Resonant soft x-ray scattering from stripe-ordered La$_{2-x}$Ba$_x$CuO$_4$ using a transition edge sensor array detector
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Resonant soft x-ray scattering (RSXS) is a leading probe of valence band order in materials best known for establishing the existence of charge density wave order in the copper-oxide superconductors. One of the biggest limitations on the RSXS technique is the presence of a severe fluorescence background which, like the RSXS cross section itself, is enhanced under resonance conditions. This background prevents the study of weak signals such as diffuse scattering from glassy or fluctuating order that is spread widely over momentum space. Recent advances in superconducting transition edge sensor (TES) detectors have led to major improvements in resolution and detection efficiency in the soft x-ray range. Here, we perform a RSXS study of stripe-ordered La$_{2-x}$Ba$_x$CuO$_4$ at the Cu $L_{3/2}$ edge (932.2 eV) using a TES detector with 1.5 eV resolution, to evaluate its utility for mitigating the fluorescence background problem. We find that, for suitable degree of detuning from the resonance, the TES could be used to reject the fluorescence background, leading to a 5 to 10 times improvement in the statistical quality of the data compared to an equivalent, energy-integrated measurement. We conclude that a TES presents a promising approach to reducing background in RSXS studies and may lead to new discoveries in materials exhibiting valence band order that is fluctuating or glassy.

INTRODUCTION

Strong interplay between charge, spin, orbital, and lattice degrees of freedom in strongly interacting quantum materials leads to a myriad of emergent phenomena and phases. In 3$d$ transition metal oxides, for example, the comparable size of oxygen covalency and on-site Coulomb repulsion, as well as the magnetic nature of partially filled 3$d$ orbitals, render all of the charge, spin, orbital, and lattice degrees of freedom equal in contriving novel physics such as prominent valence band instabilities at comparatively high temperature and colossal response to varying types of external fields.

Resonant soft x-ray scattering (RSXS) is now widely recognized as one of the leading techniques for probing valence band order in quantum materials [1] [2], one of its most prominent achievements being the discovery of charge density wave (CDW) order in nearly all families of copper-oxide superconductors [3]–[10]. RSXS is a quasielastic scattering technique that exploits dispersion corrections to the atomic scattering factors due to resonance between core and valence levels to achieve valence band sensitivity. The RSXS process involves all the intermediate states involving a core hole and an additional electron in the valence shell, in principle measuring an electron spectral function similar to that probed in scanning tunneling microscopy (STM) experiments [2].

When an x-ray beam is tuned to resonance, however, it is not only the resonant scattering that is amplified but also the photo-absorption, which is identical with the first step in resonant scattering. The vast majority of photo-absorbed excited states decay through radiative channels and don’t contribute to coherent scattering. Although radiative processes are almost isotropic, the sheer size of the photo-absorption cross section in the soft x-ray regime makes core level fluorescence the dominant signal in RSXS. This inelastic background has become a serious limitation on the RSXS technique, particularly when trying to detect faint signals from glassy or fluctuating order in which the scattering structure factor is spread over momentum space in a diffuse manner.

A potential solution to this problem is to use an energy-resolving detector. In hard x-ray experiments, fluorescence background is often eliminated by using proportional, solid state detectors that discriminate between photons with different energy. Unfortunately, this approach has not been possible in RSXS because highly efficient semiconductor detectors have not been widely available for soft x-rays. Furthermore, the fluorescence emission in soft x-ray experiments is near-threshold—typically within a few eV of the coherently scattered light—and semiconductor detectors lack the energy resolution needed to discriminate in this way.

Transition edge sensors (TES) are energy-resolving detectors that have been widely used in astronomical cosmic microwave background surveys. [11]. Thanks to recent advancements in their performance and usability, such detectors have begun to be adopted at x-ray facilities [12]. State of the art TES array detectors offer superior energy resolution to solid state detectors (about
1.5 eV FWHM at 900 eV), excellent quantum efficiency and solid angle coverage compared, for example, to spectrometers based on diffraction gratings [13]. A typical TES system comprises hundreds of sensors, which boosts the data collection rate by allowing parallel studies of multiple reciprocal space points.

Here, we present a study of the charge stripe order in La$_{2-x}$Ba$_x$CuO$_4$ ($x = 0.125$) (LBCO) using a TES array detector. LBCO is a prototypical high-temperature superconductor whose charge order has been studied extensively with RSXS techniques using energy-integrating detectors [3, 10]. Our goal is to use this material as a test case to quantify the advantages of introducing energy discrimination into such measurements, and hopefully identify the central issues that arise when using such techniques to study valence band phenomena more generally.

**EXPERIMENTAL SETUP**

TESs are cryogenic energy sensors exploiting the sharp superconducting-to-normal phase transition to achieve energy resolution. TESs operate in an electrothermal steady state in contact with a cryogenic heat bath and in constant voltage bias, which puts the TES at its transition edge. When an x-ray impinges on a TES, its temperature and, in turn, resistance increase through a continuous superconducting-to-normal transition. Consequently, the current going through a TES temporarily drops. Shortly after, it recovers to its quiescent level by negative electrothermal feedback. This transient current drop is measured by a SQUID readout system through mutual inductance.

Johnson noise and thermal fluctuation between a TES and the heat bath are the dominant limiting factors determining the energy resolution [11]. The resolution of a TES depends on its heat capacity, $C$, and is approximately given by

$$\Delta E \sim \sqrt{k_B T_{op} C / \alpha I}$$

where $\alpha I = (T_{op}/R_{op}) \partial R / \partial T |_{T_{op}}$, $T_{op}$ is the operating temperature of the TES, $R_{op}$ is its resistance in its quiescent state, and the derivative of the resistance curve, $R(T)$, is evaluated at $T_{op}$ and at the bias current, $I_{op}$.

The detector used in these experiments consists of an array of 240 sensors laid out as shown in Fig. 1B. The sensor array is operated at $T_{op} = 70$ mK using an adiabatic demagnetization refrigerator (ADR), and is mounted on the end of a snout allowing it to be positioned near the sample in a vacuum chamber used for RSXS experiments (Fig. 1(A)). The cryogenic system requires strict management of the thermal load from every part of the device including the readout system. Thus, the number of room temperature wires into the readout chip needs to be minimized. This is achieved by implementing a time division multiplexing (TDM) scheme in which the same readout system is used to address multiple sensors by switching from one to another [14]. TDM results in a compromise between the number of sensors used and the energy resolution, since having more multiplexed sensors results in slower readout of each sensor, resulting in arrival time errors that worsen the energy resolution [14]. The current experiments were done with a 24-sensor subsector of the TES, highlighted in Fig. 1(B), to illustrate the advantages of multiplexing while operating close to the optimal resolution. All TES spectra

![FIG. 1. Schematic of the TES / RSXS scattering setup at Sector 29 at the Advanced Photon Source. (A) Layout of the scattering chamber (gray) showing the location of the TES detector snout and cryostat (yellow). The snout was placed on a translation stage and bellows allowing it to be positioned close to the sample so the detector can cover $\sim 11^\circ$ of scattering angle. (B) Expanded view of the sensor head (yellow) and detector array (green). The TES consists of 240 individually addressable sensors. The data presented here was taken with a 24-element subsector of the array (orange expanded view).]
FIG. 2. (A) Resolution function of the TES (blue line) measured via diffuse elastic scattering from a thin layer of gold on polished silicon. (orange line) Fit function used in analysis of the data. (B) Sample spectrum taken with sensor #15 far from the CDW Bragg condition showing elastic, $d-d$, and fluorescence emission features in the data. The colored lines represent the different components of the fit model (see text).}

in this study were created by binning individual photon events into histograms comprising 0.1 eV intervals. The resolution varied among different sensors but was approximately $\Delta E = 1.5$ eV as determined from diffuse elastic scattering from a gold target (Fig. 2(A))

RSXS experiments were carried out at the IEX facility in Sector 29 at the Advanced Photon Source using a two-axis reflectometer with a base sample temperature of 18 K. The LBCO crystal used had a doping level $x \approx 1/8$ with a superconducting transition temperature of $T_c = 4$ K. The crystal was pre-oriented by x-ray diffraction (XRD) and mounted so that the reciprocal lattice vector of the charge order, which is around $(0.25, 0, 1.5)$, lies in the scattering plane. This allowed the CDW reflection to be optimized despite the restricted number of sample motions of the instrument. The TES detector is mounted on the RSXS chamber on a fixed port at a scattering angle of approximately $2\theta = 125^\circ$ (Fig. 1(A)). The energy response curve of the TES was measured between every scan set and used to correct for small drifts in detector calibration and gain.

**RESULTS**

A representative TES spectrum illustrating the basic features of the data is shown in Fig. 2(B). This spectrum was taken using sensor #15 at an incident beam energy of 938.9 eV with an integration time of 2 min. While the 1.5 eV energy resolution is modest, the expected features in the spectra are clearly visible, including the elastic scattering, $d-d$ excitations which are offset from the elastic peak by about 2 eV, and an incoherent emission peak at 930 eV. Note that the $d-d$ excitations are actually a coherent inelastic scattering effect, making Fig. 2(B) the first observation of a valence band, soft RIXS spectrum using the intrinsic energy resolution of a solid state detector.

The incident energy dependence of the CDW scattering, as observed with the TES array, is summarized in Fig. 3, which shows the measured intensity as a function of both incident and detected photon energy on a color plot for each of the 24 active sensors. The integration time for each distinct incident energy was 5 min. The energy was stepped in 0.5 eV increments through the Cu $L_3/2$ edge at 932.2 eV, which corresponds to electric-dipole transitions into the 3$d$ shell, enhancing sensitivity to valence band order [3]. The sample angle, $\theta$, is chosen so that sensor #25, which is located near the center of

FIG. 3. Incident energy dependence of the scattered intensity from LBCO as measured by the 24 active sensors in the TES array. The panels are numbered according to the naming convention in Fig. 1(B). The incident photon energy was tuned from 929.2 eV to 935.8 eV in 0.5 eV steps with the in-plane component of the momentum transfer held fixed. The CDW signal is observed in sensor #25 whose location corresponds to a momentum vector $q = (0.23, 0, 1.54)$. The red lines indicate the expected location of the elastic scattering.
the 24 active channels, gets the maximum CDW count rate on resonance. With the incident beam at the resonance, the reciprocal vector $\mathbf{q}$ at the middle of TES array is about (0.23, 0, 1.54). During the energy scan, Miller indices $H$ and $K$ of the momentum transfer $\mathbf{q}$ are held fixed by adjusting the sample angle, $\theta$, at each incident energy.

Fig. 3 reveals a few important general features of resonant scattering that clarify how a TES might best be used. Below resonance, photoabsorption is not allowed, but off-shell (elastic and inelastic) resonant scattering may still take place. The elastic scattering, which is the signal of interest here, shows up on the diagonals in each panel in Fig. 3 (red lines). When the incident beam energy is above the resonance, the Cu$^{2+}$ fluorescence line becomes strong and sits at fixed emitted photon energy [15]. At the incident x-ray beam energy of 932.2 eV, which corresponds to the resonance maximum, the intensity of both the elastic scattering and the x-ray fluorescence is maximized. However, the different spectral components are intermixed and cannot be resolved using the 1.5 eV resolution of the TES. Optimal background rejection therefore requires slight detuning of the energy from the resonance. For this reason, studies of the charge order were carried out at an incident beam energy of 933.7 eV at which the scattering retains most of the resonant enhancement but the elastic component is energetically resolvable using the resolution of the TES.

Having determined the optimal beam energy, we performed momentum scans through the charge order by rotating the $\theta$ angle of the sample, in 0.1° increments, at fixed incident energy (Fig. 4). In this scan the CDW sweeps across sensors #9, #5, #25, and #31 (Fig. 1(B)), in which it is clearly visible as a peak at 933.7 eV that is resolvable from the fluorescence line at 930.1 eV. The data in Fig. 4 contain enough information to determine a quantitative, energy-resolved elastic lineshape of the CDW, which should be superior to what was possible in early studies [3]. However, doing so requires some means to extract the elastic scattering from the individual spectra.

**SPECTRAL DECOMPOSITION**

Having measured energy-resolved spectra in the vicinity of the CDW, a means to extract the coherent elastic signal from the data is needed. The individual spectra (Fig. 2(B)) consist of three main features: (1) the elastic line itself, which is resolution-limited and always resides in the spectrum at the incident beam energy, (2) the $d$-$d$ excitations, which reside $\sim$2 eV below the elastic line and are also resolution limited, and (3) the fluorescence line, which we regard as the primary source of background. As shown in Fig. 3, the behavior of the fluorescence feature is complicated, deforming from a Raman-like excitation to an incoherent emission feature at 930 eV as the beam energy is tuned through the resonance [15]. A detailed spectroscopic model of these features is needed to quantify the amount of elastic scattering in the spectra. This model should properly account for the finite detector resolution, which is similar to the splitting between the elastic and fluorescence features in most of the data, by convolving with the response curve in Fig. 2(A).

The elastic scattering and $d$-$d$ excitations are both resolution-limited. We therefore model both as Dirac delta functions, which will broaden into replicas of the resolution function of the instrument when convolved with the response curve (Fig. 2(A)).

To model the fluorescence feature, we apply a modi-
fied version of the Eisenberger-Platzman-Winick (EPW) model of x-ray emission \[15\]. Taking only the resonant terms in the Kramers-Heisenberg equation and assuming constant matrix elements and density of states in the continuum, the differential cross-section has the form

\[
\frac{d\sigma}{d\omega_2}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \int_0^\infty d\epsilon_1 \int_0^\infty d\epsilon_2 \frac{(1 - n_k(\epsilon_1))n_k(\epsilon_2)}{(\omega_1 - \epsilon_1 - \Omega_L)^2 + \Gamma_L^2} \delta(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2 - \omega_1 + \omega_2),
\]

where \(\epsilon_1\) and \(\epsilon_2\) are respectively the energies of the photoexcited electron and decaying hole measured with respect to the bottom of the valence band, \(\omega_1\) and \(\omega_2\) are respectively the energies of incoming and outgoing x-ray photons, \(\Omega_L\) is the energy separation between Cu L\(_{3/2}\) core level and the bottom of the valence band, \(\Gamma_L\) is the lifetime of the core-hole, and \(n_k(\epsilon)\) is the Fermi function. Assuming temperature effects are negligible we take \(n_k(\epsilon) = \theta(E_F - \epsilon)\), where \(\theta\) is the Heaviside function and \(E_F\) is the Fermi energy, in which case the cross section reduces to

\[
\frac{d\sigma}{d\omega_2}(\omega_1, \omega_2) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \omega_2 < \omega_1 \\
\frac{1}{\Gamma_L} \left[ \arctan \left( \frac{E_F + \Omega_L - \omega_2}{\Gamma_L} \right) - \arctan \left( \frac{E_F + \Omega_L - \omega_1}{\Gamma_L} \right) \right] & \text{if } \omega_1 - E_F < \omega_2 < \omega_1 \\
\frac{1}{\Gamma_L} \left[ \arctan \left( \frac{E_F - \Omega_L - \omega_2}{\Gamma_L} \right) - \arctan \left( \frac{E_F - \Omega_L - \omega_1}{\Gamma_L} \right) \right] & \text{if } \omega_2 < \omega_1 - E_F 
\end{cases}
\]

A least-squares fit of this model to a sample spectrum, properly convolving the resolution function of the detector, is shown in Fig. 2(B). The quality of the fit is reasonable and accounts for all the primary spectral features. Note that a small amount of fluorescence is present even when the x-ray energy is below the edge because of second harmonic contamination in the x-ray beam, i.e., photons with double the nominal energy. This extra component was explicitly included in the fit (Fig. 2(B), orange line).

We now use this model to extract the elastic counts from sensors \#5 and \#25, which are representative sensors that received signal from the CDW. The result of the fits to the individual curves (Figs. 3,4) is shown in line plots in Fig. 5. The model allows each spectrum to be decomposed into discrete components, the counts being assigned to bins corresponding to \(d-d\), fluorescence, and the elastic counts of interest.

We are keenly interested in how the statistical quality of RSXS data is improved by introducing energy resolution into the measurement. We therefore assigned error values to the elastic counts in each spectrum, \(N_{\text{elastic}}\), by taking the square root of the corresponding diagonal value of the variance-covariance matrix of fit parameters \[10\]. This error value obtained in this manner, \(\Delta N_{\text{elastic}}\), accounts for statistical error as well as systematic error resulting from imperfection of the fit model. If the model were perfect the error would reduce to the Poisson result, \(\Delta N_{\text{elastic}} = \sqrt{N_{\text{elastic}}}\). In practice, we expect the error to exceed the Poisson value since the model will not fit the spectrum perfectly.

The results of the fits in Fig. 5 are summarized Fig. 6, which shows the elastic counts, \(N_{\text{elastic}}\), for sensors \#5 and \#25 plotted against energy and angle. The error bars in Fig. 6 represent \(\pm \Delta N_{\text{elastic}}\). For comparison, on the same plots we show the total photon counts, \(N_{\text{total}}\), which represents how the spectrum would have looked had it been measured with an energy-integrating detector in the customary fashion. The error in the energy-integrated points is determined purely by Poisson counting statistics, so the error bars correspond to \(\pm \sqrt{N_{\text{total}}}\).

Focusing first on the energy spectrum from sensor \#25 (Fig. 6(B)), the elastic curve differs from the energy-integrated curve in that the edge jump, seen as an increased intensity for energies greater than about 934 eV, is absent. This indicates that there is enhanced fluorescence background when the energy is tuned far above the edge, but there is little enhancement of the resonant scattering there. In other words, the apparent jump is entirely due to background fluorescence, and is not a property of the RSXS signal itself.

A dramatic difference is seen in the angle scans through the CDW peak. Had the measurement been done with an energy-integrating detector, it would have resembled Fig. 6(D), which shows a CDW peak with a background similar to past studies \[3\]. Using the fit model to extract the elastic scattering results in the curve shown in Fig. 6(F), which is plotted next to the energy-integrated spectrum with a background line subtracted. The curves in Fig. 6(F) differ in two important respects. First, the noise level in the elastic curve is lower. Second, the elas-
FIG. 5. Application of the fit model to the individual spectra shown in Figs. 3 and 4. (A) Individual TES spectra for sensor #5 for various incident beam energies, from Fig. 3. Solid lines show different terms in the fit model and open circles are the experimental data points. (B) Same plot as (A) for sensor #25. (C) Individual TES spectra for sensor #5 for various sample angles, showing enhanced elastic CDW scattering for $\theta = 35.15^\circ$, from Fig. 4. (D) Same plot as (C) for sensor #25, showing enhanced elastic CDW scattering at $\theta = 35.15^\circ$.

FIG. 6. Incident energy and angle dependence of the elastic scattering, as determined by the data fits in Fig. 5, compared to what would have been measured with an equivalent, energy-integrating detector (energy-integrated curves have been scaled to allow visual comparison). (A) Energy dependence of the elastic CDW scattering in sensor #5 (blue) compared to the energy-integrated result (red). The energy-integrated curve exhibits an asymmetry due to significant contribution from background fluorescence. (B) Same plot as panel (A) for sensor #25. (C) Angle-dependence of the energy-integrated CDW scattering in sensor #5. The CDW peak is barely visible above the fluorescence background. (D) Same plot as panel (C) for sensor #25. (E) Angle-dependence of the elastic CDW scattering in sensor #5 (blue) compared to the energy-integrated result (red). A background line has been subtracted from the red points to allow a direct, visual comparison. Note that the CDW feature is much more clearly revealed in the elastic scattering data. (F) Same plot as panel (E) for sensor #25.

We turn now to sensor #5, which only detects a distant tail of the CDW so is a good test case for how the TES performs when applied to weak signals. The result of the energy spectrum (Fig. 6(A)) is similar to sensor #25, with the edge jump being eliminated. The angle scans, however, show a qualitative difference: While the CDW peak is hardly visible above the noise level in the energy-integrated curve (Figs. 6(C), (E)), the elastic spectrum shows a well defined peak with a width similar to what was observed in sensor #25. In this case the ability to see the CDW peak at all requires an energy-resolved de-
the number of elastic and energy-integrated counts at the peak and in the tail of the CDW in LBCO for sensors 5 and 25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>Sensor</th>
<th>$N_{\text{total}} \pm \Delta N_{\text{total}}$</th>
<th>$N_{\text{elastic}} \pm \Delta N_{\text{elastic}}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.55° (peak)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>323 ± 133</td>
<td>883 ± 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.15° (peak)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1336 ± 110</td>
<td>1879 ± 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.35° (tail)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58 ± 122</td>
<td>122 ± 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.35° (tail)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>148 ± 98</td>
<td>290 ± 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

We are now in a position to make a quantitative statement about the advantage of introducing modest energy resolution into RSXS experiments. We focus on four data points in Fig. 6 corresponding to the peak in sensor #5 ($\theta = 34.55°$) (Fig. 6(E)), a location on the tail in the same curve ($\theta = 36.35°$), the peak in sensor #25 ($\theta = 35.15°$) (Fig. 6(F)), and a location on its tail ($\theta = 36.35°$). At these points we compare the magnitudes of the elastic counts, $N_{\text{elastic}}$, the energy-integrated counts, $N_{\text{total}}$, and the error values on these quantities, $\Delta N_{\text{elastic}}$ and $\Delta N_{\text{total}}$, as summarized in Table I. $N_{\text{total}}$ in this table represents the value after having subtracted a background line, as illustrated in Fig. 6(E), (F).

Note that some of the error values in Table I are larger than $\sqrt{N}$. In the case of the total counts, $N_{\text{total}}$, this is because the fluorescence background also contributes to the noise level. In the case of the elastic counts, $N_{\text{elastic}}$, an increased value of the error can be expected if the fit function is imperfect (Fig. 5).

We begin our comparison with the peak count rate in sensor #25. A useful figure of merit is the quality ratio, $N/\Delta N$, which would reduce to the signal-to-noise ratio, $S/N$, in cases where $\Delta N$ is limited by counting statistics. For the energy-integrated measurement, $N_{\text{total}}/\Delta N_{\text{total}}=12.1$. For the elastic case, this ratio $N_{\text{elastic}}/\Delta N_{\text{elastic}}=75.2$. We conclude that using energy analysis provides a factor of 6 improvement in data quality in this case.

Turning now to the peak in sensor #5, the relevant ratios are $N_{\text{total}}/\Delta N_{\text{total}}=2.4$ and $N_{\text{elastic}}/\Delta N_{\text{elastic}}=24.5$. In this case adding energy resolution results in a factor of 10 improvement in signal quality. This seems consistent with the qualitative observation that, while a peak is hardly visible in the energy-integrated measurement, it is clearly visible in the energy-resolved curve (Fig. 6(E)). This result illustrates an important point about the applicability of TES detectors in scattering: the performance improvement is higher when studying weak signals that lie at or below the noise level from the fluorescence background.

This point is further validated by examining the tails of the peak. In the case of sensor #25, the ratios are $N_{\text{total}}/\Delta N_{\text{total}}=1.5$ and $N_{\text{elastic}}/\Delta N_{\text{elastic}}=12.6$, implying a performance enhancement of 8.4. For the case of #5, we have $N_{\text{total}}/\Delta N_{\text{total}}=0.47$ and $N_{\text{elastic}}/\Delta N_{\text{elastic}}=3.2$, implying a performance improvement of 7.0. Note that these numbers represent the enhancement in performance purely from the introduction of moderate energy resolution in RSXS studies. An explicit performance comparison between a TES and a specific detector would also require accounting for quantum efficiency, solid angle coverage, number of pixels or sensors in the device, etc. Nevertheless, it is clear that, all other things being equal, introducing even modest energy resolution can improve RSXS studies by an order of magnitude.

In conclusion, we have evaluated the performance of a TES detector with 1.5 eV energy resolution for RSXS measurements from the prototypical stripe-ordered CDW material, La$_{2-x}$Ba$_x$CuO$_4$. We have found that incorporating modest energy resolution provides a factor of 5 to 10 times improvement in performance compared to equivalent, energy-integrated measurements. TES technology is likely to lead to significant new discoveries in studies of materials with emergent valence band instabilities, particularly those exhibiting glassy or short-ranged order, in which the scattering is diffuse and may lie near or below the noise level of the fluorescence background.
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