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Page 45 (figure 3.5) The line
\[ c2 = \text{eval(pre(a) union q);} \]
should read
\[ c2 = \text{eval(pre(a) union \{r\});} \]

Page 66 The sum of the Manhattan distances of tiles 5 and 6 (and the value of
\( h^{(75,76)} \)) is 3, as tile 6 is only one step out of place, and the lower bound
incorporating the linear conflict is thus 5. (The heuristic values for this problem
given by the different pattern selections in the example on page 70 are correct.)

Page 71 \( CG^{-1}(V) \) is the set of \( V \)'s immediate successors in the causal graph (thus,
the function should have been called \( CG(V) \)). The proceeding definition is
correct as intended.

Page 89 Job J2 requires resource R1 and consumes resource F1 when executed in
mode M2.

Page 102 The assumption that the admissible heuristic \( h \) is parameterized by \( R \)
is unnecessary. It is sufficient that each \( h_{R_i} \) is an admissible heurstic for the
search space defined by \( R_i \) (i.e. a lower bound on \( h^{\ast}_{R_i} \)). These heuristics do
not need to be defined in the same way.

Page 114 The reference to figures “7.2 – 7.2” should be to figures 7.2 – 7.4.

Page 153 The acknowledgement of funding should include the National Graduate
School in Computer Science (CUGS), in addition to the already mentioned
Wallenberg Foundation and ECSEL/ENSYM graduate school.