Dear American Mathematical Monthly:

Although my heptagon construction via trisection was rejected by Susan Colley I had a wonderful correspondence with her which I highly appreciate. Upon submitting my hendecagon construction via quintisection I did not know that Susan was no longer the editor and I repeatedly requested that my construction be sent to her as soon as I learned that she was replaced. I have received no human response so I must suspect that I corresponded with a bot. My suspicion grew stronger when I got a formal response (as if signed by Della Dumbaugh) claiming that my paper was "carefully" reviewed. That claim was not accompanied by any signs of unartificial intelligence since it was apparently based on confusing my explicit construction with a mere proof of its existence. That typical error from feeding an AI with the wrong task could have been easily avoided by simply forwarding my paper to Susan, as I requested. She would have certainly alerted your journal to that mistake before an automated (and meaningless) response was sent to me.

Nevertheless, the time for resuming that wonderfully informal interaction with Susan seems to have come since she would still be able to advice the board concerning my "next" construction of the 23-gon. It is "next" because it required the construction of the 11-gon. Both constructions of the 11-gon and the 23-gon are explicitly based on constructing (previously unknown) algebraic numbers of unit modulus. Please do forward both my constructions (https://semjonadlaj.com/Excerpts/Hendecagon.pdf & https://semjonadlaj.com/Excerpts/Icositrigon.pdf) to Susan before even discussing them and please do forward my best regards to her. Meanwhile, let the AI do what it most suitable for, that is, the swift verification of the relevance of the presented algebraic numbers to the said constructions.

Looking forward for your genuinely inspiring responce,

Semjon Adlaj
https://semjonadlaj.com/