Comparing MR Image Intensity Standardization Against Tissue Characterizability of Magnetization Transfer Ratio Imaging
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Purpose: To evaluate existing methods of standardization by exploiting the well-known tissue characterizing property of magnetization transfer ratio (MTR) values obtained from MT imaging, and compare the tissue characterizability of standardized T2, proton density (PD), and T1 images against the MTR images.

Materials and Methods: Image intensity standardization is a postprocessing method that was designed to correct for acquisition-to-acquisition signal intensity variations (nonstandardness) inherent in magnetic resonance (MR) images. The main idea of this technique is to deform the volume image histogram of each study to match a standard histogram, and to utilize the resulting transformations to map the image intensities into a standard scale. The method has been shown to produce a significant gain in similarity of resulting images and to achieve numeric tissue characterization. In this work we compared PD-, T2-, and T1-weighted images before and after standardization with the corresponding MT images for 10 patient MRI studies of the brain, in terms of the normalized median values on the corresponding image histograms.

Results: No statistically significant difference was observed between the standardized PD-, T2-, and T1-weighted images and the corresponding MTR images. However, a statistically significant difference was found between the pre- and poststandardized PD-, T2-, and T1-weighted images, and between the prestandardized PD-, T2-, and T1-weighted images and the corresponding MTR images.

Conclusion: These results suggest that standardized T2, PD, and T1 images and their tissue-specific intensity signatures may be useful for characterizing disease.
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class statistics and a polynomial model of the inhomogeneity field to achieve intensity normalization and histogram adjustment. However, as was recently demonstrated (10), even the process of correcting for intensity nonuniformities that arise from field inhomogeneities can introduce its own nonstandardness in image intensities.

Some researchers have attempted to calibrate MR intensities with the help of a reference material with known MR intensity characteristics, and many such efforts were made in the early days of MRI (11,12). The main drawback of such approaches is that they cannot be used to standardize MR intensities in a post hoc setting for MR images that have already been acquired without using a standard reference material. Furthermore, in large clinical trials and routine clinical scanning of sick patients, which involve hundreds or even thousands of studies (13), any approach that does not call for the use of any reference material would be attractive. Recently, Mitchell et al (14) conducted an experiment wherein they carefully studied the effect of varying TR and TE on the resulting T2 and PD image intensity values by using reference materials of known relaxation times. In the course of that study, the authors noticed intensity nonstandardness in multiple longitudinal scans of the brain. They suggested that one could overcome this variation by carefully manually sampling regions of interest (ROIs) within the ventricular CSF region and using the mean intensity within the ROIs as a reference to linearly scale all images. Unfortunately, that study was carried out on image data from one patient, and the ROIs were specified by one operator; therefore, it is unknown how well this method will work to correct for nonstandardness (in all tissues) arising from intra-/intersubject and intra-/interscanner variations. Furthermore, as demonstrated previously (15), global linear scaling cannot correct for nonstandardness—especially when it arises from intersubject and scanner variations.

To our knowledge, the only papers that address the problem of standardization of MR intensities, based solely on the image characteristics in a post hoc manner, are Refs. 15–17. Nyul and Udupa (15) presented a method that transforms images nonlinearly so that there is a significant gain in the similarity of the resulting images. This is a two-step method wherein all images (independently of patients and the specific brand of MRI scanner used) are transformed in such a way that, for the same protocol and body region, similar intensities will yield similar tissue-specific meanings. Can we then demonstrate that standardized MR intensities would not provide the same physiological interpretation as standard MR intensities? If so, this would be another independent affirmation of the tissue-specific meaning achieved after standardization. Then, perhaps, the standardized intensities in protocols such as T2, PD, and T1 could be used as intensity signatures to distinguish between normal and diseased tissue. The standardized intensities would not provide the same physiological interpretation as the MTR, or represent the actual T1 and T2 relaxation times of tissues; however, they would have tissue-specific signatures.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Ten multiple sclerosis (MS) patient studies, randomly selected from a large existing image database, were used in our evaluation. All MR images had been previously acquired with a 1.5-T scanner (Signa; GE Medical Systems, Milwaukee, WI, USA) with a quadrature transmitter/receiver head coil and existing protocols. The protocols consisted of axial PD- and T2-weighted imaging, and T1-weighted imaging with gadolinium enhancement (denoted from now on as T1E), and MT images. The PD-, T2-, and T1E-weighted imaging studies employed interleaved contiguous 3-mm-thick slices. The parameters for the PD and T2 protocols were as follows: TR/TE_{eff} = 2500/18 and 90 msec, echo train length = 8, number of excitations (NEX) = 1, matrix size = 256 × 256, and field of view (FOV) = 22 cm². For the T1E protocol TR/TE = 600/27 msec, with the other parameters as for the PD and T2 protocols. Since it takes much longer to acquire MT studies compared to the PD, T2, and T1E protocols, the corresponding MT1
and MT2 images were of lower resolution and used interleaved contiguous 5-mm-thick slices. The parameters for the MT1 and MT2 images were as follows: TR/TE = 106/5 msec, echo train length = 8, NEX = 1, matrix size = 256 × 256, and FOV = 22 cm². We used the 3DVIEWNIX software system (23) for image processing. All processing operations were carried out on a Pentium IV, Dell Inspiron 5100 notepad computer (2.3 GHz, 512MB RAM).

We represent a 3D volume image $C$ (called “scene” for short) by a pair $C = [C_f, f]$, where $C$ is a finite 3D rectangular array of voxels, called the “domain of $C$,” covering a body region of the particular patient for whom scene $C$ is acquired, and $f$ is a function that assigns an integer intensity value $f_C(c)$ to each $c \in C$. Our approach consists of the following steps:

S1: Acquire a set of scenes as per the same MRI protocol $\pi$ for the same body region $\rho$. Acquire also the corresponding MT scenes (MT1 and MT2) for the same patients for $\rho$.

S2: Correct for intensity nonuniformities in the MRI scenes of protocol $\pi$.

S3: Register the MRI scenes of protocol $\pi$ with the MT scenes.

S4: Generate the MTR scenes from the MT scenes.

S5: Standardize the MRI scenes for each protocol $\pi$.

S6: Delineate the region corresponding to the same selected tissue $t$ in all MRI scenes of protocol $\pi$.

S7: Compare scene intensity characteristics in tissue $t$, before and after standardization, for different standardization methods, with the intensity characteristics of MTR scenes in tissue $t$.

These steps are described in detail below.

**S1: Scene Data Acquisition**

We apply our method to image data obtained as per three different protocols $\pi$, namely PD, T2, T1E, and for the same body region $\rho$ which is the brain. Thus we begin with five sets of scenes denoted by $S^{T2}$, $S^{PD}$, $S^{T1E}$, $S^{MT1}$, and $S^{MT2}$. Each set consists of 10 scenes obtained for 10 different MS patients.

**S2: Inhomogeneity Correction**

We correct for background intensity inhomogeneity (arising from, among other factors, magnetic field non-uniformities) the scenes in sets $S^{T2}$, $S^{PD}$, $S^{T1E}$ to obtain new sets of scenes $S^{T2}_r$, $S^{PD}_r$, $S^{T1E}_r$ by utilizing the generalized scale-based method described in Ref. 24.

**S3: Registering Scenes**

The scenes in $S^{T2}$ and $S^{PD}$ obtained for the same patient are in registration at acquisition, and so are the scenes in $S^{MT1}$ and $S^{MT2}$. However, registration among other pairs of scenes ($T2$ and $T1E$, $T2$ and $MT1$, $T1E$ and $MT1$) cannot be guaranteed at acquisition. Since we wish to analyze the same tissue ($\tau$) region in all scenes, it is imperative that these pairs be registered. Because $T2$, PD and MT1, MT2 are registered at acquisition, only two registration operations are required (all scenes are registered with the MT scenes): $T2$ to MT1, and $T1E$ to MT1. PD to MT1 registration is achieved by using the same transformation as used for $T2$ to MT1 registration. All registration operations utilize the mutual information method described in Ref. 25. The sets of registered and redigitized scenes corresponding to the $T2$, PD, and T1E scenes are denoted by $S^{T2}_r$, $S^{PD}_r$, and $S^{T1E}_r$, respectively.

**S4: Generating the MTR Scenes**

The brain is first segmented in the scenes corresponding to each patient in sets $S^{MT1}$ and $S^{MT2}$ by using the fuzzy connectedness method (26). This segmented brain mask is then used to compute the MTR scenes as described in Ref. 17: For each scene $C^{MT1} = (C, f^{MT1})$ and $C^{MT2} = (C, f^{MT2})$ in sets $S^{MT1}$ and $S^{MT2}$, the MTR scene $C^{MTR} = (C, f^{MTR})$ is computed by setting, for each voxel $c \in C$:

$$f^{MTR}(C) = \left\{ \frac{f^{MT1}(C) - f^{MT2}(C)}{f^{MT1}(C)} \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

Figure 1 shows the same slice from the $C^{MT1}$, $C^{MT2}$, and $C^{MTR}$ scenes for one study. Note that since the background intensity inhomogeneity is generally considered to be multiplicative (27), the process of division in determining $C^{MTR}$ from $C^{MT1}$ and $C^{MT2}$ eliminates its effect in the MTR scenes, and therefore no explicit correction is applied to these scenes.

**S5: Standardizing the MR Image Intensity Scale**

Every scene in the sets $S^{T2}_r$, $S^{PD}_r$, and $S^{T1E}_r$ is subjected to an intensity scale standardization transformation. The
aim of this transformation is to make the intensities of voxels containing the same tissue as similar as possible in all transformed scenes. The method is based on deforming the intensity histogram of each given scene into a standard histogram by using a nonlinear transformation, resulting in a significant gain in the similarity of the resulting images. This process is achieved in two steps: a training step that is executed only once for each given π and ρ, and a transformation step that is executed for each scene. Training and transformation are done separately for each of the three protocols in our case. In the first step, certain landmarks of a standard histogram (for each given π and ρ) are estimated from a given set of volume images. In the transformation step, the actual intensity transformation from the intensity scale of the input volume image to the standard scale is computed by mapping the landmarks to those of the standard histogram. The median intensity and other quartile locations on the histogram were used as landmarks for transforming the scene intensities. For additional details of the method, see Refs. 15 and 16. The sets of scenes corresponding to $S_{rT2}$, $S_{rPD}$, and $S_{rT1E}$ after standardization are denoted by $S^{ST2}$, $S^{SPD}$, and $S^{ST1E}$. Figure 2a–c show the same slice from the same patient study in $S^{ST2}$, $S^{SPD}$, and $S^{ST1E}$ before standardization. The corresponding slices from sets $S^{ST2}$, $S^{SPD}$, and $S^{ST1E}$ after standardization are shown in Fig. 2d–f. We point out here that although the order in which steps 2 and 5 is applied may seem immaterial, as demonstrated in Ref. 10, standardization should be performed only after inhomogeneity correction, since the latter step can introduce its own intensity nonstandardness.

**S6: Segmenting the Same Tissue Region**

To obtain the same tissue region, the scenes in set $S^{SP}$ were segmented for white matter (WM) by using the fuzzy connectedness method (26) and were subsequently manually corrected by an expert (neuroradiologist) when necessary. Thus, all segmentations were judged to be accurate by a trained expert. WM was utilized for quantitative evaluation, since it constitutes the largest tissue region in the brain, and the interior of this tissue region can be ascertained more reliably than other brain tissue regions, such as GM and CSF. The latter two regions have far more voxels in the tissue interface region (compared to their interior) than WM, and these are subjected to partial volume effects. The segmented tissue regions were then mapped onto the scenes in sets $S^{ST2}$, $S^{SPD}$, $S^{ST1E}$, and $S^{SMTR}$ to obtain new sets of scenes denoted as $S^{SRWM}$, $S^{SRPD}$, $S^{SRT1E}$, and $S^{SRMTR}$. The scenes in these latter sets contain intensities from the corrected, registered, and standardized scenes only within the tissue masks; elsewhere, the intensities are set to zero. In a similar manner, sets $S^{ST2}$, $S^{SPD}$, and $S^{ST1E}$ were determined by mapping tissue masks onto the scenes in sets before standardization. Figure 3 shows the same slice from the same patient study in $S^{ST2}$, $S^{SPD}$, $S^{ST1E}$, and $S^{SRMTR}$, and the WM mask ($r = WM$) for this study in $S^{SRMTR}$ obtained via fuzzy connectedness.

**S7: Comparison With MTR**

At the end of step 6 we have three groups of sets of scenes $S_{WM}$, $S_{PD}$, and $S_{MTR}$, where $r$ stands for one of T2, PD, and T1E, with a total of seven sets, each containing 10 scenes. Each of these scenes constitutes a WM image of T2, PD, T1E, (before and after standardization), and MTR. Our idea is to first perform a normalization of the tissue intensities of each scene within each of the seven sets, so that they are all roughly on the same scale as the MTR. Subsequently, we compare these normalized intensity values for scenes obtained before and after intensity standardization with the normalized MTR values. We hypothesized that the normal-
ized values obtained after standardization would match the normalized MTR values significantly more closely than would values obtained before standardization. To accomplish this comparison, for each of the 70 scenes, we determine the median intensity within the WM mask, thus generating 10 median intensity values for each of the seven sets of scenes. The maximum median MTR values obtained from first six sets is then compared with the set of 10 normalized values obtained after standardization. To accomplish this comparison, for each of the 70 scenes, we determine the median intensity within the WM mask, thus generating 10 median intensity values for each of the seven sets of scenes. The maximum of the 10 median values is then determined for each of the seven sets of scenes. By using this maximum of the median values for each set, the individual median values are normalized. As an example, consider the set $S_{SWM}^{T_2}$, the 10 median values in each of the seven sets, are transformed into a new value $M_{i}^{T_2}$ as follows:

$$M_{i}^{T_2} = \frac{\mu_{i}^{T_2}}{\mu_{i}^{T_2,\text{max}}} \cdot M_{i}^{T_2,\text{max}}$$

The 10 median values in each of the seven sets $S_{SWM}^{T_2}, S_{SWM}^{PD}, S_{SWM}^{T_1E}, S_{SWM}^{PD}, S_{SWM}^{T_1E}$, and $S_{SWM}^{T_1E}$ are transformed in this manner. Each set of 10 normalized values in the first six sets is then compared with the set of 10 normalized median MTR values obtained from $S_{SWM}^{MTR}$ by a paired t-test. The set of 30 sets values coming from corresponding to sets $S_{SWM}^{GM}, S_{SWM}^{PD}, S_{SWM}^{T_1E}$ were also compared with the 10 values in $S_{SWM}^{MTR}$ by an analysis of variance (ANOVA). A similar comparison was also performed for the values in $S_{SWM}^{PD}, S_{SWM}^{T_1E}$, and $S_{SWM}^{T_1E}$.

The quantitative aspects of our results are displayed in Figs. 4–8. Figure 4a–g show the histograms of five of the 10 scenes in the sets $S_{SWM}^{PD}, S_{SWM}^{T_1E}, S_{SWM}^{PD}, S_{SWM}^{T_1E}$, $S_{SWM}^{PD}$, $S_{SWM}^{T_1E}$, and $S_{SWM}^{T_1E}$. The low-intensity part of the histograms that corresponds to the background voxels in these scenes has been removed from the display in order to show the interest of interest on a better scale. The histograms of the scenes before standardization are plotted in Fig. 4a–c, and the histograms of the scenes after standardization, along with the histograms of the MTR scenes, are shown in Fig. 4d–g. Figure 5a and b show the histograms of the five patient studies in Fig. 4a, but for $\tau = GM$ (sets $S_{SWM}^{GM}$ and $S_{SWM}^{PD}$). Figure 5c shows an overlay of the histograms for $S_{SWM}^{PD}$ (Fig. 4b) and $S_{SWM}^{PD}$ (Fig. 5a), and Fig. 5d shows the overlay of the histograms for $S_{SWM}^{PD}$ (Fig. 4e) and $S_{SWM}^{PD}$ (Fig. 5b).

Figures 6–8 show a slice from each of three PD scenes before and after standardization, and the corresponding slices from the MTR scenes for the same patient studies. Also shown in Figs. 6–8 are the slices from the corresponding binary scenes. The first binary image for the first intensity image in Figs. 6–8 was obtained by using a fixed threshold interval to segment approximately the WM region of the brain. The same threshold interval was used for the remaining two studies.

The quantitative aspects of our results are displayed in Tables 1 and 2. In Table 1 the normalized median values within WM for all 10 studies are listed for all protocols ($T_2$, PD, and T1E) both before and after standardization. The table also shows the normalized median MTR values in WM for all studies. The $P$-values resulting from the paired t-test comparing the normalized median values in each of columns 1–6 with those in column 7 in Table 1 are listed in Table 2. The $P$-values resulting from the ANOVA comparing the normalized median values in each of columns 1–3 and columns 4–6 with those in column 7 in Table 1 were computed and found to be 0.019 and 0.474, respectively.
DISCUSSION

Several observations can be made from the histograms in Fig. 4. Clearly, the histograms are much better aligned after standardization than before, for all three protocols (compare Fig. 4a–c with Fig. 4d–f). Further, the degree of alignment after standardization seems to be similar to the degree of alignment of MTR histograms (compare Fig. 4d–f with g). The corresponding plots for GM in Fig. 5a and b reveal that the intensity standardization method works across all tissues simultaneously. No separate tissue-specific adjustment is needed. In addition, Fig. 5c and d clearly demonstrate the numerical tissue characterizability endowed by the standardization method. The histograms for WM and GM overlap before standardization (Fig. 5c), but are clearly separated (as indicated by the dotted line) after standardization (Fig. 5d). In fact, the combined population histograms from all 10 patient studies (not shown) before standardization is quite chaotic with multiple modes, whereas standardization results in a clean unimodal histogram for each tissue region. These characteristics provide a qualitative proof of our conjecture that the intensity standardization method achieves a result similar to the inherent standard-

Figure 4. Histograms of scenes from the sets (a) $S_{STWM}$, (b) $S_{STWM}$, (c) $S_{ST1M}$, (d) $S_{ST2M}$, (e) $S_{ST2M}$, (f) $S_{ST2M}$, and (g) $S_{STM}$. 

Figure 5. Histograms of scenes from the sets (a) $S_{STWM}$, (b) $S_{STWM}$, (c) $S_{STWM}$, (d) $S_{STWM}$, (e) $S_{STWM}$, (f) $S_{STWM}$, and (g) $S_{STWM}$. The dotted line in d shows the clear separation between the standardized histograms for GM and WM.
Figures 6–8 provide a further qualitative proof of the numeric tissue characterizability endowed by the standardization method. In Fig. 6a (before standardization), the threshold interval chosen for this data set is appropriate to characterize numerically the WM. However, the same interval seems to characterize some WM and mostly GM in another data set displayed in Fig. 6b and e, and almost entirely the GM and some weak MS lesions in a third data set displayed in Fig. 6c and f. Upon standardization, the threshold interval derived from the first data set (Fig. 7a) excellently characterizes WM consistently in all three data sets (Fig. 7d–f). This characterizability agrees qualitatively with the manner in which MTR characterizes WM (Fig. 8d–f); however, because of poorer spatial and contrast resol-
tion in MTR, the delineation of WM by thresholding in MTR scenes is not as crisp as it is in PD scenes.

Moving now to the quantitative results displayed in Table 1, we note that the normalized median WM values seem to be more erratic and widespread (as indicated by the histograms in Fig. 4a–c) before standardization than after. This is confirmed by the P-values listed in the first row of Table 2. The erratic nature of the normalized median values before standardization compared to the disciplined behavior of the normalized MTR values is reflected by the P-values in the second row of Table 2 and the corresponding values for the ANOVA (0.019). On the other hand, the normalized median values seem to be much better disciplined after standardization than before, and seem to agree with the pattern of normalized median MTR values, as reflected by the P-values listed in the third row of Table 2 and the corresponding values for the ANOVA (0.474).

MR image intensity standardization methods achieve the ability of numeric tissue characterization for the commonly used MRI protocols, for different brain tissues (WM and GM) as well as for other organs (15,16). In this regard, the standardized intensities behave much like the MTR values. MTR values in the whole brain and in different tissue regions have been used in the past to characterize various neurological diseases, such as MS (18–22). Our study suggests that with standardization, commonly used anatomic MRI protocols may be utilized in a similar role. This may potentially yield information similar to that produced by MTR, but at a higher spatial and contrast resolution. Note that we are not suggesting that intensity standardized PD, T2, or T1 images would replace MT imaging, since the phenomena underlying MTR images are quite different, and MTR images have utility beyond simply possessing numerical tissue characterizability (18–20).

Table 1
Normalized Median Values in WM Before and After Standardization for the 10 Studies for T2, PD, and T1E Protocols, and the Normalized Median MTR Values for the Same Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>$S_{T2}^{2 \text{WM}}$</th>
<th>$S_{T2}^{0 \text{WM}}$</th>
<th>$S_{PD}^{1 \text{E WM}}$</th>
<th>$S_{PD}^{2 \text{WM}}$</th>
<th>$S_{PD}^{0 \text{WM}}$</th>
<th>$S_{T1}^{1 \text{E WM}}$</th>
<th>$S_{T1}^{2 \text{WM}}$</th>
<th>$S_{T1}^{0 \text{WM}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.985</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.962</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.949</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Along similar lines, an interesting question arises as to whether the tissue characterizability of MR spectroscopy (MRS) can also be achieved via the detection of subtle differences in standardized intensities. Because anatomic MRI protocols provide higher spatial and contrast resolution, they may have higher sensitivity for tissue and disease signatures carried by segmented tissue regions than the substantially less sensitive MTR and MRS. These issues require further research. Our premise is that in many diseases, there is alteration at the microscopic level in the tissue structure. These alterations are manifested, ever so subtly, as image intensities. These signatures are lost and not detectable because of the chaotic intensity nonstandardness that is commonly present. Standardized signals may carry these subtle signatures and may help in early detection of diseases and their classification. An advantage of enhancing the sensitivity and specificity of anatomic MRI protocols is that, since they have better spatial and contrast resolution than more functional protocols, such as MTR and MRS, different tissue components can be segmented, and intensity signatures can be analyzed in tissue components. Further, one can employ computerized atlases in conjunction with MR images to analyze intensity signatures in specific functionally distinct anatomic regions.
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