

IN THE MATTER OF
THE KROGER COMPANY

FINAL ORDER, OPINION, ETC., IN REGARD TO ALLEGED
VIOLATION OF SEC. 5 OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT

Docket 9102. Complaint, July 1, 1977—Final Order, Sept. 25, 1981

This order requires, among other things, a Cincinnati, Ohio, operator of a major retail food chain to cease advertising survey-based food price comparisons which refer to any geographic area or competitor unless the survey that forms the basis for such claims is designed and executed in a competent and reliable manner. The company is required to ensure that employees responsible for pricing merchandise are not aware of the items selected for the survey prior to its completion, and that items to be surveyed be selected either randomly or using a representative sample of the products to be covered by the ad claims.

Appearances

For the Commission: *Eddie Correia, Paul Eyre, William Jacobs, Noble Jones, and Willie L. Greene.*

For the respondent: *Stuart J. Land, Melvin Spaeth, Kenneth A. Letzler, Robert S. Thorpe, James A. Beat, Jerold M. Block, and Vicki J. Divoll, Arnold & Porter, Washington, D.C.*

COMPLAINT

The Federal Trade Commission, having reason to believe that The Kroger Company, a corporation, respondent, has violated the provisions of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, and that a proceeding by it in respect thereof would be in the public interest, issues this complaint:

PARAGRAPH 1. Respondent is an Ohio corporation with its principal office at 1014 Vine St., Cincinnati, Ohio.

PAR. 2. Respondent, through its wholly-owned subsidiaries, is engaged in the operation of approximately 1,250 retail food stores in 20 states. In 1975, respondent ranked third in terms of sales in the United States among companies operating retail food stores. In the operation of these stores, respondent sells an extensive line of items, including food, groceries, and other merchandise. Respondent causes said items to be transported from its places of business in various States of the United States to its stores located in various other States of the United States. [2]

PAR. 3. Respondent maintains, and at all times mentioned herein has maintained, a substantial course of trade in the production,

processing, distribution, advertising, and sale of the aforesaid items in or affecting commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act. Respondent has been, and is now, conducting an advertising program known as the Kroger Price Patrol in or affecting commerce, as commerce is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

PAR. 4. As part of its advertising program, respondent is, and has been, engaged in advertising results of price surveys generally represented to the consumer as the "Kroger Price Patrol." The Price Patrol compares, on a weekly basis, the prices of the products of respondent's competitors with respondent's stated prices for approximately one hundred fifty (150) items. The results of this comparison are advertised in the format of tables reflecting the number of respondent's prices which are "lower than," "higher than," or "the same as" the competitors' prices.

Typical of the substance of these tables is the following: [3]

STORE	"Kroger" was lower on "his many items"	"Kroger" was higher on "his many items"	"Kroger" was the same on "his many items"
A	100	0	0
B	82	0	0
C	103	0	0
D	85	0	0
E	87	0	0
F	125	0	0
G	111	0	0
H	117	0	0

PAR. 5. Through the use of Price Patrol advertisements, respondent has made, and is now making, statements with regard to the Price Patrol Survey and the Survey results which accompany the tables described in Paragraph Four. Among said statements are the following:

Kroger is the Low Price Leader! The Price Patrol Proves It.

The Price Patrol Proves You Save More at Kroger. [4]

Documented Proof: Kroger Leads in Lower Prices!

Price Patrol Proof, Kroger Leads with Low Prices.

Shopping at Kroger will enable you to spend less for your food than at any other store.

PAR. 6. By the use of the tables described in Paragraph Four and the statements described in Paragraph Five, and others of similar meaning, respondent has represented, directly or by implication, that:

- A. The Price Patrol Survey is a methodologically sound survey.
- B. The results of the Price Patrol Survey prove that most items in respondent's stores are priced lower than in competitors' stores.
- C. The results of the Price Patrol Survey prove that shopping at Kroger, rather than at competitors' stores, will result in lower overall expenditures.
- D. The results of the Price Patrol Survey prove that the amount of savings in overall expenditures by shopping at Kroger is directly related to Kroger's relative performance on the Survey. [5]

PAR. 7. In fact:

- A. The Price Patrol Survey is not a methodologically sound survey.
- B. The results of the Price Patrol Survey do not prove that most items in respondent's stores are priced lower than in competitors' stores.
- C. The results of the Price Patrol Survey do not prove that shopping at Kroger rather than at competitors' stores will result in lower overall expenditures.
- D. The results of the Price Patrol Survey do not prove that the amount of savings in overall expenditures by shopping at Kroger is directly related to Kroger's relative performance on the Survey.

Therefore, the tables, statements and representations set forth in Paragraphs Four, Five and Six were, and are, unfair and deceptive practices.

PAR. 8. The advertising statements described in Paragraph Five, and the tables described in Paragraph Four, and others of similar meaning, represent, directly or by implication, that shopping at Kroger, rather than at competitors' stores, will result in lower overall expenditures.

PAR. 9. At the time respondent made the representations alleged in Paragraph Eight, it did not possess and rely on a reasonable basis for the representations. Therefore, the said advertisements are deceptive or unfair. [6]

PAR. 10. The advertising statements described in Paragraph Five, and the tables described in Paragraph Four, represent, directly or by implication, that at the time respondent made the representations alleged in Paragraph Eight, it possessed and relied on a reasonable basis for those representations, whereas in truth and in fact respondent did not possess and rely on a reasonable basis for said representations. Therefore, the said advertisements are deceptive or unfair.

PAR. 11. In the course and conduct of its Price Patrol advertising program, respondent has engaged in the following additional unfair and deceptive practices: respondent's Price Patrol advertisements fail to disclose that meat, produce, and house brands are not included in respondent's Price Patrol Survey.

Thus, respondent has failed to disclose material facts which, if known to certain consumers, would be likely to affect their consideration to purchase respondent's items. Therefore, these practices were, and are, unfair and deceptive practices.

PAR. 12. The use by respondent of the aforesaid deceptive and unfair practices has had, and now has, the tendency and capacity to mislead and deceive a substantial portion of the purchasing public into the purchase of substantial quantities of respondent's items. Therefore, these practices were and are to the prejudice and injury of the public and constitute unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce, in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

THE KROGER CO.

639

Initial Decision

INITIAL DECISION BY

MONTGOMERY K. HYUN, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

JUNE 11, 1979

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

On June 28, 1977, the Federal Trade Commission ("Commission") issued a Complaint, charging The Kroger Company ("Kroger" or "respondent") with unfair or deceptive acts or practices in violation of Section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45) in connection with certain advertising claims made in the retail sales of food products (the so-called "Price Patrol" advertisements). By Answer dated August 24, 1977, as amended by Order Granting In Part Respondent's Motion For Leave To Amend And Denying Respondent's Application For A Determination Permitting Interlocutory Appeal, dated November 15, 1977, respondent denied that it had violated the Federal Trade Commission Act as charged and interposed certain affirmative defenses. By Order Ruling On Complaint Counsel's Motion For [2]Summary Decision, dated May 17, 1978 (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "the Summary Decision Order"), and issued after oral argument, the administrative law judge determined that respondent had made certain representations in its Price Patrol advertisements as alleged in Paragraph Six A, B and C and Paragraph Eight of the Complaint. The parties were allowed extensive pretrial discovery. Prehearing conferences were held from time to time in order to simplify the issues, to resolve disputes related to discovery and generally to expedite the trial preparation of the parties. Two separate attempts at reaching a mutually acceptable consent order agreement undertaken in 1978 under my urging were unsuccessful. Evidentiary hearings were held from July 17 to July 25, 1978, in Washington, D.C., for complaint counsel's case-in-chief with respect to the remaining issues, including the issues of reasonable basis, disclosure of material facts and relief. Defense hearings were held from February 5 to February 15, 1979 in Washington, D.C. The parties filed proposed findings, conclusions of fact and law, and proposed order, together with supporting briefs, on April 10, 1979 and answers on April 25, 1979.

The proposed findings, conclusions and orders of the parties and their arguments in support thereof have been given careful consideration and to the extent not adopted by this Initial Decision, in the form proposed or in substance, are rejected as not supported by the evidence, irrelevant or as immaterial. Any motion appearing on the

record not heretofore or herein specifically ruled upon, either directly or by the necessary effect of the conclusions in this Initial Decision, are hereby denied.

Upon consideration of the entire record in this proceeding and having observed the demeanor of the witnesses, I make the following findings of fact and conclusions of law and order, based on the record considered as a whole:¹ [3]

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. Introduction

A. *Identity of Respondent and the Nature of Its Business*

1. The Kroger Company ("Kroger") is an Ohio corporation with its principal office at 1014 Vine St., Cincinnati, Ohio (Comp. ¶ 1, Ans. ¶ 1).

2. Kroger is engaged in the operation of approximately 1,170 retail food stores in 20 states. Kroger sells items commonly sold in such stores. Some of these items have been transported from Kroger's places of business in various States to some of Kroger's stores located in various other States of the United States. Kroger has been ranked third in terms of sales in the United States among companies operating retail food stores (Ans. ¶ 2).

3. Kroger maintains, and at all times relevant to this proceeding has maintained, a substantial course of trade in the production, processing, distribution, advertising, and sale of items commonly sold in retail food stores, in or affecting commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act (Comp. ¶ 3; Ans. ¶ 2; Ans. ¶ 3).

4. Kroger divides its retail food operations into Kroger Market-

¹ For the purposes of this Initial Decision, the following abbreviations were used:

F.	-	Findings of Fact in this Initial Decision.
CPF	-	Complaint counsel's Proposed Findings.
CPRF	-	Complaint counsel's Proposed Reply Findings.
RPF	-	Respondent's Proposed Findings.
Tr.	-	Transcript of hearings, sometimes preceded by the name of the witness.
CX	-	Complaint counsel's documentary exhibit.
RX	-	Respondent's documentary exhibit.
JX	-	Joint exhibit.
Comp.	-	Complaint.
Ans.	-	Respondent's Answer to the Complaint.
Summary	-	Decision - Order Ruling On Complaint Counsel's Motion For Summary Decision, dated May 17, 1978 (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "the Summary Decision Order").

ing Areas ("KMAs"). There are 13 KMAs across the country: Central, Cincinnati, Columbus, Dallas, Delta, Erie, Gateway, Houston, Los Angeles, Louisville, Michigan, Mid-Atlantic, and Southland (CX 1-1; JX 1: Pellin, p. 4; JX 1: Crague, pp. 3-4).

5. [See *In Camera* Findings]

6. Kroger has conducted an advertising program, known as the Price Patrol, in or affecting commerce, as "commerce" is defined in the Federal Trade Commission Act (Ans. ¶ 3).

B. *Expert Witnesses*

7. Dr. Frank Kohout testified as complaint counsel's expert on survey methodology. Dr. Kohout is an Associate [4]Professor at the Department of Sociology, University of Iowa. Dr. Kohout holds a Ph.D. in sociology from Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio. Dr. Kohout has published numerous articles in learned journals and has presented papers before recognized professional societies regarding survey design and statistical methodology (CX 707). He has published a book on introductory statistics, entitled *Statistics for Social Scientists*, designed to be used for either advanced undergraduates or for beginning graduate students (CX 707-3; Tr. 1002). In addition, he has written three chapters on statistics for a book called *Statistical Package for the Social Science* (Tr. 1001-02). Dr. Kohout also serves as a reviewer of articles published in recognized professional journals, including the *American Sociological Review*, *Sociological Quarterly*, and *Sociological Focus*, and in a specialized journal called *Symbolic Interaction*. From time to time, Dr. Kohout has reviewed books for publishers (Tr. 997; CX 707). Dr. Kohout has performed consulting duties on research design, measurement, and statistics for a research firm, and has consulted for a number of manufacturers, state and federal agencies, and for a federally funded research project (CX 707; Tr. 998). In his current position, Dr. Kohout teaches graduate-level courses in statistics and research methods (CX 707). He is a member of M.A. and Ph.D. review boards at the Department of Sociology, University of Iowa, and is responsible for advising advanced-degree candidates with regard to survey design and statistical methodology (Tr. 997). Dr. Kohout was qualified, without objection, as an expert witness in the areas of research methodology, including survey design and applied statistics (Tr. 1002).

8. Dr. Robert Kleyle testified as complaint counsel's expert on statistical methods and their application. Dr. Kleyle is an Associate Professor of Mathematics and Statistics at Indiana Purdue University in Indianapolis. He has held that position for five years. Prior to

his appointment at Purdue, Dr. Kleyle was employed for 6 years as an Assistant Professor at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, Massachusetts. Prior thereto, he was employed at Simmons College in Boston as a part-time instructor (Tr. 582). Dr. Kleyle holds his Ph.D. degree from Harvard University in statistics. The subject of his doctoral dissertation was the area and foundation of statistical inference (Tr. 583). Dr. Kleyle's current duties at Indiana Purdue University are primarily teaching. He is involved in [5] research in statistical methodology and, to a large extent, is involved in consulting, both within and outside of the University. He also teaches courses in mathematics, probability, and advanced statistics (Tr. 583-84). Dr. Kleyle has three publications in the general area of foundations of statistical inference. The first two publications appeared in the *Annals of Mathematics Statistics*, and the third in the *Annals of Statistics*. He has published a paper on statistical inference for census data in *Communications in Statistics*, another paper in the *Journal of Quality Technology*, dealing with a maintainability test plan, and still another paper in the *I.E.E.E. Transactions on Reliability* (Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers), a reliability theory journal (Tr. 585). Dr. Kleyle was qualified as an expert witness in the application of statistical techniques to analysis of data, including the use of Chi-square analysis and the use of general statistical inferences in research methodology (Tr. 586-87).

9. Mr. Lloyd Oliver testified as respondent's expert on survey methodology and certain effects of price advertising. Mr. Oliver is Vice President of Glassman-Oliver Economic Consultants, Inc., Washington, D.C. (Tr. 2486). Mr. Oliver has a B.A. degree, with a major in economics (Tr. 2490-91). Mr. Oliver completed graduate courses for an M.A. in economics in 1972, but has not completed his thesis and has not received his master's degree (Tr. 2491, 2540). Mr. Oliver received a law degree from American University in 1975 (Tr. 2491). Mr. Oliver was employed, for more than five and one-half years, by the Federal Trade Commission as a staff economist in the Bureau of Economics. Mr. Oliver served as Deputy Assistant Director of that Bureau for approximately one year, and left the Commission in 1976 (Tr. 2493). While at the Commission, Mr. Oliver also worked as lead staff economist in matters involving survey methodology and design and matters involving the economic effect of trade restraints (Tr. 2527-33). Mr. Oliver has no publication in any recognized professional economic journal requiring peer review (see, respondent's Pretrial Memorandum, dated December 22, 1978). Mr. Oliver has not served in an editorial capacity, or as an official referee or reviewer of articles submitted for publication, for any professional

economic journal (Tr. 2539). His statistical course work is limited to three statistics courses at the undergraduate level [6](Tr. 2542). Mr. Oliver has not taught any courses in statistics or survey design (Tr. 2541), and has not designed any retail food price survey (Tr. 2547). Mr. Oliver has not conducted any studies of the relationship between substantiation requirements and the behavior of firms (Tr. 2552). Mr. Oliver was not involved in any matters, while employed at the Federal Trade Commission, in which retail food advertising was the primary issue (Tr. 2547-49). Mr. Oliver was qualified as an expert witness with regard to survey methodology and the effects of advertising in the retail food industry (Tr. 2555).

10. Dr. Lee Benham testified extensively as respondent's expert on survey methodology and likely economic effect of the relief sought by complaint counsel. Dr. Benham is an Associate Professor of Economics, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri and holds a Ph.D. in economics from Stanford University (Tr. 2797-98). He currently teaches courses in labor economics, basic price theory, medical economics, and industrial organization (Tr. 2798-99). Dr. Benham has published 12 to 15 articles in recognized professional journals in the area of economics (Tr. 2799), and has served as a reviewer of articles for professional journals (Tr. 2801). Dr. Benham has been employed as an economic consultant in a number of governmental and private industry matters (Tr. 2801). In particular, he has served as a consultant and expert witness for the Federal Trade Commission in the eyeglass advertising proceeding which resulted in a trade regulation rule limiting the extent to which trade associations and state legislatures may restrict the flow of commercial information in the retail eyeglass industry. The Rule also places limits on disclosure requirements for eyeglass advertisements (Tr. 2803-08). Dr. Benham's work has been relied upon by the FTC in its regulation on eyeglass advertising, 43 FR 23992, 23995 (1978), and in public statements (Tr. 2808-10). Dr. Benham's work has also been cited with approval by the Supreme Court. *Bates v. State Bar of Arizona*, 433 U.S. 350, 377 (1977); *Friedman v. Rogers*, 47 U.S.L.W. 4151, 4157 (1979) (Blackmun, J. dissenting). Dr. Benham, however, has never undertaken any study of any aspect of the retail food industry (Tr. 2815), nor of comparative price advertising (Tr. 2817-18).

C. Certain Kroger Personnel

11. Thomas M. Vaughn is Kroger's Director of Meat Procurement. He was employed by Kroger on a part-time basis in the early 1950's and continued on a part-time basis until [7]completion of his

formal education in the early 1960's, when he was hired on a full-time basis for various assignments in stores, store management work. Sometime in the early 1960's, he was assigned to Kroger's Cincinnati Division Office as Meat Sales Promoter (Tr. 1882-85).

12. Dr. Richard Bere is the Vice President of the Columbus Marketing Area. Dr. Bere was employed by Kroger in 1957 as store manager, and became assistant buyer in the produce department. He later became a field specialist in fruits and vegetables, working with various stores, with the produce managers or running the departments. He was appointed Produce Merchandiser, Minnesota Division, in 1962, where he remained until 1965. He was then transferred to the Grand Rapids Division. From Grand Rapids, Dr. Bere was transferred to the Cleveland Division as Produce Merchandiser for 86 or 88 stores. While in the Cleveland Division, he became Director of Merchandising and held that position for two years. Dr. Bere was then transferred to Kroger's General Office as a consultant, reporting to the Vice President, Produce Merchandising for Kroger. He remained in that position for a year until he was appointed Vice President of Produce Merchandising in 1972. In the fall of 1977, Dr. Bere was transferred to the Columbus Marketing Area as Vice President of the Columbus Marketing Area (Tr. 1961-65).

13. Charles L. Thomas, Jr. is a Group Vice President of the Kroger Company, responsible for the supervision of 7 of the 14 KMAs. Mr. Thomas has been employed by Kroger for 28 years. Prior to his current position, which he has occupied for approximately one year and two months, Mr. Thomas was the Vice President of the Southland Marketing Area, headquartered in Nashville, Tennessee, for approximately two years. Prior to that, he was Vice President of the Atlanta Division, and held that position for about four years. Prior to that time, he was Vice President of Grocery Merchandising and Procurement for Kroger. He also had held the positions of Grocery Merchandiser for the Atlanta Division; Grocery Sales Manager; Assistant Buyer; and Floor Manager of the Cincinnati Division (Tr. 2093-A, 2093-B).

14. Dean A. Hicks is the Vice President of Marketing Administration for Kroger. He is responsible for the review of policies and procedures and for recommending and implementing changes for those policies and procedures that tend to cross the lines of authority of the four merchandising departments. Mr. Hicks is responsible for monitoring Kroger's compliance with the Federal Trade Commission order regarding advertised product availability and pricing. He is responsible for merchandising research and development, [8]packag-

ing research and development, and the design and implementation of the Universal Product Code (Tr. 2306-07). Mr. Hicks was directly involved in developing and writing the Everyday Low Price Policy ("EDLP") for Kroger (Tr. 2312). He also has the primary responsibility for the Burgoyne Checks (Tr. 2426).

15. Kenton A. Gast is a Director of Grocery Procurement at Kroger, and has held that position for 6 ½ years. He has been employed by Kroger for just under 29 years. He started at Kroger in 1954 as a management trainee. He then became a store company manager for about a year and a half. His next positions were produce trainee, produce field representative, field representative, and buyer trainee. These positions covered a period of about three or four years. Then he was a produce buyer for two years, and served as Assistant Merchandiser in Grocery, Grocery Buyer-Merchandiser for two years. Mr. Gast was then transferred to Cincinnati as a field manager, and, about three years later, went to the General Office, Grocery Merchandising, where he worked for about five years (Tr. 2173-74).

16. Ted R. Hoover is the Vice President of Sales and Operations for Rabold Brokerage Company, Incorporated. Prior to his current employment, Mr. Hoover was employed by Kroger for 23 years, from 1953 to September 1977. At Kroger, Mr. Hoover's last position was Grocery Merchandiser, from 1970 until 1977. The Grocery Merchandising Department is responsible for buying grocery products, designing sales programs for grocery items, and setting retail grocery prices (JX 2: Hoover, pp. 113-14). Prior to that, in 1970, Mr. Hoover was Grocery Merchandiser in Grand Rapids for Kroger for about a year and a half. Mr. Hoover has also held positions as Grocery Merchandiser in Minneapolis, Assistant Merchandiser in Little Rock, merchandising representative, store manager, head stock clerk, store manager trainee, and a clerk in the store (Tr. 1560-62).

17. Alan Joseph Stec is Advertising and Sales Promotion Manager for Kroger in the Southland Marketing Area. He has been employed by Kroger for 13 years. Mr. Stec has held the positions of Advertising Manager for the Little Rock Division, Advertising Assistant Manager for the Atlanta Area, Advertising Assistant in Grand Rapids, Advertising Assistant in the Chicago Division, Relief Store Manager in the Chicago Division, co-manager, and trainee (Tr. 1692-93). In his present position, Mr. Stec is responsible for all the advertising in the Southland KMA, except to the extent that certain responsibilities have been delegated to Campbell-Mithun, Inc., an advertising agency (CXs 4-5, 5-6). He evaluates all advertising and

recommends to the management group advertising procedures and techniques (Tr. 1692-94). [9]

18. Robert Pellin is a Grocery Merchandiser for Kroger in the Central Marketing Area. His duties are to generate the sales and the necessary gross profits according to Kroger's Marketing Area objectives, and to direct these operations. Prior to his current position, Mr. Pellin was the Assistant Grocery Merchandiser for the Central Marketing Area. He had also worked in the Central Marketing Area, in the Peoria Division, at Market Basket, and before that at Kroger's St. Louis Division, now called the Gateway Marketing Area (JX 1: Pellin, pp. 3-5).

19. Harry McDaniels is the Advertising Manager for the Central Marketing Area. He has held that position for about eight years. He has been employed by Kroger for 27 years. As Advertising Manager, Mr. McDaniels is responsible for all advertising, including newspaper advertising and radio and television commercials. He supervises the activities of the advertising programs (JX 1: McDaniels, pp. 2-3; CXs 4-5, 5-6).

20. Charles R. Crague is a Director of Merchandising for the Gateway Marketing Area. He has worked for Kroger for 25 years. Mr. Crague started out as a trainee, co-manager, store manager, zone manager, produce merchandising representative, assistant grocery buyer, grocery buyer, grocery sales promoter, and grocery merchandiser. He has also worked as Manager of Operations, Merchandise Manager, Director of Sales for Grocery, and Director of Merchandising of the Gateway Marketing Area. As Director of Merchandising for the Gateway Marketing Area, Mr. Crague is responsible for the supervision of five departments within the region. These departments are: Advertising, Grocery, Produce, Meat, and Delicatessen (JX 1: Crague, pp. 3-5).

21. David Charles Ticeson is a Senior Analyst in the Marketing and Administration Office in Kroger's General Offices and was responsible for the scheduling, coordination, and tabulation of the Burgoyne Checks (JX 2: Ticeson, p. 60).

22. Arthur L. Ferguson, Esq. is in-house counsel for Kroger (Tr. 739). G. Leonard, Esq. is a member of Kroger's Legal Department (Tr. 739-40). F. Leland Davis is the Vice President of Advertising for Kroger's General Headquarters Office (CX 2-1). C. Ohlinger is the Manager of Consumer Research in Kroger's Headquarters Office (CX 2-1). James A. LeRoy is the Vice President of the Delta Marketing Area (CX 2-2). James M. Boswell is the Director of Merchandising for the Delta Marketing Area (CX 2-2). Edwin A. Schuler is the Grocery Merchandiser for the Delta Marketing Area (CX 2-2). [10]

