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Abstract

This data article is a follow up to the cross-national data on the environmental affection and cognition of adolescent students of varying levels of interest in ecosystem services and sustainability [1]. The data is being provided as a pooled cross-sectional panel of the 2015 [2] and 2018 [3] publicly released student questionnaire data files from the Programme for International Student assessment (PISA). The 2015 cross-section was used in the studies “Interest in the biosphere and students’ environmental awareness and optimism: A global perspective” [4] and “Scientific media dieting and students’ awareness and expectations about the environmental issues of deforestation and species extinction in the Middle East and North America: An integrated cross cultural ecologic-economic analysis” [5]. The present article presents key information and indicators on the world youth population before and after United Nations (UN) country members’ adoption of the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development in 2015. In doing so, it provides about a five year window of facts and figures, which can be used by researchers and policy makers to evaluate the effectiveness of early stage implementation of SDGs strategies in relation to youth education, access to information and communication technologies (ICT), and well-being worldwide. The presented data covers 409747 youth respondents distributed across 46 countries, 199511 of the respondents are from the 2015 cross-section, and the remaining 210236 from the 2018 cross-section. The data is further supplemented with spatial metadata containing the geographical coordinates of each of the covered 46 countries, which can be used for spatial Analysis and econometric modeling as illustrated in the present data article.
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### Specifications Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Economics and Econometrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific subject area</td>
<td>Development and Welfare Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of data</td>
<td>Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How data were acquired</td>
<td>The main data files- from the SAS versions of the publicly released student questionnaires of the 2015 [2] and 2018 [3] Program for International Student assessment (PISA); The country level geospatial data-from the GADM database of Global Administrative Areas [6]. All data extractions were achieved using the R statistical software [9].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data format</td>
<td>Raw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filtered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R formatted Data frames and lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters for data collection</td>
<td>The criteria for variables selection was defined as the set of all ICT related repeated youth measurements in both the 2015 and 2018 cycles of the PISA, followed by the exclusion of all youth respondents from countries not represented in both cycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of data collection</td>
<td>The main R data object “Pool_Panel58” presented in this article was specifically extracted from the raw SAS data files “cy6_ms_cmb_stu_qqq.sas7bdat” and “cy07_msu_stu_qqq.sas7bdat” in the publicly released folders of the 2015 and 2018 “student questionnaires data files” respectively. The country level spatial metadata were collected from the GADM database of Global Administrative Areas [6].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data source location</td>
<td>Institution: The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Country: 46 (OECD and Non-OECD) countries worldwide as listed in Table (1) and further mapped in figure (1) below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data accessibility</td>
<td>With the article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And also available with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Repository name: Mendeley Data [11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct URL to data:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.17632/pntxmgf8td.1">http://dx.doi.org/10.17632/pntxmgf8td.1</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value of the Data

- This data allows researchers to examine within nations, as well as between nations changes in youth outcome measures, including Access to ICT resources, subjective well-being, and educational performance
- Due to its timing, it also provides a unique opportunity for evaluating the effectiveness of youth related SDG strategies that have been in implementation since 2015, under Goal 9, target 9C; Goal 4, target 4.4; and Goal 8, target 8.6 among others.
- The data also includes spatial Meta data, in the form of country map coordinates, for all 46 covered countries, which allows prospective investigators to address research questions within both, the time dimension and the spatial dimension.
- Specifically for example, using the Difference-in-difference estimation, one can rely on this data to uncover Differences in Youth Access to ICT resources and/or Subjective well-being in the SDG era across the 46 Nations and/or Economic Blocks (OECD countries vs Non-OECD countries).
Data Description

This data article is being provided to update and extend the previously published data article [1]. The article updates and extends the former because it includes data extract of the most recently released 2018 “Programme for International Student Assessment” (PISA) [3], in addition to data extract from the 2015 PISA [2]. In fact, the 2015 and 2018 cross-sections are pulled into a Panel data, which allows for investigations in more dimensions than the former published cross-sectional data of the 2015 PISA. Another key aspect on which the current data article extends the former article [1], is in its provision of country level geospatial metadata that are useful for spatial econometric modelling, and geographical mapping of country level youth response data aggregates. Overall, the present data article provides six R data objects, which are:

- “Pool_Panel58” that contains the pooled panel of youth respondents’ information, which are described in more details in table (2) and table (3) below.
- “Xsec_2015” and “Xsec_2018” represent respectively the 2015 and 2018 cross-sections of the recorded youth respondents’ information. Except for the data structure, the contents in terms of variables are identical to the description provided in table (2) and Table (3).
- “Pool_Panel58_tmap3” contains youth respondents information aggregated across both “country” and “year”, and further augmented with “.sf” spatial Meta data (shape files) from the GADM library [6]. These shape files are lists of spatial coordinates of the 46 countries, and are useful for the geographical mapping of the aggregated youth response data. This version of the aggregated data is useful for spatial analysis of country level youth responses over the full panel coverage (2015 to 2018), without cross-sectional distinction.
- “Pool_Panel58_tmap2” contains youth respondents information aggregated across “country” only, and augmented with country spatial coordinates for geographical mapping. This version of the aggregated data is useful for spatial analysis of country level youth responses in 2015 and 2018 distinctively.
- “Pool_Pan.plys” contains a list of 46 shape polynomial files, representing each of the 46 countries in the provided sample of youth respondents’ information “Pool_Panel58”. It is derived from the raw individual country “.sp” files in the GADM library [6]. This polynomial data file is required if one wishes to implement a spatial econometric analysis using the shared data “Pool_Panel58”, as is the case in [7].
Recall that the initial data file “Pool_Panel58” is a pooled panel of the student-questionnaire data files from 2015 and 2018 PISA, covering youth respondents’ information from 46 countries worldwide. As a triennial survey of adolescent students around the world, PISA was launched by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), to assess the degree of preparedness of students near the end of their compulsory education, for full participation in modern societies.

The geographical coverage of the shared data is summarized in figure (1), which maps the global count of youth respondents in the pooled sample. For further clarity in the contribution of each country to the final sample, figure (2) and figure (3) map the annual cross-country counts of youth respondents for the years 2015 and 2018 respectively. Supplementing the geographical mappings of the data, are the country level data summaries in Table (1), which shows the absolute frequency and percent relative frequency distributions of youth respondents across the 46 countries in the data. The first column summarizes the 2015 sub-sample, while the second column covers the 2018 sub-sample, and the third the pooled data sample.

Figure 1: Global mapping of respondents count by country over the two years 2015 and 2018 (See dynamic web link at http://rpubs.com/brassbe1982/globyouthcount_fig1)
Figure 2: Global mapping of youth respondents count by country for the year 2015 (See dynamic web link at http://rpubs.com/brassbe1982/glob2015count_fig2)

Figure 3: Global mapping of youth respondents count by country for the year 2018 (See dynamic web link at http://rpubs.com/brassbe1982/glob2018count_fig3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>2015 Sub-sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>2018 Sub-sample</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combined 2015 + 2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>409747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8251</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>7938</td>
<td>3.78%</td>
<td>16189</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2388</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>2144</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>4532</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>9528</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
<td>4618</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>14146</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>3351</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>2453</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>5804</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>4296</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>3866</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>8162</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Taiwan</td>
<td>4853</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>5107</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>9960</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>8554</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>4766</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>13320</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>4279</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>5100</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>9379</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>3756</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td>4316</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>8072</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>4029</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>8335</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2716</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>3848</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>6586</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2555</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>3723</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>4164</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>3546</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>7710</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3882</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>3404</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>7286</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3765</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>3495</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>7260</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>2616</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>4335</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>4150</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>4510</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>8660</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>2676</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>4191</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td>6867</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>3338</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>6508</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>2203</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>4058</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3839</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>3468</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>7307</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>7866</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
<td>6565</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>14431</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>4450</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
<td>5454</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>9904</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>3172</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>6316</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (1) frequency and percent relative frequency distributions of youth respondents (Continue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>2015 Sub-sample</th>
<th>2018 Sub-sample</th>
<th>Combined 2015 + 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>4102</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>3834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>3104</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>3250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macao</td>
<td>3286</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>3199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>5637</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>3593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>3143</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>4317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>3084</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>2370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>3511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>5059</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>2293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3431</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>4052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>3429</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>3294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>6703</td>
<td>3.36%</td>
<td>9212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>3976</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td>4873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>4485</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>4803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>3904</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>3396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>4240</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>21518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3440</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>3387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>3317</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>2808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>8937</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
<td>13409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>4123</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
<td>5819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7910</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>7718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>3822</td>
<td>1.92%</td>
<td>3272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>2266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental Design, Materials, and Methods

The main data file “Pool_Panel58” that contain youth level response information was extracted from the raw SAS (TM) version of the “student questionnaire data files” of the 2015 and most recent 2018 PISA. These raw files are released, as zipped folders under the names “PUF_SAS_COMBINED_CMB_STU_QQQ.zip” [2] and SAS_STU_QQQ.zip [3]. These zipped folders are very large data folders each with raw SAS formatted data files “.sas7bdat”, along with their respective description files “.sas7bdat.format.sas”.

The R data object “Pool_Panel58” was specifically extracted from the SAS data files “cy6_ms_cmb_stu_qqq.sas7bdat” and “cy07_msu_stu_qqq.sas7bdat” in the shared folders of the 2015 and 2018 “student questionnaire data files” respectively. Due to the very large size of the raw data files, and the memory constraint imposed by the R statistical software, the attached R extraction codes were used to import only the subsets of each raw data file containing the variables of primary interest. The criteria for variables selection was defined as the set of all ICT (Information and Communication Technology) related repeated youth measurements in both, the 2015 and 2018 cycles of the PISA.

These measurements were pooled into a single R data object “data58N”. Since we wanted a version of the queried data that would not only allow for inter-temporal, but also inter-and-intra-country youth level outcomes analyses, we dropped from the final pooled sample “Pool_Panel58”, all youth respondents from countries not represented in both cycles of the PISA. This last version of the pooled data “Pool_Panel58”, obtained after subsequent treatments of “data58N”, covers 409747 youth respondents distributed across 46 countries worldwide. The 2018 extract of this last version covering a set of five countries in the Middle East region was used for the analysis in [7]. This data article presents however, the full data set. For further details on the sampling design of the PISA, please consult the OECD report [8].

Below we describe the experimental factors contained in the pooled data “Pool_Panel58”. Table (2) shows the descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviations) for select key quantitative measurements, while table (3) presents the descriptive statistics (absolute frequency and percent relative frequency) for select key qualitative measurements. All data treatments, variable reformulation, and descriptive statistics were implemented within the R statistical Software [9]; (see the attached R computer codes, for more details).

In addition to the description of the variables in table (2) and table (3), using the R library “dplyr” [10], we provide descriptive analytics of country level aggregated youth outcomes. The result of these treatment are summarized in the R data objects “Pool_Panel58_tmap2” and “Pool_Panel58_tmap3” as previously described in the data section above. For more illustration, Figures (4-9) below provide the geographical mapping of a select number of key country level aggregated youth responses from “Pool_Panel58_tmap3”. Further details on the initial non-aggregated indices and their interpretations can also be found in section 3.1.1 of [7].
### Table 2: Descriptive statistics for select key quantitative measurements in “Pool_Panel58” (N = 409747)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantitative variables</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BELONG</td>
<td>Sense of belonging in school (index of youth subjective well-being)</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTRES</td>
<td>Index of ICT resources availability to youth at home</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>1.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nPhonInternAcH</td>
<td>Number of Phones with internet access at home</td>
<td>3.693</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nCompH</td>
<td>Number of computers at home (Desktop, Laptop, notebook)</td>
<td>2.975</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>Student's age in years</td>
<td>15.789</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExpecOccup</td>
<td>Student's expected occupational status by age 30</td>
<td>64.698</td>
<td>18.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEDRES</td>
<td>Index of home educational resources availability</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTPOSS</td>
<td>Index of cultural possessions at home</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISCED</td>
<td>Index of highest education of parents (international standard classification of education - ISCED)</td>
<td>4.754</td>
<td>1.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCS</td>
<td>Standardized PISA Index of economic, social and cultural status.</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>1.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISEI</td>
<td>Index of highest parental occupational status</td>
<td>52.674</td>
<td>22.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W_FSTUWT</td>
<td>Student final weight in the Data</td>
<td>48.241</td>
<td>105.470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** s.d. represents the standard deviation of the quantitative measurement.

### Table 3: Descriptive statistics for select key qualitative measurements in “Pool_Panel58” (N = 409747)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative variables</th>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Abs. Freq.</th>
<th>Rel. Freq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>InternetLink</td>
<td>0-No link to the internet at home</td>
<td>24508</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Yes has link to the internet at home</td>
<td>385239</td>
<td>94.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0- Male</td>
<td>195688</td>
<td>47.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Female</td>
<td>214059</td>
<td>52.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMIG</td>
<td>Respondent’s immigration status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-Native</td>
<td>348269</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-Second-generation</td>
<td>29988</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3- First-generation</td>
<td>31490</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GradeLev</td>
<td>Student grade level in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th grade</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>14664</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9th grade</td>
<td>135224</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10th grade</td>
<td>208150</td>
<td>80.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11th grade</td>
<td>47084</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12th and 13th grade</td>
<td>2610</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LangH</td>
<td>Most spoken language at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-other languages</td>
<td>52377</td>
<td>12.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1- language of the test</td>
<td>357370</td>
<td>87.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Abs. Freq. and Rel. Freq. represent respectively the absolute frequency and relative frequency distributions of the qualitative variables.
Figure 4: Spatial distribution of pooled (2015 and 2018) country level weighted average of “Youth access to ICT resources”.

(See dynamic web link at http://rpubs.com/brassbe1982/ICTRESindex_fig4)
Figure 5: Spatial distribution of pooled (2015 and 2018) country level weighted average of “number of computers at youth’s home (desktop, laptop, and notebook)”. (See dynamic web link at http://rpubs.com/brassbe1982/nCompH_fig5)
Figure 6: Spatial distribution of pooled (2015 and 2018) country level weighted average of “number of phones with internet access at youth’s home”.
(See dynamic web link at http://rpubs.com/brassbe1982/nPhonInternAcH_fig6)
Figure 7: Spatial distribution of pooled (2015 and 2018) country level weighted average of “youth’s sense of belonging in school”.
(See dynamic web link at http://rpubs.com/brassbe1982/Belong_fig7)
Figure 8: Spatial distribution of pooled (2015 and 2018) country level weighted average of “youth’s family wealth index”.
(See dynamic web link at http://rpubs.com/brassbe1982/WealthIndex_fig8)
Figure 9: Spatial distribution of country level weighted average of “youth’s index of Economic and Socio-cultural Status”.
(See dynamic web link at http://rpubs.com/brassbe1982/ESCSindex_fig9)
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