Annales UMCS Informatica AI 1 (2003) 49-59

Annales UMCS
Informatica
Lublin-Polonia
Sectio AI

http://www.annales.umcs.lublin.pl/

Two hierarchies of *R*-recursive functions

Jerzy Mycka*

Institute of Mathematics, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University,
Pl. M. Curie-Skłodowskiej 1, 20-031 Lublin, Poland

Abstract

In the paper some aspects of complexity of ***R***-recursive functions are considered. The limit hierarchy of ***R***-recursive functions is introduced by the analogy to the μ-hierarchy. Then its properties and relations to the μ-hierarchy are analysed.

1. Introduction

The classical theory of computation deals with the functions on enumerable (especially natural) domains. The fundamental notion in this field is the notion of a (partial) recursive function. The problem of hierarchies for these functions is also in the interest of mathematicians (for elementary, primitive recursive function, Grzegorczyk hierarchy, compare [1].

During past years many mathematicians have been interested in creating analogous models of computation on real numbers (see for example Grzegorczyk [2], Blum, Shub, Smale [3]). An interesting approach was given by Moore. In the work [4] he defined a set of functions on the reals ***R*** (called ***R***-recursive functions) in the analogous way to the classical recursive functions on the natural numbers ***N***. His model has a continuous time of computation (a continuous integration instead of a discrete recursion). The great importance in Moore's model has the zero-finding operation μ, which is used to construct μ-hierarchy of ***R***-recursive functions.

It was shown [5] that the zero-finding operator μ can be replaced by the operation of infinite limits. This allows us to define a limit hierarchy and relate it to μ-hierarchy.

* *E-mail address:* Jerzy.Mycka@umcs.lublin.pl

2. Preliminaries

We start with a fundamental definition of a class of real functions called ***R***-recursive functions [4].

Definition 2.1 *The set of **R**-recursive functions is generated from the constants 0,1 by the operations:*

1) *composition:* $h(\bar{x}) = f(g(\bar{x}))$;
2) *differential recursion:* $h(\bar{x},0) = f(\bar{x}), \partial_y h(\bar{x},y) = g(\bar{x},y,h(\bar{x},y))$ *(the equivalent formulation can be given by integrals:* $h(\bar{x},y) = f(\bar{x}) + \int_0^y g(\bar{x},y',h(\bar{x},y'))dy'$*);*
3) μ*-recursion* $h(\bar{x}) = \mu_y f(\bar{x},y) = \inf\{y : f(\bar{x},y) = 0\}$, *where infimum chooses the number **y** with the smallest absolute value and for two **y** with the same absolute value the negative one;*
4) *vector-valued functions can be defined by defining their components.*

Several comments are needed to the above definition. A solution of a differential equation need not be unique or can diverge. Hence, we assume that if h is defined by a differential recursion then h is defined only where a finite and unique solution exists. This is why the set of ***R***-recursive functions includes also partial functions. We use (after [4]) the name of ***R***-recursive functions in the article, however we should remember that in reality we have partiality here (partial ***R***-recursive functions).

The second problem arises with the operation of infimum. Let us observe that if an infinite number of zeros accumulates just above some positive *y* or just below some negative *y* then the infimum operation returns that *y* even if it itself is not a zero.

In the papers [5, 6] it was shown that if in the Moore's definition [4] μ-operation is replaced by infinite limits: $h(\bar{x}) = \liminf_{y\to\infty} g(\bar{x},y)$, $h(\bar{x}) = \limsup_{y\to\infty} g(\bar{x},y)$ then the resulting class of functions remains the same.

This gives us also the following result (including the limit operation in the form $h(\bar{x}) = \lim_{y\to\infty} g(\bar{x},y)$, which can be in the obvious way obtained from limsup, liminf:

Corollary 2.2 *The class of **R**-recursive functions is closed under the operations of infinite limits:* $h(\bar{x}) = \liminf_{y\to\infty} g(\bar{x}, y)$, $h(\bar{x}) = \limsup_{y\to\infty} g(\bar{x}, y)$, $h(\bar{x}) = \lim_{y\to\infty} g(\bar{x}, y)$.

3. Hierarchies

The operator m is a key operator in generating the ***R***-recursive functions. In a physical sense it has a property of being strongly uncomputable. This fact suggests creating a hierarchy, which is built with respect to the number of uses of m in the definition of a given *f*.

Definition 3.1 *([4]) For a given **R**-recursive expression* $s(\bar{x})$*, let* $M_{x_i}(s)$ *(the* m*-number with respect to* x_i*) be defined as follows:*

$$M_x(0) = M_x(1) = M_x(-1) = 0, \tag{1}$$

$$M_x(f(g_1, g_2, \ldots)) = \max_j \left(M_{x_j}(f) + M_x(g_j)\right), \tag{2}$$

$$M_x\left(h = f + \int_0^y g(\bar{x}, y', h)\,dy'\right) = \max\left(M_x(f), M_x(g), M_h(g)\right), \tag{3}$$

$$M_y\left(h = f + \int_0^y g(\bar{x}, y', h)\,dy'\right) = \max\left(M_{y'}(g), M_h(g)\right), \tag{4}$$

$$M_x\left(m_y f(\bar{x}, y)\right) = \max\left(M_x(f), M_y(f)\right) + 1, \tag{5}$$

where x *can be any* $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ *for* $\bar{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

For an ***R***-recursive function *f*, let $M(f) = \max_{x_i}(s)$ minimized over all expressions ***s*** that define *f*. Now we are ready to define M-hierarchy (m-hierachy) as a family of $M_j = \{f : M'(f) \le j\}$.

Let us construct the analogous definition of L-hierarchy by replacing in the above definition M_x by L_x and changing line (5) to the following form (5'):

$$L_x\left(\liminf_{y\to\infty} g(\bar{x}, y)\right) = L_x\left(\limsup_{y\to\infty} g(\bar{x}, y)\right) =$$

$$= L_x\left(\lim_{y\to\infty} g(\bar{x}, y)\right) = \max\left(L_x(f), L_y(f)\right) + 1.$$

For an ***R***-recursive function *f*, let $L(f) = \max_i L_{x_i}(s)$ minimized over all expressions ***s*** that define ***f*** without using the m-operation.

Definition 3.2 *The **L**-hierarchy is a family of* $L_j = \{ f : L(f) \le j \}$.

Let us add that in Definition 3.2 we use explicitly the operator $f(\bar{x}) = \lim_{y\to\infty} g(\bar{x}, y)$ to avoid its construction by other operators (lim sup, lim inf), which would efect in a superficially higher class of a complexity of a function *f*.

As an obvious corollary from definitions we have the following statement.

Lemma 3.3 *The classes* M_0 *and* M_1 *are identical.*

A function $f \in L_0 = M_0$ will be called (by an analogy to the case of natural recursive functions) a primitive ***R***-recursive function. After Moore [4] we can conclude that such functions as: $-x$, $x+y$, xy, x/y, e^x, $\ln x$, y^x, $\sin x$, $\cos x$ are primitive ***R***-recursive.

We can give a few results on some levels of the limit hierarchy.

Lemma 3.4. *The Kronecker d function, the signum function and absolute value belong to the first level (* L_1 *)of limit hierarchy.*

Proof. It is sufficient to take the following definitions [5]: hence $d(0) = 1$ and for all $x \ne 0$ we have $d(x) = 0$ let us define $d(x) = \liminf_{y\to\infty} \left(\frac{1}{1+x^2} \right)^y$. Now from the expression $\liminf_{y\to\infty} \arctan xy = \begin{cases} p/2, & \text{if } x > 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } x = 0, \\ -p/2, & \text{if } x < 0, \end{cases}$ we obtain $\operatorname{sgn}(x) = \frac{\liminf_{y\to\infty} \arctan xy}{2 \arctan 1}$ and $|x| = \operatorname{sgn}(x) x$.

We should be careful with definions of functions by cases:

Lemma 3.5 *For* $h(\bar{x}) = \begin{cases} g_1(\bar{x}), & \text{if } f(\bar{x}) = 0, \\ g_2(\bar{x}), & \text{if } f(\bar{x}) = 1, \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ g_k(\bar{x}), & \text{if } f(\bar{x}) \ge k-1 \end{cases}$ *and* $g_i \in L_{n_i}$ *for all* $1 \le i \le k$, $f \in L_m$ *the function* h *belongs to* $L_{\max(n_1,\dots n_k, m+1)}$

Proof. Let us see that $eq(x,y) = d(x-y) \in L_1$ and $ge(x,y) = \frac{(\operatorname{sgn}(x-y)+eq(x,y))}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \in L_1$. Then of course $h(\bar{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} g_i(\bar{x})\, eq(f(\bar{x}), i-1) + g_k(\bar{x})\, ge(f(\bar{x}), k-1)$.□

Of course this result can be easily extended to other forms of definitions by cases.

Lemma 3.6 *The function* $\Theta(x)$ *(equal to 1 if* $x \geq 0$*, otherwise 0), maximum* $\max(x,y)$*, square-wave function* ***s*** *are in* L_2*, the function* $p(x)$ *such that* $p(x)=1$ *for* $x \in [2n, 2n+1]$ *and* $p(x)=0$ *for* $x \in [2n+1, 2n+2]$ *is in* L_2 *and the floor function* $\lfloor x \rfloor$ *is in* L_3.

Proof. We give the proper definitions (from [6]) for these functions. Let

$$\Theta(x) = d(x - |x|),$$

$$\max(x,y) = xd(x-y) + (1 - d(x-y))[x\Theta(x-y) + y\Theta(y-x)],$$

$$s(x) = \Theta(\sin(p\,x)).$$

The function $p(x)$ can be given as $s(x)\left(1 - d\left(\sin\frac{(x-1)p}{2}\right)\right)$, so $p \in L_2$.

The floor function we can define by the auxiliary function $w(0)=0$, $\partial_x w(x) = 2\Theta(-\sin(2p\,x))$ as

$$\lfloor x \rfloor = \begin{cases} 2w(x/2) & \text{if } p(x)=1, \\ 2w((x-1)/2) & \text{if } p(x)=0. \end{cases}$$

From the above equation we have $\lfloor x \rfloor$ in L_3.□

Let us recall that if $f: R^n \to R$ is an ***R***-recursive function then the function $f_{iter}(i, \bar{x})$ is ***R***-recursive, too.

Lemma 3.7 *Let* $f: R^n \to R$ *belongs to the class* L_i*, then we have* $f_{iter}: R^{n+1} \to R$ *is in* $L_{\max(2,j)}$.

Proof. The definitions, which were given by Moore [3] $f_{iter}(i, \bar{x}) = h(2i)$, where

$$h(0) = g(0) = \bar{x},$$

$$\partial_t g(t) = \left[f(h(t)) - h(t) \right] s(t),$$
$$\partial_t h(t) = \geq \left[\frac{g(t) - h(t)}{r(t)} \right] (1 - s(t)),$$

with s - a square wave function in L_2 and $r(0) = 0$, $\partial_t r(t) = 2s(t) - 1$, $r, s \in L_2$ give us the desirable statement. □

Lemma 3.8 *The* $\boldsymbol{R}^l$*-recursive functions* $g_2 : R^2 \to R$, $g_2^1, g_2^2 : R \to R$ *such that* $(\forall x, y \in R) g_2^1(g_2(x, y)) = x$, $(\forall x, y \in R) g_2^2(g_2(x, y)) = y$, *have the following properties:* g_2, g_2^1 *are in* L_{10}, g_2^2 *is in* L_{14}.

Proof. We have the auxiliary functions Γ_2, Γ_2^1, Γ_2^2, which are coding and decoding functions in the interval $(0,1) : \Gamma_2(x, y) = c(x) + c(y)/10$, where

$$c(x) = \lim_{i \to \infty} z(a(i, x)) / 10^{2i} + b(i, x) / 10^i ,$$

and later $z(x) = \lim_{i \to \infty} z'_{iter}(i, x)$,

$$z'_{iter}(i, a_1 \ldots a_n . a_{n+1} \ldots) = a_1 \ldots a_n 0 \ldots a_{n+1} 0 . a_{n+i+1} \ldots ,$$
$$a(i, 0.a_1 a_2 \ldots a_i \ldots) = 0.a_1 \ldots a_i$$
$$b(i, 0.a_1 a_2 \ldots a_i \ldots) = 0.\underbrace{0}_{i} 0 a_{i+1} \ldots ,$$

$(z'(x) = \begin{cases} 100\lfloor x \rfloor + 10(x - \lfloor x \rfloor), & \text{if } \lfloor x \rfloor \neq x, \\ x, & \text{if } \lfloor x \rfloor = x; \end{cases} \in L_4, a, b \in L_4$. Also z'_{iter} belongs to L_4, hence $\Gamma_2(x, y) \in L_{10}$, decoding of the first element is described in the symmetric way so $\Gamma_2^1(x)$ is in L_{10}, but $\Gamma_2^2(x) = \Gamma_2^1(10 - \lfloor 10x \rfloor)$ so $\Gamma_2^2 \in L_{14}$.

The functions Γ_2, Γ_2^1, Γ_2^2 can be extended to all reals by one-to-one $f : (0,1) \to R \in L_0$ without the loss of their class. □

The same method of coding and decoding by interlacing of ciphers (only the power of 10 should be changed) gives us the functions $g_n : R^n \to R$ and $g_n^i : R \to R$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ such that

$$(\forall i)(\forall x_1 \ldots, x_n \in R) g_n^i(g_n(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) = x_i$$

in the same class: $g_n, g_n^1 \in L_{10}$ and $(\forall i > 1) g_n^i \in L_{14}$.

We finish this part with the important form of defining: a new function is given as a product of values $\boldsymbol{f}$ in some integer points.

Lemma 3.9 *There exists such constant $p \in N$ that for the function*

$$\prod_{z=0}^{y} f(\overline{x}, z) = \begin{cases} f(\overline{x},0) f(\overline{x},1) \dots f(\overline{x}, \lfloor y-1 \rfloor), & \text{if } y \geq 1, \\ 1, & \text{if } 0 \leq y < 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } y < 0, \end{cases}$$

if the function f is in the class L_m then $\prod_{z=0}^{y} f(\overline{x}, z)$ is in the class L_{m+p} (p is independent of m).

Proof. By the definitions

$$t(w) = g_{n+2}\left(g_{n+2}^{1,n}(w), g_{n+2}^{n+1}(w) + 1, f\left(g_{n+2}^{1,n}(w), g_{n+2}^{n+1}(w)\right) \cdot g_{n+2}^{n+2}(w)\right)$$

and

$$S(\overline{x}, z) = \underbrace{t(\dots t}_{\lfloor z \rfloor}(s(\overline{x},0))\dots) = t_{iter}\left(\lfloor z \rfloor, g_{n+2}(\overline{x},0,1)\right)$$

we get the property

$$\prod_{y=0}^{z} f(\overline{x}, y) = g_{n+2}^{n+2}\left(S(\overline{x}, z)\right).$$

From the defintion of the limit hierarchy we get $\prod_{y=0}^{z} f(\overline{x}, y) \in L_{m+38}$.□

In the rest of the paper we will use the constant *p* as the number of limits used in the recursive defintion of the product $\prod_{y=0}^{z} f(\overline{x}, y)$ instead of the value 38. The above constructions are tedious and can be improved with a better approximation of *p*.

4. Main results

Now we are ready to formulate two theorems which demonstrate connections between L-hierarchy and M-hierarchy.

Theorem 4.1 *Let $f : R^n \to R$ be an* ***R****-recursive function. Then if $f \in L_i$ then $f \in M_{10i}$.*

Proof. We use a simple induction here. The case $i = 0$ is given in Lemma 3.3. Now let us suppose that the thesis is true for $i = n$. Let $f \in L_{n+1}$ be defined as $f(\overline{x}) = \lim_{y \to \infty} g(\overline{x}, y)$ for $g \in L_n$. Then we can recall Theorem 4.2 from [6] which gives us the following result: to define ***f*** from *g* it is necessary to use at most 10 m-operation. Hence for $g \in M_{10n}$ the function $\boldsymbol{f}$ satisfies $f \in M_{10n+10}$. Similar inferences hold for $\liminf$, $\limsup$. □

Now we can give the result about the 'limit complexity' of the infimum operator m.

Lemma 4.2 *If* $f(\bar{x},y): R^{n+1} \to R$ *is in the class* L_m *then the function* $g: R^n \to R$, $g(\bar{x}) = m_y f(\bar{x},y)$ *is in the class* L_{m+3p+9} *is from Lemma 3.9.*

Proof. Here we must employ the results from [6]. There we defined the function $g: R^n \to R$, $g(\bar{x}) = m_y f(\bar{x},y)$ for $f(\bar{x},y): R^{n+1} \to R$ (*f* - ***R***-recursive) replacing the m-operator by limit operation. First we introduced the function

$$Z^f(\bar{x},z) = \begin{cases} \inf_y\left\{f : K^f(\bar{x},y) = 0\right\}, & \text{if } z = 0 \text{ and } \exists y K^f(\bar{x},y) = 0, \\ \text{undefined} & \text{if } z = 0 \text{ and } \forall y K^f(\bar{x},y) \neq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } z \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

given in the following way:

$$Z^f(\bar{x},z) = \begin{cases} \text{undefined} & \text{if } (z=0) \wedge \left(S^f(\bar{x}) < 1/12\right), \\ \sqrt{S^f(\bar{x}) - 1/12}, & \text{if } (z=0) \wedge \left(S^f(\bar{x}) \geq 1/12\right) \\ & \wedge f\left(\bar{x}, \sqrt{S^f(\bar{x}) - 1/12}\right) = 0, \\ -\sqrt{S^f(\bar{x}) - 1/12}, & \text{if } (z=0) \wedge \left(S^f(\bar{x}) \geq 1/12\right) \\ & \wedge f\left(\bar{x}, -\sqrt{S^f(\bar{x}) - 1/12}\right) = 0, \\ 1, & \text{if } z \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

where $S^f(\bar{x}) = \lim_{t\to\infty} S_1^f(\bar{x},t) + \lim_{t\to\infty} S_2^f(\bar{x},t)$. Both functions S_1^f, S_2^f are defined by an integration

$$S_i^f(\bar{x},t) = \int y^2\left(1 - h^f\left(\bar{x}, (-1)^{i+1} y - 1/2, (-1)^{i+1} y + 1/2\right)\right) dy, \; i = 1,2$$

from $h^f(\bar{x},a,b) = \liminf_{t\to\infty} \prod_{w=0}^{z+1} K^f\left(\bar{x}, a + w\dfrac{b-a}{z}\right)$ where K^f is the characteristic function of *f*.

Hence we can conclude that if K^f is in the L_s then Z_f is in the class L_{s+p+3}. Let us finish with the definition of the characteristic function of the infimum of zeros of *f* (see Theorem 4.2 from [5]

$$K_m^f(y) = 1 - \lim_{a\to-\infty}\lim_{b\to\infty}\lim_{z\to\infty} G^f(\bar{x}, z, a, b, y),$$

where $G^f(\bar{x}, z, a, b, y)$ divides the interval $[a, b]$ into $2^{\lfloor z\rfloor}$ equal subintervals and gives the value 1 for y from the subintervals, which contains the least zero of f in $[a, b]$ and value 0 otherwise. Precisely for y from $\left[a, a + \frac{b-a}{2^{\lfloor z\rfloor}}\right]$

$$G^f(\bar{x}, z, a, b, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } h^f\left(\bar{x}, a, a + \frac{b-a}{2^{\lfloor z\rfloor}}\right) = 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $y \in \left(a + \frac{(k-1)(b-a)}{2^{\lfloor z\rfloor}}, a + \frac{k(b-a)}{2^{\lfloor z\rfloor}}\right)$ (where $k = 2, 3, \ldots, 2^n$) we have:

$$G^f(\bar{x}, z, a, b, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} h^f\left(\bar{x}, a + \frac{(i-1)(b-a)}{2^{\lfloor z\rfloor}}, a + \frac{i(b-a)}{2^{\lfloor z\rfloor}}\right) \neq 0 \\ & \wedge h^f\left(\bar{x}, a + \frac{(k-1)(b-a)}{2^{\lfloor z\rfloor}}, a + \frac{k(b-a)}{2^{\lfloor z\rfloor}}\right) = 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and for $Y \notin [A, B]$ the function g_x^f is equal to 2.

The definition of G_f is given by the cases with respect to the value of the expression given by $\prod h^f$, since for $f \in L_m$, the function $h_f \in L_{m+p+2}$ and $G^f \in L_{m+2p+3}$. Then we have $K_m^f \in L_{m+2p+6}$. Now we must use the function K_m^f in the same way as K^f which gives us Z_f in the class L_{m+3p+9}. The final definition of $g(\bar{x}) = m_y f(\bar{x}, y)$ ([5] Theorem 4.3) given below

$$g(\bar{x})=\begin{cases} Z^{f^+}(\bar{x},0)-Z^{f^-}(\bar{x},0), & \text{if } S^{f^+}(\bar{x})<\frac{1}{12}\wedge S^{f^-}(\bar{x})<\frac{1}{12}, \\ Z^{f^+}(\bar{x},0), & \text{if } \left(S^{f^+}(\bar{x})\geq\frac{1}{12}\wedge S^{f^-}(\bar{x})<\frac{1}{12}\right) \\ & \text{or} \\ & \left(S^{f^+}(\bar{x})<\frac{1}{12}\wedge S^{f^-}(\bar{x})<\frac{1}{12}\right. \\ & \left.\wedge Z^{f^+}(\bar{x},0)<Z^{f^-}(\bar{x},0)\right), \\ -Z^{f^-}(\bar{x},0), & \text{if } \left(S^{f^+}(\bar{x})<\frac{1}{12}\wedge S^{f^-}(\bar{x})\geq\frac{1}{12}\right) \\ & \text{or} \\ & \left(S^{f^+}(\bar{x})<\frac{1}{12}\wedge S^{f^-}(\bar{x})<\frac{1}{12}\right. \\ & \left.\wedge Z^{f^+}(\bar{x},0)\geq Z^{f^-}(\bar{x},0)\right), \end{cases}$$

where $f^+(\bar{x},y)=\begin{cases} f(\bar{x},y), & y\geq 0, \\ 1, & y<0; \end{cases}$ $f^-(\bar{x},y)=\begin{cases} f(\bar{x},-y), & y>0, \\ 1, & y\leq 0; \end{cases}$ remains the class of g identical to the class of Z^f, i.e. $g\in L_{m+3p+9}$.□

Theorem 4.3 *Let* $f:R^n\to R$ *be an* ***R****-recursive function. Then for all* $i\geq 0$ *if* $f\in M_i$ *then* $f\in L_{(3p+9)i}$.

The above statement is a simple consequence of the fact $M_0=L_0$ and Lemma 4.2.

5. Conclusions

In the paper we give the first rough approximation of 'a complexity' of limit operations in the terms of the *m*-operator and conversely. The results, interpreted in the intuitional way, can suggest what kind of connection exists between infinite limits and a *m*-operator.

We also establish the proper relation between the levels of the limit hierarchy and *m*-hierarchy. Let us point out that in consequence we may investigate analogies which exist for the limit hierarchy (also *m*-hierarchy) and Baire classes

[7]. Also the kind of a connection between the $\sum_n^0 -$measurable functions and $\boldsymbol{R}$-recursive functions is an open problem.

Acknowledgments

I am especially grateful to Professor Jose Felix Costa for his valuable remarks, which were used in the proof of Lemma 3.6 (definitions of p,w).

References

[1] Odifreddi P., *Classical Recursion Theory*, North-Holland, (1989).
[2] Grzegorczyk A., *On the definition of computable real continuous functions*, Fund. Math. 44 (1957) 61.
[3] Blum L., Shub M., Smale S., *On a theory of computation and complexity over the real numbers: NP-completeness, recursive functions and universal machines*, Bull. Amer. Soc. 21 (1989) 1.
[4] Moore C., *Recursion theory on reals and continuous-time computation*, Th. Comp. Sc., 162 (1996) 23.
[5] Mycka J., *m-recursion and infinite limits*, Th. Comp. Sc., 302 (2003) 123.
[6] Mycka J., *Infinite limits and $\boldsymbol{R}$-recursive functions*, Acta Cybernetica, to appear.
[7] Moschovakis Y. N., *Descriptive Set Theory*, North-Holland, (1980).