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Results and discussion

The effects of the photodynamic treatment on the tumor growth were evaluated by measuring the tumor volume. The tumor volume was calculated using the following equation:

\[ V = \frac{4}{3} \pi r^3 \]

where \( V \) is the volume, and \( r \) is the radius of the tumor. The results showed a significant decrease in the tumor volume after the photodynamic treatment, indicating the effectiveness of the treatment.

Table 1. Comparison of tumor volumes after photodynamic treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Volume (mm³)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photodynamic</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data were analyzed using statistical software, and the results were found to be statistically significant (p < 0.05).

Table 2. Comparison of tumor volumes after photodynamic treatment and tumor weight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Volume (mm³)</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photodynamic</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data were analyzed using statistical software, and the results were found to be statistically significant (p < 0.05).

Conclusion

The results of this study demonstrate the potential of photodynamic treatment as a novel strategy for treating tumors. Further studies are needed to optimize the treatment protocol and to evaluate the long-term effects of the treatment.

Experimental materials and methods

Photodynamic treatment was performed using a specific wavelength of light. The tumor was exposed to the light for a specified duration, and the tumor volume was measured before and after the treatment.

Table 3. Comparison of tumor volumes before and after photodynamic treatment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Volume (mm³) before</th>
<th>Volume (mm³) after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photodynamic</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data were analyzed using statistical software, and the results were found to be statistically significant (p < 0.05).
The objective of this section is to develop a thermodynamic model that will explain the large differences in the solubility of 

[Table 3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Pd (mg/l)</th>
<th>Pb (mg/l)</th>
<th>Cd (mg/l)</th>
<th>Cr (mg/l)</th>
<th>Na (mg/l)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Analyzed compositions of PbII and PdII solutions

The solubility of Pd(II) in aqueous solution was measured as a function of the concentration of Pd(II) in solution.

[Graph]

The solubility of Pd(II) in aqueous solution was measured as a function of the concentration of Pd(II) in solution.

Table 2. Results of oxalate molar extraction from a selected set of duplicate samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>(Total)</th>
<th>Pb (IV)</th>
<th>Pb (III)</th>
<th>Pb (II)</th>
<th>Pb (I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The solubility of Pd(II) in aqueous solution was measured as a function of the concentration of Pd(II) in solution.
for the "events" interaction parameters. These parameters describe the changes in the probability of interaction with different spin states of the system. The changes are due to the interplay between different factors, such as spin exchange and spin polarization.

The figure shows the calculated and experimental curves for the "events" interaction parameters. The calculated curves are in black, and the experimental data are in red. The agreement between the two sets of data is excellent, indicating that the theoretical model is a good representation of the real-world phenomena.

The figure also includes a table that summarizes the calculated and experimental values for the "events" interaction parameters. The values are listed for different spin states, and the discrepancies between the two sets of data are highlighted.

The results of these calculations are significant for understanding the behavior of quantum systems and have implications for the development of new quantum technologies. The agreement between the calculated and experimental data provides confidence in the theoretical model and demonstrates its effectiveness in predicting the behavior of quantum systems.

For more information on this topic, please refer to the original research paper or contact the authors for further details.
For the activity coefficient of $P_{i}$ (which uses only the expanded Debye-Hückel equation), the activity $C$ coefficients (which are the $C_{i}$ parameters) are shown in Table 2. The model (structure of the equation) parameters are also shown in Table 3. $C_{i}$ is the binary interaction model parameter of $C_{i}$, and $C_{j}$ is the binary interaction model parameter of $C_{j}$.

An additional parameter is the Debye-Hückel collision number $n_{D}$, which is shown in Table 3. The model (structure of the equation) parameters are also shown in Table 3. $C_{i}$ is the binary interaction model parameter of $C_{i}$, and $C_{j}$ is the binary interaction model parameter of $C_{j}$.

An additional parameter is the Debye-Hückel collision number $n_{D}$, which is shown in Table 3. The model (structure of the equation) parameters are also shown in Table 3. $C_{i}$ is the binary interaction model parameter of $C_{i}$, and $C_{j}$ is the binary interaction model parameter of $C_{j}$.
\[
\phi\left(\frac{\mu}{M}\right) = 0 \quad \text{for all species \( \mu \)}
\]

\[
\text{by} \quad \text{coefficient} \ (\phi) \text{ and separate coefficient are defined}
\]

\[
\text{where } \phi \text{ is the standard deviation potential for species } \mu.
\]

\[
\text{It is convenient to express the activity of the species as in}
\]

\[
\text{P} \text{h} \text{enomenological equations}
\]
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