

## CORRECTION OF AN ERROR IN THE PAPER “CHARACTERIZATION OF PERFECT INVOLUTION GROUPS”

TORBEN MAACK BISGAARD

The purpose of the present note is to point out a gap in the proof of Lemma 4 in [1] and to indicate how it can be mended. In the proof of Lemma 4 in [1], the following situation is encountered:  $E$  is a finite subset of  $\mathbb{R}^k$ ;  $\varphi$  is a real-valued function on  $E$ ;  $(\pi_t)_{t \in E}$  is a family of probability measures on  $E$  such that for  $t \in E$ ,

$$t = \int u \, d\pi_t(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(t) \leq \int \varphi \, d\pi_t.$$

As in [1], we denote by  $S$  the set of those  $t \in E$  such that  $\pi_t$  is  $\varepsilon_t$ , the Dirac measure. The problem is to construct, given  $x \in E$ , a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $S$  such that

$$x = \int t \, d\mu(t) \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(x) \leq \int \varphi \, d\mu.$$

In [1], one defines a sequence  $(\mu_n)_{n \geq 0}$  of probability measures on  $E$  by  $\mu_0 = \varepsilon_x$  and  $\mu_{n+1} = \sum_{t \in E} \mu_n(\{t\})\pi_t$ ; one then chooses an accumulation point  $\mu$  of  $(\mu_n)$ . It is claimed that  $\mu = \sum_{t \in E} \mu(\{t\})\pi_t$ . This conclusion is unwarranted. Indeed, it would be true if the whole sequence  $(\mu_n)$  converged to  $\mu$ . However, all that we know is that some subsequence  $(\mu_{n_k})$  of  $(\mu_n)$  converges to  $\mu$ . In this case, all that we get from  $\mu_{n+1} = \sum_{t \in E} \mu_n(\{t\})\pi_t$  by inserting  $n = n_k$  and going to the limit is  $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mu_{n_k+1} = \sum_{t \in E} \mu(\{t\})\pi_t$ , which is not good enough since the sequence  $(\mu_{n_k+1})$  might have a limit different from that of  $(\mu_{n_k})$ . To repair this, let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the set of those subsets  $D$  of  $E$ , containing  $S$ , such that there is a probability measure  $\mu$  on  $D$  such that  $x = \int t \, d\mu(t)$  and  $\varphi(x) \leq \int \varphi \, d\mu$ . Since  $E$  is a finite set, we can choose  $D \in \mathcal{D}$  minimal with respect to the inclusion ordering. If  $D = S$ , we have the desired measure  $\mu$  on  $S$ . Suppose  $D \neq S$ ; we shall derive a contradiction. Choose  $t \in D \setminus S$ . Since

$t \notin S$ , we have  $\pi_t \neq \varepsilon_t$  by definition, that is,  $\pi_t(\{t\}) < 1$ . From  $t = \int u d\pi_t(u)$ , by subtracting  $\pi_t(\{t\})t$  from both sides and dividing by  $1 - \pi_t(\{t\})$ , we get

$$t = \int u d\varrho(u)$$

where  $\varrho$  is the probability measure  $(1 - \pi_t(\{t\}))^{-1}\pi_t|(D \setminus \{t\})$ . Similarly,

$$\varphi(t) \leq \int \varphi d\varrho.$$

Define  $D^* = D \setminus \{t\}$ . Define a probability measure  $\mu^*$  on  $D^*$  by  $\mu^*(\{u\}) = \mu(\{u\}) + \mu(\{t\})\varrho(\{u\})$  for  $u \in D^*$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \int_D u d\mu(u) = \int_{D^*} u d\mu(u) + \mu(\{t\})t \\ &= \int_{D^*} u d\mu(u) + \mu(\{t\}) \int_{D^*} u d\varrho(u) = \int_{D^*} u d\mu^*(u) \end{aligned}$$

and (similarly)  $\varphi(x) \leq \int_{D^*} \varphi d\mu^*$ . The existence of a probability measure  $\mu^*$  with these properties shows that  $D^* \in \mathcal{D}$ , in contradiction with the minimality of  $D$ .

#### REFERENCES

1. Bisgaard, T. M., *Characterization of perfect involution groups*, Math. Scand. 65 (1989), 245–258.

NANDRUPSVEJ 7 ST. TH.  
DK-2000 FREDERIKSBERG C  
DENMARK  
E-mail: torben.bisgaard@get2net.dk