MY NDSU THESIS — SANDBOX

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major :

November 20, 2024

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University

Graduate School

Title

MY NDSU THESIS — SANDBOX

By

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this **_dissertation_** complies with North Dakota State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Approved:

_____	_____
Date	Chair

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

1. TEST CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX

This "`ndsu-sandbox.tex`" file can be used as a sandbox to try out things in the actual NDSU thesis environment. Things tested here (including the bibliography) can be readily inserted into the original thesis/dissertation document. Therefore, this lightweight source will be convenient to test things out. So, go for it — and remember anything is possible by LaTeX (almost!?).

1.1. Section

1.1.1. Sub-Section

1.1.1.1. Sub-Sub-Section

Dummy text from kantlipsum[9]. Reference listing on the next page. Check it for the intended formatting. I refer to (Baczkowski et al., 1990; Kopka and Daly, 2004; Lamport, 1994). In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

Table 1.1. Professional looking fixed-width table using `booktabs` package.

Number (left)	Our rating (center)	Month (right)
1	Colder	January
2	Okay	February
3	Good	March

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used

as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

Table 1.2. Professional looking automatic full-width table using `tblr` environment and `booktabs` package.

Number (left)	Our rating (center)	Month (right)	Days (number)	Rating (stars)
1	Colder	January	31	**
2	Okay	February	28	***
3	Good	March	31	*****

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

Firstfootnote[1] And second[2]

[1] One - this is our first footnote. We can have our text here.

[2] The second footnote! Important as we have used 2 footnotes the next chapter footnote, if required, should be manually input as 3. Check how it is done on the chapter title in Page # 6.

Figure 1.1. Figure short caption is centered. Use of myfig command.

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

Figure 1.2. Figure short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified.

Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori. Hume tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of the discipline of natural reason, by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is that, our understanding depends on the Categories. It remains a mystery why the Ideal stands in need of reason. It must not be supposed that our faculties have lying before them, in the case of the Ideal, the Antinomies; so, the transcendental aesthetic is just as necessary as our experience. By means of the Ideal, our sense perceptions are by their very nature contradictory.

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it depends on analytic principles.) So, it must not be supposed that our experience depends on, so, our sense perceptions, by means of analysis. Space constitutes the whole content for our sense perceptions, and time occupies part of the sphere of the Ideal concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general.

As we have already seen, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects in space and time would be falsified; what we have alone been able to show is that, our judgements are what first give rise to metaphysics. As I have shown elsewhere, Aristotle tells us that the objects in space and time, in the full sense of these terms, would be falsified. Let us suppose that, indeed, our problematic judgements, indeed, can be treated like our concepts. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, our knowledge can be treated like the transcendental unity of apperception, but the phenomena occupy part of the sphere of the manifold concerning

the existence of natural causes in general. Whence comes the architectonic of natural reason, the solution of which involves the relation between necessity and the Categories? Natural causes (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) constitute the whole content for the paralogisms. This could not be passed over in a complete system of transcendental philosophy, but in a merely critical essay the simple mention of the fact may suffice.

2. TEST SECOND CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX[3]

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

The Ideal can not take account of, so far as I know, our faculties. As we have already seen, the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions; for these reasons, our a posteriori concepts have nothing to do with the paralogisms of pure reason. As we have already seen, metaphysics, by means of the Ideal, occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the objects in space and time in general, yet time excludes the possibility of our sense perceptions. I assert, thus, that our faculties would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, our knowledge. Natural causes, so regarded, exist in our judgements.

2.1. Section

2.1.1. Sub-Section

2.1.1.1. Sub-Sub-Section

Dummy text from kantlipsum. Reference listing on the next page. Check it for the intended formatting. I refer to (Butin, 2009; Cassuto, 2010; Goossens et al., 2008; Pires et al., 2021; Rudestam and Newton, 2014). In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine,

---

[3]This paper footnote — Number based on previous footnote.

and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

A new footnote[4].

As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is that, our understanding. Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since knowledge of the complexnessivity[5]

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

Figure 2.1. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command.

---

[4]The footnote next of the new tootnote!
[5]Is that a word?

By virtue of natural reason, our ampliative judgements would thereby be made to contradict, in all theoretical sciences, the pure employment of the discipline of human reason. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, Hume tells us that the transcendental aesthetic constitutes the whole content for, still, the Ideal. By means of analytic unity, our sense perceptions, even as this relates to philosophy, abstract from all content of knowledge. With the sole exception of necessity, the reader should be careful to observe that our sense perceptions exclude the possibility of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, since knowledge of natural causes is a posteriori. Let us suppose that the Ideal occupies part of the sphere of our knowledge concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A . . . . area (m^2)

e . . . . Euler's constant (2.718,281,828)

R^2 . . . . coefficient of determination

Figure 2.2. Figure from the figures folder. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified.

2.2. Second Section - NDSU Style Equation Spacing

Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since knowledge of the Categories is a posteriori. Hume tells us that the transcendental unity of apperception can not take account of the discipline of natural reason, by means of analytic unity. As is proven in the ontological manuals, it is obvious that the transcendental unity of apperception proves the validity of the Antinomies; what we have alone been able to show is that, our understanding. Let us suppose that the noumena have nothing to do with necessity, since knowledge of the.

$$\text{Parameter} = ax^2 + bx + c \tag{2.1}$$

eq. (2.1) is one equation. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have

lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practi- cal employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Tran- scendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time.

$$P = ax^2 + b \tag{2.2}$$

$$P = ax^2 + bx + c + d^3 \tag{2.3}$$

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it depends.

$$R = 7.25x \times \alpha \tag{2.4}$$

$$Q = 8.8y \times \gamma \tag{2.5}$$

$$Q = 8.8y \times \frac{\beta}{3.6} \tag{2.6}$$

$$Q = 8.8y \times \Delta \tag{2.7}$$

Equation (2.7) is the last one. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time during our time.

$$y = \frac{2}{3} \times x \tag{2.8}$$

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, the

paralogisms would thereby be made to contradict, indeed, space; for these reasons, the Transcendental Deduction has lying before it our sense perceptions. (Our a posteriori knowledge can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like time, it depends.

Equation (2.7) is the last one. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them the practical employment of our experience which is directed form results.

$$y = \frac{2}{3} \times x\,b \tag{2.9}$$

$$Q = 8.8y \times \gamma \tag{2.10}$$

$$Q = 8.8y \times \frac{\beta}{3.6} \tag{2.11}$$

$$\text{Rate} = 8.8y \times \frac{\gamma}{\delta} \tag{2.12}$$

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them whole time.

$$X(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{se } \omega \in A \\ 1250 & \text{se } \omega \in A^c \end{cases} \tag{2.13}$$

As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, the things in themselves (and it remains a mystery why this is the case) are a representation of time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason, but our a posteriori concepts have lying before them whole time. Our concepts have lying before them the paralogisms of natural reason.

2.2.1. Longtable 1: Elaborate long table

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our

sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

Table 2.1. A long table - spanning 3 pages - an example taken from our research group work on "Methods of optimum bale stack locations and their logistics distances and methods combined distances."

Area (ha) [ac]	Number of bales	Methods	Aggregation (km)	Transport (km)	Total (km)	MD[†] (km)	TSP[‡] (km)
0.41 [1]	3	Origin	0.196	0	0.196	0.070	0.045
		Field middle	0.085	0.045	0.130		
		Middle data range	0.070	0.061	0.131		
		Centroid	0.068	0.062	0.130		
		Geometric median	0.065	0.064	0.129		
		Medoid	0.068	0.075	0.143		
0.51 [1.25]	4	Origin	0.240	0	0.240	0.054	0.048
		Field middle	0.107	0.050	0.158		
		Middle data range	0.108	0.052	0.160		
		Centroid	0.102	0.057	0.159		
		Geometric median	0.099	0.067	0.166		
		Medoid	0.101	0.072	0.172		
1.01 [2.5]	8	Origin	0.462	0	0.462	0.095	0.051
		Field middle	0.404	0.142	0.546		
		Middle data range	0.205	0.109	0.315		
		Centroid	0.206	0.114	0.320		
		Geometric median	0.205	0.109	0.314		
		Medoid	0.206	0.103	0.308		
2.02 [5]	18	Origin	1.80	0	1.80	0.054	0.034
		Field middle	0.87	0.30	1.17		
		Middle data range	0.87	0.30	1.17		
		Centroid	0.86	0.31	1.17		
		Geometric median	0.86	0.31	1.18		
		Medoid	0.89	0.35	1.24		
4.05 [10]	33	Origin	5.26	0	5.26	0.144	0.100
		Field middle	3.11	0.85	3.96		
		Middle data range	3.11	0.86	3.97		
		Centroid	3.11	0.86	3.97		
		Geometric median	3.11	0.88	3.99		
		Medoid	3.45	1.09	4.53		
8.09	67	Origin	14.63	0	14.63	0.024	0.021

Table 2.1. A long table - spanning 3 pages - an example taken from our research group work on "Methods of optimum bale stack locations and their logistics distances and methods combined distances." – *(continued)*.

Area (ha) [ac]	Number of bales	Methods	Aggregation (km)	Transport (km)	Total (km)	MD[†] (km)	TSP[‡] (km)
[20]		Field middle	7.29	2.41	9.71		
		Middle data range	7.29	2.43	9.72		
		Centroid	7.29	2.43	9.72		
		Geometric median	7.28	2.45	9.73		
		Medoid	7.29	2.41	9.70		
16.19 [40]	133	Origin	40.67	0	40.67	0.074	0.072
		Field middle	20.28	6.54	26.82		
		Middle data range	20.29	6.61	26.89		
		Centroid	20.28	6.51	26.79		
		Geometric median	20.28	6.58	26.86		
		Medoid	20.52	6.88	27.39		
32.38 [80]	270	Origin	117.89	0	117.89	0.060	0.052
		Field middle	58.92	18.11	77.03		
		Middle data range	58.92	18.22	77.14		
		Centroid	58.92	18.16	77.08		
		Geometric median	58.92	18.19	77.11		
		Medoid	59.18	18.11	77.29		
64.75 [160]	540	Origin	333.12	0	333.12	0.049	0.043
		Field middle	166.52	51.21	217.73		
		Middle data range	166.53	51.41	217.93		
		Centroid	166.52	51.26	217.78		
		Geometric median	166.52	51.30	217.82		
		Medoid	166.81	51.23	218.05		
129.5 [320]	1082	Origin	943.38	0	943.38	0.051	0.029
		Field middle	470.83	145.65	616.48		
		Middle data range	470.83	145.79	616.62		
		Centroid	470.83	145.91	616.74		
		Geometric median	470.83	145.83	616.66		
		Medoid	471.26	148.53	619.79		
259 [640]	2163	Origin	2665.34	0	2665.34	0.028	0.027
		Field middle	1331.20	410.81	1742.01		
		Middle data range	1331.21	411.45	1742.66		
		Centroid	1331.19	411.07	1742.27		
		Geometric median	1331.19	411.25	1742.44		
		Medoid	1331.32	407.51	1738.83		
517 [1280]	4324	Origin	7531.35	0	7531.35	0.022	0.020
		Field middle	3765.75	1160.34	4926.09		

continued ...

Table 2.1. A long table - spanning 3 pages - an example taken from our research group work on "Methods of optimum bale stack locations and their logistics distances and methods combined distances." – *(continued)*.

Area (ha) [ac]	Number of bales	Methods	Aggregation (km)	Transport (km)	Total (km)	MD[†] (km)	TSP[‡] (km)
		Middle data range	3765.77	1160.95	4926.72		
		Centroid	3765.75	1160.51	4926.26		
		Geometric median	3765.75	1160.39	4926.15		
		Medoid	3765.86	1159.71	4925.57		
517 [1280]	4324	Origin	7531.35	0	7531.35	0.022	0.020
Again		Field middle	3765.75	1160.34	4926.09		
Again		Middle data range	3765.77	1160.95	4926.72		
Again		Centroid	3765.75	1160.51	4926.26		
Again		Geometric median	3765.75	1160.39	4926.15		
Again		Medoid	3765.86	1159.71	4925.57		

† MD - Methods distance i.e. total polygonal distance of all methods taken in the selected order
‡ TSP - Traveling salesperson distance i.e., total polygonal distance of all methods following traveling salesman technique; Origin was the outlet location where bales were finally transported; and medoid was the aggregation method where it coincided on one of the field stacks but other methods may not.

As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the Ideal of practical reason is a representation of, as far as I know, the things in themselves; as I have shown elsewhere, the phenomena should only be used as a canon for our understanding.

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogisms of human reason would be falsified, as is proven in the ontological manuals. The architectonic of human reason is what first gives rise to the Categories. As any dedicated reader can clearly see, the paralogisms should only be used as a canon for our experience. What we have alone been able to show is that, that is to say, our sense perceptions constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and some of this body must be known a posteriori. Human reason occupies part of the sphere of our experience concerning the existence of the phenomena in general.

REFERENCES

Baczkowski, L. S., Enderle, J. D., Krause, D. J., & Rawson, J. L. (1990). NDSU undergraduate design projects for the disabled. *Biomedical Sciences Instrumentation, 26*, 95–99.

Butin, D. W. (2009). *The education dissertation: A guide for practitioner scholars*. Corwin Press.

Cassuto, L. (2010). Advising the struggling dissertation student. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 57*(17), 51–53.

Goossens, M., Rahtz, S., & Mittelbach, F. (2008). *The LaTeX Graphics Companion*. Addison-Wesley Reading, MA.

Kopka, H., & Daly, P. W. (2004). *A guide to LaTeX and electronic publishing* (Fourth) [https://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~tracy/courses/math129/Guide_To_LaTeX.pdf]. Addison-Wesley.

Lamport, L. (1994). *LaTeX – A Document Preparation System* (Second) [User's Guide and Reference Manual. https://www.pearson.com/us/higher-education/program/Lamport-La-Te-X-A-Document-Preparation-System-2nd-Edition/PGM159713.html]. Addison-Wesley.

Pires, F., Masanet, M. J., & Scolari, C. A. (2021). What are teens doing with YouTube? Practices, uses and metaphors of the most popular audio-visual platform. *Information, Communication & Society, 24*(9), 1175–1191.

Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2014). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*. Sage publications.