Corrections by Darij Grinberg

- page 18, Properties, (3): After "Explicitly", add ", if".

- page 21, proof of Theorem: In the proof of injectivity of θ,
you write: "$\tip(r_{s'}) = w \tip(r_s)$". This should be
"$\tip(r_{s'}) = \tip(r_s) w$" instead.

- page 22, proof of Proposition: Replace "length > 1" by "length
≥ 1" on the last line of the proof.
But more importantly, I think the proof of the proposition can be simplified:
Assume that M is a finite-dimensional $K\left<\left<Q\right>\right>$-module.
Let $N = \dim M$. We shall show that $pM = 0$ for any path p of length $> N$.
Indeed, let $p = a_k a_{k-1} \cdots a_1$ be a path of length $k > N$.
We must show that $pM = 0$. In other words, we must show that $pm = 0$
for any $m \in M$. Thus, fix $m \in M$.
We must prove $pm = 0$. Assume the contrary; hence, $pm \neq 0$.
Set $m_n = a_n a_{n-1} \cdots a_1 m$ for each $0 \leq n \leq k$. Then,
$m_k = pm \neq 0$.
Now, consider the sequence of vector subspaces
$\left< m_0, m_1, \ldots, m_k \right>,
 \left< m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_k \right>,
 \ldots,
 \left< m_{k-1}, m_k \right>,
 \left< m_k \right>$
of M. Each of these subspaces contains the next one as a subset, and
so their dimensions are weakly decreasing. Moreover, the dimension of
the first one is $\leq \dim M = N$, whereas the dimension of the last
one is 1 (since $m_k \neq 0$). Thus, the dimensions appearing in
these sequence are numbers between 1 and N. Consequently, two of
these dimensions must be equal (since in total, the sequence contains
$k + 1 > k > N$ dimensions, but there are only N numbers between 1
and N). In other words, there exist some i and j with $i < j$
such that the subspaces $\left< m_i, m_{i+1}, \ldots, m_k \right>$ and
$\left< m_j, m_{j+1}, \ldots, m_k \right>$ have the same dimension. Of
course, these two subspaces must therefore be equal (since the latter
is included in the former). Thus, $m_i \in \left< m_j, m_{j+1},
\ldots, m_k \right>$. Hence, $m_i = x m_i$ where x is some linear
combination of paths of length ≥ 1. This rewrites as $(1 - x) m_i
= 0$. This yields $m_i = 0$, since $1 - x$ is invertible in the ring
$K\left<\left<Q\right>\right>$. Thus, $pm = 0$, since pm is a left
multiple of m_i. This contradicts $pm \neq 0$. This contradiction
completes the proof.

- page 27, definitions of "overlap ambiguity" and "inclusion
ambiguity": You should probably say that f means the word in
question.

- page 31, proof of (the first) Lemma: On the last line of the proof,
the $\cong$ sign between L and N should probably be a $\cap$ sign.

- page 32, Example, (ii): The displayed equation (which defines
$d/(dx)$) should not end with a period.

- page 33, proof: "a polynomial $f = \sum r_i X$" --> "a polynomial $f
= \sum r_i X^i$".

- page 33, proof: On the last line of the proof, "$\widehat{r}$"
should probably be defined (or replaced by "r").

- page 36, proof of Proposition: Replace "$[r, P] = \forall r$" by
"$[r, P] = 0 \forall r$" (on the first line of the proof).

- page 42, definition of graded/homogeneous submodules: Replace "$n \in Z$" (under the direct-sum sign) by "$n \in \mathbb{Z}$".

- page 45, first Definition: "if $\theta : R \to A$ is a ring" -> "if $\theta : R \to A$ is a ring homomorphism".

- page 45, Construction: "left Ore set" may be better off explicitly defined (you only introduced the "left Ore condition").
More substantially: In "$(s, m) \sim (s', m)$", the second m should be an m'.

- page 58: Missing period after "Definition".