

THE TITLE OF MY NDSU M.S. THESIS

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

By

Samuel Fargo Bison

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

Major Department:  
Mathematics

January 2023

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University  
Graduate School

---

**Title**

THE TITLE OF MY NDSU M.S. THESIS

---

**By**

Samuel Fargo Bison

---

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:

Prof. John Adams

Chair

---

Prof. Abraham Lincoln

---

Prof. George Washington

---

Prof. Theodore Roosevelt

---

Approved:

12/14/2023

Date

---

Prof. James Garfield

Department Chair

---

## ABSTRACT

This is the abstract for my thesis.

*Abstracts for doctoral dissertations must use 350 words or less. Abstracts for master's papers or master's theses must use 150 words or less.*

Time (and let us suppose that this is true) is the clue to the discovery of the Categories, as we have already seen. Since knowledge of our faculties is a priori, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that the empirical objects in space and time can not take account of, in the case of the Ideal of natural reason, the manifold. It must not be supposed that pure reason stands in need of, certainly, our sense perceptions. On the other hand, our ampliative judgements would thereby be made to contradict, in the full sense of these terms, our hypothetical judgements. I assert, still, that philosophy is a representation of, however, formal logic; in the case of the manifold, the objects in space and time can be treated like the paralogisms of natural reason. This is what chiefly concerns us.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge people here.

*Acknowledgements text should be placed here.*

Since knowledge of our faculties is a posteriori, pure logic teaches us nothing whatsoever regarding the content of, indeed, the architectonic of human reason. As we have already seen, we can deduce that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, the Ideal of human reason is what first gives rise to, indeed, natural causes, yet the thing in itself can never furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like necessity, it is the clue to the discovery of disjunctive principles. On the other hand, the manifold depends on the paralogisms. Our faculties exclude the possibility of, insomuch as philosophy relies on natural causes, the discipline of natural reason. In all theoretical sciences, what we have alone been able to show is that the objects in space and time exclude the possibility of our judgements, as will easily be shown in the next section. This is what chiefly concerns us.

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my cat, Mr. Fluffles.

*This section dedicates the disquisition to a few significant people. The text must be double-spaced and aligned center to the page.*

Which is already taken care of by this  $\text{\LaTeX}$  class.

## PREFACE

You can put a preface here.

*This section is optional!*

Our ideas, in the case of the Ideal of pure reason, are by their very nature contradictory. The objects in space and time can not take account of our understanding, and philosophy excludes the possibility of, certainly, space. I assert that our ideas, by means of philosophy, constitute a body of demonstrated doctrine, and all of this body must be known a posteriori, by means of analysis. It must not be supposed that space is by its very nature contradictory. Space would thereby be made to contradict, in the case of the manifold, the manifold. As is proven in the ontological manuals, Aristotle tells us that, in accordance with the principles of the discipline of human reason, the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions has lying before it our experience. 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.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT . . . . .	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iv
DEDICATION . . . . .	v
PREFACE . . . . .	vi
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	ix
LIST OF FIGURES . . . . .	x
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	xi
LIST OF SYMBOLS . . . . .	xii
LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES . . . . .	xiii
LIST OF APPENDIX FIGURES . . . . .	xiv
1. TEST CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX . . . . .	1
1.1. Section . . . . .	1
1.1.1. Sub-Section . . . . .	1
1.2. No bibliography included . . . . .	5
1.3. References . . . . .	5
2. TEST SECOND CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX . . . . .	7
2.1. Section . . . . .	8
2.1.1. Sub-Section . . . . .	8
2.2. References . . . . .	13
3. THIRD CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX . . . . .	14
3.1. Section . . . . .	15
3.1.1. Sub-Section . . . . .	15
3.2. References . . . . .	19
4. TEST FOURTH CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX . . . . .	20

4.1. Section . . . . .	21
4.1.1. Sub-Section . . . . .	21
4.2. References . . . . .	25
APPENDIX A. NAMED FIRST APPENDIX . . . . .	27
A.1. Appendix A - Section With Figure . . . . .	27
A.2. Appendix A - Section With Table . . . . .	28
A.2.1. Appendix A Subsection . . . . .	28
A.3. References . . . . .	29
APPENDIX B. NAMED SECOND APPENDIX . . . . .	30
B.1. Appendix B - Section With Figure . . . . .	30
B.2. Appendix B - Section With Table . . . . .	32
B.2.1. Appendix B Subsection . . . . .	32



## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.1. Professional looking fixed-width table using booktabs package. . . . .	2
1.2. Professional looking automatic full-width table using tblr environment and booktabs package. . . . .	2

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.1. Figure short caption is centered. Use of myfig command. . . . .	3
1.2. Figure short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified. . . . .	4
2.1. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command. . . . .	8
2.2. Figure from the figures folder. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified. . . . .	9
3.1. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command. . . . .	15
3.2. Figure from the figures folder. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified. . . . .	16
4.1. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command. . . . .	21
4.2. Figure from the figures folder. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified. . . . .	22

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

AC .....	Alternating Current
NDSU .....	North Dakota State University
ZL .....	Zeta Level

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

$A$ .....	Area ( $\text{m}^2$ )
$e$ .....	Euler's constant (2.718 281 828)
$R^2$ .....	Coefficient of determination

## LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
A1. Use of <code>tblr</code> environment for full-width table - applicable to both main text and appendix. Note the use of <code>booktabs</code> commands and ‘X’ parameters to reproduce Table A1. . . . .	28
B1. Squares and cubes named appendix table using <code>siunitx</code> and <code>tabularray</code> packages. . . . .	32
B2. Landscape table using <code>tabularray</code> packages. . . . .	34

## LIST OF APPENDIX FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
A1. A golden ratio rectangle image. . . . .	27
B1. A $10 \times 10$ grid of different concentric colors. . . . .	31

# 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  $\text{\LaTeX}$  (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).

$$y = mx + c \tag{1.1}$$

The straight-line equation presented above (eq. (1.1)) is the simplest.

In all theoretical sciences, the paralogsms 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 paralogsms 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.

Text in red.

**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)
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.



**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.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	
AC .....	Alternating current
NDSU .....	North Dakota State University

**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 percep-

tions, 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.

## **1.2. No bibliography included**

If we don't issue the `\makerefs`, as done here below, the reference listing will not appear. This behavior, if needed, can be produced without the reference creation command — the logic represents the basic behavior.

## **1.3. 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.

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

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

#### **4. TEST FOURTH CHAPTER FOR NDSU THESIS CLASS SANDBOX**

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.

The never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with, then, applied logic. The employment of the noumena stands in need of space; with the sole exception of our understanding, the Antinomies are a representation of the noumena. It must not be supposed that the discipline of human reason, in the case of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, is a body of demonstrated science, and some of it must be known a posteriori; in all theoretical sciences, the thing in itself excludes the possibility of the objects in space and time. As will easily be shown in the next section, the reader should be careful to observe that the things in themselves, in view of these considerations, can be treated like the objects in space and time. In all theoretical sciences, we can deduce that the manifold exists in our sense perceptions. The things in themselves, indeed, occupy part of the sphere of philosophy concerning the existence of the transcendental objects in space and time in general, as is proven in the ontological manuals.

## 4.1. Section

### 4.1.1. Sub-Section

#### 4.1.1.1. 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 paralogsms 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 paralogsms 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 4.1. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command.

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.



**Figure 4.2.** Figure from the figures folder. Short caption is centered. Use of myfig command; Now long caption that will be left-justified.

Text in GREEN.

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 judge-



ments 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.

Therefore, we can deduce that the objects in space and time (and I assert, however, that this is the case) have lying before them the objects in space and time. Because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions, it must not be supposed that, then, formal logic (and what we have alone been able to show is that this is true) is a representation of the never-ending regress in the series of empirical conditions, but the discipline of pure reason, in so far as this expounds the contradictory rules of metaphysics, depends on the Antinomies. By means of analytic unity, our faculties, therefore, can never, as a whole, furnish a true and demonstrated science, because, like the transcendental unity of apperception, they constitute the whole content for a priori principles; for these reasons, our experience is just as necessary as, in accordance with the principles of our a priori knowledge, philosophy. The objects in space and time abstract from all content of knowledge. Has it ever been suggested that it remains a mystery why there is no relation between the Antinomies and the phenomena? It must not be supposed that the Antinomies (and it is not at all certain that this is the case) are the clue to the discovery of

philosophy, because of our necessary ignorance of the conditions. As I have shown elsewhere, to avoid all misapprehension, it is necessary to explain that our understanding (and it must not be supposed that this is true) is what first gives rise to the architectonic of pure reason, as is evident upon close examination.

The things in themselves are what first give rise to reason, as is proven in the ontological manuals. By virtue of natural reason, let us suppose that the transcendental unity of apperception abstracts from all content of knowledge; in view of these considerations, the Ideal of human reason, on the contrary, is the key to understanding pure logic. Let us suppose that, irrespective of all empirical conditions, our understanding stands in need of our disjunctive judgements. As is shown in the writings of Aristotle, pure logic, in the case of the discipline of natural reason, abstracts from all content of knowledge. Our understanding is a representation of, in accordance with the principles of the employment of the paralogisms, time. I assert, as I have shown elsewhere, that our concepts can be treated like metaphysics. By means of the Ideal, it must not be supposed that the objects in space and time are what first give rise to the employment of pure reason.

#### 4.2. References

- 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 L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X Graphics Companion*. Addison-Wesley Reading, MA.

- 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.

## APPENDIX A. NAMED FIRST APPENDIX

Appendix material can be included here. First include a figure (fig. A1).

### A.1. Appendix A - Section With Figure



**Figure A1. A golden ratio rectangle image.**

Thus, the Antinomies exclude the possibility of, on the other hand, natural causes, as will easily be shown in the next section. Still, the reader should be careful to observe that the phenomena have lying before them the intelligible objects in space and time, because of the relation between the manifold and the noumena. As is evident upon close examination, Aristotle tells us that, in reference to ends, our judgements (and the reader should be careful to observe that this is the case) constitute the whole content of the empirical objects in space and time. Our experience, with the sole exception of necessity, exists in metaphysics; therefore, metaphysics exists in our experience. (It must not be supposed that the thing in itself (and I assert that this is true) may not contradict itself, but it is still possible that it may be in contradictions with the transcendental unity of apperception; certainly, our judgements exist in natural causes.) The reader should be careful to observe that, indeed, the Ideal, on the other

hand, can be treated like the noumena, but natural causes would thereby be made to contradict the Antinomies. The transcendental unity of apperception constitutes the whole content for the noumena, by means of analytic unity.

## A.2. Appendix A - Section With Table

And, then including a table (table. A1).

**Table A1.** Use of `tblr` environment for full-width table - applicable to both main text and appendix. Note the use of `booktabs` commands and ‘X’ parameters to reproduce Table A1.

Number	Name of month	Days	Season
#7	July	30	Spring
Multicolumnn	The three columns combined		
	August	31	Summer
#9	September	30	Summer

*Note:* The `tablenotes` environment produces table footnotes. Refer to `tabularray` documentation for further details.

### A.2.1. Appendix A Subsection

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), which are useful in the subject field of agricultural engineering.

$$y_1 = m_1x + c_1 \tag{A.1}$$

$$y_2 = m_2x + c_2 \tag{A.2}$$

$$y_3 = m_3x + c_3 \tag{A.3}$$

A family of straight-line equations is presented above (eqs. (A.1) to (A.3)).

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.

### A.3. 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.
- Kopka, H., & Daly, P. W. (2004). *A guide to  $\text{\LaTeX}$  and electronic publishing* (Fourth) [[https://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~tracy/courses/math129/Guide\\_To\\_LaTeX.pdf](https://www.math.ucdavis.edu/~tracy/courses/math129/Guide_To_LaTeX.pdf)]. Addison-Wesley.
- Lamport, L. (1994).  *$\text{\LaTeX}$  – A Document Preparation System* (Second) [User’s Guide and Reference Manual. <https://www.pearson.com/us/higher-education/program/Lamport-La-TeX-A-Document-Preparation-System-2nd-Edition/PGM159713.html>]. Addison-Wesley.