Standardized individual IQ test scores are frequently consulted for the identification of specific learning disabilities (SLD) largely due to the routine use of an ability–achievement discrepancy identification procedure (Reschly & Hosp, 2004; Zirkel, 2013). Therefore, the validity of high-stakes decisions regarding the presence of SLD is directly influenced by the validity of IQ test score interpretations. One aspect of validity evidence that is particularly important is the degree to which the scoring structure of the test matches the theoretical structure of the underlying construct, referred to as structural validity (Messick, 1995).

Structural Validity of the WISC-IV for the Standardization Sample

The Wechsler intelligence scales are among the most popularly used IQ tests for assessment of children and adolescents (Stinnett, Havey, & Oehler-Stinnett, 1994) and the structural validity of the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children–Fourth Edition (WISC-IV; Wechsler, 2003a) has been investigated extensively by its developers and by independent researchers (Chen & Zhu, 2008; Keith, Fine, Taub, Reynolds, & Kranzler, 2006; Watkins, 2006; Wechsler, 2003b). Both exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory (CFA) factor analyses were conducted to assess the fidelity of the WISC-IV scoring structure with the standardization sample for the 10 subtests that make up the core battery as well as for all 15 core and supplementary subtests (Wechsler, 2003b). EFA results suggested an oblique four-factor model fit the core battery best, which was also supported by results of the CFA after comparing several competing models with one-, two-, three-, four-, and five-correlated factors. The oblique four-factor model was also found to generally measure the same construct across gender (Chen & Zhu, 2008) and age (Keith et al., 2006), extending empirical support for the structural validity of the WISC-IV.

However, the oblique four-factor model did not include a higher-order g factor and this has been criticized because the Wechsler theoretical structure of intelligence posits a multilevel structure (Wechsler, 2003b). Two groups of independent researchers recognized this issue (Keith et al., 2006; Watkins, 2006). Keith et al. (2006) and Weiss, Keith, Zhu, and Chen (2013) used the WISC-IV standardization sample data from all 15 subtests and compared the fit of a second-order factor model with four first-order factors matching those specified in Wechsler and a second-order g factor to the fit of five first-order factors as specified by the Cattell–Horn–Carroll (CHC; McGrew, 1997; 2005) theoretical model of intelligence. Both models fit the data equally well with negligible differences in the reported fit...
Structural Validity of the WISC-IV for Clinical Samples

IQ tests are seldom administered to nonclinical samples in applied practice. Rather, they are almost exclusively administered to students who are suspected of having a disability. It is well documented that IQ test scores obtained from clinical samples tend to have different distributional characteristics than IQ test scores obtained from nonclinical samples (Canivez & Watkins, 1998; Chen & Zhu, 2012; Devena, Gay, & Watkins, 2013; Nakano & Watkins, 2013; Watkins, Wilson, Kotz, Carbone, & Babula, 2006). Therefore, it is prudent to investigate the structural validity of the WISC-IV with clinical samples because it is those individuals who will most likely be administered the test.

Only one EFA has been conducted on the WISC-IV with a clinical sample (Watkins et al., 2006). It used the scores from the core battery with a clinical sample of 432 students referred for special education evaluations. Results supported the oblique four-factor model proposed by Wechsler (2003b) and highlighted the contributions of g through the application of the Schmid-Leiman (1957) orthogonalization procedure. The g factor accounted for 76% of the common variance and 47% of the total variance explained by the model, leaving the combined four domain-specific factors only contributing an additional 15% of the total variance.

The structural validity of the WISC-IV for clinical samples has been investigated in seven CFA studies. Four of the seven CFA studies (Canivez, 2014; Devena et al., 2013; Nakano & Watkins, 2013; Watkins, 2010) tested first-order oblique models, a higher-order model (see Figure 1), and a bifactor model (see Figure 2; Holzinger & Swineford, 1937). In bifactor models, the general factor directly affects all measured variables and is orthogonal to the domain specific factors, each of which affects a subset of the measured variables. This structure led Gignac (2008) to label this a direct hierarchical structure and to suggest that g is a breadth factor. In the higher-order model, g directly affects the first-order factors, which in turn, directly affect the measured variables. General intelligence in this model is a superordinate construct that indirectly affects measured variables. That is, g is fully mediated by the first-order factors in the higher-order model.

Participants in Nakano and Watkins (2013), Watkins (2010), and Canivez (2014) included 176, 355, and 345 students referred for special education evaluations, respectively, and participants in Devena et al. (2013) consisted of 297 children and adolescents administered comprehensive psychological evaluations at a pediatric hospital outpatient facility. Watkins, Devena et al., and Canivez all identified the bifactor model as fitting the data best, but Nakano and Watkins favored the second-order Wechsler model on the basis of empirical criteria—though differences in model fit statistics were small. In spite of these interpretive differences, the g factor accounted for 69% to 76% of the common variance in all analyses and an overwhelming 33% to 50% of the total variance explained by the model. The combined four domain-specific factors only contributed an additional 1.4% to 17% of the total variance, thereby accruing additional support for the predominance of g in explaining IQ test performance on the WISC-IV. Empirical research investigating the structural validity of the French and British versions of the WISC-IV with referred and nonclinical samples have noted similar conclusions regarding the superiority of the bifactor model for explaining the relationships between subtest scores (Golay, Reverte, Rossier, Favez, & Lecerf, 2013; Watkins, Canivez, James, James, & Good, 2013; Watkins, Canivez, James, James, & Good, 2013).
and negligible contributions of domain specific factors over and above $g$ when this information is reported (Watkins et al., 2013).

The remaining three CFA studies on the WISC-IV with clinical samples evaluated the fit of a series of second-order models, but did not evaluate the fit of a bifactor model (Bodin, Pardini, Burns, & Stevens, 2009; Chen & Zhu, 2012; Weiss et al., 2013). Bodin et al. (2009) determined the adapted Wechsler (2003b) model with four first-order factors and a superordinate $g$ factor best fit a clinical sample of

---

**Figure 1.** Higher-order structure of the WISC-IV for 1,537 students with learning disabilities.

Note. BD = Block Design; CD = Coding; CO = Comprehension; DS = Digit Span; $g$ = General Intelligence; LN = Letter-Number Sequencing; MR = Matrix Reasoning; PCn = Picture Concepts; PR = Perceptual Reasoning factor; PS = Processing Speed factor; SI = Similarities; SS = Symbol Search; VC = Verbal Comprehension factor; VO = Vocabulary; WM = Working Memory factor.

**Figure 2.** Bifactor structure of the WISC-IV for 1,537 students with learning disabilities.

Note. BD = Block Design; CD = Coding; CO = Comprehension; DS = Digit Span; $g$ = General Intelligence; LN = Letter-Number Sequencing; MR = Matrix Reasoning; PCn = Picture Concepts; PR = Perceptual Reasoning factor; PS = Processing Speed factor; SI = Similarities; SS = Symbol Search; VC = Verbal Comprehension factor; VO = Vocabulary; WM = Working Memory factor.
344 children and adolescents who were administered the core battery of the WISC-IV as part of a neuropsychological evaluation at a pediatric hospital. The Schmid-Leiman (1957) orthogonalization procedure was also used to assess the individual contributions of each factor. Bodin et al. reported that 77% of the common variance was attributed to g along with 48% of the total variance, whereas the combined four domain-specific factors contributed only an additional 15% of the total variance explained by the model.

The second-order Wechsler (2003b) model supported by Bodin et al. and Nakano and Watkins (2013) has also been reported to measure the same construct across clinical and nonclinical groups of the WISC-IV standardization sample (Chen & Zhu, 2012) as well as a second-order CHC model with both four- and five-first-order factors (Weiss et al., 2013). However, the CHC models included in Weiss et al. (2013) required use of all 15 subtests and contained numerous cross-loadings analogous to Keith et al. (2006). Canivez and Kush (2013) noted these and other concerns about the Weiss et al. study in a commentary published within the same special issue of the Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment. For example, the literature review neglected to cite empirical evaluations of rival models, several intermediate latent factors were required to support the general CHC structure (i.e., a Quantitative Reasoning factor was created to explain the relationship between the Figure Weights and Arithmetic subtests and an Inductive Reasoning factor was created to explain the relationship between the Picture Concepts and Matrix Reasoning subtests), and the variance attributed to the CHC factors above and beyond g was not reported.

Although the structural validity of the WISC-IV has been investigated with clinical samples, the generalizability of the results do not extend to specific homogenous clinical subpopulations because each clinical sample consisted of a heterogeneous group of children and adolescents diagnosed with myriad disabilities (Bodin et al., 2009; Canivez, 2014; Chen & Zhu, 2012; Devena et al., 2013; Nakano & Watkins, 2013; Watkins, 2006, 2010; Watkins et al., 2006; Weiss et al., 2013). It is possible that the theoretical structure of the WISC-IV is different for various homogenous clinical populations and it is important that this possibility be tested. Unfortunately, no study has evaluated the structural validity of the WISC-IV for a single clinical subsample. Given the prevalent use of IQ test scores for determining the presence of SLD (Reschly & Hosp, 2004; Zirkel, 2013) and the popularity of the WISC-IV (Stinnett et al., 1994), the purpose of the present investigation is to evaluate the structural validity of the WISC-IV for children and adolescents diagnosed with SLD.

**Method**

**Participants**

Participants were 1,537 (62.5% male) students with learning disabilities enrolled in two large Southwestern school districts. Educational records indicated that participants’ ethnic/racial backgrounds was 72.0% Caucasian, 16.6% Hispanic, 5.3% African American, 2.1% Native American, 1.5% Asian/Pacific, and 2.5% Other/Missing. Students were 6 to 16 years of age ($M = 10.4, SD = 2.3$ years) and enrolled in grades kindergarten through eleven ($Md = 4$).

Most participants were given multiple learning disability diagnoses. For example, 70.7% of the participants had a learning disability in reading, 48.1% had a learning disability in math, and 57.0% had a learning disability in written expression. Of the students with a reading disability, 76.2% had an additional learning disability diagnosis in math, written expression, oral expression, or listening comprehension. Likewise, a large proportion of the students with a math disability (73.9%) had an additional learning disability diagnosis in another academic area. In addition, 238 students with learning disabilities had a secondary diagnosis (e.g., speech-language impairment, other health impairment, emotional disability, etc.).

**Instruments**

The WISC-IV contains 10 core and 5 supplemental subtests, each with a population mean of 10 and standard deviation of 3. The core subtests are used to form four factor indexes, where the Verbal Comprehension Index (VC) is based on the Similarities, Vocabulary, and Comprehension subtests; the Perceptual Reasoning Index (PR) is based on Block Design, Matrix Reasoning, and Picture Concepts subtests; the Working Memory Index (WM) on the Digit Span and Letter-Number Sequencing subtests; and the Processing Speed Index (PS) on the Coding and Symbol Search subtests. The FSIQ is also formed from the 10 core subtests. The factor indexes and FSIQ each have a population mean of 100 and standard deviation of 15. The supplemental subtests were not included in this study because their infrequent application precluded requisite statistical power for multivariate analyses.

Examiners used a variety of academic achievement measures, but the majority of scores were from a version of the Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (47.3%) and a version of the Woodcock–Johnson Tests of Achievement (49.8%). Both measures are well-developed scales with nationally representative normative samples and strong psychometric characteristics (Thorndike & Thorndike-Christ, 2010).

**Procedures**

Participants were enrolled in two large southwestern public school districts. The first district had an enrollment of 32,500 students and included 31 elementary, 8 middle, and 6 high schools. Ethnic composition for the 2009–2010 academic year was 67.2% Caucasian, 23.8% Hispanic, 4.0% African American, 3.9% Asian, and 1.1% Native American. The second district served 26,000 students in 2009–2010,
with 16 elementary schools, 3 kindergarten through 8th grade schools, 6 middle schools, 5 high schools, and 1 alternative school. Caucasian students composed 83.1% of enrollments, Hispanic 10.5%, Asian 2.9%, African American 1.7%, and other ethnic minorities 1.8%.

After obtaining Internal Review Board and school district approval, eight trained school psychology doctoral students examined approximately 7,500 student special education files and retrieved assessment data from all special education files spanning the years 2003 to 2010 where psychologists had administered the WISC-IV. Following this procedure, data were obtained on 2,783 students with a primary diagnoses of learning disabilities (57.6%), emotional disability (11.6%), attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (8.0%), intellectual disability (2.6%), other disabilities (12.1%), and no diagnosis (8.0%). Of the 1,603 students with learning disabilities, 66 did not have scores from all 10 core WISC-IV subtests.

The 1,537 students with complete WISC-IV scores were determined to be learning disabled by local multidisciplinary teams following district and state guidelines that permitted the use of ability–achievement discrepancies. In general, diagnostic criteria resulted in expected reading–math score patterns for students with learning disabilities in reading and math. For example, students with a learning disability in reading exhibited lower reading scores than students with a learning disability in math (M = 79.3 vs. 83.0, respectively) and students with a learning disability in math exhibited lower math scores than students with a learning disability in reading (M = 80.0 vs. 88.4, respectively). This reading–math pattern was magnified when students with an exclusive learning disability in reading (M reading = 82.8, M math = 95.5) were compared to students with an exclusive learning disability in math (M reading = 93.2, M math = 81.3).

### Analyses

Mplus 7 for the Macintosh (Muthén & Muthén, 2012) was used to conduct CFA using maximum likelihood estimation with Satorra-Bentler (1994) scaling to correct for minor departures of multivariate normality. Consistent with previous WISC-IV structural analyses, four first-order models and two hierarchical models were specified and examined (a) one factor; (b) two oblique verbal and nonverbal factors; (c) three oblique verbal, perceptual, and combined working memory/processing speed factors; (d) four oblique verbal, perceptual, working memory, and processing speed factors as per Wechsler (2003b); (e) a higher-order model (as per Bodin et al., 2009) with four first-order factors; and (f) a bifactor (sometimes called direct hierarchical or nested) model (as per Watkins, 2010) with four domain specific factors. See Gignac (2008) for a detailed description of higher-order and bifactor models and Figures 1 and 2 for illustrations of each model.

Given the complexity of the statistical models and the extreme degree of comorbidity among participants, it was not possible to divide the learning disability sample into discrete subtypes (i.e., reading, math, written expression) and retain sufficient power for subsequent CFAs (Kline, 2011). Comorbidity has been found among other large samples of students with learning disabilities (Benson & Taub, 2013). Consequently, analyses were conducted with the total sample of students with learning disabilities.

Although there are no universally accepted cutoff values for model fit indices, multiple indices that represented a variety of fit criteria were examined (Kline, 2011), specifically the (a) $\chi^2$, (b) comparative fit index (CFI), (c) root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and (e) Akaike’s information criterion (AIC). The standards for good model fit were (a) $\text{CFI} \geq .95$, (b) $\text{RMSEA} \leq .06$, and (c) $\text{SRMR} \leq .06$ (Hu & Bentler, 1999). There are no specific criteria for information-based fit indices like the AIC, but smaller values indicate better approximations of the true model (Vrieze, 2012). For a model to be deemed superior, it had to (a) exhibit good fit according to CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR standards and (b) display the smallest AIC value.

Finally, factor reliabilities were estimated with coefficient omega ($\omega$) and omega hierarchical ($\omega_h$) as per Watkins (2013). The traditional coefficient alpha reliability estimate has long been known to be biased (Sijtsma, 2009; Yang & Green, 2011) and coefficient omega has been recommended as its replacement (Brunner, Nagy, & Wilhelm, 2012; Reise, 2012). Omega estimates reliability based on the total systematic variance in each factor including variance from the general factor and the domain specific factor, whereas omega hierarchical estimates the reliability of each factor with variance from the general factor removed. Thus, $\omega_h$ controls for that part of reliability due to the general factor and is useful for judging the utility of factor index scores (Reise, 2012). There are no absolute standards for evaluating the magnitude of $\omega$ or $\omega_h$, but it has been tentatively suggested that values near .75 might be preferred, and values greater than .50 might be a minimum (Reise, Bonifay, & Haviland, 2013).

### Results

As reflected in Table 1, WISC-IV subtest and index scores were lower than the national average ($d = -0.6$). These descriptive statistics were expected because lower cognitive and achievement scores are frequently observed in clinical samples (Benson & Taub, 2013; Watkins, 2010). Univariate skewness and kurtosis values were under 1.0, but multivariate normality was not supported ($\chi^2 = 326.9$, $df = 20$, $p < .001$; Doornik & Hansen, 2008).

The model fit statistics presented in Table 2 illustrate the increasingly better fit obtained from 1 to 4 first-order factors. Based on the standards for CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR
indices, the correlated four-factor, higher-order, and bifactor models were all good fits to the data. However, the four factors were highly correlated (Md = .52) in the oblique first-order model, suggesting the presence of a general factor (Gorsuch, 1983), making that model an inadequate explanation of the data. When comparing the higher-order and bifactor models, the bifactor model exhibited superior fit according to all the fit indices, including the AIC. Thus, it was selected as the best explanation of the WISC-IV factor structure among students with learning disabilities.

Table 3 presents decomposed WISC-IV subtest variance estimates based on the bifactor model. The general factor accounted for 47.9% of the common variance and 23.7% of the total variance, the VC factor accounted for 21.8% of the common variance and 10.8% of the total variance, the PR factor accounted for 8.1% of the common variance and 4.0% of total variance, the WM factor accounted for 6.4% of the common variance and 3.2% of the total variance, and the PS factor accounted for 15.7% of the common variance and 7.8% of the total variance (see Table 3). Thus, the g factor accounted for substantially greater portions of WISC-IV common and total variance relative to the domain specific factors. In addition, communality was lower than uniqueness for six of the ten WISC-IV subtests.

The omega and omega hierarchical coefficients presented in Table 3 are estimates of the reliability of the WISC-IV factors. In the case of the four domain specific factors, $\omega_h$ coefficients estimated the scale reliabilities with the effects of the general factor removed and ranged from .166 (PR) to .525 (PS). In contrast, the $g$ factor exhibited a $\omega_h$ coefficient of .667. These values suggest that if both total and factor scores are formed, interpretation of the factor scores “as precise indicators of unique constructs is extremely limited—very little reliable variance exists beyond that due to the general factor” (Reise, 2012, p. 691).
Discussion

Results of the present study generally support the structural validity of the WISC-IV for a clinical sample of students identified as having SLD. Moreover, results indicate that the bifactor model was a superior fit to the data, which consisted of four domain specific factors matching Wechsler’s (2003b) structure and a general intelligence breadth factor. This substantiates results of previous research on the WISC-IV with heterogeneous clinical samples (Canivez, 2014; Devena et al., 2013; Watkins, 2010). Nakano and Watkins (2013) is the only published study in which a second-order model exhibited a better fit than the bifactor model. However, Nakano and Watkins reported that both models with a higher-order factor fit the data well and differences in the model fit statistics were minimal.

The bifactor model has numerous advantages over other models of intelligence. Principally, it elucidates the individual contributions of all first-order factors and it enables researchers to study the external criterion validity of domain specific subabilities (Brunner, 2008; Chen et al., 2006; Schmiedek & Li, 2004). Bifactor models are also more parsimonious than second-order factor models (Gustafsson, 2001) and resemble Carroll’s (1993) conceptualization of g as a breadth factor. Applying a bifactor model to the WISC-IV data in this study, approximately 48% of the common variance was attributed to g, along with 24% of the total variance. However, the general intelligence factor explained more than twice the amount of the total variance of any single domain specific factor.

Some popular contemporary theories of intelligence unwittingly emphasize interpretation of domain specific factors over g (Flanagan, Ortiz, & Alfonso, 2013; McGrew, 1997, 2005), but the results of the present study do not support those claims. Specifically, 6 of the 10 subtests contained more specific and error variance than general or group factor variance. In addition, the \( \omega_h \) values of .166 to .525 for the four first-order factors indicate that those factors did not retain much precision of measurement independent of the general factor. This implies large confidence intervals around the factor scores and makes interpretation of a person’s specific ability very uncertain (Brunner et al., 2012).

The present study represents the first CFA with a homogeneous clinical sample, but it is not without limitations. Participants were recruited from a single geographic location, which may limit generalizability. In addition, approximately 15% of participants were concurrently diagnosed with a second educational disability. SLD are highly comorbid with other conditions, such as attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (DuPaul, Gormley, & Laracy, 2013; Nelson & Canivez, 2012), developmental coordination disorders (Kaplan, Wilson, Dewey, & Crawford, 1998), and epilepsy (Fastenau, Shen, Dunn, & Austin, 2008). Therefore, participants are representative of the population of students diagnosed with SLD. Furthermore, the present investigation included a single sample of students with SLD. This precluded an empirical evaluation of measurement invariance with a nonclinical sample. The WISC-IV has demonstrated measurement invariance with a heterogeneous group of students.

### Table 3. Sources of Variance in the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children–Fourth Edition Among 1,537 Children With Learning Disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>VC</th>
<th>PR</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>PS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>.504 .254</td>
<td>.534 .285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.539 .461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO</td>
<td>.528 .279</td>
<td>.735 .540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.819 .181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>.446 .199</td>
<td>.504 .254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.453 .547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>.536 .287</td>
<td>.273 .075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.362 .638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCn</td>
<td>.558 .311</td>
<td>.114 .013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.324 .676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>.606 .367</td>
<td>.562 .316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.683 .317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>.416 .173</td>
<td>.418 .175</td>
<td>.562 .316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN</td>
<td>.508 .258</td>
<td>.378 .143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>.212 .045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>.445 .198</td>
<td>.647 .419</td>
<td>.617 .383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total variance</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% common variance</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \omega )</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.543</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \omega_h )</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. b = standardized loading of subtest on factor; BD = Block Design; CD = Coding; CO = Comprehension; DS = Digit Span; h² = communality; LN = Letter-Number Sequencing; MR = Matrix Reasoning; PCn = Picture Concepts; PR = Perceptual Reasoning factor; PS = Processing Speed factor; SI = Similarities; SS = Symbol Search; u² = uniqueness; Var = percentage variance explained in the subtest; VC = Verbal Comprehension factor; VO = Vocabulary; WM = Working Memory factor.
students with disabilities (Chen & Zhu, 2012), and future research should investigate the degree to which measurement invariance is sustained across a nonclinical sample of students and a homogeneous sample of students with SLD. Notwithstanding results of the present investigation verify those of numerous others that detect the dominating influence of a general intelligence factor (Bodin et al., 2009; Canivez, 2014; Devena et al., 2013; Watkins, 2006, 2010; Watkins et al., 2006). As a result, interpretation of the WISC-IV in applied settings should emphasize the Full-Scale IQ score and interpretation of domain-specific factor scores should be undertaken only after considering their precision of measurement and with the understanding that “each specific factor score estimate provides little information beyond that provided by the general factor estimate” (DeMars, 2013, p. 374).
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