## Erratum/Addendum for *Topics in Spectral Geometry*, preliminary online version dated May 29, 2023

Michael Levitin, Dan Mangoubi, and Iosif Polterovich

December 2, 2023 denotes entries added in this version of Erratum/Addendum



- ▶ **p. 13, line 3:** replace "rises" by "raises"
- P. 36, line 4 of the paragraph directly above the heading of \$2.1.2: replace "compact" by "closed"
- **p.40, formula (2.1.6):** in the second integral, replace " $d\sigma$ " by "ds"
- **p. 39, line following (2.1.5):** remove the word from "that for for"
- **p. 76, line -3:** remove the word from "real domain analyticity"
- P. 81, first line of Exercise 3.2.14(iii): replace "disjoined" by "disjoint"
- p. 141, second line of the second paragraph: replace "has led" by 'have led"
- P. 153, first line after the statement of Theorem 5.1.4: replace "have measure" by "has measure"
- **Provide two lines above formula (7.1.15):** replace " $L(\Omega_k)$ " by " $L(\partial \Omega_k)$ "
- **p. 238, formula (7.1.15):** replace "L(Ω)" by "L(∂Ω)"
- **p. 256, line -1:** replace "Exercise 7.3.6(iv)" by "Exercise 7.3.6(iii)"
- P. 260, third line above Theorem 7.3.8: replace "(7.3.8), and (7.3.8) imply" by "(7.3.8), and (7.3.9) imply"
- p. 266, fourth line of Exercise 7.3.15: replace "Figure 7.2" by "Figure 7.3"

**p. 266, Exercise 7.4.3** replace the first displayed formula by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{-\Lambda}I_0'(\sqrt{-\Lambda})}{I_0(\sqrt{-\Lambda})}, & \text{if } \Lambda < 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \Lambda = 0, \\ \frac{\sqrt{\Lambda}J_0'(\sqrt{\Lambda})}{J_0(\sqrt{\Lambda})}, & \text{if } \Lambda > 0, \end{cases}$$

and replace the second displayed formula by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\sqrt{-\Lambda}I'_m(\sqrt{-\Lambda})}{I_m(\sqrt{-\Lambda})}, & \text{if } \Lambda < 0, \\ m, & \text{if } \Lambda = 0, \\ \frac{\sqrt{\Lambda}J'_m(\sqrt{\Lambda})}{J_m(\sqrt{\Lambda})}, & \text{if } \Lambda > 0, \end{cases}$$

P. 277, first line of Remark 7.4.14: replace "Theorem 7.2.11" by "Theorem 7.4.11"



- **P** 28, two lines above Remark 1.2.14: because an issue with the preprint [BouWat17] became known in July 2023, the best existing upper bound for  $R(\lambda)$  has exponent  $\frac{131}{416} + \varepsilon$  [M. N. Huxley, *Exponential sums and lattice points III*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 87 (2003), 591–609]
- **p. 68, above Exercise 3.1.6:** on reflection, the phrase "Proposition 3.1.3 follows immediately" is somewhat misleading. Therefore, for methodological purposes, we extend the argument outlining the proof of Proposition 3.1.3. Let  $\mathscr{E}_k := \text{Span}\{u_k, u_{k+1}, \ldots\}$ . Then  $R[u] \ge \lambda_k$  for any  $u \in \mathscr{E}_k \setminus \{0\}$ . If we now consider an arbitrary  $\mathscr{L} \subset \text{Dom}(\mathscr{Q})$  with dim  $\mathscr{L} = k$ , then there exists  $u \in \mathscr{E}_k \cap \mathscr{L} \setminus \{0\}$  (since the codimension of  $\mathscr{E}_k$  is k 1), and therefore

$$\max_{u \in \mathscr{L} \setminus \{0\}} R[u] \ge \lambda_k.$$

On the other hand, the equality is attained if we take  $\mathcal{L} = \text{Span}\{u_1, \dots, u_k\}$ .

- P. 317, reference [ColGGS22]: add bibliographical data, Rev. Mat. Complut. (2023). doi: 10.1007/\$13163-023-00480-3.
- P. 319, reference [FilLPS23]: add full bibliographical data, Invent. Math. 234 (2023), 129– 169. doi: 10.1007/s00222-023-01198-1
- p. 324, reference [KarLagPol22]: add full bibliographical data, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.
  47 (2023), article no. 77. doi: 10.1007/s00205-023-01912-6
- P. 331, reference [Ros22b]: add full bibliographical data, Math. Z. 305 (2023), article 62. doi: 10.1007/s00209-023-03382-8