p.715, Corollary 4.3: $\zeta \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0$ should be $\zeta^\circ \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0$.

In the proof: The second sentence 'As $\zeta^\circ_{\mathbb{R}}$-stability implies the $\zeta_{\mathbb{R}}$-stability, τ is surjective thanks to Proposition 4.1(1)' is ridiculous, as we cannot assume both $\zeta \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0$ and $\zeta^\circ \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0$. The proof should be corrected as follows:

First assume σ is injective and τ is surjective everywhere. Then the argument goes through to get a contradiction. Therefore σ has a kernel or τ has a cokernel at a point $\xi \in X_{\zeta^\circ}$. If σ has a kernel, the argument goes through. If τ has a cokernel at ξ, we consider $\tau_\xi^* \colon V \to \mathcal{R}_\xi^*$ and take $0 \neq \eta \in \operatorname{Ker} \tau_\xi^*$. Then the same argument as in the case σ has a kernel shows η is an isomorphism.