

**Retraction of
a boring follow-up paper to
“Which ITG Stepcharts are Turniest?”
titled, “Which ITG Stepcharts are
Crossoveriest and/or Footswitchiest?”**

Ben Blum

bblum@alumni.cmu.edu

In my 2017 paper, a boring follow-up paper to *Which ITG Stepcharts are Turniest?* titled, *Which ITG Stepcharts are Crossoveriest and/or Footswitchiest?* (Blum 2017), I wrote of maximum \mathcal{T} , XO%, FS%, and JK% values as follows:

A chart could conceivably end right before such a step, sneaking through some small ϵ extra turniness (VII 2014) (similar to the case of 270s in (Blum 2016)),

[...]

By the way, the theoretical maxima for XO%, FS%, and JK% are $50-\epsilon$, $100-\epsilon$, and $100-\epsilon$, respectively (VII 2014).

However, in the experimental results, *Tachyon Epsilon* (Matt 2013) placed among the lowest-ranking stepchart packs in every category, yet I neglected to properly cite Dr. VII’s landmark paper from 2014 at that time. Though we may never know what, if anything, is Epsilon? we now know at least what it is not: crossoveriest and/or footswitchy.

In conclusion, please reject my paper. I messed up on it.

References

- B. Blum. Which ITG stepcharts are turniest? SIGBOVIK, 2016.
- B. Blum. Which ITG stepcharts are crossoveriest and/or footswitchiest? SIGBOVIK, 2017.
- M. Matt. Tachyon epsilon, 2013.
- T. VII. What, if anything, is epsilon? SIGBOVIK, 2014.