Saturation and Collapse in Dynamical Systems: Emergent Irreversibility and Threshold Phenomena

Mahmoud Manafi, Mohammad Ojaqhi

Abstract

This paper presents a saturation-collapse framework for algebraic structure in which algebraic coherence, reversibility, and composability deteriorate as functions of an intrinsic saturation functional. In contrast to classical algebra, where axioms are assumed to hold universally, the proposed framework permits axioms to remain valid only within specified regimes and to fail in a structured and derivable manner beyond them. Collapse is not imposed as a primitive notion but arises naturally through the degeneration of admissible endomorphisms. The framework establishes a unified formal language for irreversibility, threshold effects, and structural degradation, and is readily applicable to groups, semigroups, and dynamical algebraic systems.

Keywords: Saturation, Collapse, Degeneration, Dynamical Systems, Irreversibility

1 Motivation and Significance

Classical abstract algebra is built on globally valid axioms: associativity, invertibility, and closure either hold everywhere or fail entirely. However, many mathematical and applied systems exhibit threshold behavior: beyond a certain level of accumulation, density, or complexity, structure degrades, reversibility is lost, or composition becomes impossible.

Examples of such behavior appear across mathematics and science:

- degeneration in algebraic geometry,
- loss of reversibility in dynamical systems,
- phase transitions in statistical mechanics,
- information loss in computation and logic.

Despite their ubiquity, these phenomena are usually treated externally to algebraic structure. The saturation–collapse framework proposes a different approach:

> Collapse is an intrinsic algebraic phenomenon that emerges from saturation-driven degeneration of morphisms.

This shifts the focus from static axioms to dynamic structural limits, providing a new lens for understanding irreversibility and breakdown within algebra itself.

2 Definitions

We begin with a minimal assumption defined by Manafi(2026).

Definition 2.1. *Let S be a nonempty set. Elements of S represent states of the system. At this stage, no algebraic operation, topology, or order is assumed.*

The central structural ingredient is a saturation measure.

Definition 2.2. *A* saturation function *is a map*

$$\sigma : S \to [0, +\infty].$$

The value $\sigma(x)$ represents the degree of accumulation, load, or structural stress of a state x.

We impose only minimal assumptions:

- saturation is intrinsic to the state,
- saturation may increase under dynamics,
- saturation need not be linear, continuous, or bounded.

Definition 2.3 (Admissible Endomorphisms)**.** *Let $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \{f : S \to S\}$ be a collection of maps such that*

$$\sigma(f(x)) \geq \sigma(x) \quad \textit{for all } x \in S.$$

Elements of $\mathcal{E}$ represent admissible processes or transformations. Invertible elements of $\mathcal{E}$ correspond to reversible dynamics; non-invertible elements encode irreversibility.

Collapse is derived from degeneration of admissible dynamics.

Definition 2.4 (Critical Saturation)**.** *Define the critical saturation level*

$$\sigma_c := \inf\Big\{\sigma(x) \;\Big|\; \textit{every admissible endomorphism } f \textit{ with } \sigma(f(x)) > \sigma(x) \textit{ is non-invertible}\Big\}.$$

This value marks the threshold beyond which irreversible behavior is unavoidable.

Definition 2.5 (Collapse Set)**.** *The collapse set is*

$$C := \{x \in S \mid \sigma(x) \geq \sigma_c\}.$$

Collapse is thus not assumed but derived: states collapse precisely when no reversible saturation-increasing dynamics remain.

Once the collapse set is identified, algebraic structure may be introduced conditionally.

Definition 2.6 (Partial Composition)**.** *Let $\star : S \times S \rightharpoonup S$ be a partial operation defined by*

$$x \star y \textit{ is defined iff } \sigma(x) + \sigma(y) < \sigma_c.$$

Associativity and closure hold only within the subcritical region $S \setminus C$.

Note: Irreversibility and Endomorphism Degeneration

For states in the collapse set:

- No admissible saturation-increasing endomorphism is invertible,
- Dynamics degenerate into idempotent or constant maps,
- Symmetry is lost intrinsically.

Collapse corresponds to a transition from group-like behavior to semigroup-like behavior.

3. Examples

3.1 The Integers

Let

$$S = \mathbb{Z}, \quad \sigma(n) = |n|.$$

Group endomorphisms are maps $f_k(n) = kn$.

- For $|k| = 1$: invertible, saturation-preserving.
- For $|k| \geq 2$: saturation-increasing, non-invertible.

Thus irreversibility appears at every nonzero saturation level. Global collapse is trivial, but local collapse is stratified, producing nested regions of degeneration.

This example demonstrates that collapse need not be sharp and can occur in layers.

3.2 Polynomials Over a Field

Consider the ring of polynomials $S = k[t]$ over a field k, with saturation given by degree: $\sigma(f) = \deg(f)$ for $f \in k[t]$, and $\sigma(0) = -\infty$ (or a suitable convention for constants).

Admissible endomorphisms in $\mathcal{E}$ are ring endomorphisms $\phi : k[t] \to k[t]$, determined by $\phi(t) = g(t)$ where $\deg(g) \geq 1$ to ensure $\sigma(\phi(f)) \geq \sigma(f)$ for non-constant f (since $\deg(f \circ g) = \deg(f) \cdot \deg(g)$).

- If $\deg(g) = 1$, ϕ is invertible (automorphisms are linear substitutions).
- If $\deg(g) \geq 2$, ϕ is non-invertible, as it increases degrees irreversibly.

The critical saturation $\sigma_c = 1$, since for polynomials of degree ≥ 1, saturation-increasing maps (higher-degree substitutions) are non-invertible. The collapse set C consists of polynomials of degree ≥ 1, where composition degenerates (e.g., repeated high-degree substitutions lead to rapid degree explosion and loss of invertibility).

This illustrates layered collapse in infinite-dimensional structures, akin to information loss in functional composition, and connects to algebraic geometry (e.g., degenerations of morphisms).

3.3 Finite Words (Free Monoid)

Let S be the free monoid on a finite alphabet A (all finite words over A, including the empty word ϵ), with concatenation as the operation. Define saturation as word length: $\sigma(w) = |w|$, and $\sigma(\epsilon) = 0$.

Admissible endomorphisms in $\mathcal{E}$ are monoid endomorphisms $f : S \to S$, specified by images $f(a)$ for $a \in A$ where each $f(a)$ is a word with $|f(a)| \geq 1$ to non-decrease lengths under application.

- If all $|f(a)| = 1$, f is invertible (permutations of A).
- If any $|f(a)| \geq 2$, f increases lengths for non-empty words and is non-invertible.

The critical saturation $\sigma_c = 1$, as words of length ≥ 1 have no invertible length-increasing endomorphisms. The collapse set C includes all non-empty words, where dynamics degenerate (e.g., repeated applications lead to exponentially growing lengths, modeling irreversibility in string rewriting systems or computation).

Partial composition $w \star v = w \cdot v$ (concatenation) is defined iff $|w| + |v| < \sigma_c$, restricting to trivial cases. This example captures threshold phenomena in formal languages and automata, where "saturation" mimics memory or complexity bounds.

3.4 Vector Spaces with Dimension

Let S be the set of all finite-dimensional subspaces of an infinite-dimensional vector space V over a field k (for example, $V = k^{\mathbb{N}}$ or the space of polynomials $k[t]$).

Define saturation as dimension:

$$\sigma(U) = \dim(U) \quad \text{for } U \in S.$$

(Note that $\dim(U) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, and we may consider σ bounded or extend it appropriately if needed.)

To fit the framework, we need to define admissible endomorphisms $\mathcal{E}$ acting on S (maps $S \to S$) that non-decrease saturation. One natural (though non-standard) choice is to consider linear operators $f : V \to V$ that induce maps on subspaces: for $U \in S$, define $f_*(U) = f(U)$ (the image under f), and require $f_*(U) \in S$ with

$$\dim(f(U)) \geq \dim(U).$$

Thus $\mathcal{E}$ consists of such induced maps f_* where f is linear on V and satisfies the dimension condition.

- **Invertible elements**: Those induced by invertible linear maps f on V that preserve dimension exactly (i.e., isomorphisms of V that map finite-dimensional subspaces to finite-dimensional subspaces of the same dimension).
- **Non-invertible elements**: Maps induced by linear operators that strictly increase dimension on some subspaces (e.g., nilpotent or shift-like operators that embed subspaces into higher-dimensional ones), or projections/expansions that cannot be inverted while preserving the finite-dimensional structure.

Since dimension cannot increase under an invertible linear map (invertible maps preserve dimension exactly), any saturation-*strictly*-increasing map (where $\dim(f(U)) > \dim(U)$ for some U) must be non-invertible in this sense.

The critical saturation σ_c can be taken as ∞ (or any sufficiently large finite number if we cap dimensions), reflecting that collapse occurs in the ”limit” as dimension grows without bound: there are no invertible saturation-increasing dynamics beyond any finite threshold, leading to degeneration toward infinite-dimensional behavior.

The collapse set C would then consist of subspaces with $\dim(U) \geq N$ for large N (or conceptually all finite-dimensional subspaces if $\sigma_c = \infty$), where repeated application of admissible maps tends to produce higher-dimensional images irreversibly, losing the ability to return to lower dimensions invertibly.

This example illustrates the framework's potential for geometric applications: collapse represents degeneration to infinite or maximal dimensions, where finite structure is lost, mirroring phenomena in algebraic geometry (e.g., degenerations of varieties or limits in Grassmannians) and functional analysis (e.g., passage from finite-rank to compact operators).

4. Related Work and Conceptual Background

Manafi's framework (2026) intersects with several established lines of research in algebra, logic, and structural theory, yet differs fundamentally in both its organizing principles and its conclusions. This section reviews the most closely related bodies of literature and clarifies the conceptual gap addressed by the saturation–collapse perspective.

A natural point of comparison is the theory of partial algebraic structures, developed in universal algebra and mathematical logic (Burmeister, 1986). In partial algebras, operations are not required to be total, and undefinedness is treated as a basic structural feature. Closely related are essentially algebraic theories, in which operations are defined only under specified equational conditions (Adámek, Rosický, and Vitale, 2011). While these frameworks allow operations to fail outside designated domains, the restriction is static and syntactic: the domain of definition is fixed by the theory itself. There is no intrinsic mechanism by which operations become undefined as a result of internal system evolution. In contrast, the saturation–collapse framework introduces partiality as an emergent phenomenon governed by a real-valued saturation functional on the state space.

A second relevant class of structures arises in semigroup theory and its generalizations, particularly inverse semigroups and restriction semigroups (Lawson, 1998; Kudryavtseva and Leech, 2015). These structures naturally model irreversible or partially defined processes and have found applications in computation and dynamics. However, irreversibility in these theories is axiomatic: one begins with a non-group structure. In the present framework, irreversibility is not assumed but derived. Invertibility is lost precisely when saturation-respecting endomorphisms become non-injective or non-surjective, making irreversibility a consequence of structural collapse rather than a defining property. Within universal algebra, the theory of quasivarieties allows algebraic laws to hold conditionally, expressed as implications between equations (Mal'cev, 1970; Gorbunov, 1998). This permits a limited form of context-dependent validity of axioms. Nevertheless, the context remains purely logical: the conditions under which axioms apply are not tied to an intrinsic quantitative property of the underlying set. By contrast, in the saturation–collapse framework, the validity of axioms such as associativity or invertibility depends explicitly on saturation levels, linking algebraic coherence to the internal state of the system.

Another conceptual parallel appears in degeneration and deformation theory, particularly in algebraic geometry and representation theory (Hartshorne, 1977; standard treatments of Gröbner and toric degenerations). In these settings, algebraic structures are studied under variation of an external parameter, and singular limits often yield degenerate objects. While these theories rigorously analyze structural collapse, the degenerating parameter is external to the algebraic system. In the present framework, saturation is intrinsic, defined directly on the state space, and collapse is detected through the degeneration of admissible endomorphisms rather than through an external limiting process. These relationships are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Comparison of Related Frameworks and the Saturation–Collapse Perspective

Framework	**Partial operations**	**Irreversibility**	**Threshold behavior**	**Source of degeneration**
Partial algebras / essentially algebraic theories	Yes	No	No	Syntactic constraints
Semigroups / restriction semigroups	Sometimes	Yes (assumed)	No	Choice of algebraic category
Quasivarieties	Conditional axioms	No	No	Logical implications
Degeneration theory	Typically no	Sometimes	Yes	External parameter
Saturation–collapse framework	**Emergent**	**Derived**	**Intrinsic**	**Endomorphism degeneration driven by saturation**

As Table 1 indicates, existing frameworks each capture isolated aspects of collapse-like behavior—partiality, irreversibility, conditional validity, or degeneration—but none unifies these features through an intrinsic, state-dependent mechanism.

The Saturation-collapse framework offers such a unification by treating saturation as a fundamental structural invariant and characterizing collapse as the point at which saturation preserving endomorphisms cease to be invertible. This perspective introduces several conceptual advances. Algebraic axioms are no longer assumed to hold globally, but are instead understood as properties that may persist only within low-saturation regimes.

Irreversibility arises intrinsically from the structure of the system rather than being imposed axiomatically. Moreover, collapse can manifest in abrupt or layered forms, enabling the identification of stratified regimes with partial algebraic coherence.

Together, these features distinguish the proposed framework from existing theories and establish it as a novel contribution to abstract algebra, providing a systematic approach to the analysis of threshold phenomena and structural degradation within algebraic systems.

5. Information Loss in Computation and Logic

In computation and logic, information loss occurs when distinct inputs cannot be uniquely recovered from outputs, rendering processes irreversible. This subsection explores this phenomenon through the lens of the saturation–collapse framework, contrasting it with classical perspectives and demonstrating that such loss emerges as an unavoidable structural feature in supercritical regimes.

Classical View:
Traditionally, algebraic and computational structures are assumed to operate in a reversible manner:

- In a perfect reversible world (such as a group or invertible functions in computation), every transformation is a bijection.
- One can always reverse the process uniquely, ensuring no information is lost.
- If a transformation becomes non-invertible, it is typically attributed to an external factor, such as a "bug," system breakdown, or added noise/dissipation.

This view treats irreversibility as an aberration rather than an intrinsic property.

Framework's View:
The saturation–collapse framework reframes information loss as an emergent, unavoidable consequence of intrinsic system dynamics when saturation accumulates beyond a critical threshold:

- Information loss is not a mistake—it is forced by the mathematics of the system itself when saturation gets too high.
- Saturation $\sigma(x)$ measures the degree of "load," accumulation, complexity, or structural stress of a state x.
- Admissible moves (the allowed dynamics or transformations) are endomorphisms f that never decrease saturation: $\sigma(f(x)) \geq \sigma(x)$.
- Below the critical threshold σ_c, some of these moves can still be reversible (invertible)—one can go backwards, preserving information.
- Above σ_c (in the collapse set C), every saturation-increasing endomorphism ($\sigma(f(x)) > \sigma(x)$) becomes non-invertible, implying that distinct states $x \neq y$ may map to the same output $f(x) = f(y)$, resulting in irrecoverable information about the origin.

This shift emphasizes that irreversibility arises endogenously from the degeneration of admissible endomorphisms, without external interventions.

Unavoidability of Information Loss:
The framework mathematically establishes that information loss is unavoidable in supercritical states under saturation-increasing dynamics. This is formalized as follows:

Proposition.[Unavoidable Information Loss in Collapse] Let $x \in C$, i.e., $\sigma(x) \geq \sigma_c$, where

$$\sigma_c := \inf\big\{\sigma(x) \;\big|\; \text{every admissible endomorphism } f \text{ with } \sigma(f(x)) > \sigma(x) \text{ is non-invertible}\big\}.$$

Then, for every $f \in \mathcal{E}$ with $\sigma(f(x)) > \sigma(x)$, f is non-invertible. In particular, if the system evolves via such saturation-increasing dynamics from x, information loss occurs: there exist distinct states whose images under f coincide, preventing unique recovery of preimages.

Proof. By Definition 2.4, the critical saturation σ_c is defined such that for all states x with $\sigma(x) \geq \sigma_c$, every admissible endomorphism f satisfying $\sigma(f(x)) > \sigma(x)$ fails to be invertible. Non-invertibility implies non-injectivity (in finite or well-behaved settings) or, more generally, the absence of a left inverse, meaning multiple distinct inputs can map to the same output. Thus, under any dynamics that further increase saturation from a collapsed state, information about the precise preimage is structurally lost, as no reversible saturation-increasing transformation exists. This holds by the intrinsic construction of $\mathcal{E}$ and σ_c, without external assumptions. □

This proposition underscores the framework's key insight: in computation and logic modeled via saturation-dependent structures, information loss transitions from avoidable to inevitable precisely at the collapse threshold, derived solely from endomorphism properties.

6. Degeneration in Algebraic Geometry

In algebraic geometry, *degeneration* (or specialization) refers to the limiting process within a family of algebraic varieties or schemes. More precisely, given a flat morphism $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to B$ over a base scheme B (typically the affine line $\mathbb{A}^1$ or a disk), the general fibers $\pi^{-1}(t)$ for $t \neq 0$ are often smooth or non-degenerate, while the special fiber $\pi^{-1}(0)$ is degenerate—typically exhibiting singularities, reduced dimension, loss of irreducibility, or diminished symmetries. Flatness ensures that arithmetic invariants (such as the Hilbert polynomial) remain constant across fibers, making such degenerations a powerful tool for moduli problems, classification, and enumerative geometry (e.g., Gromov–Witten theory via degeneration to toric limits, or compactifications of moduli spaces of curves and abelian varieties).

The saturation–collapse framework offers a novel algebraic reinterpretation of degeneration by shifting the mechanism from an external parameter (the base point $t \to 0$) to an intrinsic, state-dependent saturation functional $\sigma : S \to [0, \infty]$. Collapse emerges endogenously from the degeneration of admissible endomorphisms rather than being imposed by a limiting family.

Consider, for instance, the polynomial ring $S = k[t]$ over a field k, with saturation given by degree: $\sigma(f) = \deg(f)$ (with $\sigma(0) = -\infty$ by convention). Admissible endomorphisms in $\mathcal{E}$ are ring endomorphisms $\phi : k[t] \to k[t]$ induced by substitutions $t \mapsto g(t)$ with $\deg(g) \geq 1$, ensuring $\sigma(\phi(f)) = \deg(f) \cdot \deg(g) \geq \sigma(f)$ for non-constant f. Linear substitutions ($\deg(g) = 1$) are invertible (automorphisms), while higher-degree ones are non-invertible and strictly increase saturation. The critical saturation is $\sigma_c = 1$: beyond this threshold (polynomials of degree ≥ 1), saturation-increasing compositions lead to rapid degree explosion and irreversible loss of structure, mirroring classical degenerations of smooth curves to singular ones (e.g., nodal or cuspidal fibers) without requiring an external base.

More generally, the framework recasts degeneration as a threshold phenomenon driven by morphism degeneration: as saturation accumulates under admissible dynamics, invertible endomorphisms vanish beyond σ_c, forcing transitions from reversible (group-like) to irreversible (semigroup-like) behavior. This aligns with semistable degenerations in moduli theory, where stability thresholds mark the onset of singularities, but provides a purely algebraic derivation independent of geometric families or flatness conditions.

The saturation–collapse perspective thus affects degeneration in algebraic geometry by:

- internalizing the collapse mechanism via endomorphism properties rather than external parameters,
- allowing stratified or layered degenerations (via saturation spectra or collapse depth invariants),
- unifying threshold-driven structural breakdown across geometric and purely algebraic settings.

This approach may inspire new tools for studying degeneration in contexts where families are difficult to construct explicitly, such as non-commutative or tropical degenerations, or for deriving irreversibility in geometric dynamics intrinsically.

7. Conclusion

The saturation–collapse framework provides a unified algebraic explanation for various threshold phenomena, including information loss (in computation/logic) and loss of reversibility (in dynamical systems). In both cases, classical views treat these as external anomalies (e.g., bugs, noise, or dissipation), assuming reversibility (bijections or unique backward recovery) as the default. Your model reframes them as intrinsic and unavoidable structural features: when a state's saturation $\sigma(\mathrm{x})$ exceeds the critical threshold σ_c (defined as the infimum where all strictly saturation-increasing admissible endomorphisms become non-invertible), any further accumulation forces non-invertibility. This leads to merging of distinct states (non-injectivity), causing irrecoverable loss—whether of input information (computation) or backward trajectory uniqueness (dynamics). The key insight is that collapse emerges endogenously from degeneration of the admissible endomorphism collection $\mathcal{E}$, without external assumptions, offering a precise algebraic mechanism for why such breakdowns occur precisely beyond σ_c.

In statistical mechanics, phase transitions refer to abrupt changes in the macroscopic properties of a many-body system as a control parameter (typically temperature, pressure, or magnetic field) is varied. These transitions are characterized by singularities or discontinuities in thermodynamic potentials (free energy or its derivatives), distinguishing ordered phases (e.g., ferromagnetic, liquid, crystal) from disordered ones (paramagnetic, gas, fluid). First-order transitions involve latent heat and coexistence of phases with discontinuous order parameters, while second-order (continuous) transitions exhibit divergences in response functions (susceptibility, specific heat) and critical exponents at the transition point, often described by renormalization group methods and universality classes.

The saturation–collapse framework offers an algebraic reinterpretation of phase transitions by viewing them as threshold-driven structural degenerations emerging intrinsically from saturation accumulation, rather than solely from probabilistic or ensemble averages. Consider a statistical mechanical system whose microstates form the state space S, with saturation $\sigma(x)$ quantifying accumulated "stress" or order (e.g., inverse temperature-like, magnetization magnitude, or density deviation from criticality). Admissible endomorphisms $\mathcal{E}$ model allowed transformations (e.g., spin flips, particle exchanges, or coarse-graining maps) that non-decrease saturation: $\sigma(f(x)) \geq \sigma(x)$. Below the critical saturation σ_c (the infimum where strictly saturation-increasing maps lose invertibility), reversible or symmetry-preserving dynamics dominate, corresponding to the high-symmetry, disordered phase. Beyond σ_c (in the collapse set C), saturation-increasing transformations become non-invertible, forcing symmetry breaking, order emergence, or structural irreversibility—mirroring the onset of an ordered phase where macroscopic coherence replaces microscopic fluctuations. For example, in the Ising model, saturation could be linked to the absolute value of magnetization or inverse temperature; as σ crosses σ_c, spin-aligning endomorphisms (favoring ordered configurations) become non-invertible, driving the system toward ferromagnetic order with broken symmetry, akin to the second-order transition at the Curie point. This algebraic mechanism derives the transition endogenously from endomorphism degeneration, without invoking external fields or mean-field approximations explicitly.

The saturation–collapse perspective thus affects phase transitions in statistical mechanics by:

- internalizing the critical point via saturation thresholds and morphism properties rather than partition function singularities alone,
- allowing layered or stratified transitions (via saturation spectra), potentially capturing crossover regimes or multicritical points,
- unifying phase transitions with other threshold phenomena (information loss, dynamical irreversibility, geometric degeneration) under a common algebraic collapse mechanism.

This approach may provide new tools for analyzing phase transitions in finite or non-equilibrium systems, where traditional thermodynamic limits are subtle, or for deriving critical behavior intrinsically from algebraic structure.

AI Disclosure: The authors declare that generative artificial intelligence tools (ChatGPT and Grok) were used solely for the purpose of improving the clarity, grammar, and academic English of the manuscript. These tools were not used for data analysis, interpretation of results, theory development, or the generation of original scientific content. All conceptual contributions, analyses, and conclusions presented in this article are entirely the responsibility of the authors.

8. References

Adámek, J., Rosický, J., and Vitale, E. M. (2011). Algebraic Theories: A Categorical Introduction to General Algebra. Cambridge University Press.

Burmeister, P. (1986). A Model Theoretic Oriented Approach to Partial Algebras. Akademie-Verlag, Berlin.
Gorbunov, V. A. (1998). Algebraic Theory of Quasivarieties. Siberian School of Algebra and Logic.
Hartshorne, R. (1977). Algebraic Geometry. Springer-Verlag.
Kudryavtseva, G., and Leech, J. (2015). Restriction semigroups and inductive groupoids. Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra, 219(10), 4403–4428.
Lawson, M. V. (1998). Inverse Semigroups: The Theory of Partial Symmetries. World Scientific.
Mal'cev, A. I. (1970). Algebraic Systems. Springer-Verlag.
Manafi, M. (2026). Orientation note: Collapse Structures—Algebraic Foundations of Intrinsic Irreversibility https://manafi-institute.de/Resources

Mahmoud Manfi:Manafi Institute for Saturation Studies (MISS), Researcher, manafi@manafi-institute.de

Mohammad Ojaqi: Department of Statistics and I.O. and Didactic of Mathematics, University of Oviedo, Asturias, Spain, ojaghimohammadjavad@uniovi.es