## Range for

## Chapter 2 Conditionally Safe Features

 $\oplus$ 

Using the ZipIterator, all three containers can be traversed using a single range-based for loop:

Each iteration, instead of yielding a single element, yields an std::tuple of elements resulting from the traversal of multiple ranges simultaneously. To be used, the elements must be unpacked from the std::tuple using std::get. Zip iterators become much more attractive in C++17 with the advent of structured bindings, which allow multiple loop variables to be declared at once, without the need to directly unpack the std::tuple. The implementation and usage of ZipRange above is just a rough sketch: The full design and implementation of zip iterators and zip ranges are beyond the scope of this section.

## Adapters are required for many tasks

In the usage examples above, we have seen a number of adapters, e.g., to traverse subranges, to traverse a container in reverse, to generate sequential values, and to iterate over multiple ranges at once. None of these adapters would be required for a classic **for** loop, which for a one-off situation might express the solution more simply. On the other hand, the adapters that we would create to make range-based **for** loops usable in more situations can lead to the development of a reusable *library* of adapters. Using the ValueGenerator class from Range generators, for example, produces simpler and more expressive code than using a classic **for** loop would.<sup>11</sup>

## No support for sentinel iterator types

For a given range expression, <u>range</u>, begin(<u>range</u>) and end(<u>range</u>) must return the same type to be usable with a range-based for loop. This limitation is problematic for ranges of indeterminate length, where the condition for ending a loop is not determined by comparing two iterators. For example, in the RandomIntSequence example (see *Use Cases* — *Range generators* on page 687), the end iterator for the infinite random sequence holds a null pointer and is never used, not even within **operator**!=. It would be more efficient and

 $\oplus$ 

 $<sup>^{11}</sup>$ The Standard's Ranges Library, introduced in C++20, provides a sophisticated **algebra** for working with and adapting ranges.