Ruby - Feature #5553

A method for Hash that works differently depending on whether a key exists

11/03/2011 03:41 AM - sawa (Tsuyoshi Sawada)

Status:	Rejected	
Priority:	Normal	
Assignee:		
Target version:		

Description

A method Hash#if key(key, [default], &pr) which works like the following will be often used, and is useful.

```
a = {morning: "0000", daytime: "00000", evening: "00000", nothing: nil}
a.if_key(:morning){|str| "#{str}00!"} #=> "000000!"
a.if_key(:nothing){|str| "#{str}00!"} #=> "00!"
a.if_key(:midnight){|str| "#{str}00!"} #=> nil
a.if_key(:nothing, "000"){|str| "#{str}00!"} #=> "000"
```

That is, when key' exists, then the corresponding value will be passed to pr'. Otherwise, the given `default' or the implicit default will be returned.

History

#1 - 11/03/2011 07:22 AM - alexeymuranov (Alexey Muranov)

In your example, the :nothing key exists, so shouldn't it be a.if_key(:nothing, " $\square \square \square$ "){|str| "#{str} $\square \square$!" } #=> " $\square \square$!" ?

Why would the code with this method be better than the following one:

if a.has key?(key)

block here

else

default value or another block here

end

or (a.has_key?(key)? simple operation: default)

This seems easier to read.

If you plan to always use it with the same block, maybe it should be made into a separate class with an appropriate method?

#2 - 11/03/2011 05:43 PM - sawa (Tsuyoshi Sawada)

The whole point of this suggestion is that I feel some redundancy to have to call the method fetch or [] on the hash after checking that the key exists using key?. With this proposed method, the method call fetch or [] is unnecessary, and you can just refer to a block variable.

#3 - 11/03/2011 07:48 PM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)

- Status changed from Open to Feedback

#4 - 11/03/2011 08:44 PM - alexeymuranov (Alexey Muranov)

I see. But then you may also want to pass a second procedure which is run if the key does not exist, and to have both the key and the value passed to the procedures, that is to introduce a method of the form #fetch_and_use(key, proc_if_key_found, proc_if_not). I am afraid that optimizing like this for all possible use cases may require introducing many new methods.

On the other hand, if you want to use a hash in this way with same procedures multiple times, then what about adding a method Hash#on found proc= analogous to Hash#default proc= to be able to do like this:

11/13/2025

Update 4/11/2011. If the goal is to simply avoid searching for the key twice, then there is Hash#assoc:

```
key_if_exists, value = h.assoc(key)
if key_if_exists.nil?
puts "Bad key"
else
puts "The value is #{value}"
end
```

However, if you use nil as a key, then this will not work. It is still possible to do

```
if pair = h.assoc(key)
puts "The value is #{pair[1]}"
else
puts "Bad key"
end
```

Or to introduce Hash#paranoiac_fetch :) :

```
key_exists, value = h.paranoiac_fetch(key)
if key_exists
puts "The value is #{value}"
else
puts "Bad key"
end
```

As to the original proposal, maybe defining some kind of a lazy Hash#map_values(&block) would be a better? (Or Hash#on_found_proc=(&block), that would behave identically.)

I saw #4890, but there it is exclusively about Enumerable.

#5 - 11/20/2012 08:58 PM - mame (Yusuke Endoh)

- Status changed from Feedback to Rejected

No feedback, looks hopeless to me. Closing.

Yusuke Endoh mame@tsg.ne.jp

11/13/2025 2/2