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Abstract—Existing fingerprint-based indoor localization uses either fine-grained channel state information (CSI) from the physical layer or coarse-grained received signal strength indicator (RSSI) measurements from the MAC layer. In this paper, we propose to use an intermediate channel measurement — spatial beam signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) that are inherently available during the beam training phase as defined in the IEEE 802.11ad standard — to construct the feature space for location-and-orientation-dependent fingerprinting database. We build a 60-GHz experimental platform consisting of three access points and one client using commercial-off-the-shelf routers and collect real-world beam SNR measurements in an office environment during regular office hours. Both position/orientation classification and coordinate estimation are considered using classic machine learning approaches. Comprehensive performance evaluation using real-world beam SNRs demonstrates that the classification accuracy is 99.8\% if the location is only interested, while the accuracy is 98.6\% for simultaneous position-and-orientations classification. Direct coordinate estimation gives an average root-mean-square error of 17.52 cm and 95\% of all coordinate estimates are less than 26.90 cm away from corresponding true locations. This concept directly applies to other mmWave band (e.g., 5G) devices where beam training is also required.

I. INTRODUCTION

WiFi-based indoor localization has received long attraction over the past two decades [1]. Among all frameworks, fingerprinting-based method provides an efficient solution for online localization with low computational complexity [2]. On the other hand, it requires enormous time and resources to construct an offline database with chosen fingerprinting features at locations-of-interest to enable fast online localization.

Existing WiFi-based fingerprinting systems have used received signal strength indicator (RSSI) as the feature to construct the offline training database due to easy access to commercial 802.11ac devices and low hardware requirements. Machine learning methods such as the \textit{k}-nearest neighbor (kNN), linear/quadratic discriminant analysis (LDA/QDA), support vector machine (SVM) and decision trees (DT) can be applied to the RSSI-based fingerprinting data and show improved localization accuracy [3], [4]. The common issues of RSSI include 1) instability of RSSI measurements at a given location and 2) coarse-grained channel information.

The use of channel state information (CSI) for fingerprinting-based localization gains momentum at 2.4-GHz and 5-GHz frequency bands in [5]–[10] (references therein) due to open-source WiFi network interface cards (NICs) such as Intel WiFi Link 5300 NIC. Specifically, these NICs provide subcarrier channel frequency responses (CFR) in an orthogonal frequency-division multiplexing (OFDM) system and capture the multipath effect via wideband channel responses. Compared with RSSI measurements, these CSI measurements are more stable and provide location-sensitive features. For instance, FIFS leverages the weighted average of CSI amplitudes over three antennas [5], while DeepFi exploits 90 CSI amplitudes from all 30 subcarriers at all three antennas with a deep autoencoder network [7], [8]. To address the firmware problem for phase information, [11] proposed to use CSI phase for angle of arrival (AoA) estimation with 5-GHz WiFi signals. [12] used a capture device to extract the CSI from the CSI feedback step from the user to the access point, converted into so-called angle measurements for fingerprinting data, and applied machine learning algorithms on such fingerprinting data.

For higher frequency bands beyond 5-GHz frequency band, e.g., 28-GHz band for 5G wireless communications and 60-GHz for 802.11ad WiFi [13], obtaining real-world fingerprinting measurements is significantly more challenging and usually requires dedicated prototyping device platforms [14]–[18]. One of unique features of these millimeter-wave (mmWave) applications is to employ high-resolution beampatterns, via either analog beamforming, fully digital beamforming, or hybrid beamforming [19], [20], to compensate for higher path loss at mmWave bands. More specifically, during the so-called beam training phase, a pre-determined set of varying spatial beampatterns is used to probe the environment. For each probing beampattern, a spatial beam SNR is recorded and beampatterns with the strongest beam SNR are selected for subsequently transmitting and receiving. For a given probing beampattern, spatial beam SNR is RSSI-like coarse-grained channel measurement. However, with multiple varying beampatterns, a set of spatial beam SNRs embed more spatial channel responses than the traditional RSSI measurement. Furthermore, spatial beam SNRs are inherently available in the 5G and IEEE 802.11ad standard, that enables zero overhead for the overall hardware and software infrastructure.

The use of beam information in mmWave frequency bands has been considered in the past for indoor localization in [21], [22] and references therein. Particularly, [21] proposed a direct localization (as opposed to the fingerprinting-based approach) with particle filters along with linear programming and Fourier analysis to real-world beam SNR measurements from commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) 60-GHz WiFi routers. Another related work is to use two-dimensional power delay
profile (PDP) over multiple beampatterns as fingerprints at 28-GHz band for outdoor localization [22]. It mainly exploits the fact that users’ locations can be registered by multipath delays due to surrounding obstructions (e.g., buildings and trees). To obtain high-resolution PDP, it assumes that base stations transmit short pulses with a sequence of directive beamforming patterns and a high sample rate is required at the user to separate closely-spaced delays. Moreover, this concept was verified only using ray-tracing simulated datasets.

As opposed to using the two-dimensional PDP in [22] that requires additional hardware modifications, this paper proposes to use spatial beam SNRs\(^1\), conveniently available during the beam training phase in the 5G and 802.11ad standards, as location-and-orientation-dependent fingerprints with zero overhead. Based on the open source software framework [24] to extract 60-GHz beam SNR measurements, we build an experimental platform consisting of multiple access points (APs) and collect comprehensive indoor measurements in an office environment during regular office hours. Note that these real-world measurements account for hardware constraints such as quantization of beam SNR values (i.e., beam SNRs are acquired at a resolution of 0.25 dB) and non-ideal system factors such as irregular antenna beampatterns.

With these real-world beam SNR measurements at several locations-of-interest, we construct a fingerprinting dataset in the offline training phase. For the online localization phase, both position-and-orientation classification and coordinate estimation are considered using, among classic machine learning approaches, the (weighted) nearest neighboring (NN) and Gaussian process (GP) regression approaches. Comprehensive performance evaluation using real-world beam SNRs demonstrates that we can achieve an accuracy of 98.6% for simultaneously localizing 7 positions with a sub-meter separation and 4 orientations that are 90° apart, while conventional approaches using RSSI-like single-SNR measurements offer an accuracy around 40%. If location is the only interest, the accuracy increases to 99.8% for using spatial beam SNRs, which is significantly higher than the accuracy around 54% for using single-SNR measurements. The beam SNR-based fingerprinting localization also shows robustness when the test data were collected at several off-grid locations that are different from those used for training data. In this case, the coordinate estimation with the Gaussian process method gives an average root-mean-square error (RMSE) of 17.52 cm and 95% of all coordinate estimates are less than 26.90 cm away from their true locations.

II. FINGERPRINTING-BASED INDOOR LOCALIZATION WITH BEAM SNR MEASUREMENTS

In the following, we introduce the beam SNRs, a type of zero-overhead measurement available in the 802.11ad standard. The beam SNRs feature is a coarse-grained channel measurement but carries rich information on spatial propagation paths, for fingerprinting-based indoor localization.

A. Beam SNRs Measurements from 802.11ad Devices

To compensate for higher path loss in mmWave bands, IEEE 802.11ad standards use directional antenna beampatterns to focus transmitting energy on a desired direction. To search for this desired direction, a series of pre-defined beampatterns or sectors are used by APs to send beacon messages to potential clients which in a listening mode with a quasi-omnidirectional beampattern. Then, clients send a series of beampatterns while the APs are in a listening mode. After the sector sweeping, the connection can be established by choosing the pair of beam sectors by the AP and user. Such sector sweep is periodically repeated and the beam sectors are updated to adapt to the environmental changes. As a result, the beam SNR measurements from multiple beam sectors are inherently available from 802.11ad devices without any overhead. As one of commercial 60-GHz WiFi devices, TP-Link AD7200 router uses a phased array of 32 antenna elements to send 36 pre-defined directional beampatterns. Due to the antenna housing and calibration, irregular antenna beampatterns are effectively formed in the phased array [21].

Given the antenna beampatterns, the beam SNR for the \(m\)th beampattern is defined as

\[
h_m = \text{Beam SNR}_m = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^{I} \gamma_m(\theta_i) P_i(\theta_i),
\]

where \(I\) is the total number of paths, \(\theta_i\) is the azimuth angle for the \(i\)th path, \(P_i(\theta_i)\) is the signal power at the \(i\)th path, \(\gamma_m(\theta_i)\) is the \(m\)th antenna beampattern gain at the \(i\)th path, and \(\sigma^2\) is the noise variance. For TP-Link AD7200 routers, the beam SNRs are recorded in a stepsize of 0.25 dB.

B. Offline Training Dataset

To construct the fingerprinting dataset, we stack all SNR measurements from all beam sectors as a vector, e.g., \(\mathbf{h} = [h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_M]^T\) with \([\cdot]^T\) denoting the transpose. When multiple APs are used, we combine beam SNR measurements from each AP to form one fingerprinting snapshot, i.e., \(\mathbf{h} = [\mathbf{h}_1^T, \mathbf{h}_2^T, \ldots, \mathbf{h}_P^T]^T \in \mathbb{R}^{MP \times 1}\), where \(P\) is the number of APs. For a given location and orientation, \(R\) fingerprinting snapshots, \(\mathbf{h}_1(l, o), \ldots, \mathbf{h}_R(l, o)\), are collected to construct the

\^[1\text{Separately, Part-I of this work [23] proposes to use RSSI along with beam indices for fingerprinting-based indoor localization.}}\]
Fig. 2: Constructing offline training datasets with beam SNRs measured at \( L \) locations and \( O \) orientations.

offline training dataset, where \( l \) and \( o \) are the indices for the location and orientation, respectively.

Fig. 1 shows an example of real-world beam SNR measurements at one AP using the commercial TP-Link AD7200 router in an office environment, where \( M = 36 \) beam sectors are swept to measure SNRs. It is seen that the beam SNR patterns remain stable over time (packet index) with a few fluctuations at some packet indices. The distinct pattern over the beam index is the fingerprinting feature we capture in the training dataset. By collecting many realizations of beam SNR measurements at multiple APs over \( L \) locations-of-interests and \( O \) orientations, we will have \( LO \) sets of \( MP \times R \) beam SNR measurements in the training dataset. The training dataset is illustrated in Fig. 2.

C. Online Localization Using Spatial Beam SNRs

When new fingerprinting measurements from an unknown location are available, the problem of interest is to, with a chosen performance metric, find the best match of the new measurements in the offline training dataset and determine its location. In the following, we introduce the NN and GP algorithms for classification and coordinate estimation.

1) Position/Orientation Classification: One simple approach to classify new fingerprinting measurements into one of training locations is the \( k \)NN method. The \( k \)NN method relies on a metric of distance, e.g., Euclidean distance and Minkowski distance of \( \ell_p \) norms, between the beam SNR measurements. A decision is made by examining the labels on the \( k \) nearest neighbors with respect to new fingerprinting measurements and taking a vote. Specifically, we define the distance metric between two beam SNR vectors as follows

\[
d(h, h') = \sqrt{\frac{1}{M}(h - h')^T W (h - h')}, \tag{2}
\]

where \( W \) is a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements denoting the importance of corresponding beam sectors. This weighted distance metric can be straightforwardly extended to the case of multiple SNR measurements and multiple APs.

We first train the \( k \)NN classification model based on all beam SNR measurements in the training data in Fig. 2 with both location and orientation labels. Then, for a candidate location and orientation, we collect a batch of \( Q \) beam SNR snapshots, \( \hat{h}_1, \ldots, \hat{h}_Q \), and compute the batch of all \( Q \) test snapshots with a window of \( Q \) measurements sliding through the training dataset

\[
d_t(l, o) = \frac{\sum_{q=1}^{Q} (\hat{h}_{t+q-1}(l, o) - \hat{h}_q)^T W (\hat{h}_{t+q-1}(l, o) - \hat{h}_q)}{MQ}, \tag{3}
\]

where \( t = 1, \ldots, R - Q + 1, l = 1, \ldots, L \) and \( o = 1, \ldots, O \). From all \( (R - Q + 1)LO \) computed distances, the \( k \) nearest samples are selected and, from their labels of locations and orientations, the most frequently appeared label is picked as the predicted label for the candidate location and orientation. When \( k = 1 \), the location and orientation are determined by choosing the one giving the smallest distance:

\[
(l, o) = \arg \min_{l,o} \left[ \min_{t=1,...,R-Q+1} d_t(l, o) \right]. \tag{4}
\]

When only the location is of interest, we can simply repeat the above process by only using the location label from the training dataset. Similarly, one can apply other classification methods to the beam SNR measurements. In Section III-C, we will evaluate localization performance of various classification methods on real-world beam SNR measurements collected in an office environment.

2) Coordinate Estimation: We can also estimate coordinates of test locations using fingerprinting datasets. One widely used approach is the weighted \( k \)NN method which uses a weighted mean of the coordinates of \( k \) nearest training locations as the estimated coordinates. The weight coefficients are computed using the Euclidean distance in the feature space. In this paper, due to multiple orientations at a given location and a limited number of training locations, we adopt a weighted \( k \)NN method directly on the beam SNR measurement space. Specifically, the above classification step obtains the smallest \( k \) distances between the new measurement and the training dataset. For each of the \( k \) beam SNR measurements in training data, we compute the distance \( \{d_i\}_{i=1}^K \) as (3). Then the coordinates of test data are estimated as follows

\[
(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i \times (x_i, y_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} w_i}, \tag{5}
\]

where \( (x_i, y_i) \) is the coordinate of training locations with the \( k \) smallest distances, and \( w_i \) is the corresponding weight determined by \( w_i = \gamma / d_i + \varepsilon \) with \( \varepsilon \) is a small positive number to prevent the denominator from zero and \( \gamma \) is a normalized parameter.

It is noted that the weighted \( k \)NN method still relies on the classification results. Instead, we can directly estimate the coordinate of test locations by directly formulating the coordinate estimation as a supervised regression problem from the multi-AP beam SNR measurements to two-dimensional (2-D) coordinates. Specifically, we first apply the GP with a choice of kernel function (e.g., exponential and radial-basis function) to labeled fingerprinting data at training locations. A
set of hyperparameters of the chosen kernel is optimized with beam SNR measurement as input and training coordinates as output by maximizing the log marginal-likelihood (ML) with an equally likely prior on all training locations. Then, the direct coordinate estimation is obtained by applying the optimized GP to the new beam SNR measurement.

III. INDOOR EXPERIMENT

In the following, we evaluate the fingerprinting-based indoor localization with beam SNR measurements collected from a testbed platform in an office environment during office hours.

A. Testbed Platform

The testbed consists of four 802.11ad devices, three serving as APs and one serving as the client, in a configuration shown in Fig. 3. These 4 devices are connected via wire cables to a workstation to allow configurations of the role of each device and to access the beam SNR measurements. Particularly, we chose Talon AD7200 routers that use a Qualcomm QCA9500 60 GHz chipset that comes with a phased antenna array of 32 antenna elements and fully implements the IEEE 802.11ad standard. During the beam training phase, a total number of 36 predefined antenna patterns are swept by changing the weights in the antenna elements. When the router is in reception mode, quasi omni-directional antenna pattern is used.

To access the raw beam SNR measurements, we follow the work in [21], [25], [26] and used the open-source software package in [24]. Particularly, we used the Nexmon firmware patching framework [27], which enables the development of binary firmware extensions in C.

B. Experiment Configuration

The testbed is deployed in an office environment during office hour, as shown in Fig. 3. There are 6 offices on both sides and 8 cubicles in the middle. All 6 offices and 4 cubicles on the right are occupied by staff. Furniture including chairs, tables, desktops are present in the cubicles.

These 3 APs, denoted as red triangles, are fixed in the aisle with fixed orientations. Specifically, AP1, AP2 and AP3 point to $90^\circ$, $180^\circ$ and $0^\circ$, respectively, where the orientation reference is marked out in Fig. 3. To collect fingerprinting training data, we position the client at one of 7 locations-of-interest marked by crosses in Fig. 3. At each of the 7 locations, we collect beam SNR measurements by rotating the client to 4 orientations at $[0^\circ, 90^\circ, 180^\circ, 270^\circ]$. Overall, the offline training dataset consists of beam SNR measurements from $L = 7$ locations and $O = 4$ orientations.

Samples of the collected data at AP1 are shown in Fig. 4. It is seen from Fig. 4 that all beam SNR measurements are stable over time (packet index) with only a few fluctuations at a few packets, possibly due to people moving. On the other hand, the measurements are sensitive to the client’s position and orientation as beam SNRs change more rapidly over beam indices.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A. Location and Orientation Classification

In this section, we present our results for the fingerprinting-based localization system. For this purpose, we use the confusion matrix as the performance metric for position and orientation classification

$$C(i, j) = \frac{1}{T_i} \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbb{1}\{\hat{l}_t(j) = i\},$$

where $i$ and $j$ are indices, respectively, for the estimated and true locations/orientations, $T_i$ is the number of sample batches in the test dataset, and $\mathbb{1}\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function.

| Loc. / Ori. | $0^\circ$ | $90^\circ$ | $180^\circ$ | $270^\circ$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>417 (480)</td>
<td>594 (549)</td>
<td>562 (361)</td>
<td>560 (326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>572 (140)</td>
<td>546 (302)</td>
<td>582 (176)</td>
<td>402 (224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>207 (319)</td>
<td>267 (253)</td>
<td>565 (328)</td>
<td>428 (299)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>520 (204)</td>
<td>510 (192)</td>
<td>453 (167)</td>
<td>129 (223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>511 (287)</td>
<td>498 (322)</td>
<td>396 (307)</td>
<td>118 (303)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>507 (427)</td>
<td>419 (220)</td>
<td>300 (190)</td>
<td>281 (156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>530 (199)</td>
<td>210 (72)</td>
<td>413 (139)</td>
<td>510 (196)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 5: Confusion matrices for simultaneous position-and-orientation classification using the $k$NN method ($k = 3$). Indices represent 28 combinations of 7 positions and 4 orientations.

TABLE II: Impact of Classification Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location + Orientation</th>
<th>Location Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single SNR</td>
<td>Beam SNRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDA</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDA</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NN</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>98.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3NN</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which equals 1 when the argument is true or 0 otherwise. In addition, $\hat{i}(h_{ij})$ is the location/orientation estimate by using the $i$th sample batch from the test data collected at $j$th location/orientation. To evaluate the classification performance, we collected independent test datasets at the same 7 locations with 4 orientations on a different date, where the number of test data is shown in parentheses of Table I.

1) Beam SNRs versus Single SNR: Fig. 5 compares the confusion matrix using the $k$NN method of $k = 3$ with a) beam SNR measurements and b) single SNR (RSSI-like) measurements. Particularly, we extract only one SNR measurement (from the highest average SNR) from all 36 beam SNRs at each AP. It is clear to conclude from Fig. 5 that the $k$NN method is able to localize both position and orientation accurately by using spatial beam SNRs. Specifically, a classification accuracy of 98.55% is achieved on average by the $k$NN method with beam SNRs, whereas the $k$NN method with the single SNR offers an average success rate of 35.6%. For location-only classification, using spatial beam SNRs can significantly improve the classification accuracy from 48.1% of the single SNR case to 99.81%.

TABLE III: Classification accuracy for different combinations of APs using independent test dataset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APs</th>
<th>Location + Orientation</th>
<th>Location Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP1</td>
<td>83.27%</td>
<td>98.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP2</td>
<td>84.85%</td>
<td>92.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP3</td>
<td>81.26%</td>
<td>90.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 APs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP1 + AP2</td>
<td>97.50%</td>
<td>99.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP1 + AP3</td>
<td>91.98%</td>
<td>99.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP2 + AP3</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
<td>97.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All 3 APs</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Impact of Classification Methods: To evaluate the impact of classification methods, we apply other classical machine learning methods, namely LDA, QDA, SVM and DT methods, to the same training and test datasets used by the $k$NN method. The results are shown in Table III. Overall, we observe that 1) classification using beam SNRs significantly improves the classification accuracy over that using single SNR and 2) all classification methods except the DT show comparable performance for both simultaneous location-and-orientation and location-only classifications.

3) Impact of the Number of APs: Next, we evaluate the localization performance by using single AP or combinations of 2 APs. The classification accuracy is shown in Table III. When only one AP is used, the success probabilities of simultaneous location-and-orientation classification can reach at 83.27%, 84.85% and 81.26%, respectively, for AP1, AP2 and AP3. When one more AP is available, the probabilities of successful determination is increased to 97.50%, 91.98% and 93.00%, respectively. The best performance is achieved by using all three APs. Similar observation can be made for the location-only classification.

B. Coordinate Estimation

In practice, it is unlikely that the test data are collected at the same location or orientation in the training dataset. Therefore, we next evaluate the performance of coordinate estimation using 4 off-grid test locations, as shown as Loc-A/B/C/D in green squares in Figs. 6 (a) and (b). The test dataset at 4 off-grid locations was collected 4 month later than the fingerprinting training dataset collected in 7 fingerprinting locations.

We apply the weighted $k$NN method and the GP-based regression method (as detailed in Section II-C.2) to the off-grid test dataset. Figs. 6 (a) shows the distribution of coordinate estimates for the GP method (Corresponding results for the weighted $k$NN method are skipped due to page limit). It is seen that the GP method gives clustered estimates around true positions. It is notable that the coordinate estimates at Loc-D are biased to the right, while the estimates at Loc-C are more centered at Loc-C. By computing distances between these estimates and the true locations, we plot the cumulative distribution function (CDF) in Fig. 6 (b) for estimation distance errors for all 4 off-grid locations for the GP method. It is found that he GP method gives an average RMSE of 17.52 cm, while the weighted $k$NN shows an average RMSE of 27.18 cm. Out of all coordinate estimates at these 4 test locations, 95% of them are less than 26.90 cm away from corresponding true locations.

V. CONCLUSIONS

To the best of our knowledge, our study is the first-of-its-kind to use spatial beam SNRs, collected during the beam training phase from commercial 802.11ad devices, to construct the offline fingerprinting database. This concept also applies to mmWave band 5G devices where beam training is also required. With a multi-AP testbed in an indoor office
environment, localization performance was evaluated by considering various factors such as the number of training data, different combinations of access points, and various machine learning algorithms. The classification accuracy is 98.6% for simultaneous location-and-orientation classification and above 99.8% for location-only classification. The robustness of direct coordinate estimation was tested when the test data were collected at several off-grid locations. Next, we plan to further exploit deep-learning approaches for direct coordinate estimation and evaluate the impact of the blockage of human body on the localization performance.
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