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1. Introduction and Preliminaries

In what follows, $X$ denotes a real Hilbert space with an inner product $< , >$, and the symbol $\| \cdot \|$ denotes the norm in $X$. An operator $T : X \to X$ is called “$\alpha$-expansive” if there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\|Tx - Ty\| \geq \alpha \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in X$. The operator is called expansive if $\alpha = 1$. In 1974, Nirenberg [1] proposed a problem as to whether or not a continuous and expansive operator $T : X \to X$ is surjective if $R(T)^\perp \neq \emptyset$. I shall give a positive answer for the problem provided that $R(T)^\perp$ is unbounded. Clearly, $T$ cannot be surjective if $R(T)^\perp$ is bounded.

Remark 1. Recently, I published a paper in [2] planning to give a proof of the problem. A minor error was found after publication. The editors decided a retraction based on their belief that the error is profound and not fixable. However, the error was minor, not profound and fixable. I submitted a corrigendum about the published paper but the editors decided to retract it based on the error in the original paper. Thus, the present paper reuses contents from [2]. The differences between the current and the retracted papers are given below.

(i) In Theorem 7, it is assumed that $R(T)$ has unbounded interior which was not assumed in [2].

(ii) The sequences $p(n, m)$ and $q(n, m)$ used in Step 1 in [2] are not required (in the current paper) to show the $(S_\epsilon)$ property of the operator $S + \lambda I$. Instead, the $(S_\epsilon)$ property of $S + \lambda I$ is achieved based on Kirschbraun-Valentine [3, 4] extension theorem (c.f., $L^{10} - L^7$ on page 5 of the current paper). It is essential to mention that Valentine’s [4] result is a generalization of Kirschbraun [3] extension theorem.

Morel and Steinlein [5] constructed an example of such an operator $T$ defined from $\ell^1(N)$ into $\ell^1(N)$ satisfying the stated conditions but fails to be surjective. In a Hilbert space setting (i.e., if $H = \ell^2(N)$), Szczepanski [6] constructed a family of nonsurjective continuous maps $\{ F_\epsilon : H \to H \}_{\epsilon > 0}$ such that $R(F_\epsilon)$ contains $B_1(0)$ and $F_\epsilon$ is expansive on each sphere and $\|Fx - Fy\| \geq \|x - y\|$ for all $x, y \in P_\epsilon$, where $P_\epsilon = \{ x \in H : 1 < \|x\| < 1 + \epsilon \}$.
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Recently, Kartsatos [9, Theorem 6 (with \(\alpha = 1\) and \(c \in (0, 1)\)), and Xiang [10], Theorem 2.12 (with \(c \in (-\infty, a)\)), gave surjectivity results if the condition \(R(T) = \emptyset\) is replaced by strong monotonicity of \(T + aI\).

The following remarks on the recent result due to Ives and Preiss [11], are essential.

Remark 2. Ives and Preiss [11], Theorem 4, constructed an operator \(\mathcal{P} : X \rightarrow X\) (where \(X = L^2(0, \infty)\)) satisfying the following properties.

(i) \(\mathcal{P}x = x\) for all \(x \in B_1(0)\)

(ii) The \(\mathcal{P}\) image of \(\{x \in X : \|x\| \geq 1\}\) is nowhere dense in \(X\)

(iii) \(\mathcal{P}\) is not surjective.

We shall show that (i) and (ii) imply the boundedness of \(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{P})\). Indeed, let \(F = \mathcal{P}(X \setminus B_1(0))\). The continuity and expansiveness of \(\mathcal{P}\) and the closedness of \(X \setminus B_1(0)\) show that \(F\) is closed. Since \(F\) is nowhere dense, it follows that \(F^c = \emptyset\), i.e., \(F = \partial F\) and \(X \setminus F = X\). Let \(V = R(\mathcal{P})\). Then, for each \(x \in V\), there exists a sequence \(\{x_n\}\) in \(X \setminus F\) such that \(x_n \rightarrow x\) as \(n \rightarrow \infty\). Since \(V\) is nonempty and open containing \(x\) (\(V\) is a neighbourhood of \(x\)), there exists a positive integer \(N\) such that \(x_n \in V\) for all \(n \geq N\). In addition, we see that

\[
R(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{P}(B_1(0)) \cup \mathcal{P}(X \setminus B_1(0)) = B_1(0) \cup F,
\]

i.e., we have \(V = V \cap (B_1(0) \cup F) = B_1(0) \cup (F \cap V)\). Since \(x_n \in F\) for all \(n\) (i.e., \(x_n \in F \cap V\) for all \(n\)) and \(B_1(0)\) and \(F \cap V\) are disjoint, we conclude that \(x_n \in B_1(0)\) for all \(n \geq N\). This shows that \(x \in B_1(0)\), i.e., \(V \subseteq B_1(0)\). Thus, the set \(V\) is bounded, i.e., \(\mathcal{P}\) is not surjective.

Remark 3. Remark 2 shows that conditions (i) through (v) in Theorem 4 due to Ives and Preiss [11] imply that \(R(T)\) has a bounded interior, i.e., \(T\) is nonsurjective. It is essential to mention that the result in [11] did not give a negative answer for Nirenberg's problem if \(R(T)\) is unbounded. In addition, we point out that the case of boundedness of \(R(T)^*\) can be ignored from the statement of Nirenberg's problem.

The following definition is needed in the sequel.

Definition 4. Let \(Y\) be a real reflexive Banach space and \(Y^*\) be its dual space. Let \(G\) be a nonempty, bounded, and open subset of \(Y\) and \(S : \bar{G} \rightarrow Y^*\) be bounded on finite dimensional subsets of \(Y\). Then, \(S\) is said to be \(\ast\) of type \((S_n)\) if a sequence \(\{x_n\}\) in \(\bar{G}\) satisfies \(x_n \rightarrow x_0\) and \(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} S(x_n) = 0\); then, \(x_n \rightarrow x_0\) and \(S(x_n) \rightarrow S(x_0)\) as \(n \rightarrow \infty\).

Broder [12], Definition 5, introduced the following definition.

Definition 5. Let \(G\) be a nonempty, bounded, and open subset of a reflexive Banach space \(Y\). A family of operators \(\{S_t\}_{t \in [0, 1]}\), defined from \(G\) into \(Y^*\), is called a “homotopy of class \((S_t)\)” if for sequences \(\{x_n\}\) in \(\bar{G}\) and \(\{t_n\}\) in \([0, 1]\) such that \(x_n \rightarrow x_0\), \(t_n \rightarrow t_0\) and \(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (S^{t_n}x_n, x_n - x_0) \leq 0\), we have \(x_n \rightarrow x_0\) and \(S^{t_n}x_n \rightarrow S^{t_0}x_0\) as \(n \rightarrow \infty\).

The operator \(J : Y \rightarrow 2^{Y^*}\) defined by

\[
J(y) = \{y^* \in Y^* : (y^*, y) = \|y^*\|^2, y = \|y\|\},
\]

is called the normalized dual mapping. It is well-known that \(J\) is single-valued, bounded, monotone, bicontractive, surjective, and of type \((S_t)\) if \(Y\) and \(Y^*\) are locally uniformly convex and real reflexive Banach spaces.

Theorem 7 gives a proof of the Nirenberg problem.

Lemma 6. Let \(G\) be a nonempty, bounded, and open subset of a real reflexive Banach space \(Y\). Let \(f^* \in Y^*\). Then, the following basic properties hold.

(i) Normalization. \(d(J, G, 0) = 1\) if \(0 \in G\) and \(d(J, G, 0) = 0\) if \(0 \notin G\).

(ii) Existence. Let \(S : \bar{G} \rightarrow Y^*\) be a bounded operator of type \((S_t)\) such that \(f^* \in S(\partial G)\) and \(d(S, G, f^*) \neq 0\). Then, \(f^* \in S(G)\).

(iii) Homotopy Invariance. Let \(\{S_t\}_{t \in [0, 1]}\) be a homotopy of class \((S_t)\) defined from \(G\) into \(Y^*\) such that \(f^* \in S_t(\partial G)\) for all \(t \in [0, 1]\). Then, \(d(S_t, G, f^*)\) is independent of \(t \in [0, 1]\).

(iv) Invariance under Affine Homotopy. Let \(S_t : \bar{G} \rightarrow Y^*\) \((i = 1, 2)\) be a bounded operator of type \((S_t)\) and \(K^t = T_0 + (1 - t)S_2\) for \(t \in [0, 1]\). Then, \(\{K_t\}_{t \in [0, 1]}\) is a homotopy of class \((S_t)\), and \(d(K_t, G, f^*)\) is independent of \(t \in [0, 1]\) provided that \(\ast \in K^t(\partial G)\) for all \(t \in [0, 1]\).

2. Main Result

Theorem 7. Let \(X\) be a real Hilbert space and \(T : X \rightarrow X\) be a continuous and \(\alpha\)-expansive operator such that \(R(T)^*\) is unbounded. Then, \(T\) is surjective.

Proof. Choose \(x_0 \in R(T)^*\). Then, there exists \(r > 0\) such that \(B_r(x_0) \subseteq R(T)\). Let \(T \bar{x} = T \bar{x} - x_0\). Then, the operator \(\bar{T} : X \rightarrow X\) is \(\alpha\)-expansive and continuous such that \(R(T)^* - x_0 = R(T)\). It follows that \(R(T)^*\) is unbounded if and only if \(R(\bar{T})^*\) is unbounded. Clearly, the set \(V = B_r(x_0) - x_0\) is open and \(0 \in V \subseteq R(\bar{T})\), i.e., \(0 \in R(\bar{T})^*\). In addition, we see that \(T\) is surjective if and only if \(\bar{T}\) is surjective. Thus, we assume without loss of generality that \(0 \in R(T)^*\). Let \(U = R(T)^*\) and \(f \in X\). The continuity \(\alpha\)-expansive conditions imply
that $R(T)$ is closed and
\[
\|T^{-1}x - T^{-1}y\| \leq \alpha^{-1}\|x - y\|,
\]
for all $x \in R(T)$ and $y \in R(T)$. Then, it follows that
\[
(\langle T^{-1}x + \alpha^{-1}x, x-y \rangle - \langle T^{-1}y + \alpha^{-1}y, y-x \rangle)
\]
\[
= \langle T^{-1}x - T^{-1}y, x-y \rangle + \alpha^{-1}\|x-y\|^2
\]
\[
\geq -\|T^{-1}x - T^{-1}y\|\|x-y\| + \alpha^{-1}\|x-y\|^2
\]
\[
\geq -\alpha^{-1}\|x-y\|^2 + \alpha^{-1}\|x-y\|^2
\]
\[
= 0,
\]
for all $x \in R(T)$ and $y \in R(T)$, i.e., $T^{-1} + \alpha^{-1}I: R(T) \rightarrow X$ is a continuous and monotone operator. It holds that $U \subseteq R(T)$ because $R(T)$ is closed and $U \subseteq R(T)$. Let $S: U \rightarrow X$ be the restriction of $T^{-1} + \alpha^{-1}I$ on $U$. Let $\lambda > 0$, and for each $f \in X$ and $\mu \in (0, 1)$, let $f_{\mu} = \mu^{-1/2}f$. Let
\[
S_{\chi}x = Sx + \lambda (x - f_{\mu}), x \in U.
\]
The monotonicity of $S$ implies
\[
\langle S_{\mu}x - S_{\mu}y, x - y \rangle \geq \lambda\|x - y\|^2,
\]
for all $x \in U$ and $y \in U$. The monotonicity of $S$ and the condition $0 \in \partial U$ yield
\[
\langle S_{\mu}x, x \rangle = \langle Sx - S0 + S0 + \lambda (x - f_{\mu}), x \rangle
\]
\[
\geq \lambda\|x\|^2 - \left(\lambda\|f_{\mu}\| + \|S0\|\right)\|x\|,
\]
for all $x \in U$. Since $\partial U$ is unbounded, the right side of (7) approaches infinity as $\|x\| \rightarrow \infty$. Then, there exists $R = R(f_{\mu}) > 0$ such that
\[
\langle Sx + \lambda(x - f_{\mu}), x \rangle > 0,
\]
for all $x \in U \cap \partial B_R(0)$. Let $\Omega = U \cap \partial B_R(0)$. We shall show that the operator $S + \lambda(I - f_{\mu}): \Omega \rightarrow X$ is of type $(S_\lambda)$. We shall apply Kirszbraun-Valentine [3, 4] extension theorem. Indeed, the Lipschitz operator $T^{-1}$ (with Lipschitz constant $\alpha^{-1}$) can be extended to an operator $P: X \rightarrow X$ with the same Lipschitz constant. Thus, the operator $\tilde{S} + \lambda(I - f_{\mu}): \Omega \rightarrow X$ is continuous and uniformly monotone, i.e., $\tilde{S}$ is of type $(S_\lambda)$. Let $\tilde{S}_\Omega$ be the restriction of $\tilde{S}$ on $\tilde{\Omega}$. We shall show that $\tilde{S}_\Omega$ is of type $(S_\lambda)$. Indeed, let $x_n \in \tilde{\Omega}$ for all $n$ such that $x_n \rightarrow x_0 \in X$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then
\[
\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \tilde{S}x_n - x_0, x_n - x_0 \rangle \leq 0.
\]
It is enough to show that $x_n \rightarrow x_0 \in \Omega$. Since $\tilde{S} = \tilde{S}_\Omega$ on $\tilde{\Omega}$, it follows that
\[
\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \tilde{S}x_n - x_n, x_n - x_0 \rangle \leq 0.
\]
The uniform monotonicity of $\tilde{S}$ with domain $X$ (i.e., using (5), (6) and $\tilde{S} = \tilde{S}_1$ on $\tilde{\Omega}$) shows that
\[
\langle \tilde{S}x_n - \tilde{S}x_0 + \tilde{S}x_0, x_n - x_0 \rangle = \langle \tilde{S}x_n - \tilde{S}x_0, x_n - x_0 \rangle
\]
\[
+ \langle \tilde{S}x_0, x_n - x_0 \rangle
\]
\[
\geq \lambda\|x_n - x_0\|^2 + \langle \tilde{S}x_0, x_n - x_0 \rangle,
\]
for all $n$. Thus, (9)–(11) yield
\[
\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \lambda\|x_n - x_0\|^2 + \langle \tilde{S}x_0, x_n - x_0 \rangle \rangle \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \langle \tilde{S}x_n, x_n - x_0 \rangle \leq 0.
\]
Since $\langle \tilde{S}x_0, x_n - x_0 \rangle \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (because $x_n \rightarrow 0$), (12) shows that
\[
\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda\|x_n - x_0\|^2 \leq 0,
\]
i.e., $x_n \rightarrow x_0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Clearly $x_0 \in \Omega$ because $x_n \in \Omega$ for all $n$. The continuity of $\tilde{S}_\Omega$ implies that $\tilde{S}x_n \rightarrow \tilde{S}x_0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, the operator $\tilde{S}_\Omega = S + \lambda(I - f_{\mu}): \Omega \rightarrow X$ is bounded, continuous, and of type $(S_\lambda)$. Clearly, the identity operator $I: \Omega \rightarrow X$ is bounded and of type $(S_\lambda)$. For each $\lambda > 0$, let $H_\lambda: [0, 1] \times \Omega \rightarrow X$ be given by
\[
H_\lambda(t, x) = t(\lambda x + \lambda x - \lambda f_{\mu}) + (1-t)x, (t, x) \in [0, 1] \times \Omega.
\]
Then, (iv) of Lemma 6 shows that the family $\{H_\lambda(t_x)\}_{t \in [0, 1]}$ is an affine homotopy of class $(S_\lambda)$. Clearly, $0 \neq H_\lambda(0, x)$ for all $x \in \partial \Omega$. Thus, exactly one of the following holds:

(i) There exists $\lambda > 0$ such that for each $\lambda' \geq \lambda$, there exist $\mu^* \in (0, 1)$ and $x_{\lambda'} \in \partial \Omega$ such that $H_{\lambda'}(t_{\lambda'}, x_{\lambda'}) = 0$ for all $\lambda' \geq \lambda'$

(ii) For each $\lambda > 0$ there exists $\lambda' \geq \lambda$ such that
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\[ H_{\lambda'}(t, x) \neq 0 \text{ for all } (t, x) \in [0, 1] \times \partial \Omega \text{ and some } \lambda' \geq \lambda'. \]

Suppose (i) holds, i.e., there exists \( n > 0 \) such that for each \( n' \geq n \), this corresponds \( t_n' \in [0, 1] \), \( x_n' \in \partial \Omega \subseteq \Omega \subseteq U \subseteq R(T) \), and \( y_{n'} \in X \) such that \( x_n' = T y_{n'} \) and \( H_{\lambda'}(t_n', x_n') = 0 \) for all \( n'' \geq n', \) i.e., for each \( n' \geq n \), we have

\[ t_n'(y_{n'} + \alpha^{-1} Ty_{n'} + n'' Ty_{n'} - n'' f_{\mu}) + (1 - t_n') Ty_{n'} = 0, \]

for all \( n'' \geq n' \). Replacing \( n \) by \( n_0 \), \( n' \) by \( n \), and \( n'' \) by \( n' \) in (16), for each \( n \geq n_0 \), we get

\[ t_n(y_n + \alpha^{-1} Ty_n + n Ty_n - n f_{\mu}) + (1 - t_n) Ty_n = 0, \]

for all \( n' \geq n \). Next we choose a sequence of natural numbers \( \{N_n\} \) such that \( t_n \in (1/N_n, 1] \) for all \( n \). Clearly, \( \lambda_n > n \) and \( t_n \in (1/N_n, 1] \) for all \( n \) (i.e., \( t_n \lambda_n > 1 \) for all \( n \)). Since \( \lambda_n > n \) for all \( n \), (17) implies

\[ t_n(y_n + \alpha^{-1} Ty_n + \lambda_n Ty_n - \lambda_n f_{\mu}) + (1 - t_n) Ty_n = 0, \]

for all \( n \). Clearly, \( t_n \neq 0 \) for all \( n \). Dividing (18) by \( t_n \) for all \( n \), we arrive at

\[ y_n^{-1} y_n + Ty_n = \lambda_n y_n^{-1} f_{\mu}, \]

for all \( n \), where \( y_n = \alpha^{-1} + \lambda_n + (1 - t_n) t_n \). The boundedness of \( \{x_n\} \) and \( T^{-1} \) shows that \( \{y_n\} \) is bounded. Assume without loss of generality that \( t_n \longrightarrow t_0 \in [0, 1] \) as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \). Suppose \( t_0 = 0 \). The sequence \( \{t_n \lambda_n\} \) cannot converge to 0 because \( t_n \lambda_n > 1 \) for all \( n \). Then, we consider either \( \{t_n \lambda_n\} \) is unbounded or bounded. Suppose \( \{t_n \lambda_n\} \) is unbounded, i.e., there exists a subsequence of \( \{t_n \lambda_n\} \), denoted by \( \{t_n \lambda_n\}_n \), such that \( t_n \lambda_n \longrightarrow \infty \) as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \). Since \( t_0 = 0 \), \( \{y_n\} \) and \( \{Ty_n\} \) are bounded, letting \( n \longrightarrow \infty \) in (18) implies

\[ t_n \lambda_n Ty_n - t_n \lambda_n f_{\mu} + Ty_n \longrightarrow 0, \]

as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \), i.e., \( c_n Ty_n \longrightarrow f_{\mu} \) as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \), where \( c_n = 1 + t_n \lambda_n / t_n \lambda_n \) for all \( n \). Since \( c_n \longrightarrow 1^+ \) as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \) and \( \{Ty_n\} \) is bounded, we conclude that \( x_n = Ty_n \longrightarrow f_{\mu} \in R(T) = R(T) \) as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \). Letting \( \mu \longrightarrow 1^+ \) gives \( f \in R(T) \).

Next we assume that \( \{t_n \lambda_n\} \) is bounded. Assume without loss of generality that there exists a subsequence, denoted again by \( \{t_n \lambda_n\}_n \), such that \( t_n \lambda_n \longrightarrow a \in [1, \infty) \) as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \). Then, \( c_n \longrightarrow (a + 1)a^{-1} \) and

\[ x_n = Ty_n \longrightarrow a(a + 1)^{-1} f_{\mu} \in R(T) = R(T), \]

as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \). Since \( d = a(a + 1)^{-1} \in (0, 1) \), letting \( \mu \longrightarrow d \) gives \( f \in R(T) \).

Next we consider the case \( t_0 \in (0, 1], \) Then, we have \( \mu_n = \alpha^{-1} + (1 - t_n) t_n \longrightarrow \mu_0 = \alpha^{-1} + (1 - t_0) t_0 \in \mathbb{R} \) and

\[ \lambda_n y_n^{-1} = \frac{\lambda_n}{\alpha^{-1} + \lambda_n + (1 - t_n) t_n}, \]

\[ \mu_n + N_n + (n - 1) \]

\[ = \frac{1}{1 + \xi_n \mu_n}, \]

for all \( n \), where \( \xi_n = (N_n + (n - 1))^{-1} \). Since \( \xi_n \longrightarrow 0 \) as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \) and \( \mu_0 \in \mathbb{R} \), it follows that \( \lambda_n y_n^{-1} \longrightarrow 1 \) as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \). Letting \( n \longrightarrow \infty \) in (19) yields \( x_n = Ty_n \longrightarrow f_{\mu} \in R(T) = R(T) \). Letting \( \mu \longrightarrow 1^- \) shows that \( f \in R(T) \). In all cases, each \( f \in X \) satisfying (i) lies in \( R(T) \).

Suppose (ii) holds. Then, there exists a subsequence of \( \{n\} \), denoted again by \( \{n\} \), such that \( 0 \in H_n(t, \partial \Omega) \) for all \( t \in [0, 1] \) and \( n \). Then, (iv) of Lemma 6. shows that the family \( \{H_n(t)\}_{t \in [0, 1]} \) is a homotopy of class \( (S_n) \) defined from \( \Omega \) into \( X \) such that \( 0 \in H_n(t, \partial \Omega) \) for all \( t \in [0, 1] \) and \( n \). Let \( d \) stand for Browder degree mapping. Applying (iii) of Lemma 6., we conclude that \( d(H_n(t), \Omega, 0) \) is independent of \( t \in [0, 1] \), i.e., (i) and (iii) of Lemma 6. give

\[ d(S + nI - nf_{\mu}, \Omega, 0) = d(I, \Omega, 0) = 1 \]

for all \( n \). In addition, (ii) of Lemma 6. confirms that \( n f_{\mu} \in (S + nI)(\Omega) \) for all \( n \). Thus, for each positive integer \( n \), there exist \( x_n \in \Omega \) and \( y_n \in X \) such that \( x_n = Ty_n \) for all \( n \) and

\[ nf_{\mu} = S\lambda_n + n x_n - T^{-1} x_n + \alpha^{-1} x_n + nx_n \]

\[ = (n + \alpha^{-1}) Ty_n + y_n, \]

for all \( n \). Since \( \{x_n\} \) and \( T^{-1} \) are bounded, it follows that \( \{y_n\} \) is bounded. In addition, (24) gives

\[ x_n = Ty_n = nt_n f_{\mu} - t_n y_n \longrightarrow f_{\mu} \in \partial \Omega \subseteq U \subseteq R(T), \]

as \( n \longrightarrow \infty \) because \( t_n \longrightarrow 0 \) and \( nt_n \longrightarrow 1 \), where \( t_n = (n + \alpha^{-1})^{-1} \). Thus, letting \( \mu \longrightarrow 1^- \) shows that \( f \in R(T) \). Thus, each \( f \in X \) satisfying (i) or (ii) lies in \( R(T) \). This shows that \( T \) is surjective. The proof is completed.
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