VII Corrections to §9, §11 of [NFS]

(1) In the def. of "good sequence of pseudo projecta" in §9, condition (a) should read: (a) $\omega\rho_i$ is p.r. closed if $i > 0$.
(The requirement: $\omega\rho_0$ p.r. closed if $\omega\rho_0 < ht(M$ was too strong. Let e.g. $\bar{M} = J_{\alpha+\alpha}$ | $\alpha = crit(\pi)$, $\pi : \bar{M} \prec M$, ... Set $\rho_0 = \sigma(\alpha)+\alpha$, $\rho_{i+1} = \alpha$. Then $\sigma : \bar{M} \xrightarrow[\Sigma^*]{} M$ mod $(\vec{\rho})$ and $\omega\rho_0$ is not p.r. closed.)

(2) Lemma 1.2 of §9 is false as stated. We should set: $\rho_i'' = \sup \sigma'' \rho_i$ if $\omega\rho_i = \kappa$ or $\omega\rho_{i+1} \leq \kappa < \omega\rho_i$; $\rho_i'' = \rho_i^*$ if not. Similarly for $\vec{p}''$ in Lemma 4.2. The rest of the proof of Lemma 4 does not change.

(3) The proofs of Lemmas 2.1 – 2.4 in §11 are garbled. (Apparently we originally proved weaker results and later forgot to change some of the proofs.) These lemmas are restated with corrected proofs as Fact 5 – – Fact 9 in §1 of our notes "More on Iterability".

VIII Corrections to "More on Iterability"

(1) Fact 2 on p. 8 of §1 is misstated. It should read: Let $u = u_{\ell i} = \omega\rho^{\omega}_{N_\ell}$. Then $\ell < h < i \rightarrow \mu_{\ell i} < \mu_{hi}$.
(We also note that we generally have: $\ell \leq h < i$. Then $\mu_{\ell i} \leq \mu_{hi}$.)

(2) In the def. of $\bar{\sigma} = \sigma(\lambda, \gamma)$ on p. 9 of §1 write $\sup\{\xi < \gamma \mid \mu_{\xi,\gamma} < \lambda\}$ instead of $\sup\{\dots\}$.

(3) The proof of §3 Lemma 3, which establishes the main result is incomplete. The completion is, in fact, in pp. 52-64 of §1, which were mistakenly appended to §1 rather than §3.

(4) There is also an error in the proof of §3 Lemma 2. The claim in Lemma 2.1 should have been stated as:
(+) Let $A \subset \tilde{\tau}_i$ be $\Delta_1(P_i)$ in a parameter p and let $\tilde{A} \subset \tilde{\tau}_i$ be $\Delta_1(S_i)$ in $\tilde{p} = \delta_i(p)$ by the same definition.
Then A is $\Delta_1(P^*_i)$ in a parameter q and $\tilde{A}$ is $\Delta_1(\tilde{S}_i)$ in $\tilde{q} = \delta_i(q)$ by the same definition.

The proof went by supposing (+) to be false for a counterexample y of minimal length $i+1$. The proof of (3) then requires (+) to be false in the above form. The rest of the proof is unchanged. This version of Lemma 2.1 suffices for the later applications.