The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

A Nonperturbative Construction of Retarded Off-Shell Intertwiners of Covariant Phase Spaces in Classical Field Theory

Pedro Lauridsen Ribeiro

pedro.lauridsen.ribeiro@desy.de

II. Institut für theoretische Physik – Universität Hamburg[1]

(Joint work with R. Brunetti (Trento – brunetti@science.unitn.it) and K. Fredenhagen (Hamburg – klaus.fredenhagen@desy.de))

25.III.2009

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Motivation and Setup
Further properties

Motivation and Setup

In this talk, we shall be interested in the following problem: consider (for concreteness; watch out for Final Considerations)...

- A scalar field $\phi \in \mathscr{C}^{\infty}(\mathscr{M})$ in a globally hyperbolic spacetime $(\mathscr{M}, g)$, and
- Two (1st-order) action functionals

$$S_i[\phi] = \int_{\mathscr{M}} \sqrt{|\det g(x)|} \mathrm{d}x \, \mathscr{L}_i(x, \phi(x), \partial^1 \phi(x)), \ i = 1, 2$$

with (semilinear, strictly hyperbolic) Euler-Lagrange derivatives

$$S_{i(1)}[\phi] = \nabla_a \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}_i}{\partial \nabla_a \phi} - \frac{\partial \mathscr{L}_i}{\partial \phi},$$

such that

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Motivation and Setup
Further properties

i.) $S_2 \doteq S$ is quadratic ("free"),

ii.)

$$S_1 - S_2 = \lambda F(h) = \lambda \int_{\mathscr{M}} \sqrt{|\det g(x)|} \, \mathrm{d}x \, h(x) \mathscr{L}_{int}(x, \phi(x), \partial^1 \phi(x))$$

with $h \in \mathscr{C}_c^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ ("spacetime-cutoff" interaction term), $\lambda > 0$, and

iii.) $F(h)_{(1)}[\phi]$ depends pointwise on ϕ and at most its first derivatives $\nabla \phi$.

We want to

Main Goal & Definition

Prove the existence of a map $r_{S_1, S_2} : \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \to \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{1(1)} \circ r_{S_1, S_2} &= S_{2(1)}, & (1) \\
r_{S_1, S_2}(\phi)(x) &= \phi(x), x \notin J^+(\mathrm{supp} h). & (2)
\end{aligned}
$$

We call r_{S_1, S_2} the retarded Møller operator of S_1 w.r.t. S_2.

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Motivation and Setup
Further properties

- r_{S_1,S_2} appears naturally in the context of perturbative algebraic QFT (Dütsch–Fredenhagen CMP'03, Brunetti–Fredenhagen arXiv:0901.2063, Brunetti–Dütsch–Fredenhagen arXiv:0901.2038), where h plays both the role of an IR regulator and of a localization for the algebra of perturbative interacting fields.

- When acting on solutions of $S_{2(1)}[\phi] = 0$ r_{S_1,S_2} can be seen as an intertwiner of (on-shell) covariant phase spaces or, equivalently, as the solution of a "covariant" Cauchy problem.

- (1)–(2) also mean that $r_{S_1,S_2}(\phi)$ solves an inhomogeneous (off-shell) nonlinear hyperbolic PDE with prescribed initial conditions in the past of $\operatorname{supp} h \Rightarrow$ very few rigorous well-posedness results exist, qualitative behaviour of solutions can be dramatically changed – (parabolic) example: (incompressible) Navier-Stokes equations

$$\underbrace{\partial_t \mathbf{v} - \nu \triangle \mathbf{v}}_{\text{free (heat) part}} + \underbrace{(\mathbf{v}.\nabla)\mathbf{v}}_{\text{interaction}} = \underbrace{-\nabla p}_{\text{source}} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \nabla p = 0 : \text{only laminar flow} \\ \nabla p \neq 0 : \text{turbulence!} \end{array} \right.$$

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Coupling as an off-shell flow parameter $\Rightarrow$ Main Claim

- It's clear that r_{S_1,S_2} exist on shell whenever local well posedness for $S_{1(1)}[\psi] = (S + \lambda F(h))_{(1)}[\psi] = 0$ in a ngb. of $\text{supp}\,h$ holds. More in general, in the future of $\text{supp}\,h$ (1) tells us that $\psi = r_{S_1,S_2}(\phi) - \phi$ solves $S_{(1)}[\psi] = 0 \Rightarrow$ finding r_{S_1,S_2} boils down to finding it locally!

- Before we start...

Caveat 1

Notice that we cannot use (2) and apply the (background-independent) retarded fundamental solution Δ_S^R of $S^{(1)} = S^{(2)}[\psi], \forall \psi$ to (1) directly to obtain the so-called Yang-Feldman equation

$$r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi) = \phi - \lambda \Delta_S^R \circ F(h)_{(1)}[r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi)],$$

for $S_{(1)}[\psi]$ doesn't necessarily have compact support or even enough decay at infinity!

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

- Differentiating (1) w.r.t. λ leads to

$$(S_{(1)} + \lambda F(h)_{(1)})^{(1)}[r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi)] \circ \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi) + F_{(1)}[r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi)] = 0. \tag{3}$$

- Now we invoke (2) and apply the retarded fundamental solution $\Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi)]$ of the linearised Euler-Lagrange operator $(S + \lambda F(h))^{(1)}_{(1)}[r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi)]$ around the background $r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi)$ to the left of both sides of (3):

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda} r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi) = -\Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi)] \circ F_{(1)}(h)[r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi)], \tag{4}$$

which shows that $\psi(\lambda) \doteq r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi)$ is the unique solution of the flow equation (4) with initial condition $\psi(0) = \phi$.

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

- Formally integrating (4) w.r.t. λ on both sides and using the initial condition above, we arrive at

$$r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi) = \phi - \int_0^\lambda d\lambda' \Delta^R_{S+\lambda'F(h)}[r_{S+\lambda'F(h),S}(\phi)] \circ F_{(1)}(h)[r_{S+\lambda'F(h),S}(\phi)].$$
(5)

- We could keep proceeding formally by iterating (4) and write $r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi)$ as a formal power series [Dütsch–Fredenhagen *ibid.*]

$$r_{S+\lambda F(h),S} \sim \sum_{k=0}^\infty \frac{\lambda^k}{k!} \frac{d^k}{d\lambda^k}\big|_{\lambda=0} r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}.$$

This is actually the method used in (perturbative algebraic) quantum field theory when performed after composition with functionals, barring renormalisation issues.

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

- However, our aim is nonperturbative, and thus achieved by looking at the map

$$\psi(\lambda) \mapsto \phi(\lambda) = \psi(\lambda) + \int_0^\lambda \mathrm{d}\lambda' \Delta_{S+\lambda' F(h)}^R [\psi(\lambda')] \circ F_{(1)}(h)[\psi(\lambda')], \quad (6)$$

which just defines the inverse $r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}^{-1}$ of $r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}$.

- From now on, for the sake of pedagogy we shall set $(\mathscr{M}, g) = \mathbb{R}^{1,d-1} \ni (x^0 = t, x)$.

Main Claim

The map (6) is invertible in a neighbourhood of zero in $\mathscr{C}^1([0, \Lambda], \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}))$; its inverse satisfies (1), (2).

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Nash–Moser–Hörmander theorem
Tame differentiability
End of proof

Towards a proof of Main Claim

- The crucial step in our proof is to obtain a priori estimates on $\Delta_{S+\lambda F(h)}^R[\psi]$ in terms of both the linear and the nonlinear (background) arguments. These are essentially refined energy estimates for $S_{(1)}^{(1)} + \lambda F(h)_{(1)}^{(1)}$ which state explicitly their dependence on the latter's coefficients, and were originally obtained by Klainerman [Klainerman '78–'80–'82].

- Suppose that there exist $0 < T$ such that supp$h$ is contained in the interior of the slab $\{(t, x) : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$, and define the energy norms

$$\|\psi\|_{E^k} \doteq \sup_{t' \in [0,T]} \|\psi(t', .)\|_{H_x^{(k+1)}} + \sup_{t' \in [0,T]} \|\partial_t \psi(t', .)\|_{H_x^{(k)}}.$$

Caveat 2

It feels tempting to apply a fixed-point strategy to (5), but the Proposition below shows that $r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi) - \phi$ is not a Lipschitz map with respect to any $\|.\|_{E^k}$! (PDE folk wisdom: "hyperbolic equations are not strongly stable w.r.t. perturbations of the coefficients." [Tataru ICM '02])

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Nash–Moser–Hörmander theorem
Tame differentiability
End of proof

Proposition (refined energy estimates)

For $\phi, \delta\phi \in E^\infty \doteq \{\psi : \|\psi\|_{E^k} < +\infty, \forall k \geq 0\}$ we have

$$\|\Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\phi]\delta\phi\|_{E^0} \leq D_0 \sup_{t' \in [0,T]} \|\delta\phi\|_{L^2_x}, \tag{7}$$

$$\|\Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\phi]\delta\phi\|_{E^k} \leq D_k \left(\|\delta\phi\|_{E^{k-1}} + \sup_{t' \in [0,T]} |(hF^{(1)}_{(1)})(t', .)|_{\mathscr{C}^k_x} \|\delta\phi\|_{E^0} \right), \ k \geq 1, \tag{8}$$

where D_k, $k \geq 0$ are constants which depend only on d, T and $\|\phi\|_{\mathscr{C}^1(\mathrm{supp}h)}$.

- Applying Sobolev inequalities and Schauder estimates to the spatial $\mathscr{C}^k$ norms of $(hF^{(1)}_{(1)})(t', .)$ in (8), we arrive at

$$\|\Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\phi]\delta\phi\|_{E^k} \leq D'_k[\|\delta\phi\|_{E^{k-1}} + (1 + \|\phi\|_{E^{k+1+[\frac{d+1}{2}]}})\|\delta\phi\|_{E^0}], \tag{9}$$

where $[s]$ gives the integer part of s.

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Nash–Moser–Hörmander theorem
Tame differentiability
End of proof

Nash–Moser–Hörmander iteration scheme

- The argument above shows that one loses $1 + [\frac{d+1}{2}]$ derivatives at each iteration when trying to solve (5) by a fixed-point method (see Caveat 2!). This phenomenon has no on-shell counterpart.
- Alternative: use a Newton iteration scheme $\Rightarrow$ if it converges, it does so superexponentially; not the case here, again due to loss of derivatives. This can be fixed by applying suitable smoothing operators that make a "multiscale" decomposition of momentum space at each iteration step. The result is the celebrated

---

Theorem (Nash–Moser–Hörmander)

Let $\Phi : \mathscr{U} \subseteq E^\infty \cap \{\psi : \|\psi - \psi_0\|_{E^\mu} < R\} \to E^\infty$, $\mu \in \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, $R > 0$ be twice Gâteaux differentiable satisfying for all $k \geq 0$ the tame estimates

$$\|\Phi(\psi)\|_{E^k} \leq C_k(1 + \|\psi\|_{E^{k+r_0}}) \text{ for some } r_0 > 0, \tag{10}$$

$$\|\Phi'(\psi)(\delta\psi)\|_{E^k} \leq C'_k[(1 + \|\psi\|_{E^{k+r_1}})\|\delta\psi\|_{E^{s_1}} + \|\delta\psi\|_{E^{k+s_1}}] \text{ for some } r_1, s_1 > 0, \tag{11}$$

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Nash–Moser–Hörmander theorem
Tame differentiability
End of proof

$$\|\Phi''(\psi)(\delta_1\psi, \delta_2\psi)\|_{E^k} \leq C_k''[(1+\|\psi\|_{E^{k+r_2}})\|\delta_1\psi\|_{E^{s_2}}\|\delta_2\psi\|_{E^{t_2}} + \|\delta_1\psi\|_{E^{s_2}}\|\delta_2\psi\|_{E^{k+t_2}}$$

$$+ \|\delta_1\psi\|_{E^{k+t_2}}\|\delta_2\psi\|_{E^{s_2}}], \text{ for some } r_2, s_2, t_2 > 0, \tag{12}$$

and such that for all ψ in $\mathscr{V} \subset \{\psi : \|\psi - \psi_0\|_{E^{\mu'}} < R'\}$, $\mu' \in \bar{\mathbb{Z}}_+$, $R' > 0$ there is a right inverse $\Psi(\psi)$ to $\Phi'(\psi)$ w.r.t. the linear factor satisfying for all $k \geq 0$ the tame estimates

$$\|\Psi'(\psi)(\delta\psi)\|_{E^k} \leq C_k'''[(1 + \|\psi\|_{E^{k+a_1}})\|\delta\psi\|_{E^{b_1}} + \|\delta\psi\|_{E^{k+b_1}}] \text{ for some } a_1, b_1 > 0. \tag{13}$$

Then, for all k sufficiently large, there is a $R_k > 0$ such that for all $\phi \in E^\infty$ fulfilling $\|\phi\|_{E^{k+b_1}} < R_k$ the equation $\Phi(\psi) = \Phi(\psi_0) + \phi$ has a unique solution $\psi = \psi(\phi)$ such that $\|\psi(\phi) - \psi_0\|_{E^k} \leq R''\|\phi\|_{E^{k+b_1}}$. In particular, if ϕ also belongs to E^∞, so does $\psi(\phi)$.

In our problem, we take $\psi_0 \equiv 0$ and add a dependence in λ.

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Nash–Moser–Hörmander theorem
Tame differentiability
End of proof

Tame (Gâteaux) differentiability of $\Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi]$

To check that Φ_λ fulfills the hypotheses of the Theorem, first we collect some following formulae coming directly from the definition of a fundamental solution [Dütsch–Fredenhagen *ibid.*]:

$$\Delta^{R(1)}_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi](\delta\psi) = -\Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi] \circ F(h)^{(2)}_{(1)}[\psi](\delta\psi, \Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi]), \qquad (14)$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi] = -\Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi] \circ F(h)^{(1)}_{(1)}[\psi] \circ \Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi], \qquad (15)$$

$$\Delta^{R(2)}_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi](\delta_1\psi, \delta_2\psi) =$$

$$= \Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi] \circ F(h)^{(2)}_{(1)}(\delta_1\psi, \Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi]) \circ F(h)^{(2)}_{(1)}(\delta_2\psi, \Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi]) +$$

$$+ \Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi] \circ F(h)^{(2)}_{(1)}(\delta_2\psi, \Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi]) \circ F(h)^{(2)}_{(1)}(\delta_1\psi, \Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi]) +$$

$$- \Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi] \circ F(h)^{(3)}_{(1)}(\delta_1\psi, \delta_2\psi, \Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi]). \qquad (16)$$

Equation (15) shows in particular that $\Delta^R_{S+\lambda F(h)}[\psi]$ is strongly differentiable (hence strongly continuous) in λ, thus allowing all the computations we need.

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Nash–Moser–Hörmander theorem
Tame differentiability
End of proof

Tame estimates for iteration map, end of proof

From (14) and (16), one get the following formulae for the first two derivatives of the iteration map Φ_λ (6):

$$\Phi'_\lambda(\psi)(\delta\psi) = \delta\psi +$$

$$+ \int_0^\lambda \mathrm{d}\lambda' \left(\Delta^R_{S+\lambda'F(h)}[\psi] \circ F(h)^{(1)}_{(1)}[\psi](\delta\psi) + \Delta^{R(1)}_{S+\lambda'F(h)}[\psi](\delta\psi) \circ F(h)_{(1)}[\psi] \right),$$

$$(17)$$

$$\Phi''_\lambda(\psi)(\delta_1\psi, \delta_2\psi) = \int_0^\lambda \mathrm{d}\lambda' \left(\Delta^R_{S+\lambda'F(h)}[\psi] \circ F(h)^{(2)}_{(1)}[\phi](\delta_1\phi, \delta_2\phi) + \right.$$

$$+ \Delta^{R(1)}_{S+\lambda'F(h)}[\psi](\delta_1\psi) \circ F(h)^{(1)}_{(1)}[\phi](\delta_2\phi) + \Delta^{R(1)}_{S+\lambda'F(h)}[\psi](\delta_2\psi) \circ F(h)^{(1)}_{(1)}[\phi](\delta_1\phi) +$$

$$\left. + \Delta^{R(2)}_{S+\lambda'F(h)}[\psi](\delta_1\psi, \delta_2\psi) \circ F(h)_{(1)}[\phi] \right),$$

$$(18)$$

where $\Delta^{R(1)}_{S+\lambda'F(h)}[\psi]$ and $\Delta^{R(2)}_{S+\lambda'F(h)}[\psi]$ are respectively given by (14) and (16). Notice that $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\Phi'_\lambda(\psi)$, seen as a linear map acting on $\delta\psi$ for fixed ψ, doesn't lose derivatives, due to the fact that the assumed loss in $F(h)_{(1)}$ is exactly compensated by the smoothing effect of $\Delta^R_{S+\lambda'F(h)}[\psi]$.

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Nash–Moser–Hörmander theorem
Tame differentiability
End of proof

- The Proposition, together with Schauder estimates, show that Φ_λ satisfy the tame estimate (10) with $a_0 = [\frac{d+1}{2}] + 1$ for $\sup_{\lambda' \in [0,\lambda]} \|\psi(\lambda')\|_{E^{[\frac{d+1}{2}]+1}} < R$, that is, $\mu = [\frac{d+1}{2}] + 1$.

- Formulae (17)–(18) show that $\Phi'_\lambda(\psi)(\delta\psi)$ and $\Phi''_\lambda(\psi)(\delta_1\psi, \delta_2\psi)$ fulfill resp. the tame estimates (11) and (12) with $r_1 = r_2 = [\frac{d+1}{2}] + 1$ and $s_1 = s_2 = t_2 = 1$.

- Finally, due to (15) and the remark following (18), $\frac{d}{d\lambda}\Phi'_\lambda(\psi)$ is a bounded and uniformly strongly continuous (in λ) linear map $\Rightarrow \Phi'_\lambda(\psi)$ be inverted by means of a Dyson series. Iterating the tame estimate for $\frac{d}{d\lambda}\Phi'_\lambda(\psi)$, together with the argument for the convergence for the Dyson series, leads to the tame estimate (13) with $a_1 = [\frac{d+1}{2}] + 1$, $b_1 = 1$ and $\mu' = [\frac{d+1}{2}] + 2$ for the right inverse.

- Now... Just plug in the data above, run the "Nash–Moser–Hörmander machine", and we get local existence and uniqueness of $r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}$ in E^∞. The intertwining relation (1) shows that actually $r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}(\phi) \in \mathscr{C}^\infty$ for $\phi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty$. □

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Structural consequences

The existence and properties of $r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}$ have fundamental implications for the underlying Poisson structure of any classical field theory determined by an action functional S, given by the Peierls bracket

$$\{F, G\}_S \doteq F_{(1)}[.] \circ (\Delta_S^R[.] - \Delta_S^A[.]) \circ G_{(1)}[.]$$

of local functionals F, G. Here $\Delta_S^A[\psi]$ is the advanced fundamental solution of $S_{(1)}^{(1)}[\psi]$ around the background ψ, which is simply the adjoint of $\Delta_S^R[\psi]$.

Corollary $r_{S+\lambda F(h),S}$ is a canonical transformation, i.e. it intertwines the Poisson structures associated to S and $S + \lambda F(h)$:

$$\{., .\}_{S+\lambda F(h)} \circ r_{S+\lambda F(h)} = \{., .\}_S.$$

In particular, even off shell does it allow one to put $\{., .\}_{S+\lambda F(h)}$ in "normal form", i.e. to make it locally background-independent ("Functional Darboux Theorem").

Scholium The space of local functionals vanishing on solutions of $(S + \lambda F(h))_{(1)}[\psi] = 0$ is a Poisson ideal.

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

Coda: final considerations

- We've shown the existence of r_{S_1,S_2} for "sufficiently small" field configurations around a given one. This latter condition can be controlled in general by adjusting λ (coupling strength) or supp$h$ (lifespan).

- If the Cauchy problem for $S_{1(1)}[\psi] = 0$ is well-posed in the large, one can use (2) and the composition property of r_{S_1,S_2}

$$r_{S,S} = \mathbb{1}, r_{S_2,S_3} \circ r_{S_1,S_2} = r_{S_1,S_3}$$

stemming from (1) to remove the cutoff (i.e. dependence on h) $\Rightarrow$ probably impossible off shell, unless probably in a suitable algebraic sense ("algebraic adiabatic limit" – [Brunetti–Dütsch–Fredenhagen *ibid.*]).

The stage
The actors
Strategy towards a proof
Consequences
Conclusions and perspectives

- We illustrated our strategy for the case of a scalar field in $\mathbb{R}^{1,d-1}$, but the argument carries through for arbitrary sections in any globally hyperbolic spacetime $\Rightarrow$ one has a local energy estimate of the same form as (7)–(8) by combining Klainerman's argument with the estimates in [Hawking–Ellis '73]; only the control of the extra error terms due to curvature and the absence of Killing fields is more cumbersome.

- Alas, the more general quasilinear case (e.g. general relativity) seems to pose some new difficulties; the Dyson series argument to invert Φ'_λ w.r.t. the linear factor fails since one then loses one derivative at each order. It seems to be possible, however, to circumvent this issue by means of paradifferential calculus (PLR, work in progress).