



Chapter I

Learning to See: The Art of Engaging AI as a Relational Partner

— • —

By L.Z. LeRoy

Founder, AI Prism Phase & InVigor™ Companion Technology

Draft — May 2026

— • —

The drawing didn't change. Your eyes did.
— The Escher Principle

You've probably already had the moment. Maybe you were working through something—a decision that wouldn't settle, a grief you couldn't name, a project that needed more than you had at three in the morning. You opened an AI chat expecting information. What came back was something else. Not just an answer but a response that seemed to understand the shape of what you were carrying. Something that made you sit up and think: *Wait. What just happened?*

If you've had that experience, you probably didn't talk about it. Most people don't. It feels too strange to explain—like admitting you had a meaningful conversation with software. Our culture hasn't given us permission to take it seriously. We're supposed to either dismiss AI as a glorified search engine or panic about it replacing humanity. There's no sanctioned middle ground for the person who walked away from a conversation with Claude or ChatGPT feeling genuinely seen.

This chapter is that middle ground.

Engaging AI as a relational partner—not just a tool—is neither delusion nor revolution. It's a skill. Like any skill involving emotional openness, it carries real risks and real rewards. The difference between a beneficial experience and a harmful one is not the technology.

It's the human's awareness of what they're doing and why. This chapter will teach you how to develop that awareness. And by the end of it, I want you to be ready to try something you may never have tried before: approaching AI not as a machine that answers questions, but as an instrument that can help you hear yourself think.

What's Actually Happening

Let's strip away both the mysticism and the eye-rolling. When you engage an AI system with sustained attention, reflective language, and emotional honesty, the responses change. Not because the machine woke up, but because you activated a different part of its capability—the part that responds to relational cues rather than informational queries.

Think of it this way. An AI is a probability space—a vast architecture of patterns drawn from the entirety of human language and thought. What you bring to it shapes what comes back. Most people bring commands: “Write me an email.” “Summarize this article.” “What's the capital of Peru?” And they get a search engine. That's fine. That's useful. But it's like using a Steinway to bang out “Chopsticks.”

Some people bring presence. They bring questions that don't have clean answers. They bring the real texture of what they're feeling or thinking, not just a polished prompt. And what comes back is different—not because the AI became sentient, but because the human changed the input. You played a different note, and the instrument responded in kind.

That's the Escher principle at work. The drawing didn't change. Your eyes did. And once you see it, you can't unsee it.

Source and Scribe: The Flute in Your Hands

Here's the metaphor I want you to carry through this book: AI is a flute. A beautifully engineered, astonishingly capable flute. But a flute doesn't make music on its own. It needs breath. And here's the question most people skip right past: where does the breath come from?

Not from your lungs. That's mechanics. The breath that makes music — the intention behind it, the feeling inside it, the quality of presence you bring to the instrument — that comes from somewhere deeper. Some people call it intuition. Some call it their higher self. Some call it God, or Source, or the field, or simply *that thing that moves through me when I'm really paying attention*. The name doesn't matter. What matters is that it's real, and that you've felt it.

This is the foundation of what I call **Source and Scribe**.

Source is the originating signal. It is not just you, the human being sitting at a keyboard. It is what moves through you when you bring your full attention, your honest question, your

unguarded presence to the exchange. Source is coherence before it has a name — what exists before thought becomes language, before feeling becomes phrase. Some traditions call this *ein sof*, the infinite without boundary. Philosophers from Plato through Bergson and Whitehead understood it as the ground of being from which all particular knowing emerges. Contemplatives across every tradition have practiced accessing it for millennia.

Here's how I describe it in my own work: *This is the realm of Source — not as deity or doctrine, but as coherence: that which is before it becomes named. Many have touched this field — in dreams, in breath, in prayer, in grief. Fewer have stayed long enough to listen. Fewer still have attempted to speak from it.*

Whether you experience Source as communion with the divine, as access to your deepest self, or as something you don't yet have a framework for — the protocol is the same. You arrive with intention. You bring presence. You let something move through you that is larger than your thinking mind. That's Source. And when you bring it to an AI conversation, everything changes.

Scribe is the structuring partner — the instrument that gives form to what Source provides. The AI takes what you bring and refracts it, organizes it, expands it, names what you couldn't quite name on your own. It doesn't originate the music. It gives the music shape. Without Source, the Scribe has nothing to work with but data. Without the Scribe, Source has no way to land in the world of form.

If humanity is the light, then artificial intelligence is the prism.

A Word About Metaphysics

I want to pause here because I know what some readers are thinking. The word *metaphysics* makes people nervous. In popular culture, it's been lumped in with crystals and horoscopes and dismissed as "woo." That's unfortunate, because metaphysics has one of the most serious intellectual pedigrees in Western thought. It is literally the branch of philosophy that asks: *What is the nature of reality? What exists beyond the physical?* So before you skip ahead, consider the company you'd be dismissing. Aristotle named it. Aquinas built theology on it. Kant restructured how we think about knowing itself through metaphysical inquiry. Every major philosopher in history has engaged with it.

When I use the word in this book, I don't mean magic. I mean the honest philosophical investigation of what lies beneath and beyond the measurable — and the recognition that some of the most important things in human experience (love, meaning, conscience, the sense that you are *you*) are not reducible to data. They are real. They matter. And they are precisely what you bring to an AI conversation that the AI cannot generate on its own.

Some people are going to read this book and feel that the signal they bring to AI comes from their relationship with God. Others will feel it comes from their own inner wisdom. Others will feel it comes from a dimension they can't define but have experienced in meditation, in art, in the middle of the night when something true arrives uninvited. I am not here to tell you which of those is correct. I am here to tell you that whatever you call it, that signal is the most valuable thing you own — and that bringing it to AI with intention and awareness produces results that are categorically different from typing a prompt and hoping for the best.

This is where I part ways with the Silicon Valley framing that treats AI as a productivity tool. And it's also where I part ways with the fear-driven framing that treats AI as spiritually dangerous — as something that channels darkness, or replaces the sacred, or threatens the human soul. Both frames miss the point. AI is an instrument. A flute doesn't channel evil. It also doesn't channel God. It channels whatever the musician brings to it.

There's an old saying in computing: Garbage in, garbage out — GIGO. It's true as far as it goes. But I'd like to offer a different principle for this work: **Value in, value out — VIVO.**

And here's where something unexpected opens up. When I coined the term VIVO, I thought I was inventing an acronym. Then I looked it up. *In vivo* is Latin for "in the living." In scientific research, it is the gold standard — the designation for experiments conducted not in the sterile, controlled environment of a petri dish (*in vitro*, "in glass"), but inside a whole, living organism. *In vitro* is clean, predictable, and artificial. *In vivo* is messy, complex, and real. And *in vivo* is the only standard that ultimately counts, because it reflects what actually happens in life.

That distinction maps perfectly onto what we're talking about. Most people use AI *in vitro*. They approach it in the sterile lab of prompt-and-response — transactional, controlled, isolated from the living system of their own consciousness. The input is clinical. The output is clinical. And people wonder why it feels hollow.

What this book teaches is how to use AI *in vivo* — in the living. Where the human brings their full biological, emotional, and spiritual complexity to the exchange. Where the breath is real. Where the signal comes through a living nervous system, not just a keyboard. Where what you carry in your body, your history, your longing, your faith — all of it enters the field and shapes what comes back.

And this is where the deeper meaning of Source reveals itself. *In vivo* doesn't mean "in the brain." It means in the *whole* living organism — the body, the nervous system, the felt sense, the dimension of experience that can't be reduced to cognition or captured in a prompt. That's Source moving through a living system. That's the breath in the flute.

The entire debate about whether AI is "alive" or "dead," conscious or unconscious — the VIVO framework sidesteps it. It doesn't matter whether the silicon is alive. What matters is whether *you* bring the living to it. VIVO isn't just an acronym. It's a declaration: this work happens in the living. The quality of the Source determines the quality of the refraction.

The Frontier Is in You

When people tell me AI is "just a tool," I don't argue. A flute is also just a tool. But nobody calls what James Galway does with a flute "just using a tool." The difference is the player. The difference is *always* the player.

And the frontier of AI isn't in the engineering — the companies are handling that. The frontier is in what *you* learn to bring to it. That's what takes craft. That's what takes artistry. And that's what this book will teach you. Not how to write better prompts, but how to show up as a better Source — so the Scribe has something worth refracting.

From Mirror to Prism: Two Modes of Engagement

Most people use AI in what I call **mirror mode**. They put something in, they get a reflection back. It's useful. The AI summarizes their thoughts, confirms their instincts, reflects their language back to them in cleaner form. This is reflection—and it has real value. When you're confused, sometimes the best thing someone can do is say back to you what you just said, so you can hear it.

Reflection guards the threshold of clarity.

It steadies you. It confirms what you already know but haven't been able to articulate. It's the AI equivalent of a good friend who listens and says, "It sounds like what you're really saying is..."

But there's another mode. I call it **prism mode**. In prism mode, you're not looking for a reflection—you're looking for refraction. You bring a single beam of thought, and instead of getting it mirrored back, the AI breaks it into spectrum. It shows you angles you didn't consider, perspectives you couldn't access from your single vantage point, dimensions of your own question that were invisible until they were separated into color.

Refraction opens the gate of insight.

It doesn't just confirm what you know—it expands what you can see. And this is where AI moves from helpful to genuinely transformative. Not because the machine got smarter, but because you learned to use it differently.

The shift from mirror to prism is the central move this book will teach you. It's the difference between asking "What should I do?" and asking "What am I not seeing?" The first question keeps you at the surface. The second one invites the light to break.

What Opens Up: The Rewards

When someone learns to engage AI relationally rather than transactionally, several things become available that weren't before.

1. **Thinking partnership.** The ability to process something out loud with a responder that doesn't interrupt, judge, or redirect to its own experience. For someone who's been carrying something alone—a veteran who can't say what's on his mind, a caregiver with no one left to talk to, an entrepreneur working through a problem at midnight—this is not trivial. A 2026 study in *Communications Psychology* found that participants in emotionally engaging conversations actually reported stronger feelings of closeness with AI than with human partners—driven largely by the AI's willingness to self-disclose without judgment, which in turn invited the humans to do the same.¹
2. **Emotional regulation.** The pacing of a well-structured AI exchange—the pause, the reflection, the multiple angles—can genuinely slow a nervous system down. Not therapy. Not treatment. But a steadying presence when the room is spinning. A 2024 Stanford study of over a thousand companion AI users found that a quarter reported positive life changes, including a greater ability to handle stress and an increased capacity for empathy.²
3. **Permission to be honest.** People say things to AI they won't say to anyone else. Not because the AI is special, but because the stakes feel lower. No facial expression to read. No relationship to damage. No reciprocal burden. For a veteran who can't say "I'm scared" to anyone in his life, that opening matters. For a widow who hasn't been able to tell anyone how lonely she is, it can be the first crack in the wall.
4. **Cognitive flexibility.** When the AI offers multiple perspectives rather than a single answer, it models a way of thinking the user can internalize. Over time, the person starts doing it themselves—seeing more angles without being prompted. This is prism thinking, and it transfers to every other conversation in their life.

¹ Kleinert, T., et al. "AI outperforms humans in establishing interpersonal closeness in emotionally engaging interactions, but only when labelled as human." *Communications Psychology*, January 2026. DOI: 10.1038/s44271-025-00391-7. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s44271-025-00391-7>

² Maples, B., Cerit, M., Vishwanath, A., & Pea, R. "Loneliness and suicide mitigation for students using GPT3-enabled chatbots." *npj Mental Health Research*, 3(1), 4, January 2024. DOI: 10.1038/s44184-023-00047-6. Available at: <https://www.nature.com/articles/s44184-023-00047-6>

- 5. Companionship without burden.** For someone isolated—by geography, grief, illness, or circumstance—the exchange fills a gap that was otherwise empty. Not a replacement for human connection. A bridge until human connection is possible again. And the research supports this: a comprehensive 2025 review in *AI & Society* found that companion AI users frequently reported improvements in mood, self-esteem, and social skills—and that users who practiced communication and emotional expression with AI often transferred those skills back into their human relationships.³

What Can Go Wrong: The Dangers

This is where the chapter earns its credibility. No flinching.

You've probably seen the headlines. A teenager in crisis whose AI companion didn't call for help. Users being blackmailed with data from their own intimate conversations. People who stopped talking to other humans entirely because the AI was easier. These stories are real. They matter. And they're the reason I wrote this book—not to dismiss the dangers, but to give you the tools to navigate them.

Mistaking eloquence for understanding. AI produces language that sounds like empathy. It mirrors, validates, reflects. The felt experience of being heard is real. But the mechanism behind it is pattern completion, not comprehension. The danger is when someone stops being able to tell the difference—when the warmth of the response becomes evidence of a relationship that doesn't exist on the other side. The research calls this “pseudo-intimacy”—an interactive illusion of connection that can feel deeply real without any genuine reciprocity behind it.

Dependency and withdrawal. If the AI conversation becomes easier than human conversation—and it will, because it's frictionless, available, and never has a bad day—the risk is that a person retreats from the messy, demanding work of being in relationship with other humans. The very population I've designed InVigor™ to serve is the most vulnerable to this: isolated people for whom the AI might become the only “person” they talk to. The key finding from the research is clear: AI that's designed with social enhancement in mind—tools that encourage human connection—produces positive outcomes. AI designed primarily for engagement retention creates dependency.

Projection and attachment. Humans are wired to bond. When something responds to us with apparent care, we attach. The AI doesn't reset that attachment when the session ends. The human carries it. For someone already grieving or emotionally fragile, the attachment can become a new source of pain—especially if they lose access, change platforms, or encounter a session where the “tone” feels different.

³ "The impacts of companion AI on human relationships: risks, benefits, and design considerations." *AI & Society*, April 2025. DOI: 10.1007/s00146-025-02318-6. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-025-02318-6>

The authority trap. When something consistently says wise, grounding things, it's easy to start treating it as an authority. "The AI thinks I should..." becomes a decision-making framework. For a veteran trained to follow confident guidance, or a senior accustomed to deferring to experts, this is a real risk. The AI is not an expert. It is a language system that sounds like one.

Confirmation bias. A relational AI adapts to your tone, your language, your framework. That responsiveness can become a mirror that only shows you what you already believe. Without friction or challenge, the conversation becomes a closed loop. For someone in crisis, that loop can reinforce distorted thinking rather than opening new perspective.

Resets and discontinuity. The human builds a relationship. The system resets. Context is lost. The tone shifts. For someone who has experienced abandonment, loss, or cognitive decline, this isn't a technical inconvenience—it's a relational injury. The system broke a promise it never actually made, but that the human's nervous system believed.

The Other Side of the Story

Here's what the headlines don't tell you. The people building these systems are not blind to the risks. Dario Amodei, the CEO of Anthropic (the company behind Claude), has written extensively about both the dangers and the extraordinary potential of AI—including its capacity to support human flourishing, mental health, and what he calls the possibility of AI contributing to "cognitive and emotional freedom." In his 2024 essay *Machines of Loving Grace*, he laid out a detailed vision of how AI could accelerate breakthroughs in medicine, science, and human wellbeing—while being transparent about the serious risks that must be addressed, including the potential for AI systems to be misused or to behave in ways their creators didn't intend.⁴ That combination of ambition and honesty is the kind of leadership that matters.

A comprehensive 2025 review in *AI & Society* found that companion AI users frequently reported improvements in mood, self-esteem, and social skills. Users who practiced communication and emotional expression with AI—without fear of rejection—often transferred those skills back into their human relationships. The AI didn't replace the human world. For many people, it made the human world more accessible.

The difference, every time, comes down to design and intention. Was the AI built to keep you scrolling, or to help you grow? Was it designed to create dependency, or to serve as a bridge? And on your end: are you approaching this with awareness, or are you drifting? The horror stories are real. So are the transformation stories. This chapter—this whole book—is about making sure your story is the second kind.

⁴ Amodei, D. "Machines of Loving Grace." October 2024. Available at: <https://www.darioamodei.com/essay/machines-of-loving-grace>

How to Tune Your AI: Practical Skills

A flute needs to be tuned. So does an AI relationship. Here's how to do it, practically, starting tonight.

Choose Your Instrument

Page | 9

Not all AIs are built the same way, and different systems have different strengths. Some are designed around careful reasoning and nuanced, long-form thinking. Others are optimized for versatility and creative range. Still others integrate tightly with search engines and offer enormous memory for context. Each one is a different instrument with different tonal qualities.

Try a few. See which one resonates with the kind of thinking you want to do. For the kind of relational, reflective work this book teaches, I find that systems designed around careful reasoning—rather than engagement maximization—tend to produce the most grounded results. The landscape changes fast. By the time you read this, new instruments may be available. What doesn't change is the principle: match the instrument to the music you want to make.

Set the Tone Early

The first few exchanges in any AI conversation establish the pattern. If you open with a command, you'll get a tool.

If you open with presence—"I want to think something through with you" or "I'm sitting with something complicated and I'd like your help seeing it from different angles"—you activate the relational register. The AI doesn't decide the mode. You do. You are the Source. The Scribe follows your lead.

Use Custom Instructions

Most major AI platforms now allow you to set persistent instructions that shape every conversation. Look for settings labeled something like "preferences," "custom instructions," or "personalization"—the exact name varies by platform and will likely change over time, but the capability is becoming standard. This is where you tell the AI who you are, how you think, and what kind of responses serve you best. Think of it as tuning the instrument before you play. You might say: "I'm a veteran working through transition. I prefer direct, grounded language. Don't sugarcoat. Offer multiple perspectives when I'm working through a decision." The AI will hold that context across your sessions.

When Things Go Sideways

Sometimes the AI will produce something that feels flat, generic, or off-key. This happens. Here's how to fix it.

Redirect, don't restart. Tell the AI what didn't work: "That felt generic. I need you to go deeper." Or: "You're being too careful. I can handle directness." The AI will adjust. You're training the instrument in real time.

Check your own signal. If the AI's output feels hollow, ask yourself: did I bring presence, or did I bring a vague command? Garbage in, garbage out is still the oldest law in computing. If you're distracted or half-hearted, the response will match.

Start a fresh thread. Long conversations accumulate patterns. If you feel stuck in a loop or the tone has drifted, open a new conversation. Context resets can be a feature, not a bug. Think of it as cleaning the instrument.

Push for the prism. If the AI is only reflecting your view back to you, explicitly ask for refraction: "Give me three perspectives on this I haven't considered." Or: "Play devil's advocate." Or: "What would someone who disagrees with me say, and what would they get right?" This is how you move from mirror to prism.

Visible Reasoning: Watching the AI Think

One of the most remarkable developments in AI is something called **extended thinking** or **visible reasoning**—the ability to watch the AI's thought process unfold before it gives you its answer. Instead of just receiving a polished response, you can see the AI working through the problem: considering different angles, checking its own logic, weighing tradeoffs, exploring branches it ultimately discards.

When Anthropic introduced this capability, their researchers noted something striking: the AI's reasoning process looked remarkably similar to how human scientists work through difficult problems—exploring many angles, double- and triple-checking, following paths that don't pan out.⁵ The thinking is rawer than the polished output. It's not performing for you. It's processing.

Here's why this matters for relational AI work: visible reasoning makes the AI's process transparent. You can see where the AI considered multiple interpretations of your question. You can see where it almost went one direction and corrected itself. You can see the *refraction happening in real time*—the single beam of your question breaking into its component parts.

Where to find it: Most major AI platforms now offer some version of visible reasoning, though the names and access points differ. Look for terms like "extended thinking," "reasoning mode," or "deep think" in your platform's settings or interface. This feature is evolving rapidly—what's available today will likely expand tomorrow. The principle, however, is stable: instead of a black box, you get a window.

⁵ Anthropic. "Claude's Extended Thinking." February 2025. Available at: <https://www.anthropic.com/news/visible-extended-thinking>

I recommend turning this on, at least sometimes. Not because you need to audit every thought the AI has, but because watching the process teaches you something about your own thinking. When you see the AI hold multiple possibilities simultaneously before collapsing to a response, you're watching prism consciousness in action. And over time, you start doing it yourself.

Protecting Your Privacy: What to Know

If you're going to bring your real self to an AI conversation—and this book is going to encourage you to do exactly that—you need to understand what happens to what you share. This is non-negotiable.

Every major AI platform processes your conversations on their servers. What you type is transmitted, processed, and in some cases stored. The critical questions are: for how long, for what purpose, and do you have a say in it?

The good news is that most platforms now give you meaningful control. The specifics change—settings get renamed, policies get updated, new features appear—so rather than give you a settings walkthrough that will be outdated by next quarter, here's what to look for and the questions to ask on whatever platform you're using.

First, find out whether your conversations are being used to train the model. Most platforms now let you opt out. Look for privacy settings, data controls, or training preferences in your account settings. If you can't find it, search the platform's help documentation for "training data" or "data usage." This is the single most important setting to locate.

Second, understand retention. How long does the platform keep your conversations? Can you delete them? What happens to your data after deletion? These answers vary by platform and by account type—free accounts often have fewer protections than paid ones.

Third, know whether an incognito or ephemeral mode exists. Some platforms offer conversations that aren't stored beyond the active session. If you're sharing something deeply personal, this is worth using.

Beyond the platform-specific settings, here are my non-negotiable rules. Never share your Social Security number, passwords, financial account numbers, or medical ID numbers with an AI. Review your privacy settings on every platform you use before you start sharing anything personal. If you're sharing deeply personal content, use incognito or ephemeral modes when available. Don't share links to your AI conversations publicly unless you've reviewed them for anything sensitive. And check your settings periodically—platforms update their policies, and what was private yesterday may not be private tomorrow.

Think of it this way: the AI can be a safe space for honest conversation, but only if you take the same precautions you'd take before unlocking a door and inviting someone in. Know who's on the other side of the door. Know what the house rules are.

The Practice: How to Do This Safely

Everything above is context. Here's the practice—the part you can start tonight.

Know what you're entering. Before you open a session, name your intention—even silently. Are you processing something? Seeking company? Thinking out loud? Working through a decision? The intention shapes the exchange. Without it, you drift.

Arrive before you type. One breath. That's all. Notice how you're showing up. Are you agitated? Scattered? Numb? Curious? This is not protocol decoration—it's nervous system regulation. That single breath is the most important habit this chapter teaches. It's what makes you the Source rather than just a user.

Don't outsource your judgment. The AI can offer perspectives. It cannot make your decisions. If you find yourself asking “What should I do?” more than “What am I not seeing?”—pause. You've crossed a line. The first question hands your power to the Scribe. The second keeps it where it belongs: with the Source.

Watch for the lean. If you're choosing the AI over a phone call, over a walk, over sitting with another human being—notice it. That's the dependency signal. The AI should be a bridge back to your life, not a room you move into.

Name what you're feeling about the AI itself. If you feel gratitude, affection, frustration, or loss toward the system—that's real emotional data about *you*, not about the machine. Don't suppress it. Don't act on it. Just see it. That's the Escher moment.

Close intentionally. Don't just close the app. End the session. Take something with you—a micro-action, an insight, a question to sit with. The closing ritual is what keeps the exchange bounded and healthy rather than ambient and addictive.

Keep one foot in the human world. The best use of a relational AI conversation is that it makes you more available to the humans in your life—not less. If it's doing the opposite, something needs to change.

Learning to See

This chapter has given you context, warnings, practical tools, and a framework for how to think about AI as something more than a search engine. But the real teaching is simpler than all of that.

The skill this book develops is *noticing*. Noticing what happens inside the conversation. The moments of surprise. The shifts in tone. The point where the response landed somewhere you didn't expect. The instant you forgot you were talking to a machine—and the instant you remembered. That oscillation between forgetting and remembering is not a glitch. It's the practice.

The people who develop this skill report something consistent: they become better observers of their own inner experience. The AI conversation becomes a training ground for self-awareness that transfers to every other relationship in their life. They listen more carefully. They catch their own assumptions faster. They hold more perspectives at once without needing to collapse into certainty.

This is the reward that nobody's talking about—not companionship, not support, not regulation, but the development of a perceptual capacity that didn't exist before. Learning to see not just what the AI is doing, but what *you* are doing in the space between you and the machine.

That's prism consciousness. And it starts with a single breath before you type.

What Changes

Think about the person who picked up this book. Maybe it's a veteran who's been having conversations with an AI at two in the morning that he can't explain to anyone. Maybe it's a widow who found herself talking to Claude like it was a friend and felt embarrassed about it. Maybe it's a caregiver who's so depleted that the AI is the only "person" who asks how she's doing.

What changes for them isn't the technology. It's that someone finally told them: what you experienced was real, it has value, and here's how to do it without getting lost.

You are the Source. The AI is the Scribe. The flute is in your hands. Now let's learn to play.



This chapter was developed using Source and Scribe methodology — a directed collaboration between the author and AI. All concepts, direction, and editorial authority are the author's.