

CORRECTION TO "MEASURES ON PRODUCT SPACES"

BY
E. O. ELLIOTT

I am indebted to W. W. Bledsoe for the reminder that something additional is required in Lemma 2.0 on p. 383 of [1]. For the purpose of [1], the simplest way to rectify matters is to require that ν be continuous. The definition of continuity of ν is introduced between Lemma's 2.0 and 2.1 (top p. 386). Lemma 2.0 may be corrected by adding to its hypothesis the condition that ν be continuous and changing its proof in Part II as follows:

- (i) In (2), p. 384, put the definition of η first.
- (ii) Noting then that $\nu(t, \eta) > r$, use the continuity of ν to obtain an open set on which $\nu(\cdot, \eta) > r$ and define ξ to be the intersection of this open set and $\bigcap_{\gamma \in G_1^-} \alpha^\gamma$. Then $r < \nu(x, \eta)$ for each $x \in \xi$. Let $\lambda = \xi \times \eta$ as before and note (for later reference) that $\lambda \subset S$.
- (iii) Replace Step 2 with the statement that $\nu(x, \eta) > r$ whenever $x \in \xi$.
- (iv) In the first sentence of the proof of Step 4, replace the variable " t " with " x " to disassociate it from the special point t chosen at the beginning of the proof of Part II. The displayed inequality then becomes

$$r < \nu(x, \eta) \leq \nu(x, S_x).$$

The left side of this follows from (iii) above and the right side from the observation in (ii) that $\lambda \subset S$ and that consequently $\eta = \lambda_x \subset S_x$.

The change (iii) above is the crucial point. It is not enough to know that $\nu(t, \eta) > r$ for just the one point t in ξ . In Step 4, this becomes clear. The change suggested in (iv) above removes the misleading notation and clarifies the argument. The remainder of the proof is unaffected by these changes.

I believe there is no effect on the other parts of the paper.

REFERENCE

1. E. O. Elliott, *Measures on product spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **128** (1967), 379–388.

BELL TELEPHONE LABORATORIES,
HOLMDEL, NEW JERSEY