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Unless otherwise specified, data come from the sources listed below.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Flow of Funds Reports: Debt, international capital flows, and the size and activity of various financial sectors
Bureau of Economic Analysis: Economic output (GDP), spending, wages, and sector profit
BlackBox Logic and Standard & Poor's: Data on loans underlying CMLTI 2006-NC2
CoreLogic: Home prices
Inside Mortgage Finance, 2009 Mortgage Market Statistical Annual: Data on origination of mortgages, issuance of mortgage-backed securities and values outstanding
Markit Group: ABX-HE index
Mortgage Bankers Association National Delinquency Survey: Mortgage delinquency and foreclosure rates
10-Ks, 10-Qs, and proxy statements filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission: Company-specific information
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