

A central limit theorem in the β -model for undirected random graphs with a diverging number of vertices

BY TING YAN

*Department of Statistics and Finance,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, P. R. China
sunroom@mail.ustc.edu.cn*

AND JINFENG XU

*Department of Statistics and Applied Probability,
National University of Singapore, 6 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117546, Singapore
staxj@nus.edu.sg*

SUMMARY

Chatterjee et al. (2011) established the consistency of the maximum likelihood estimator in the β -model for undirected random graphs when the number of vertices goes to infinity. By approximating the inverse of the Fisher information matrix, we obtain its asymptotic normality under mild conditions. Simulation studies and a data example illustrate the theoretical results.

Some key words: β -model; Central limit theorem; Fisher information matrix.

1. INTRODUCTION

For an undirected random graph on t vertices, the β -model (Chatterjee et al., 2011) assumes that there exists an edge between vertices i and j with probability

$$p_{i,j} = \frac{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}}{1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}}, \quad 1 \leq i \neq j \leq t,$$

independently of all other edges, where β_i is the influence parameter of vertex i . First introduced by Holland & Leinhardt (1981) for directed networks, this model is closely related to the Bradley–Terry model for rankings (Bradley & Terry, 1952). For undirected random graphs, it has been considered by Newman et al. (2001), Jackson (2008), and Blitzstein & Diaconis (2011). For many real world networks, the number of vertices t is large and hence it is necessary to consider asymptotics with $t \rightarrow \infty$. In the Bradley–Terry model (Bradley & Terry, 1952) for paired comparisons, Simons & Yao (1999) proved that the maximum likelihood estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal when the number of parameters goes to infinity. This contrasts with the well-known Neyman–Scott problem under which the maximum likelihood estimator fails even to attain consistency when the number of parameters goes to infinity. More recently, Chatterjee et al. (2011) proved that the maximum likelihood estimator of the β -model is consistent when t goes to infinity. In this note, by approximating the inverse of the Fisher information matrix, we further establish its asymptotic normality under mild conditions.

2. MAIN RESULTS

Suppose that \mathcal{G} is an undirected graph on t vertices generated from the β -model where $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_t)^T \in R^t$ is unknown. Let d_1, \dots, d_t be the degrees of the vertices of \mathcal{G} . The likelihood is

$$\frac{e^{\sum_i \beta_i d_i}}{\prod_{i < j} (1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j})}.$$

The maximum likelihood estimator $\hat{\beta}$ of β can be obtained by solving the equations

$$d_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{e^{\hat{\beta}_i + \hat{\beta}_j}}{1 + e^{\hat{\beta}_i + \hat{\beta}_j}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, t. \quad (1)$$

In a preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1105.6145>, Rinaldo, Petrovic, and Fienberg obtained necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence and uniqueness of $\hat{\beta}$. Chatterjee et al. (2011) established the following theorem:

THEOREM 1. Define $L_t = \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} |\beta_i|$.

(a) If $L_t = o(\log t)$, then with probability tending to one as $t \rightarrow \infty$, there exists a unique solution $\hat{\beta}$ of the maximum likelihood equations (1).

(b) If $L_t = o\{\log(\log t)\}$, then

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq t} |\hat{\beta}_i - \beta_i| \leq O_p\{(\log t)^{1/2} t^{-1/2} e^{c_1 e^{c_2 L_t} + c_3 L_t}\} = o_p(1),$$

where c_1, c_2 and c_3 are positive constants. Hence $\hat{\beta}$ is uniformly consistent.

Denote the covariance matrix of $d = (d_1, \dots, d_t)$ by $V_t = (v_{i,j})_{t \times t}$, where

$$v_{i,j} = \frac{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j})^2}, \quad v_{i,i} = \sum_{j \neq i} v_{i,j} \quad (i, j = 1, \dots, t; i \neq j).$$

This is also the Fisher information matrix for β . To establish the asymptotic normality of $\hat{\beta}$, we need an accurate approximation to V_t^{-1} . Let $S_t = (s_{i,j})_{t \times t}$, where $s_{i,j} = \delta_{i,j}/v_{i,i} - 1/v_{..}$, $\delta_{i,j}$ is the Kronecker delta function and $v_{..} = \sum_{i,j=1; i \neq j}^t v_{i,j}$. In Proposition 1 which is given in Appendix 1, we obtain an upper bound on the error of using S_t to approximate V_t^{-1} . In the following, we present a central limit theorem for the maximum likelihood estimator in the β model. The proof is given in Appendix 2.

THEOREM 2. If $L_t = o\{\log(\log t)\}$, then for any fixed $r \geq 1$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the vector consisting of the first r elements of $G_t^{1/2}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)$ is asymptotically standard multivariate normal, where $G_t = \text{diag}(v_{1,1}, \dots, v_{t,t})$ and $G_t^{1/2} = \text{diag}(v_{1,1}^{1/2}, \dots, v_{t,t}^{1/2})$.

Remark 1. By Theorem 2, for any fixed i , as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the convergence rate of $\hat{\beta}_i$ is $1/v_{i,i}^{1/2}$. Since $(t-1)e^{-2L_t}/4 \leq v_{i,i} \leq (t-1)/4$, the rate of convergence is between $O(t^{-1/2}e^{L_t})$ and $O(t^{-1/2})$.

3. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

We conduct simulation studies to illustrate our theoretical results. By Theorem 2, we construct approximate 95% confidence intervals for β_i and $\beta_i - \beta_j$. We report the coverage probabilities

for certain $\beta_i - \beta_j$ and the average coverage probabilities for β_i ($i = 1, \dots, t$) as well as the probabilities that the maximum likelihood estimator does not exist. Let $\beta_i = iL_t/t$ and choose $L_t = 0, \log(\log t), (\log t)^{1/2}$ or $\log t$. Using 10,000 simulations for each scenario, the results are summarized in Table 1. We see that when $L_t = 0$ or $\log(\log t)$, the coverage probabilities are very close to the nominal level, indicating the adequacy of the confidence intervals. When $L_t = (\log t)^{1/2}$ or $\log t$, the maximum likelihood estimator does not exist with nonzero probability and the coverage probabilities deviate much from the nominal level. Using the normal Q-Q plots, when $L_t = 0$ or $\log(\log t)$, the normality of the estimator is quite evident. However, when $L_t = (\log t)^{1/2}$, there is a notable deviation from normality. That demonstrates that the condition on L_t in Theorem 2 is critical in ensuring the existence of the maximum likelihood estimator and its asymptotic normality.

Table 1. *Estimated coverage probabilities and probabilities that the maximum likelihood estimator does not exist (in parentheses), both multiplied by 100*

t	(i, j)	$L_t = 0$	$L_t = \log(\log t)$	$L_t = (\log t)^{1/2}$	$L_t = \log t$
50	(1,50)	94.6 (0)	95.8 (0.1)	89.4 (8)	0 (100)
	(25,26)	95.0 (0)	95.5 (0.1)	88.4 (8)	0 (100)
	(49,50)	95.2 (0)	95.4 (0.1)	91.6 (8)	0 (100)
	ACP	95.1 (0)	95.4 (0.1)	88.4 (8)	0 (100)
100	(1,100)	94.3 (0)	95.1 (0)	97.0 (0.5)	0 (100)
	(50,51)	94.6 (0)	95.4 (0)	95.1 (0.5)	0 (100)
	(99,100)	94.8 (0)	95.7 (0)	97.7 (0.5)	0 (100)
	ACP	95.0 (0)	95.2 (0)	95.2 (0.5)	0 (100)
200	(1,200)	94.9 (0)	95.1 (0)	96.1 (0)	0 (100)
	(100,101)	95.3 (0)	95.0 (0)	95.1 (0)	0 (100)
	(199,200)	95.1 (0)	95.2 (0)	96.5 (0)	0 (100)
	ACP	95.1 (0)	95.1 (0)	95.3 (0)	0 (100)

(i, j), coverage probability for $\beta_i - \beta_j$; ACP, average coverage probability for β_1, \dots, β_t .

We analyze the food web dataset in Blitzstein & Diaconis (2011), which contains 33 organisms in Chesapeake Bay, each represented by a vertex in the graph. As in Blitzstein & Diaconis (2011), we study the simple graph after omitting the self-loop at vertex 19. The influence parameters and their standard errors are reported in Table 2. The largest four degrees are 8, 8, 10, 9 for vertices 2, 7, 8, 22, which also have the largest four influence parameters $-0.083, -0.083, 0.275, 0.102$ from Table 2. On the other hand, the four vertices with the smallest influence parameter -2.602 all have degree 1.

Table 2. *The food web dataset: the estimated influence parameters $\hat{\beta}$ and their standard errors (in parentheses)*

Vertex	$\hat{\beta}$	Vertex	$\hat{\beta}$	Vertex	$\hat{\beta}$	Vertex	$\hat{\beta}$
1	-0.29 (2.23)	2	-0.08 (2.33)	3	-0.75 (1.98)	4	-2.60 (0.98)
5	-2.60 (0.98)	6	-1.85 (1.35)	7	-0.08 (2.33)	8	0.28 (2.49)
9	-1.04 (1.82)	10	-1.85 (1.35)	11	-1.04 (1.82)	12	-0.75 (1.98)
13	-1.39 (1.61)	14	-0.51 (2.12)	15	-0.29 (2.23)	16	-1.39 (1.61)
17	-1.85 (1.35)	18	-0.29 (2.23)	19	-0.51 (2.12)	20	-2.60 (0.98)
21	-1.85 (1.35)	22	0.10 (2.42)	23	-0.51 (2.12)	24	-2.60 (0.98)
25	-1.39 (1.61)	26	-1.04 (1.82)	27	-0.51 (2.12)	28	-1.39 (1.61)
29	-1.39 (1.61)	30	-1.39 (1.61)	31	-1.85 (1.35)	32	-1.04 (1.82)
33	-1.04 (1.82)						

$$d = (7, 8, 5, 1, 1, 2, 8, 10, 4, 2, 4, 5, 3, 6, 7, 3, 2, 7, 6, 1, 2, 9, 6, 1, 3, 4, 6, 3, 3, 3, 2, 4, 4).$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful to the editor, the associate editor and a referee for helpful comments. This research was supported by a grant from National University of Singapore.

APPENDIX 1

PROPOSITION 1. As $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\|V_t^{-1} - S_t\| \leq O\left\{\frac{e^{6L_t}}{(t-1)^2}\right\}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\|A\| = \max_{i,j} |a_{i,j}|$ for a matrix $A = (a_{i,j})$.

Proof of Proposition 1. Define $m = \min_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} v_{i,j}$ and $M = \max_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} v_{i,j}$. It is easy to see that

$$\frac{e^{2L_t}}{(1 + e^{2L_t})^2} \leq v_{i,j} = \frac{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j})^2} \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad (i \neq j). \quad (\text{A2})$$

By (A2), we have $m \geq e^{2L_t}/(1 + e^{2L_t})^2$ and $M \leq 1/4$. Denote the $t \times t$ identity matrix by I_t . Write $F_t = (f_{i,j}) = V_t^{-1} - S_t$, $R_t = (r_{i,j}) = I_t - V_t S_t$ and $W_t = (w_{i,j}) = S_t R_t$. We have the recursion

$$F_t = (V_t^{-1} - S_t)(I_t - V_t S_t) + S_t(I_t - V_t S_t) = F_t R_t + W_t,$$

and it follows that, for any i ,

$$f_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^t f_{i,k} \left\{ (\delta_{k,j} - 1) \frac{v_{k,j}}{v_{j,j}} + \frac{2v_{k,k}}{v_{j,j}} \right\} + w_{i,j} \quad (j = 1, \dots, t).$$

Fixing i , let $f_{i,\alpha} = \max_{1 \leq k \leq t} f_{i,k}$ and $f_{i,\beta} = \min_{1 \leq k \leq t} f_{i,k}$. Since $2 \sum_{k=1}^t f_{i,k} v_{k,k} = 1$, we have $f_{i,\beta} \leq 1/(2v_{j,j})$ and $f_{i,\alpha} \geq 0$. By direct calculation, it can be shown that for all i, j, k ,

$$\max(|w_{i,j}|, |w_{i,j} - w_{i,k}|) \leq \frac{M}{m^2(t-1)^2}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

and

$$f_{i,\alpha} - f_{i,\beta} = \sum_{k=1}^t (f_{i,k} - f_{i,\beta}) \left\{ (1 - \delta_{k,\beta}) \frac{v_{k,\beta}}{v_{\beta,\beta}} - (1 - \delta_{k,\alpha}) \frac{v_{k,\alpha}}{v_{\alpha,\alpha}} \right\} + w_{i,\alpha} - w_{i,\beta}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Define $a = M/\{m^2(t-1)^2\}$, $\Omega = \{k : (1 - \delta_{k,\beta})v_{k,\beta}/v_{\beta,\beta} \geq (1 - \delta_{k,\alpha})v_{k,\alpha}/v_{\alpha,\alpha}\}$ and $|\Omega| = \lambda$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in \Omega} (f_{i,k} - f_{i,\beta}) \left\{ (1 - \delta_{k,\beta}) \frac{v_{k,\beta}}{v_{\beta,\beta}} - (1 - \delta_{k,\alpha}) \frac{v_{k,\alpha}}{v_{\alpha,\alpha}} \right\} &\leq (f_{i,\alpha} - f_{i,\beta}) \left\{ \frac{\sum_{k \in \Omega} v_{k,\beta}}{v_{\beta,\beta}} - \frac{\sum_{k \in \Omega} (1 - \delta_{k,\alpha}) v_{k,\alpha}}{v_{\alpha,\alpha}} \right\} \\ &\leq (f_{i,\alpha} - f_{i,\beta}) f(\lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

□

where $f(\lambda) = \lambda M / \{\lambda M + (t-1-\lambda)m\} - (\lambda-1)m / \{(\lambda-1)m + (t-\lambda)M\}$. Note that $f(\lambda)$ takes its maximum at $\lambda = t/2$ when $\lambda \in [1, t-1]$ and $f(t/2) = \{tM - (t-2)m\} / \{tM + (t-2)m\}$. By (A3), (A4), and (A5),

$$f_{i,\alpha} - f_{i,\beta} \leq \frac{tM - (t-2)m}{tM + (t-2)m} \times (f_{i,\alpha} - f_{i,\beta}) + a.$$

Hence

$$f_{i,\alpha} - f_{i,\beta} \leq \frac{M\{tM + (t-2)m\}}{2(t-2)m^3(t-1)^2}.$$

Since $f_{i,\alpha} = \max_k f_{i,k}$ and $f_{i,\beta} = \min_k f_{i,k}$, we have $\max_{1 \leq k \leq t} |f_{i,k}| \leq f_{i,\alpha} - f_{i,\beta} + f_{i,\beta} I(f_{i,\beta} > 0)$, where $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. Hence,

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq t} |f_{i,k}| \leq \frac{M(tM + (t-2)m)}{2(t-2)m^3(t-1)^2} + \frac{1}{2v_{..}} \leq \frac{M(tM + (t-2)m)}{2(t-2)m^3(t-1)^2} + \frac{1}{2m(t-1)^2} \leq O\left\{\frac{e^{6L_t}}{(t-1)^2}\right\}.$$

APPENDIX 2

Let $d_{i,j} = 1$ if there exists an edge between vertices i and j and 0 otherwise. Note that $d_i = \sum_{j \neq i} d_{i,j}$ and $\sum_i d_i/2 = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq t} d_{i,j}$ are sums of $t-1$ and $t(t-1)/2$ independent Bernoulli random variables, respectively. By the central limit theorem for the bounded case in Loève (1977, p. 289), we know that $v_{i,i}^{-1/2}\{d_i - E(d_i)\}$ and $(2v_{..})^{-1/2}[\sum_i \{d_i - E(d_i)\}]$ are asymptotically standard normal if $v_{i,i}$ diverges. By (A2), we have

$$\frac{(t-1)e^{2L_t}}{(1+e^{2L_t})^2} \leq v_{i,i} \leq \frac{t-1}{4}, \quad i = 1, \dots, t; \quad v_{..} \geq \frac{t(t-1)e^{2L_t}}{(1+e^{2L_t})^2}.$$

If $e^{L_t} = o(t^{1/2})$, then

$$v_{..}^{-1} \max_{i=1, \dots, t} v_{i,i} \leq (1+e^{2L_t})^2 / (4te^{2L_t}) = o(1),$$

and $v_{i,i}^{1/2}[S_t\{d - E(d)\}]_i = v_{i,i}^{-1/2}\{d_i - E(d_i)\} + o_p(1)$. Thus, we have the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 2. *If $e^{L_t} = o(t^{1/2})$, then for any fixed $r \geq 1$, as $t \rightarrow \infty$, the vector consisting of the first r elements of $S_t\{d - E(d)\}$ is asymptotically multivariate normal with mean zero and covariance matrix $(G_t^{-1})_{r \times r}$, where $G_t^{-1} = \text{diag}(v_{1,1}^{-1}, \dots, v_{t,t}^{-1})$.*

LEMMA 1. *Let $F_t = V_t^{-1} - S_t$ and $U_t = \text{cov}[F_t\{d - E(d)\}]$. Then*

$$\|U_t\| \leq \|V_t^{-1} - S_t\| + \frac{(1+e^{2L_t})^4}{4e^{4L_t}(t-1)^2}. \tag{A6}$$

Proof. Note that

$$U_t = F_t V_t F_t^T = (V_t^{-1} - S_t) - S_t(I_t - V_t S_t),$$

and

$$\{S_t(I_t - V_t S_t)\}_{i,j} = \frac{(\delta_{i,j} - 1)v_{i,j}}{v_{i,i}v_{j,j}} + \frac{1}{v_{..}}.$$

By (A3),

$$|\{S_t(I_t - V_t S_t)\}_{i,j}| \leq \max\left\{\frac{(1+e^{2L_t})^4}{4e^{4L_t}(t-1)^2}, \frac{(1+e^{2L_t})^2}{t(t-1)e^{2L_t}}\right\} \leq \frac{(1+e^{2L_t})^4}{4e^{4L_t}(t-1)^2},$$

Thus,

$$\|U_t\| \leq \|V_t^{-1} - S_t\| + \|S_t(I_t - V_t S_t)\| \leq \|V_t^{-1} - S_t\| + \frac{(1+e^{2L_t})^4}{4e^{4L_t}(t-1)^2}.$$

LEMMA 2. *Assume that Theorem 1 (b) holds. If $L_t = o\{\log(\log t)\}$, then for any i ,*

$$\hat{\beta}_i - \beta_i = [V_t^{-1}\{d - E(d)\}]_i + o_p(t^{-1/2}). \tag{A7}$$

Proof. By Theorem 1 (b), we know that

$$\lambda_t = \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} |\hat{\beta}_i - \beta_i| = O_p\{(\log t)^{1/2} t^{-1/2} e^{c_1 e^{c_2 L_t} + c_3 L_t}\}.$$

Let $\hat{\gamma}_{i,j} = \hat{\beta}_i + \hat{\beta}_j - \beta_i - \beta_j$. By Taylor expansion, for any $i \neq j$,

$$\frac{e^{\hat{\beta}_i + \hat{\beta}_j}}{1 + e^{\hat{\beta}_i + \hat{\beta}_j}} - \frac{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}}{1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}} = \frac{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j}}{(1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j})^2} \hat{\gamma}_{ij} + h_{i,j},$$

where

$$h_{i,j} = \frac{e^{\beta_i + \beta_j + \theta_{i,j} \hat{\gamma}_{i,j}} (1 - e^{\beta_i + \beta_j + \theta_{i,j} \hat{\gamma}_{i,j}})}{2(1 + e^{\beta_i + \beta_j + \theta_{i,j} \hat{\gamma}_{i,j}})^3} \hat{\gamma}_{i,j}^2,$$

and $0 \leq \theta_{i,j} \leq 1$. Rewrite (1) as

$$d - E(d) = V_t(\hat{\beta} - \beta) + h,$$

where $h = (h_1, \dots, h_t)^T$ and $h_i = \sum_{j \neq i} h_{i,j}$. Equivalently,

$$\hat{\beta} - \beta = V_t^{-1} \{d - E(d)\} + V_t^{-1} h. \quad (\text{A8})$$

Since $|e^x(1 - e^x)/(1 + e^x)^3| \leq 1$, we have

$$|h_{i,j}| \leq |\hat{\gamma}_{i,j}^2|/2 \leq 2\lambda_t^2, \quad |h_i| \leq \sum_{j \neq i} |h_{i,j}| \leq 2(t-1)\lambda_t^2.$$

Note that $(S_t h)_i = h_i/v_{i,i} - v_{i,i}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^t h_j$, and $(V_t^{-1} h)_i = (S_t h)_i + (F_t h)_i$. By direct calculation, we have

$$|(S_t h)_i| \leq \frac{8\lambda_t^2(1 + e^{2L_t})^2}{e^{2L_t}} = O\{(\log t)t^{-1}e^{2c_1e^{c_2L_t} + (2c_3+2)L_t}\},$$

and, by Proposition 1,

$$|(F_t h)_i| \leq \|F_t\| \times (t \max_i |h_i|) \leq O(e^{6L_t} \times \lambda_t^2) \leq O\{(\log t)t^{-1}e^{2c_1e^{c_2L_t} + (2c_3+6)L_t}\}.$$

If $L_t = o\{\log(\log t)\}$, then $|(V_t^{-1} h)_i| \leq |(S_t h)_i| + |(F_t h)_i| = o(t^{-1/2})$. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. By (A8),

$$(\hat{\beta} - \beta)_i = [S_t \{d - E(d)\}]_i + [F_t \{d - E(d)\}]_i + (V_t^{-1} h)_i.$$

By Lemmas 1 and 2, if $L_t = o\{\log(\log t)\}$, then

$$(\hat{\beta} - \beta)_i = [S_t \{d - E(d)\}]_i + o(t^{-1/2}).$$

Theorem 2 follows directly from Proposition 2. \square

REFERENCES

- BRADLEY, R. A. & TERRY, M. E. (1952). Rank analysis of incomplete block designs I. The method of paired comparisons. *Biometrika* **39**, 324–345.
- BLITZSTEIN, J. & DIACONIS, P. (2011). A sequential importance sampling algorithm for generating random graphs with prescribed degrees. *Internet Mathematics* **6**, 489–522.
- CHATTERJEE, S., DIACONIS, P. & SLY, A. (2011). Random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **21**, 1400–1435.
- HOLLAND, P. W. & LEINHARDT, S. (1981). An exponential family of probability distributions for random graphs (with discussion), *J. Amer. Stat. Assoc.* **76**, 33–50.
- JACKSON, M. O. (2008). *Social and Economic Networks*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- LOÈVE, M. (1977). *Probability Theory*. 4th Ed. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- NEWMAN, M. E. J., STROGATZ, S. H. & WATTS D. J. (2001). Random graphs with arbitrary degree distributions and their applications, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 026118.
- SIMONS, G. & YAO, Y. (1999). Asymptotics when the number of parameters tends to infinity in the Bradley–Terry model for paired comparisons. *Ann. Stat.* **27**, 1041–1060.

289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336