

Errata for Practical Programming

Produced Tue Aug 28 16:54:28 +0000 2012 for the P4.0 version of the book.

PDF	Paper	Description	Found in	Fixed in
9		#48528: 17 / 10 produces 1.7 not 1 (an integer). Int division would be 17 // 10 and produce a one. Perhaps the text is not current with now state of Python. —Gary E Mason	P4.0 15-Jan-12	
19		#47879: <code><code:bold></code> tags visible —Jessen Havill	P4.0 31-Oct-11	
75		#47819: In the v4.0 PDF and mobi version, the first example after the first paragraph in section 5.4 appears like this: <code>for <code:bold>variable</code:bold> in <code:bold>list</code:bold>: <code:bold>block</code:bold></code> where the formatting tags did not work as intended (as compared to my v2.0 PDF where the text is actually shown in bold. This error seems consistent throughout the entire book, not just this one example. A text search for ' <code><code:bold></code> ' will likely reveal a number of such problems. —Monte Milanuk	P4.0 26-Oct-11	
	91	#49551: "another fundamental concepts" should be "another fundamental concept" —Michael Ernst	P4.0 21-Jul-12	
	98	#49167: Q 7 says to print <code>half_lives</code> in 5.5 Slicing pg 84 when <code>half_lives</code> is in 5.3 Built-in Functions on Lists on pg 79 —Jay Palmer	P4.0 21-Apr-12	
	100	#49552: <code><code:bold></code> tags are visible at the beginning of section 6.2 (as they are in a number of places in the book) —Michael Ernst	P4.0 21-Jul-12	
102		#49129: For some of the pages when they try to explain new terminologies, I see a bunch of blotchy text format code like this one from page 102 <code><code:bold>condition</code:bold>: <code:bold>block</code:bold></code>	P4.0 18-Apr-12	
176		#49184: The code for inverting a dictionary appears on page 176, right before the inverting a dictionary section, and then again on page 177 (exact same code) in the inverting a dictionary section. —Trevor	P4.0 23-Apr-12	
	204	#48007: In the first if statement you have: <code>else: min2, min1 = 1,0</code> That should be <code>else: min2, min1 = 0,1</code> —Susan Rodger	P1.0 22-Nov-11	
2001	Nblbv	#49560: I relaly relaly disagree with this piece and very strongly. I have known Danny and he is a sincere generous man, who is being accused of things he never intended. The guy relaly loves india, and he shot what he saw was cinematically a very powerful location. Manjha is a powerful piece and it could be true in any part of the world. All over the world films are made which talk about darker things which actually bring humanitarian attention to them, they impact you affect you. Manjha is one such film and so was A very very silent film by Manish which won the cannes award few years ago. Neither of them intended to sell indias poverty and yes even though I am putting Tumbaad together, it wouldnt have been possible without everyones attention being drawn to Manjha. Dannys generosity is unmatched in this bollywood that we liveand work in and his dignity shows in the fact that he is silently taking all the accusations. This is a very narrow point of view that you state here and very distressing . It makes me angry that someone wrote this, without relaly knowing the man. —KHowjqFcCHHvO	P4.0 25-Jul-12	