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Abstract: We present optimal depth Boolean circuits (depth $O(\log n)$) for integer division, powering, and multiple products. We also show that these three problems are of equivalent uniform depth and space complexity. In addition, we describe an algorithm for testing divisibility that is optimal for both depth and space.

1. Introduction

It is a well known fact that addition, subtraction and multiplication on modern computers are significantly faster operations than division. Circuit designers have been unable to match the efficiency of the circuits for addition and multiplication in division circuits. Until recently there seemed to be some theoretical justification for this inability since the best known circuits for the first three problems have $O(\log n)$ depth but division appeared to have only $O(\log n)^2$ depth circuits.

Reif [Re83] reduced the division depth to $O(\log n (\log \log n)^2)$ using a circuit for computing the product of $n^{O(1)}$ $n$-bit integers $\mod 2^n+1$, based on Fourier interpolation and evaluation. This circuit had slightly more than polynomial size, but a revised version of the result [Re84] yields polynomial size and $O(\log n \log \log n)$ depth circuits for the same problem.

We present simple circuits of depth $O(\log n)$ and polynomial size, using Chinese remaindering, for the division of two $n$-bit integers and for the product of $n$ $n$-bit integers. Since the circuits we consider allow gates with fan-in at most two, our division and iterated product circuits are optimal in depth up to a constant factor.

Besides circuit depth complexity we are also interested in the deterministic space complexity of division. Borodin [Bo77] showed that if for all $n$ a problem can be solved for $n$ input bits by a circuit of depth $O(D(n))$ then it can be solved in space $O(D(n))$, provided the circuits are "log-space uniform" (i.e. some Turing machine, given any $n$ on its input tape, can generate a description of the circuit for $n$ inputs in $\log n$ space). Since Reif's circuits mentioned above are log-space uniform, it follows that integer division has space complexity $O(\log n \log \log n)$. Unfortunately our circuits for division may not quite be log-space uniform, and it remains an open question whether division has space complexity $\log n$. Motivated by this question, we prove a number of results. First we show that the three problems division, powering, and iterated product are each strongly reducible to either of the others. Thus all three have the same uniform depth complexity and the same space complexity. Next we give a simple sufficient condition (that some "good modulus sequence" $\{M_n\}$ be log-space generable) for the three problems to have space complexity $\log n$. Finally we show that the problem of testing whether an $n$-bit integer is divisible by another does indeed have uniform depth complexity $O(\log n)$ and hence space complexity $O(\log n)$.

2. Circuits and Uniformity

We adopt the usual definition of fan-in 2 Boolean circuit families in which the $n$-th circuit has $g(n)$ inputs and $h(n)$ outputs where $g$ and $h$ are non-decreasing polynomially bounded functions. With this definition depth $O(\log n)$ implies polynomial size. Using the notion of uniformity (see the Introduction) we can define a basic complexity class:

Definition [Ru81]: The class $NC^1$ consists of all functions $f$ computable by a log-space uniform circuit family of depth $O(\log n)$.

Thus every function in $NC^1$ has deterministic space complexity $O(\log n)$ [Bo77]. Using standard methods [Sa76] it is easy to see that multiplication of two $n$-bit integers and addition of $n$ $n$-bit integers are each in $NC^1$. It remains an open question whether division of two $n$-bit integers is in $NC^1$.

Although log-space uniformity is desirable for theoretical reasons, there is a weaker kind of uniformity which provides a natural condition on cir-
cuit families. The builder of computer hardware may simply want to have fast circuits which are easy to construct. Once a circuit has been con-
structed it will be used over and over again. We thus propose the following definition:

**Definition:** A family \( \langle a_n \rangle \) of circuits is \( P \)-uniform provided some deterministic Turing machine can compute the transformation \( I^n \to a_n \) in time \( n^O(1) \).

Some of our circuits require internal con-
stants which are polynomial-time computable but do not appear to be log-space computable, and thus are only \( P \)-uniform. However, even though they may not be log-space uniform they almost are, in that they can be generated in space \( O(\log n \log \log n) \).

A useful notion of reducibility for circuits is the following definition [Co83].

**Definition:** \( f \) is \( \text{NC}^1 \)-reducible to \( g \) if and only if there exists a log-space uniform circuit family \( \langle a_n \rangle \) which computes \( f \) with depth \( \text{depth}(a_n) = O(\log n) \) where, in addition to the usual nodes, oracle nodes for \( g \) are allowed.

An **oracle node** is a node which has some sequence \( y_1, \ldots, y_r \) of input edges and \( x_1, \ldots, x_s \) of output edges with associated function \( (x_1, \ldots, x_s) = g(y_1, \ldots, y_r) \).

For the purpose of defining depth, the oracle node counts as depth \( O(\log(r+s)) \).

An important consequence of this definition is that if \( f \) is \( \text{NC}^1 \)-reducible to \( g \) and \( g \) is computable by depth \( O(\log^k n) \) uniform circuits then \( f \) is also computable by depth \( O(\log^k n) \) uniform circuits. This applies whether "uniform" means "log-space uniform" or "\( P \)-uniform".

**3. Powering and Division are Equivalent**

Let \( x, y \) be \( n \)-bit positive integers. The DIVI-
SION problem is to compute the \( n \)-bit representation of \( x \)
\( [x] \). The POWERING problem is to compute
the \( n^2 \)-bit representation of \( x^i \) for \( i = 0, \ldots, n \). The following result is adapted from [Ho79].

**Theorem 3.1** DIVISION is \( \text{NC}^1 \)-reducible to POWER-
ING.

**Proof:** For integers \( x, y \), where \( 0 < x < 2^n \), \( 2 \leq y < 2^n \) we wish to compute \( [x/y] \). We first compute an under-approximation \( y^{-1} \) of \( y^{-1} \) with error \( < 2^{-n} \). Then we compute \( t = x \times y^{-1} \) which approximates \( x/y \) with error \( < 1 \), and determine which one of \( [t] \) or \( [t]+1 \) is \( [x/y] \).

Let \( u = 1 - y 2^{-j} \) where \( j \geq 2 \) is an integer such that \( 2^{j-1} \leq y < 2^j \). Thus \( |u| \leq \frac{1}{2} \). Consider the series
\[ y^{-1} = 2^{-j}(1 - u) = 2^{-j}(1 + u + u^2 + \ldots). \]
Set \( y^{-1} = 2^{-j}(1 + u + \ldots + u^{n-1}) \). Then
\[ y^{-1} - y^{-1} \leq 2^{-j} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 2^{-i} < 2^{-n}. \]

The circuit computes \( [x/y] \) using scaled arithmetic of \( n^2 \) bits of precision as follows:

1. Determine \( j \geq 2 \) such that \( 2^{j-1} \leq y < 2^j \) and compute \( u = 1 - y 2^{-j} \).
2. Evaluate \( u^i, i = 0, \ldots, n-1 \) using the \( n \)-bit powering circuit.
3. Compute \( y^{-1} = 2^{-j}(1 + u + \ldots + u^{n-1}) \)
4. Compute \( t = x y^{-1} \) and truncate to obtain \( [t] \).
5. Compute \( r = x - y[t] \) and determine whether \( [x/y] = [t] \) or \( [t] + 1 \).

All of these steps have depth \( O(\log n) \) except possibly the powering in step (2).

**Theorem 3.2** POWERING is \( \text{NC}^1 \)-reducible to DIVI-
SION.

**Proof:** Let \( x \) be an \( n \)-bit integer. We want to compute \( x^0, \ldots, x^n \). We use a similar identity to the one in the previous reduction but in reverse.

\[ \frac{2^{2n^2} + 2n^2}{2^{2n^2} - x} = \frac{2^{2n^2}}{1 - 2^{-2n^2} x} = \sum_{i=0}^{g_{2n^2}(n-1)} x^i \]

Note that \( \sum_{i=0}^{g_{2n^2}(n-1)} x^i = 2^{2n^2} x^{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^{2n^2} x^{2j} \) which is \( \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{2n^2} (2^{-n})^j < 1 \).

The circuit for computing \( x^0, \ldots, x^n \) will implement the following procedure:

1. Set \( u = 2^{2n^2} + 2n^2 \) and compute \( v = 2^{2n^2} - x \)
2. Evaluate \( y = \frac{u}{v} \) using the \( 2n^2 + 2n^2 \)-bit division circuit. From the above identity it follows that \( y = \sum_{i=0}^{g_{2n^2}(n-1)} x^i \).
3. Read off \( x^{n-1} \) as the bits in positions \( 2^n \cdot t \) to \( 2^n \cdot (t+1) - 1 \) from the right in \( y \).

All of these steps have depth \( O(\log n) \) except possibly the division in step (2). ■
4. Arithmetic Operations Modulo Small Integers

The results of this section are due to McKenzie and Cook [McCo84].

For $x$ and $m$ integers we write $x \mod m$ for the unique integer $y$ such that $y = x \mod m$ and $0 \leq y < m$.

**Lemma 4.1** For inputs $x$ of $n$ bits and $m \leq n$ the problems of computing $x \mod m$, $x^i \mod m$ or $x^{-1} \mod m$ (if an inverse exists) are all in NC$^1$.

**Proof:** Consider the mod computation first. In space $O(\log n)$ for each $m \leq n$ we may compute $a_{im} = 2^i \mod m$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$ and hardwire them into the circuit. Let $x = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i 2^i$. Then $x \mod m = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i a_{im} \mod m$. The circuit computes $y = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i a_{im}$ and reduces the result $\mod m$ by subtracting off in parallel the multiples of $m$, $m a_m, m a_{2m}, \ldots, m a_{(n-1)m}$, and choosing the appropriate difference. Since $y$ has $O(\log n)$ bits the circuit has $O(\log n)$ depth.

In order to compute $x = \frac{x}{m}$ use the above circuit and apply an NC$^1$ reduction from division to mod computation given by All and Blum [AlBl83]. Namely, for $i = 0, \ldots, n$ bit $x_i$ is 1 if and only if $2(x_0 \ldots x_{i-1} \mod m) + x_i \geq m$.

To compute $x^{-1} \mod m$ first compute $y = x \mod m$ and then in parallel multiply $y$ by each residue $x \mod m$ and find the $x$ for which the result is $\equiv 1 \mod m$. ■

**Theorem 4.2** Given integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and $p^l \leq n$ a prime power where $0 \leq x_1, \ldots, x_n < p^l$ the product $\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i \mod p^l$ can be computed in NC$^1$.

**Proof:** It is a known fact of number theory (e.g. [Hu82]) that $\mathbb{Z}_{p^l}$ is cyclic except when $p = 2$, in which case $\mathbb{Z}_{2^l}$ is generated by 5 and $2^l-1$. The basic idea of the algorithm is to hardwire in a table of discrete logarithms for each prime power $< n$ and then reduce the problem to one of computing iterated addition.

In $O(\log n)$ space it is possible to factor any number $sn$ and so determine whether it is a prime power. For each $p^l \leq n$ ($p \neq 2$ or $l > 2$) in $O(\log n)$ space one can find a generator $g$ for $\mathbb{Z}_{p^l}$ by brute force and then compute all powers of $g$ up to $p^{l-1}$ and hardwire them into the circuit. For each $4 \leq 2^l \leq n$ in $O(\log n)$ space one can compute $(-1)^{a_p} \mod 2^l$ for $a = 0, 1$ and $0 \leq b < 2^l$ and hardwire them into the circuit. These tables may be used in either direction as tables of powers or of discrete logarithms.

The algorithm then proceeds as follows:

1. Compute the largest power, $j_i$, of $p$ which divides $x_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ in parallel.
2. Compute $y_i = x_i / p^{j_i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
3. Compute $j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} j_i$.
4. Test if $p \neq 2$ or $p^l = 2^l$. If either condition holds perform A else perform B.

**Part A**

(5) Find each $y_i$ in the table for $p^l$ and read off its discrete logarithm, $a_i$.

(6) Compute $a = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i$.  

(7) Compute $a = a \mod p^{j_i} - p^{j_i-1}$.

(8) Read off $\prod_{i=1}^{n} y_i = g^a \mod p^l$ from the table.

**Part B**

(5) Find each $y_i$ in the table for $2^l$ and read off its representation as powers of $2^l-1$ and 5.

(6) Compute $a = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i$ and $b = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i$.

(7) Compute $a = a \mod 2^l$ and $b = b \mod 2^l$.

(8) Read off $\prod_{i=1}^{n} y_i = (-1)^{a_5} \mod 2^l$ from the table.

(9) Compute $\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i = p^{j_i} \prod_{i=1}^{n} y_i \mod p^l$.

The table look-ups can be computed in $O(\log n)$ depth, the modulo operations are computed as in Lemma 4.1, and the other steps can be computed using fast iterated addition circuits in $O(\log n)$ depth. ■

McKenzie and Cook also show how the above circuits may be used to compute iterated products for any small modulus by Chinese remaindering. It is interesting to note the following:

**Theorem 4.3** For $n$-bit integers $a$ and $b$, computing $a^b \mod m$ where $m \leq n$ is in NC$^1$.

**Proof:** Apply the same technique as above, taking discrete logarithms, multiplying by $b$ and then exponentiating $\mod m$. ■
5. Log Depth Circuits for Division and Iterated Product

Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be $n$ bit positive integers. The ITERATED PRODUCT problem is to compute $\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i$. It is clear that POWERING is reducible to ITERATED PRODUCT (it is little more than a special case) and so POWERING and DIVISION will be computable in small depth if we can find small depth circuits for ITERATED PRODUCT. In order to solve this problem we will make use of Chinese remaindering and the circuits for arithmetic operations modulo small integers.

The Chinese remainder theorem yields a process for determining, given the values of an integer modulo a sequence of relatively prime numbers, the result of taking that integer modulo their product. More formally the CHINESE REMAINDERING process for determining, given the values of an integer $z$ modulo a sequence of relatively prime $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_n$, is as follows:

1. Call the oracle to obtain $z \mod c_j$ for $j=1, \ldots, n$ in parallel.
2. Compute $u_i = \prod_{j \neq i} c_j$ by dividing $c$ by $c_i$ (by Lemma 4.1) for $i=1, \ldots, n$.
3. Solve $u_i w_i = 1 \mod c_i$ for $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ in parallel.
4. Compute the interpolation constants, $u_i = u_i w_i$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$.
5. Compute $y = \sum (x \mod c_j) u_j$ by multiplying in parallel and then computing a series sum.
6. For each $i$, compute $y_i = y - c_i$.
7. Set $x \mod c$ to be the unique $y_i$ such that $0 \leq y_i < c_i$.

Since each $c_i$ is small, representable in $O(\log n)$ bits, step (2) may be computed in depth $O(\log n)$. Similarly step (3) can be computed by brute force. Steps (4) and (5) can be computed by multiplying in parallel and then using multiple addition. Steps (6) and (7) involve simple multiplication and then comparisons in parallel. Each of these steps is of depth $O(\log n)$.

If we can compute $\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i \mod c_j$ for a set of relatively prime $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ such that $\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i > \prod_{i=1}^{n} c_j$, then the result of the interpolation process of Chinese remaindering will give the value of $\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i$ exactly. This fact and the above lemma motivate the following definition.

**Definition:** A sequence $M_1, M_2, \ldots$ is a good modulus sequence if and only if there are polynomials $q(n)$ and $r(n)$ such that for all $n$:

1. $2^n \leq M_n < 2^{q(n)}$
2. For any prime $p$, $p^t | M_n$ implies that $p^t \leq r(n)$.

**Theorem 5.2** ITERATED PRODUCT is $\text{NC}^1$ reducible to the problem of computing any good modulus sequence $\{M_n\}$.

**Proof:** From the definition of good modulus sequence it is clear that $M_n^2 > 2^{n^2} > \prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i$.

We obtain the following algorithm.

1. Call the good modulus sequence oracle to obtain $M_n^2$.
2. Factor $M_n^2$ to obtain prime power factors $c_i = p_i^{a_i}$ for $i=1, \ldots, s$.
3. Compute in parallel $b_{ij} = x_j \mod c_j$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$ and $j=1, \ldots, s$.
4. Compute $b_j = \prod_{i=1}^{n} b_{ij} \mod c_j$ for $j=1, \ldots, s$.

Note that $b_j = \prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i \mod c_j$.

(6) Compute $\prod_{i=1}^{n} x_i \mod c_j$ using the Chinese remaindering circuit for $c_1, \ldots, c_s$ to obtain the iterated product exactly.

Step (2) is brute force because the prime power factors are small and step (3) follows from Lemma 4.1. Using Theorem 4.2 for step (4) the entire circuit has depth $O(\log n)$.

The computational problem is now reduced to finding a good modulus sequence efficiently. The next theorem shows how this can be done.

**Theorem 5.3** ITERATED PRODUCT is computable by $P$-uniform Boolean circuits of depth $O(\log n)$.

**Proof:** In polynomial time we can find the first $n$ primes, $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ and compute their product. By the prime number theorem, $p_n = O(n \log n)$, so $\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i = 2^{O(n \log n)}$. 


Also trivially $2^n \leq \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i$.

Thus $\prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i$ for $n=1,2,\ldots$ forms a good modulus sequence.

We can compute this good modulus sequence in polynomial time, hardwire the values into the circuit and then apply Theorem 5.2 to get the desired result.

Using the previous reductions we have:

**Corollary 5.4** DIVISION and POWERING are computable by P-uniform Boolean circuits of depth $O(\log n)$.  

---

**6. Iterated Product and Powering are Equivalent**

As was previously stated POWERING is easily $\mathcal{NC}^1$ reducible to ITERATED PRODUCT but the reducibility in reverse is far from obvious.

**Theorem 6.1** ITERATED PRODUCT is $\mathcal{NC}^1$ reducible to POWERING.

**Proof** We use the reduction of ITERATED PRODUCT to computing a good modulus sequence. The algorithm proceeds as follows

1. Set $x = 2^n + 1$.
2. Use the powering circuit to compute $y = x^{2^n}$.

Note that $y = \sum_{i=1, i \neq 0}^{2n} \left\{ \frac{2n}{i} \right\}^{2^n i}$.

3. Read off $\left[ \frac{2n}{n} \right]$ as bits in positions $2n^2$ to $2n^2 + 2n - 1$ from the right in $y$.

Note that $2^{2n} > \left[ \frac{2n}{n} \right] \geq 2^n$.

By elementary arithmetic the exponent of the largest power of prime $p$ dividing $n$ is $\sum_{i=1, i \neq 0}^{n} \frac{n}{p^i}$. Thus the largest power dividing $\left[ \frac{2n}{n} \right]$ is $\sum_{i=1, i \neq 0}^{\left[ \frac{2n}{n} \right]} \left\{ \frac{2n}{p^i} \right\} - \left\{ \frac{n}{p^i} \right\}$. Now each of these terms is $\leq 1$ and the terms vanish when $p^i > 2n$ so that the largest power $p^i$ dividing $\left[ \frac{2n}{n} \right]$ satisfies $p^i < 2n$. From this we see that $\left[ \frac{2n}{1} \right]$ for $n=1,2,\ldots$ forms a good modulus sequence and so the reduction is correct.

---

**Corollary 6.2** DIVISION, POWERING, and ITERATED PRODUCT are all $\mathcal{NC}^1$ equivalent.

---

**7. Divisibility**

Although the DIVISION problem has P-uniform $O(\log n)$ depth circuits, it is still unclear whether or not it has log-space uniform $O(\log n)$ depth circuits. Despite the fact that we are unable to answer this question it is possible to find such circuits for a closely related problem, DIVISIBILITY.

Let $x,y$ be $n$-bit integers.

The output of the DIVISIBILITY problem is

$$\begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y|x \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Theorem 7.1** DIVISIBILITY is in $\mathcal{NC}^1$, and hence has deterministic space complexity $O(\log n)$.

**Proof** For each of $n$ primes $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ not dividing $y$ we can solve $y z = x \mod p_i$ to obtain $z_i$. If we could compute $M = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i$ then, as in Lemma 5.1, we could find the unique $z$ such that $0 \leq z < M$ and $z = z_i \mod p_i$ for each $i$. Such a $z$ would be the only possible candidate for a solution to $y z = x$.

$$n \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i = \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i \right) \mod q_k$$

Thus each of these terms is $\leq 1$ and the terms vanish when $p^i > 2n$ so that the largest power $p^i$ dividing $\left[ \frac{2n}{n} \right]$ satisfies $p^i < 2n$. From this we see that $\left[ \frac{2n}{1} \right]$ for $n=1,2,\ldots$ forms a good modulus sequence and so the reduction is correct.

---

**Corollary 6.2** DIVISION, POWERING, and ITERATED PRODUCT are all $\mathcal{NC}^1$ equivalent.
Compute \[ w_i = \prod_{j=1}^{i} p_j^{-1} \mod p_i \] for each \( i = 1, \ldots, n \).

(8) Compute \( u_{ik} = w_i \mod q_k \) for each \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( k = 1, \ldots, 2n \).

(9) Compute \( v_{ik} = u_{ik} \mod q_k \) for each \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( k = 1, \ldots, 2n \).

Note that \( u_{ik} \equiv u_i \mod q_k \).

(10) Compute \( z_{ik} = z_i \mod q_k \) for each \( i = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( k = 1, \ldots, 2n \).

(11) Compute \( z_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{ijk} - t M_k \mod q_k \) for each \( k = 1, \ldots, 2n \) and \( t = 1, \ldots, n p_n \).

(12) Check if there exists a \( t \) such that for all \( k \), \( u_k v_k^{(t)} = 1 \mod q_k \). If such a \( t \) exists output 1 else output 0.

All the operations are computed modulo small primes in \( O(\log n) \) depth and the remaining computations are simple tests in parallel which also have \( O(\log n) \) depth.

## 8. Summary and Open Problems

From the \( O(\log n) \) depth \( P \)-uniform circuits for the problems presented here, using the results of Alt [A184], a large class of natural problems can now be shown to have \( O(\log n) \) depth circuits. It is unknown whether any of these circuits may be made log-space uniform, which would imply that the problems are computable in deterministic log space.

An interesting problem related to powering is base conversion of integers from a fixed base, e.g. 3, to binary. This can be easily seen to have \( P \)-uniform \( O(\log n) \) depth circuits even without the machinery presented here. All that is required is to precompute \( 3^0, \ldots, 3^{n-1} \) in binary, hardwire them into the circuit, and on input \( (b_{n-1} \ldots b_0) _3 \) compute \( \sum b_i 3^i \). It is an open question whether this problem, which is reducible to powering for a fixed base, has \( O(\log n) \) depth log-space uniform circuits when the base is not a power of 2.

The class of problems which are reducible to the decision problem, DIVISIBILITY, may be worth investigating since our results imply that such problems would have log-space uniform \( O(\log n) \) depth Boolean circuits.

Finally, there is a stronger and in some ways more natural definition of uniform than log-space uniform. This stronger form was introduced by Ruzzo [Ru81] and called \( \mathcal{U}^{p_r} \)-uniform (see [Co83]). If this condition is used to define \( NC^1 \), then \( NC^1 \) can be characterized simply as the class of problems computable in time \( O(\log n) \) on an alternating Turing machine. Unfortunately, it is not clear whether all the results shown here still hold with the stronger condition. In particular, it would be interesting to know whether DIVISIBILITY, iterated product modulo small prime powers, and the reduction of iterated product to powering, have \( NC^1 \) circuits in this stronger sense.
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