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Malaria incidence in the world (2017)

Countries with indigenous cases in 2000 and their status by 2017: Countries with zero indigenous cases over at least the past 3 consecutive years are considered to be malaria free. All countries in the WHO European Region reported zero indigenous cases in 2016 and again in 2017. In 2017, both China and El Salvador reported zero indigenous cases. Source: WHO database.

WHO: World Health Organization.

WHO 2020
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- Malaria is a disease caused by protozoan parasites of the genus *Plasmodium*.
- *Plasmodium* parasites are ubiquitous and many mammals (e.g., rodents, primates, humans) have their own parasite species.
- Five species of *Plasmodium* are capable of infecting and causing disease in humans; out of these *P. falciparum* and *P. vivax* cause most morbidity and mortality.
- Infections with malaria parasites are endemic in many parts of the world; there are over 200 million cases of clinical malaria and 500,000 deaths annually.
- Control measures include prevention of transmission (bednets, vector control) and treatment of symptomatic infections (antiparasitic drugs such as artemisinin).
- In our experiments we used parasites *Plasmodium yoelii* (Py) that are natural pathogens of rodents (e.g., mice).

Murray et al. Lancet 2014; WHO 2020
Infection starts when an infected mosquito probes for blood and injects sporozoites. Generally, a median of 20 parasites are injected by the mosquito (in mice).
Basic steps of malaria life cycle

- Infection starts when an infected mosquito probes for blood and injects sporozoites. Generally, a median of 20 parasites are injected by the mosquito (in mice).
- Sporozoites migrate from injected site with blood to the liver and form liver stages.
Basic steps of malaria life cycle

- Infection starts when an infected mosquito probes for blood and injects sporozoites. Generally, a median of 20 parasites are injected by the mosquito (in mice).
- Sporozoites migrate from injected site with blood to the liver and form liver stages.
- Sporozoites replicate in the liver for some period of time (mice: 2 days, humans: 5-7 days).
Basic steps of malaria life cycle

- Infection starts when an infected mosquito probes for blood and injects sporozoites. Generally, a median of 20 parasites are injected by the mosquito (in mice).
- Sporozoites migrate from injected site with blood to the liver and form liver stages.
- Sporozoites replicate in the liver for some period of time (mice: 2 days, humans: 5-7 days).
- In the liver, parasites differentiate into merozoites which upon release in circulation replicate in red blood cells (RBCs) causing the clinical symptoms of malaria.

![Malaria life cycle diagram](image-url)
Basic steps of malaria life cycle

- Infection starts when an infected mosquito probes for blood and injects sporozoites. Generally, a median of 20 parasites are injected by the mosquito (in mice).

- Sporozoites migrate from injected site with blood to the liver and form liver stages.

- Sporozoites replicate in the liver for some period of time (mice: 2 days, humans: 5-7 days).

- In the liver, parasites differentiate into merozoites which upon release in circulation replicate in red blood cells (RBCs) causing the clinical symptoms of malaria.

- Over the course of infection, merozoites differentiate into gametocytes which are picked up by mosquitoes and differentiate into sporozoites in the mosquito’s gut.
Basic steps of malaria life cycle

- Infection starts when an infected mosquito probes for blood and injects sporozoites. Generally, a median of 20 parasites are injected by the mosquito (in mice).
- Sporozoites migrate from injected site with blood to the liver and form liver stages.
- Sporozoites replicate in the liver for some period of time (mice: 2 days, humans: 5-7 days).
- In the liver, parasites differentiate into merozoites which upon release in circulation replicate in red blood cells (RBCs) causing the clinical symptoms of malaria.
- Over the course of infection, merozoites differentiate into gametocytes which are picked up by mosquitoes and differentiate into sporozoites in the mosquito’s gut.
- Sporozoites migrate from the gut to the salivary glands where they wait until the mosquito searches for blood on another (human) host.
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- Importance of controlling mosquitoes to stop malaria epidemics has been recognized over 100 years ago.
- Basic mathematical models, as those developed by Ross and Macdonald, show the dependence of the transmission potential of malaria, given by the basic reproductive number $R_0$, as the function of parameters:

$$R_0 = \frac{ma^2bc}{gr} e^{-gv}$$

where $m$ is the ratio of mosquitoes to humans, $a$ is the mosquito biting rate, $b$ is the probability that infectious mosquito bite results in human infection, $c$ is the probability that mosquito becomes infected following a bite of an infected human, $g$ is mosquito’s death rate, $v$ is the time between mosquito becoming infected and becoming infectious, $r$ is the human recovery rate from the infection.

- Change in the biting rate $a$ or the mortality of mosquito $g$ have the nonlinear impact on the overall infectiousness of the infection.
- One important parameter $b$ – the probability that a bite by an infectious mosquito results in infection – has not been directly estimated.
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- (Female) Mosquitoes feed on their hosts by taking a blood meal.
- It is often assumed that infected mosquitoes inject sporozoites while taking the blood meal. For example, in malaria vaccine trials, volunteers are bid by infectious mosquitoes and bite is deemed “successful” if the mosquito takes the blood meal. Volunteers (vaccinated and controls) are exposed to several (e.g., 5) successful bites.

Are all mosquitoes with sporozoites equally infectious?

- It is generally assumed that infectious mosquito (i.e., carrying sporozoites) is always capable of cause infection in the host.
- However, it has been noted in early studies of malaria epidemiology that counted the average number of infectious bites humans receive and disease incidence and found 10 fold difference (between predicted and observed disease incidence). This was attributed to maternal immunity (because disease was mostly observed in young children).
Biting rate and malaria incidence rate

Early studies could accurately quantify the number of infectious bites humans receive per day in malaria endemic regions (about 0.06-0.9 per day).

Table II—Data on Anopheles prevalence and infection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mosquito density (per person)</th>
<th>Man-biting frequency (per day)</th>
<th>Sporozoite rate (proportion)</th>
<th>&quot;Infective&quot; bites per person per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanganyika (Mugeza)</td>
<td>A. gambiae</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. funestus</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. gambia</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. funestus</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.33-0.5</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Mosquito density in the Mpakene area in Tanganyika was less than in Mugeza, about half. Mugeza data are given for illustration.

Fig. 1.—Infant parasite rates in Uganda.
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Early studies could accurately quantify the number of infectious bites humans receive per day in malaria endemic regions (about 0.06-0.9 per day).

By following cohorts of newborn infants, the rate at which babies developed malaria could be also estimated (inoculation rate of 0.015 per day).

“There is also evidence, which appears conclusive to the writer, that in this area only about 1 in every 100 bites inflicted on infants by sporozoite-infected mosquitos resulted in establishment of infection, and in another area only 1 in 20 did so. There may be many causes for this failure, and their relative importance cannot at present be assessed, but among them some considerable weight must be given to the very small numbers of oocysts and sporozoites typically found in mosquitos in such places, numbers which are almost negligible when compared with those commonly seen in experimental infections.”

Experiments to probe mosquito’s ability to infect mice
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and Gayane Yenokyan at JH helped with statistics.
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Female *Anopheles stephensi* mosquitoes were infected with *Plasmodium yoelii* by feeding on blood diluted to 0.5% gametocytemia.

All experiments were performed between days 14 and 16 after the infected blood meal.

Female Swiss Webster mice aged from 4 to 9 weeks old were used.

Single mosquito feeds were performed on individual mice. Whether mosquito took the blood meal, the time it took for probing, and the location of probing was recorded.

After the bite, salivary glands were removed for sporozoite quantification by PCR.

Mice bid by infected mosquitoes were observed for the presence of blood stage infection by Giemsa-stained blood smears on days 5, 10 and 15 post-feed.
## Data example (available as supplement to the paper)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Probe time</td>
<td>PT, sec</td>
<td>Bloodmeal</td>
<td>SG load</td>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>experiment</td>
<td>feeding</td>
<td>location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SMFE-1/CA-4</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SMFE-1/CA-5</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SMFE-1/CB-1</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SMFE-1/CB-2</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SMFE-1/CB-3</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SMFE-1/CB-4</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80,942</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SMFE-1/CB-5</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76,525</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CA-1</td>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,562</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CA-2</td>
<td>0:53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CA-3</td>
<td>5:41</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CA-4</td>
<td>20:48</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,099</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CA-5</td>
<td>10:20</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CB-1</td>
<td>14:42</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CB-2</td>
<td>4:31</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CB-3</td>
<td>23:00</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CB-4</td>
<td>5:50</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,734</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CB-5</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54,131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CC-1</td>
<td>8:05</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,190</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CC-2</td>
<td>5:35</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SMFE-2/CC-3</td>
<td>8:19</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>observed</td>
<td>Ear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOES TAKING THE BLOOD MEAL INFLUENCE INFECTION PROBABILITY?
Taking the blood meal does not influence infection

1. Power analysis suggests the difference in infection (14% vs. 16%) may be significant (at $p = 0.05$) if about 600 mice were used in the experiment.
2. Mosquitoes that did not take the blood meal had a higher sporozoite load than those that did take the blood meal (panel B; KS test).
3. Intravital imaging experiments (Vanderberg and Frevert (2004) and Sinnis et al. (unpublished)) showed that sporozoites are readily injected during probing.

Vanderberg and Frevert Int J Paras 2004; Hopp et al. eLife 2015; Sinnis et al. (unpublished)
DOES SALIVARY GLAND SPOROZOITE NUMBER INFLUENCE INFECTION PROBABILITY?
Sporozoite numbers and infection probability

The median load was 8865 sporozoites, with a range of 1-647,714.
Sporozoite numbers and infection probability

On average, 17.5% became infected after a mosquito bite. Spearman rank correlation test was used.
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$$p(S) = 1 - e^{-\lambda S}$$

In the “powerlaw model” sporozoites may compete in the mosquito or the mouse (the competition is described by parameter $n$):

$$p(S) = 1 - e^{-\lambda S^n}$$

Finally, the “threshold model” assumes that infection probability is low at low sporozoite numbers but increases to a limit after crossing a threshold:
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Other tested models also include slope-threshold model, logistic model, double logistic model, models with “soft” threshold, etc.
Fitting models to data and comparing models

We fitted mathematical models to the data using likelihood approach in which the likelihood of the model given the data is defined as
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\[ L \sim \prod_{i=1}^{N} p(S_i)^{D_i} (1 - p(S_i))^{1-D_i} \]

where \( p(S_i) \) is the infection probability, \( S_i \) and \( D_i = (0, 1) \) is the sporozoite load in SG and infection probability of a mouse bid by an \( i^{th} \) mosquito, respectively, and \( N = 412 \).

- To compare how well different alternative models fit experimental data we used Akaike weights \( w \) (calculated using Akaike Information Criterion, AIC).

- Quality of model fits to data was evaluated using Hosmer-Lemeshow test (goodness-of-fit test) by binning the data and model predictions into 6-8 bins.
Models including a threshold describe the data best

Parameter estimates: single hit ($\lambda = 5.8 \times 10^{-6}$), powerlaw ($\lambda = 3.8 \times 10^{-3}$, $n = 0.41$), threshold model ($p_{\text{min}} = 0.066$, $p_{\text{max}} = 0.35$, $S^* = 20166$).
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Why threshold?

**Alternative hypotheses:**

1. The number of sporozoites in salivary gland impacts parasite’s migration to proboscis.
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Why threshold?

Alternative hypotheses:

1. The number of sporozoites in salivary gland impacts parasite’s migration to proboscis.
2. Deposition of sporozoites increases when more sporozoites are in the salivary glands.
3. Health (motility, survivability) of injected in skin sporozoites is correlated with the sporozoite load in salivary glands.
4. Infection is multi-step process and threshold arises as a cumulative low success probability of each step.
5. ?
Highly infected mosquitoes are present in nature

**Graph 1:**
- **Threshold model** (w=0.77)
- **Powerlaw model** (w=0.23)
- **Single hit model** (w=0.0)

**Graph 2:**
- Pringle 1966
- % (S>S')=17.9%

**Graph 3:**
- Pringles 1966
- Resampling from data 5000 times
- % (S>S')=18.1%
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Estimating $b$ for actual data (Pringle 1966 dataset)

- We assume that “mouse” data can be directly used to predict infection of humans with Plasmodium parasites.
- Pringle data are for north-east Tanzania (2-3% infected, $n \sim 400$ dissected).
- Kabiru et al. data are for Kilify district, Kenya (2.4% infected, $n = 48$ dissected).

Estimating $b$ for actual data (Kabiru 1997 dataset)

- We assume that “mouse” data can be directly used to predict infection of humans with Plasmodium parasites.
- Pringle data are for north-east Tanzania (2-3% infected, $n \sim 400$ dissected).
- Kabiru et al. data are for Kilify district, Kenya (2.4% infected, $n = 48$ dissected).

DOES PROBING TIME IMPACT INFECTION PROBABILITY?
No influence of probing time on infection for observed feedings

One set of experiments:

- In “uncontrolled” (observed) feeding experiments, mosquitoes were allowed to probe for any time.
Another set of experiments:

- In "controlled" feeding experiments, mosquitoes were allowed to probe for 10 sec, 1 min, or 5 min on individual mice.
- We fitted a saturating \( p = p_{\text{max}} t / (h + t) \) or logistic \( p = 1 / (1 + e^{\beta_0 - \beta_1 t}) \) function to the infection data using the likelihood method (treating as infection process as a Bernoulli trial).

![Graph showing infection probability over probe time](image-url)
DOES SALIVARY GLAND SPOROZOITE NUMBER INFLUENCE BLOOD MEAL TAKE PROBABILITY?
Some mosquitoes fail to take a blood meal
No impact of sporozoite number on probing time

![Graph showing observed feedings and probing time vs. sporozoites/mosquito](image)
Not taking a blood meal results in longer probing times

Data were binned for visualization purposes. Spearman rank correlation analysis was done on raw (unbinned) data.

Short probing times (<5 min) do not influence blood meal taking probability.
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Conclusions (mosquito and infection)

1. In a series of controlled experiments we found that not all bites by infectious mosquitoes result in malaria infection. In our experiments, only 18% of single bites resulted in infection.

2. We found that probability of infection of mice after a single bite by an infectious mosquito depends non-linearly on the sporozoite load (with rapid increase from 7% to 36% at 20,000 sporozoites).

3. Infection probability does not depend on whether mosquito takes the blood meal or not.

4. Mosquitoes that carry many sporozoites (> 20,000) have hard time finding blood (and are most likely to transmit the parasite).

5. Probing time has a limited influence on the probability of infection. Inability by mosquitoes to take the blood meal naturally results in longer probing times.

6. Prevalence of infection in mosquitoes in natural settings allows to calculate the probability of infection per infectious mosquito bite $b$ in the Ross-Macdonald model. For two analyzed datasets, $b_{med} = 0.065 - 0.1$. 

30 / 32 (36)
Whether our result hold for other Plasmodium species including those infecting humans and other mosquito species (such as *Aëdes aegypti* or *Anopheles gambiae*) remains to be determined.
Limitations and future directions

- Whether our result hold for other Plasmodium species including those infecting humans and other mosquito species (such as *Aëdes aegypti* or *Anopheles gambiae*) remains to be determined.

- Mechanisms behind the threshold dependence of the infection probability on sporozoite numbers in salivary glands remain obscure.
Limitations and future directions

- Whether our result hold for other Plasmodium species including those infecting humans and other mosquito species (such as *Aëdes aegypti* or *Anopheles gambiae*) remains to be determined.
- Mechanisms behind the threshold dependence of the infection probability on sporozoite numbers in salivary glands remain obscure.
- Because of noise in the data we were unable to accurately determine the best “threshold” model describing the data (because a set of such models fitted the data well).
Limitations and future directions

- Whether our result hold for other Plasmodium species including those infecting humans and other mosquito species (such as *Aëdes aegypti* or *Anopheles gambiae*) remains to be determined.
- Mechanisms behind the threshold dependence of the infection probability on sporozoite numbers in salivary glands remain obscure.
- Because of noise in the data we were unable to accurately determine the best “threshold” model describing the data (because a set of such models fitted the data well).
- There may be inherent errors with estimating true probing times.
Whether our result hold for other Plasmodium species including those infecting humans and other mosquito species (such as Aëdes aegypti or Anopheles gambiae) remains to be determined.

Mechanisms behind the threshold dependence of the infection probability on sporozoite numbers in salivary glands remain obscure.

Because of noise in the data we were unable to accurately determine the best “threshold” model describing the data (because a set of such models fitted the data well).

There may be inherent errors with estimating true probing times.

Mechanisms determining the wide range of sporozoite loads also have not been fully elucidated.
Limitations and future directions

- Whether our result hold for other Plasmodium species including those infecting humans and other mosquito species (such as *Aëdes aegypti* or *Anopheles gambiae*) remains to be determined.

- Mechanisms behind the threshold dependence of the infection probability on sporozoite numbers in salivary glands remain obscure.

- Because of noise in the data we were unable to accurately determine the best “threshold” model describing the data (because a set of such models fitted the data well).

- There may be inherent errors with estimating true probing times.

- Mechanisms determining the wide range of sporozoite loads also have not been fully elucidated.

- We only analyzed impact of few variables on transmission (blood meal take, probing time, sporozoite number per mosquito). It is possible that other parameters are also important in determining infection probability (e.g., age of mosquitoes, health of mosquitoes, etc.)
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QUESTIONS?
Other areas we are working on in malaria

- Do activated or memory CD8 T cells utilize unique strategies to search for pathogens in the liver?
- Are CD8 T cells attracted to sites of infection in the liver (e.g., malaria liver stages)?
- How many memory CD8 T cells are needed to protect against malaria infection?
- What is the role of chemokine receptors (CXCR3 and CCR5) in controlling malaria liver stages?
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Three important philosophy papers/ideas

- Chamberlin’s method of multiple working hypotheses.
- Platt’s strong inference.
- Oreskes’ et al. inability to verify numerical mathematical models.
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Certain systematic methods of scientific thinking may produce much more rapid progress than others.
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(more) QUESTIONS?