**Appendix X**

The road to these derivations has also been tedious and frustrating for some[[1]](#footnote-1) . The names of those on this road include Polanyi, deBoer-Zwikker and Fuller. By the time he died, Fuller had seen nearly the full development, including the QM derivation of the full isotherm fits and mesopore analysis. He certainly knew he was on the right track. However, presenting any mention of any alternative to BET, or its various combinations, has been met with stiff resistance and outrageous illogical arguments for rejection. For example, Dubinin contributed, perhaps unknowingly, with his “thermodynamic criterion,[[2]](#endnote-1),[[3]](#endnote-2)” which was likewise ridiculed, but never-the-less correct. It is now a central implication of the modern hypothesis.

These problems were the purpose for the publication of the first edition of the book mentioned above. Illogical arguments include not just as ad hominid abusive, but strawman (misquoting a statement and then disputing it.) Another failed arguments used incorrect mathematics, for example it was state that the function (1+a/A)(A/a) if A >>> a than a/A goes to 0 and this function goes to 1. Any Freshman calculus student (grade >D) would know this is, by definition, as the function **e**. Editors also committed unprofessional behavior. For example, editor stated, “These [6 publications] cannot be right since they conflict with my book. Go buy it and read it.” That is not a very nice sales pitch. Unfortunately, I had already bought a copy. The most favored criticism has been, “Everyone knows this is incorrect.” Really? Wow! Is this the Boolean every, and what is the operand? It was the only way available to get the QM developments up to that time into print. Some things have changed since then, with a firmer understanding of microporous, mesoporous and binary calculations. It is clear, that the three plots, the χ-plot, the Δχ-plot as well as the log-law-plot, are simple but important tools. The second edition is better for these areas.
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