(9.5.6.1) Replace $E_\infty$ on the second line by $E_\infty \otimes Q_p/Z_p$.

(11.4.10) The remark is incorrect, as the assumption 11.4.1.5 is not satisfied in this case.

(12.4.4.3) In the supercuspidal case it is the group $G_v$, but not necessarily $I_v$, which acts absolutely irreducibly on $V(\mathfrak{f})_v$. In the monomial case, the quadratic extension $E_w/F_v$ can be unramified.

(12.6.4.9) The sentence “If $v$ splits in $K/F\ldots$” in the proof of (iii) is incorrect, in general. As a result, one has to add the following assumption to 12.6.4.9(iii): no prime $v \mid p$ that splits in $K/F$ divides $n(g)_{St}^{(P_2,\ldots,P_n)}$. This assumption also has to be added to (12.6.4.12), but not to (12.6.4.11).

(12.6.4.12) In the proof of 12.6.4.12(iii), the inequality $m \geq m'$ should be replaced by $m \leq m'$.

(12.7.14.2)(iii) The statement and the proof are correct only in the case when $I_v$ acts absolutely irreducibly on $V_v$. If this is not the case, then $V_v \sim \text{Ind}^G_{G_v}\eta$ and $V'_v \sim \text{Ind}^G_{G'_v}\eta'$, where $\mu, \mu' : E_w^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ with $\mu' / \mu$ unramified.

(12.7.14.3)(iii), (12.7.14.5)(i) By the previous remark, the proofs (which refer to (12.7.14.2)(iii)) are incomplete in the supercuspidal case. In fact, for $p > 2$, both statements follow from [De2, Thm. 6.5] and (12.7.14.2.2). In general, these are special cases of (the second half of the proof of) Prop. 2.2.4 in [Ne5, Doc. Math. 12 (2007), 243–274]. Both references use Galois-theoretical $\varepsilon$-factors, which coincide with the automorphic ones.

(12.9.6) In fact, if $2 \nmid [F : Q]$, then there is no exceptional extension $K'/F$, either. If it existed, put $\eta' = \eta_{K'/F}$. As $K'/F$ is unramified outside $\infty P$, we have $1 = \prod_v \eta'_v(-1) = \prod_v \eta'_v(-1) = (-1)^{[F : Q]}\eta'_p(-1)$, hence $\eta'_p(-1) = -1$. In particular, $P$ is ramified in $K'/F$. As $f$ is $p$-ordinary, $\pi_P(g)$ is not supercuspidal, which implies (by 12.6.1.2.3) that $\pi(g)_{St} = \pi(\mu, \mu'\eta')$ for some $\mu : F_P^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$. The central character of $\pi(g)_{St}$ is trivial; thus $\mu^2\eta'_p = 1$ and $\eta'_p(-1) = \mu(-1)^{-2} = 1$, contradiction.

As a result, we can omit the assumption “Assume that $g$ does not have CM by $\ldots$” in (12.9.5), (12.9.8), (12.9.9), (12.9.11) and (12.9.12). Similarly, in (12.9.7), we can omit the assumptions (i), (ii) in the case $2 \nmid [F : Q]$.

(12.9.8), (12.9.9) Add the following assumption: no prime $v \mid p$ that splits in $K/F$ divides $n(g)_{St}^{(P)} n(g')_{St}^{(P)}$.

(12.9.13) In the proof, we choose $G'$ such that $g'$ also satisfies $(n(g')_{St}, (p)) = (1)$.

(12.11.12) In the proof of (iii), $SL_2(F_p) \cap h^{-1}Ch$ is contained in a not necessarily split Cartan subgroup, which implies that its order is less than or equal to $p + 1$, hence the number of elements of order 2 in $PH$ is equal to

$$|\text{Im } \{g \in SL_2(F_p) \mid g \in SL_2(F_p) \cap h^{-1}Ch\}| \geq \frac{|SL_2(F_p)|}{2 |SL_2(F_p) \cap h^{-1}Ch|} \geq \frac{|SL_2(F_p)|}{2(p + 1)} = \frac{p(p - 1)}{2}.$$ 

If $PH \sim S_4$ or $A_5$, then (assuming that $H$ is not large enough) $p \nmid |PH|$ ([Dic], §260). On the other hand, the inequalities

$$(\forall p \nmid |S_4|) \quad |\text{elements of order 2 in } S_4| = 9 < \frac{p(p - 1)}{2}$$

$$(\forall p \nmid |A_5|) \quad |\text{elements of order 2 in } A_5| = 15 < \frac{p(p - 1)}{2}$$
imply that $PH \neq S_4, A_5$. In fact, one can show more: if $G$ is not solvable and $p > 3$, then $H$ is not solvable. Indeed, non-solvability of $G$ implies that, either (1) $G$ contains $hSL_2(F_p)h^{-1}$ (which is not solvable, as $p > 3$), hence so does $H$, by Lemma; or (2) $PG \rightarrow A_5$. In the latter case the image of $c$ in $PG \rightarrow A_5$ is an element of order 2, and the subgroup of $A_5$ generated by all conjugates of such an element is equal to $A_5$; thus $PH = PG \rightarrow A_5$, which implies that $H$ is not solvable.