Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 20 (1987) 267–273
North-Holland

A note on monotonicity of a Rosenbrock method

W.H. HUNDSDORFER
Centre for Mathematics and Computer Science, P.O. Box 4079, 1009 AB Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Received 17 March 1986
Revised 8 December 1986

Abstract: For a dissipative differential equation with stationary solution u^*, the difference between any solution $U(t)$ and u^* is nonincreasing with t. In this note we present necessary and sufficient conditions in order for a similar monotonicity property to hold for numerical approximations computed from a Rosenbrock method. Our results also provide global convergence results for some modifications of Newton's method.

Keywords: Stiff differential equations, monotonicity, Rosenbrock methods, nonlinear algebraic equations, modified Newton methods.

1. Introduction

Consider an initial value problem in $\mathbb{R}^m$

$$U'(t) = f(U(t)), \quad t \geqslant 0, \qquad U(0) = u_0 \tag{1.1a, b}$$

whose solution $U(t)$ tends to a stationary solution $u^* \in \mathbb{R}^m$. For the numerical solution of (1.1) we consider a well known Rosenbrock method

$$u_{n+1} = u_n + (I - h\theta f'(u_n))^{-1} hf(u_n) \tag{1.2}$$

where θ is a positive parameter, $h > 0$ is the stepsize and the vectors $u_n \in \mathbb{R}^m$ approximate $U(t_n)$, $t_n = nh$ $(n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots)$.

Assume the function f is dissipative with respect to an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathbb{R}^m$ (i.e., $\langle f(\tilde{u}) - f(u), \tilde{u} - u \rangle \leqslant 0$ for all $\tilde{u}, u \in \mathbb{R}^m$) and let $\| x \| = \langle x, x \rangle^{1/2}$ (for $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$). This assumption implies that the difference $\| \tilde{U}(t) - U(t) \|$ of any two solutions of the differential equation (1.1a) is nonincreasing with t. The corresponding property for the numerical approximations, $\| \tilde{u}_{n+1} - u_{n+1} \| \leqslant \| \tilde{u}_n - u_n \|$, only holds under additional, rather restrictive conditions on f (see e.g. [3]). In this note we look at the less exacting monotonicity property

$$\| u_{n+1} - u^* \| \leqslant \| u_n - u^* \|, \tag{1.3}$$

and we shall present conditions on f which are necessary and sufficient for (1.3) to hold with arbitrary stepsize h. Under somewhat stronger conditions on f the convergence of u_n to u^* can be guaranteed. These results are relevant to stiff ordinary differential equations and to partial

0377-0427/87/$3.50 © 1987, Elsevier Science Publishers B.V. (North-Holland)

differential equations (via the method of lines) since neither the Lipschitz constant of f nor the dimension m are involved.

The monotonicity property (1.3) is of particular interest if scheme (1.2) is regarded as a time marching procedure for finding stationary solutions. The scheme has been used for this purpose in [4] with $\theta = 1$ (and with an approximation to the Jacobian matrix $f'(u_n)$; cf. (2.1)). We note that in such a situation (1.2) can be considered as a modified Newton procedure for solving $f(u) = 0$. By introducing $\omega = 1/\theta$ and $\lambda = 1/h\theta$ we can rewrite (1.2) as

$$u_{n+1} = u_n - \omega\left(f'(u_n) - \lambda I\right)^{-1} f(u_n),$$

in which $\omega > 0$ can be viewed as a relaxation parameter and $\lambda > 0$ ensures that $f'(u_n) - \lambda I$ is nonsingular whenever f is dissipative (see [5; sect. 5.4, 7.1]).

2. Monotonicity for numerical approximations

Besides the Rosenbrock method (1.2) we also consider the more general linearly implicit scheme

$$u_{n+1} = u_n + \left(I - h\theta J(u_n)\right)^{-1} hf(u_n) \tag{2.1}$$

where $J(u_n)$ is an $m \times m$ matrix. Further we shall use the following notation. By $L(\mathbb{R}^m)$ we denote the space of linear operators on $\mathbb{R}^m$. If $\|\cdot\|$ is a norm on $\mathbb{R}^m$, the corresponding operator norm on $L(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is also denoted by $\|\cdot\|$, and $\mu[\cdot]$ will stand for the logarithmic norm (cf. [2]).

Consider for arbitrary ϵ and δ, with $0 \leqslant \epsilon < \infty$, $0 < \delta \leqslant \infty$, the following set of assumptions (2.2)–(2.6), which will be denoted by (A_1).

$$m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } \|\cdot\| \text{ is a norm on } \mathbb{R}^m \text{ generated by an inner product } \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle; \tag{2.2}$$

$$f\colon \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}^m,\ u^* \in \mathbb{R}^m \text{ is a zero of } f, \text{ and } J\colon \mathbb{R}^m \to L(\mathbb{R}^m); \tag{2.3}$$

$$\begin{cases} D = \{u\colon u \in \mathbb{R}^m,\ \|u - u^*\| < \delta\},\ f \text{ is continuously differentiable on } D \\ \text{and } J \text{ is continuous on } D; \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

$$\begin{cases} \text{for any } u \in D \text{ we have } \mu[f'(u)] \leqslant 0 \\ \text{and } J(u) \text{ does not have positive real eigenvalues;} \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

$$\begin{cases} \text{for all } u, v \in D \text{ there is an } E(u, v) \in L(\mathbb{R}^m) \text{ such that} \\ f'(v) = J(u)(I + E(u, v)),\ \|E(u, v)\| \leqslant \epsilon. \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

Further (A_2) will stand for these assumptions (2.2)–(2.6) together with

$$J(u) = f'(u) \quad \text{for all } u \in D. \tag{2.7}$$

In (2.4) continuously differentiable means that the matrix of partial derivatives $f'(u) = (\partial f_i(u)/\partial u_j)$ exists and depends continuously on u. The condition $\mu[f'(u)] \leqslant 0$ on D is equivalent to requiring that f is dissipative on D (see e.g. [5, sect. 5.4]). The condition in (2.6) states that the relative difference between $f'(v)$ and $J(u)$ is bounded by ϵ; in case $J(u)$ is regular it reads $\|J(u)^{-1}(f'(v) - J(u))\| \leqslant \epsilon$. Thus, in a relative sense, the variation of f' on D may not be too large and $J(u)$ has to approximate $f'(u)$ accurately enough.

In order to formulate our main results we define the real functions ψ_k $(k = 1,2)$ on the interval $[\frac{1}{2}, \infty)$ by

$$\psi_1(\theta) = \min\{2\theta - 1, 1\}, \tag{2.8}$$

$$\psi_2(\theta) = \min\left\{2\theta - 1, \sqrt{(2\theta - 1)/\theta}\right\}. \tag{2.9}$$

Theorem 2.1. *Let h and δ be positive, and k equal to* 1 *or* 2. *We have* $\| u_{n+1} - u^* \| \leqslant \| u_n - u^* \|$ *(whenever* $u_n \in D$ *and* (A_k) *is valid) iff* $\theta \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$ *and* $\epsilon \leqslant \psi_k(\theta)$.

This theorem is an extension of a result by M.N. Spijker and the present author [7; sect. 4]. The proof will be given in the next section. The restriction $\theta \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$ in this theorem is not surprising since the methods with $\theta < \frac{1}{2}$ are not A-stable. For $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ we see that the monotonicity property only holds for linear problems ($\epsilon = 0$).

Under slightly stronger conditions on f it can be shown that $\| u_{n+1} - u^* \| < \| u_n - u^* \|$ (for $u_n \in D$, $u_n \neq u^*$). This leads to the following result which will also be proved in Section 3.

Theorem 2.2. *Let h and δ be positive, and k equal to* 1 *or* 2. *Assume* $u_0 \in D$, $\theta \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$, $\epsilon \leqslant \psi_k(\theta)$ *and* (A_k). *Assume in addition that either* $\epsilon < \psi_k(\theta)$ *and* $J(u)$ *is regular (for all* $u \in D$*) or* $\mu[f'(u)] < 0$ *(for all* $u \in D$*). Then* u^* *is the unique zero of f in D and* $\lim_{n \to \infty} u_n = u^*$.

3. Proof of the monotonicity results

3.1. Preliminaries

In order to prove the theorems of Section 2 we first derive some technical results. Consider arbitrary A, $B \in L(\mathbb{R}^m)$ with $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and suppose $\| \cdot \|$ is a norm on $\mathbb{R}^m$ generated by an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. For any $C \in L(\mathbb{R}^m)$ we denote by C^* its adjoint with respect to this inner product ($\langle Cx, y \rangle = \langle x, C^*y \rangle$ for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^m$).

The relation $\| Bx \| \leqslant \gamma \| Ax \|$ (for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$), with $\gamma > 0$ given, implies the existence of a $C \in L(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that $B = CA$, $\| C \| \leqslant \gamma$; if A is regular we can take $C = BA^{-1}$ and for singular A the inverse A^{-1} can be replaced by the generalized inverse of A (see e.g. [1; ch. 8]). Since $\| C^* \| = \| C \|$ for any $C \in L(\mathbb{R}^m)$ one easily arrives at the following result.

Lemma 3.1. *Let* $\gamma > 0$. *We have* $\| B^*x \| \leqslant \gamma \| A^*x \|$ *(for all* $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$*) iff* $B = AC$ *for some* $C \in L(\mathbb{R}^m)$ *with* $\| C \| \leqslant \gamma$.

Consider the following statements, with $\theta \geqslant \frac{1}{2}$ and $\epsilon \geqslant 0$,

$$B = A(I + E_1) \quad \text{for some } E_1 \in L(\mathbb{R}^m) \quad \text{with } \| E_1 \| \leqslant \epsilon, \tag{3.1a}$$

$$A = B(I + E_2) \quad \text{for some } E_2 \in L(\mathbb{R}^m) \quad \text{with } \| E_2 \| \leqslant \epsilon, \tag{3.1b}$$

and

$$B = \theta A(I + F) \quad \text{for some } F \in L(\mathbb{R}^m) \quad \text{with } \| F \| \leqslant 1. \tag{3.2}$$

Lemma 3.2. (3.1a) *implies* (3.2) *iff* $\epsilon \leqslant \psi_1(\theta)$.

Proof. Assuming (3.1a) and $\epsilon \leqslant \psi_1(\theta)$ we set $F = \theta^{-1}[E_1 + (1-\theta)I]$, in which case $B = \theta A(I+F)$ and

$$\| F \| \leqslant \theta^{-1}(\epsilon + |1-\theta|) \leqslant \theta^{-1}(\psi_1(\theta) + |1-\theta|) = 1.$$

To construct a counterexample in case $\epsilon > \psi_1(\theta)$ we first consider the simple scalar (complex) example $A = a$, $B = b$ with $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$. The condition in (3.1a) corresponds to

$$|b-a| \leqslant \epsilon |a| \tag{3.3}$$

and (3.2) corresponds to

$$|b - \theta a| \leqslant \theta |a|. \tag{3.4}$$

By simple geometrical arguments it follows that for $\epsilon > \psi_1(\theta)$ there exist $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfying (3.3) but violating (3.4).

These considerations on $\mathbb{C}$ lead to a counterexample with $A = A_1$ and $B = B_1 \in L(\mathbb{R}^2)$,

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re } a & -\text{Im } a \\ \text{Im } a & \text{Re } a \end{pmatrix}, \qquad B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re } b & -\text{Im } b \\ \text{Im } b & \text{Re } b \end{pmatrix},$$

and with $\|\cdot\|$ the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^2$ (and the corresponding spectral norm on $L(\mathbb{R}^2)$). □

Lemma 3.3. (3.1a) *and* (3.1b) *together imply* (3.2) *iff* $\epsilon \leqslant \psi_2(\theta)$.

Proof. Assume (3.1a), (3.1b) and $\epsilon \leqslant \psi_2(\theta)$. To show that (3.2) holds it is, in view of Lemma 3.1, sufficient to consider the remaining case $1 < \epsilon^2 \leqslant (2\theta - 1)/\theta$. From Lemma 3.1 it follows that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$

$$\| B^*x \|^2 - 2\langle A^*x,\ B^*x \rangle + \| A^*x \|^2 \leqslant \epsilon^2 \| A^*x \|^2,$$

$$\| B^*x \|^2 - 2\langle A^*x,\ B^*x \rangle + \| A^*x \|^2 \leqslant \epsilon^2 \| B^*x \|^2.$$

Combining these inequalities we obtain

$$\langle A^*x,\ B^*x \rangle \geqslant \left(1 - \tfrac{1}{2}\epsilon^2\right) \| B^*x \|^2.$$

From our assumption on ϵ it follows that

$$\| B^*x \|^2 \leqslant 2\theta \langle A^*x,\ B^*x \rangle,$$

and hence

$$\| (B^* - \theta A^*)x \| \leqslant \theta \| A^*x \|.$$

Statement (3.2) now follows by again applying Lemma 3.1.

Now assume $\epsilon > \psi_2(\theta)$ and $\frac{1}{2} \leqslant \theta \leqslant 1$. Then we obtain a (scalar real) counterexample by taking $m = 1$, $A = -1$, $B = -1 - \epsilon$.

Finally assume $\epsilon > \psi_2(\theta)$ and $\theta > 1$. Let $\xi \in ((2\theta-1)/\theta, 2)$ such that $\xi < \epsilon^2$, and take $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ such that b/a equals $(1 - \frac{1}{2}\xi) + \mathrm{i}\sqrt{\xi(1 - \frac{1}{4}\xi)}$. Then $|b - a| \leqslant \epsilon |a|$ and $|b-a| \leqslant \epsilon |b|$ but $|b - \theta a| > \theta |a|$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.2 such $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ lead to $A_2, B_2 \in L(\mathbb{R}^2)$ such that for $A = A_2$, $B = B_2$ the statements (3.1a), (3.1b) hold whereas (3.2) is violated. □

We note that in the above counterexamples which prove the necessity of $\epsilon \leqslant \psi_k(\theta)$ we can choose the a, $b \in \mathbb{C}$ such that Re $a \leqslant 0$, Re $b \leqslant 0$. This leads to A_k, $B_k \in L(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfying $\mu[A_k] \leqslant 0$, $\mu[B_k] \leqslant 0$ (for $k = 1, 2$).

The following lemma is a slight generalization of results in [6] and [7; lemma 4.3].

Lemma 3.5. *Assume $I - \lambda\theta A$ is regular for all $\lambda > 0$. We have $\| I + (I - \lambda\theta A)^{-1}\lambda B \| \leqslant 1$ (for all $\lambda > 0$) iff $\mu[B] \leqslant 0$ and (3.2) holds.*

Proof. Let $C = B - \theta A$. Then $I + (I - \lambda\theta A)^{-1}\lambda B = (I - \lambda\theta A)^{-1}(I + \lambda C)$, and it follows that $\| I + (I - \lambda\theta A)^{-1}\lambda B \| \leqslant 1$ iff

$$\| (I + \lambda C^*)x \| \leqslant \| (I - \lambda\theta A^*)x \| \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

The latter inequality can be written as

$$2\lambda\langle B^*x, x\rangle + \lambda^2 \| C^*x \|^2 \leqslant \lambda^2 \| \theta A^*x \|^2 \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Clearly this holds for all $\lambda > 0$ iff

$$\langle Bx, x\rangle \leqslant 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \| C^*x \| \leqslant \| \theta A^*x \| \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Application of Lemma 3.1 completes the proof. □

3.2. The proof of Theorem 2.1

For $u \in D$ we define

$$\sigma(u) = \int_0^1 \| I + (I - h\theta J(u))^{-1} hf'(u^* + \tau(u - u^*)) \| \, d\tau. \tag{3.5}$$

Since for any $u_n \in D$

$$\| u_{n+1} - u^* \| = \left\| u_n - u^* + (I - h\theta J(u_n))^{-1} h(f(u_n) - f(u^*)) \right\|$$

it follows by the mean-value theorem that

$$\| u_{n+1} - u^* \| \leqslant \sigma(u_n) \| u_n - u^* \|. \tag{3.6}$$

Application of the Lemmas 3.2, 3.3 and 3.5 with $A = hJ(u_n)$ and $B = hf'(u^* + \tau(u_n - u^*))$ shows the sufficiency of $\epsilon \leqslant \psi_k(\theta)$ for having $\| u_{n+1} - u^* \| \leqslant \| u_n - u^* \|$ in case (A_k) holds, $k = 1, 2$. The necessity will be proved by some counterexamples.

A counterexample in case (A_1) holds, $\epsilon > \psi_1(\theta)$ is given by $hJ(u) = \lambda A_1$, $hf(u) = \lambda B_1 u$ (for $u \in \mathbb{R}^2$) with A_1, B_1 as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, $\lambda > 0$ and $\| \cdot \|$ the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^2$. With $u^* = 0$, $u_n \in \mathbb{R}^2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \| u_{n+1} - u^* \| &= \left\| \left(I + (I - \lambda\theta A_1)^{-1}\lambda B_1\right)(u_n - u^*) \right\| \\ &= \left\| I + (I - \lambda\theta A_1)^{-1}\lambda B_1 \right\| \| u_n - u^* \| > \| u_n - u^* \| \end{aligned}$$

provided $\lambda > 0$ is suitably chosen (see Lemma 3.5).

Next we give a scalar (real) example for $\epsilon > \psi_2(\theta)$, $\frac{1}{2} \leqslant \theta \leqslant 1$ in case (A_2) is valid. This counterexample is similar to one given by Sandberg and Shichman [6].

Take, for convenience, $h = 1$, $\delta > 1$ and $u^* = 0$, $u_0 = 1$. Let $\eta \in (2\theta - 1, \epsilon)$ and $f(u) = \lambda g(u)$ (for $u \in \mathbb{R}$) with $\lambda > 0$ and g: $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ a continuously differentiable function such that

$$g(0) = 0, \qquad g'(u) \in [-1-\epsilon, -1] \quad \text{for all } u \in \mathbb{R},$$
$$g(u) = -u + \eta \quad \text{for } u \leqslant -1, \qquad g(u) = -u - \eta \quad \text{for } u \geqslant 1.$$

Such an f meets the conditions imposed in (A_2). Further we have

$$u_1 = (1 + \lambda\theta)^{-1}(1 + \lambda(\theta - 1 - \eta))$$

and thus $|u_1 - u^*|$ tends to $\theta^{-1}(\eta + 1 - \theta) > 1 = |u_0 - u^*|$ for $\lambda \to \infty$.

Finally we assume $\epsilon > \psi_2(\theta)$, $\theta > 1$. For this we construct a complex, scalar counterexample, which can, as before, be converted to a real one by identifying $\mathbb{C}$ with $\mathbb{R}^2$ in the usual way. Suppose $(2\theta - 1)/\theta < \xi < \min\{2, \epsilon^2\}$ and let $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that Re $a < 0$, Re $b < 0$ and $b/a = (1 - \frac{1}{2}\xi) + i\sqrt{\xi(1 - \frac{1}{4}\xi)}$ (as in the proof of Lemma 3.3). Then $|b - a| < \epsilon|a|$, $|b - a| < \epsilon|b|$ but $|b - \theta a| > \theta|a|$, and thus for $\lambda > 0$ suitably chosen $|1 + (1 - \lambda\theta a)^{-1}\lambda b| > 1$ (see Lemma 3.5). We put $\alpha = \lambda a$ and $\beta = \lambda b$.

Let D be the unit disk in $\mathbb{C}$, $h = 1$, $u^* = 0$, and define

$$f(u) = \Phi(0)(\alpha - \beta) + \alpha u + \Phi(u)(\beta - \alpha),$$
$$\Phi(u) = -\frac{2k}{k+1}\left(\tfrac{1}{2} - \tfrac{1}{2}u\right)^{1+1/k}$$

for $u \in \mathbb{C}$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is to be specified later. Then $f(0) = 0$ and

$$f'(u) = \alpha + \phi(u)(\beta - \alpha), \qquad \phi(u) = \left(\tfrac{1}{2} - \tfrac{1}{2}u\right)^{1/k}.$$

The image of D under ϕ tends to the interval (0, 1) on the real axis if $k \to \infty$. By using this property it can be shown that, for k sufficiently large, the conditions on f in (A_2) are satisfied. Moreover, since $f'(1) = \alpha$ and $f(1)$ tends to β for $k \to \infty$,

$$|1 + (1 - \theta f'(1))^{-1} f(1)| > 1$$

provided k is sufficiently large. It follows that, for such k and u_0 close to 1,

$$|u_1 - u^*| > |u_0 - u^*|.$$

3.3. The proof of Theorem 2.2

First we show that under the assumptions of Theorem 2.2 the function σ, defined by (3.5), satisfies $\sigma(u) < 1$ (for all $u \in D$). Examination of the proof of Lemma 3.5 shows that for $A, B \in L(\mathbb{R}^m)$ satisfying (3.2) and $\mu[B] \leqslant 0$ we have

$$\| I + (I - \lambda\theta A)^{-1}\lambda B \| < 1 \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 0$$

provided we assume in addition either

$$\mu[B] < 0$$

or

$$A \text{ is regular and } B = \theta A(I + F), \quad \| F \| < 1.$$

Further it is easily seen, by regarding the proofs of Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3, that if A is regular and we have (3.1a) with $\epsilon < \psi_1(\theta)$ or (3.1a), (3.1b) with $\epsilon < \psi_2(\theta)$ then there is an $F \in L(\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that $B = \theta A(I+F)$, $\| F \| < 1$. By setting $A = hJ(u)$, $B = hf'(u^* + \tau(u - u^*))$ it follows that the assumptions of Theorem 2.2 imply $\sigma(u) < 1$ on D.

The function σ is continuous on D. Therefore we obtain for arbitrary $u_0 \in D$

$$\| u_n - u^* \| \leqslant s_0^n \| u_0 - u^* \|$$

with $s_0 = \max\{ \sigma(u): u \in D, \| u - u^* \| \leqslant \| u_0 - u^* \| \} < 1$. From this it is clear that u^* is the unique zero of f in D and that the u_n converge to u^* for $n \to \infty$.

Acknowledgement

The author is grateful to professor M.N. Spijker for the valuable and stimulating discussions on the topic of this paper.

References

[1] A. Ben-israel and T.N.E. Greville, *Generalized Inverses: Theory and Applications* (Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1974).

[2] K. Dekker and J.G. Verwer, *Stability of Runge–Kutta Methods for Stiff Nonlinear Differential Equations* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1984).

[3] W.H. Hundsdorfer, The numerical solution of nonlinear stiff initial value problems, CWI Tract 12, Centre for Math. and Comp. Sci., Amsterdam, 1984.

[4] B. van Leer and W.A. Mulder, Relaxation methods for hyperbolic equations, Report 84-20, Dept. of Math. and Informatics, Delft Univ. of Techn., Delft, 1984.

[5] J.M. Ortega and W.C. Rheinboldt, *Iterative Solution of Nonlinear Equations in Several Variables* (Academic Press, New York, 1970).

[6] I.W. Sandberg and H. Shichman, Numerical Integration of systems of stiff nonlinear initial value problems, *B.S.T.J.* **47** (1968) 511–527.

[7] M.N. Spijker, A note on monotonicity and contractivity in the numerical solution of stiff differential equations, Report 1985-25, Inst. of Appl. Math. and Comp. Sci., Univ. of Leiden, 1985.