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– In all the text the vectors are not always well denoted as such: on the same page the same vector quantity \( \phi \) may be written \( \phi \) (few cases are listed below).

– Similarly the same partition function may be denoted by \( Z \) or \( \widetilde{Z} \) (e.g. p. 57, p. 94...).

• p. 23 (al page): \( A_i \rightarrow a_i \)

• p. 62 (eq. 2.44): \( e^{-r/q} \rightarrow e^{-r/\xi} \)

• p. 75 (last equation): \( X = X \rightarrow X = X - X^3/3 \). The written equation is trivially satisfied, so to get only the solution \( X = 0 \) we need to go the next order.

• p. 105 (§2): thus ensuing \( \rightarrow \) ensuring

– p. 111: On this page the explanation involving the spacetime dimension and the range of the vector field index is not very clear. In fact if we want to stick to \( d \) dimension, then we should replace:

  • §2: \( u_\alpha \) with \( \alpha = 0, \ldots, 3 \) \( \rightarrow \) \( u_\alpha \) with \( \alpha = 0, \ldots, d-1 \) since the vector field has the same dimension as the spacetime

  • eq. 5.2: \( d^3 j \rightarrow d^d j \)

Moreover in §2 saying that the case \( \alpha = 0, \ldots, 3 \) includes the case \( \alpha = 1, 2, 3 \) is slightly odd.

• p. 111 (eq. 5.3): \( k' \rightarrow k' \)

• p. 114 (eq. 5.15): \( f \rightarrow f \)
p. 131 (sec. 6.1.2): The sentence 'dimensionless with respect to time' is quite confusing; saying that we just want the characteristic scale (which is by definition is not a time) would be clearer.

p. 165: This passage is quite confusing. In fact we do not 'take the equality' as it is written, but we define the RHS of eq. 7.71 to be \( \tilde{F} \), since we still have \( F \leq \tilde{F} \) and the two symbols need to be distinguished. Then one can minimize \( \tilde{F} \) to try to approach \( F \). It is only on p. 166 that we see that in this specific example one has \( F = \tilde{F}_{\text{min}} \).

- p. 190 (eq. 8.36-37): \( f \to \bar{f} \)
- p. 220 (above eq. 9.87): \( b^{d-2-d\phi} \to b^{d-2-d\phi} \)
- p. 242 (below eq. 10.59): 'further in sec. 9.6.3' \( \to \) 'sec. 9.6.4'
- p. 302 (above eq. A.21): 'satisfies the normalization requirement (A.14)' \( \to \) (A.13)