory Allocations

Unlike `std::unique_ptr`, a `std::shared_ptr` must store not only the managed object, but also the type-erased deleter and allocator, as well as the number of `std::shared_ptr`s and `std::weak_ptr`s which own or refer to the managed object. This information is managed as part of a dynamically allocated object referred to as the *control block*.

Existing runtime implementations of `std::make_shared`, `std::allocate_shared`, `std::make_shared_for_overwrite`, and `std::allocate_shared_for_overwrite`, allocate memory for both the control block, *and* the managed object, from a single dynamic memory allocation; via `reinterpret_cast`. This practise aligns with a remark at 20.3.2.2.7 [util.smartptr.shared.create]; quoted below:

(7.1) — Implementations should perform no more than one memory allocation.
— [*Note 1*: This provides efficiency equivalent to an intrusive smart pointer. — *end note*]

As `reinterpret_cast` is not permitted within a constant expression, an alternative approach is required for `std::make_shared`, `std::allocate_shared`, `std::make_shared_for_overwrite`, and `std::allocate_shared_for_overwrit`
A straightforward solution is to create the object first, and pass its address to the appropriate `std::shared_ptr` constructor. Considering the control block, this approach amounts to two dynamic memory allocations; albeit at compile-time. Assuming that the runtime implementation need not change, the remark quoted above could either be removed, or changed to "Implementations should perform no more than one runtime memory allocation."

2.3 Relational Operators

Comparing dynamically allocated pointers within a constant expression is legal, provided the result of the comparison is not unspecified. Such comparisons are defined in terms of a partial order, applicable to pointers which either point "to different elements of the same array, or to subobjects thereof"; or to "different non-static data members of the same object, or to subobjects of such members, recursively…"; from paragraph 4 of 7.6.9 [expr.rel]. A simple example program is shown below:

```
constexpr bool ptr_compare()
{
  int* p = new int[2]{};
  bool b = &p[0] < &p[1];
  delete [] p;
  return b;
}

static_assert(ptr_compare());
```

It is therefore unsurprising that we include the `std::shared_ptr` relational operators within the scope of our proposal to apply `constexpr` to all functions within 20.3 [smartptr]; the `std::shared_ptr` aliasing constructor makes this especially simple to configure:

```
constexpr bool sptr_compare()
{
  double *arr = new double[2];
  std::shared_ptr p{&arr[0]}, q{p, p.get() + 1};
  return p < q;
}

static_assert(sptr_compare());
```

Furthermore, in the interests of `constexpr` consistency, we propose that the relational operators of `std::unique_ptr` *also* now include support for constant evaluation. As discussed above, the results of such comparisons are very often well defined.

It may be argued that a `std::unique_ptr` which is the sole owner of an array, or an object with data members, presents less need for relational operators. Yet we must consider that a custom deleter can easily change the operational semantics; as demonstrated in the example below. A `std::unique_ptr` should also be legally comparable with itself.

```
constexpr bool uptr_compare()
{
  short* p = new short[2]{};
  auto del = [](short*){};
  std::unique_ptr<short[]>                 a{p+0};
  std::unique_ptr<short[],decltype(del)> b{p+1, del};
  return a < b;
}

static_assert(uptr_compare());
```

2.4 Maybe Not Now, But Soon

A core message of C++23's [P2448R2] is that the C++ community is served better by including the language version alongside the tuple of possible inputs (i.e. function and template arguments) considered for a `constexpr` function invocation within a constant expression. Consequently, while there are some functions in 20.3 [smartptr] which cannot possibly be so evaluated *today*, we propose that these should also be specified with the `constexpr` keyword. The following lists all such functions or classes:

- 20.3.2.1 [util.smartptr.weak.bad]: `std::bad_weak_ptr` cannot be constructed as it inherits from a class, `std::exception`, which has no `constexpr` member functions.
- 20.3.3 [util.smartptr.hash]: The `operator()` member of the class template specialisations for `std::hash<std::unique_ptr<T,D>>` and `std::hash<std::shared_ptr<T>>` cannot be defined according to the *Cpp17Hash* requirements (16.4.4.5 [hash.requirements]). (A pointer cannot, during constant evaluation, be converted to an `std::size_t` using `reinterpret_cast`; or otherwise.)
- 20.3.2.5 [util.smartptr.owner.hash]: The two `operator()` member functions of the recently adopted `owner_hash` class, also cannot be defined according to the *Cpp17Hash* requirements.
- 20.3.2.2.6 [util.smartptr.shared.obs]: The recently adopted `owner_hash()` member function of `std::shared_ptr`, also cannot be defined according to the *Cpp17Hash* requirements.

3 Impact on the Standard

This proposal is a pure library extension, and does not require any new language features.

4 Implementation

An implementation based on the GNU C++ Library (libstdc++) can be found here. A comprehensive test suite is included there within `tests/shared_ptr_constexpr_tests.cpp`; alongside a standalone bash script to run it. All tests pass with recent GCC and Clang (i.e. versions supporting P2738; `__cpp_constexpr >= 202306L`).

5 Proposed Wording

6 Acknowledgements

Thanks to all of the following:

— (In alphabetical order by last name) Thiago Macieira, Arthur O'Dwyer, and everyone else who contributed to the online forum discussions.

7 References

[P0784R7] Daveed Vandevoorde. 2019. More constexpr containers.
https://www.open-std.org/jtc1/sc22/wg21/docs/papers/2019/p0784r7.html

[P2273R3] Andreas Fertig. 2021. Making `std::unique_ptr` constexpr.
https://www.open-std.org/jtc1/sc22/wg21/docs/papers/2021/p2273r3.pdf

[P2448R2] Barry Revzin. 2022. Relaxing some `constexpr` restrictions.
https://www.open-std.org/jtc1/sc22/wg21/docs/papers/2022/p2448r2.html

[P2738R1] David Ledger. 2023. `constexpr` cast from `void*`: towards `constexpr` type-erasure.
https://www.open-std.org/jtc1/sc22/wg21/docs/papers/2023/p2738r1.pdf