ERRATA, VOLUME 5

J. Ernest Wilkins, Jr., *A variational problem in reactor theory*, pp. 345–348.

W. T. Reid [1] has pointed out that the theorem proved in a paper previously published [2] is incorrect and has exhibited a counter example. The theorem will, however, become true if an additional hypothesis is made, namely that the considered function $u_0(x)$ is bounded below by a positive constant. No modifications in the proof of the theorem are necessary. It remains true without this hypothesis on $u_0(x)$ provided the class of functions $u(x)$ in U is further restricted to be such that $u(x)/u_0(x)$ is essentially bounded. In this case, the equation just below equation (5) must be replaced by

$$\lim \int_e u_0(x) \left[v(x) - \sum_{n=0}^{m} \frac{k_n' v_n(x)}{\lambda_n} \right]^2 dx = 0.$$

Since u/u_0 is bounded, the same limiting relation holds with $u_0(x)$ replaced by $u(x)$, and so the error in the argument leading to equation (6) does not affect that equation.

The kernel function $H(x, y)$ must be real-valued, although this was not stated explicitly in the original paper.

References

1. W. T. Reid, Review of [2], Math. Rev. vol. 16 (1955) p. 266.

2. J. E. Wilkins, Jr., *A variational problem in reactor theory*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. vol. 5 (1954) pp. 345–348.

ERRATA, VOLUME 6

Eugene Schenkman, *The existence of outer automorphisms of some nilpotent groups of Class* 2, pp. 6–11.

Professor Reinhold Baer has kindly pointed out to me that Lemma 3 is not correct as stated.

If one adds to the hypothesis after the first comma on p. 8 the statement "*and if also az, b, · · · , f generate G*," then the lemma and its subsequent applications are correct.

Y. K. Wong, *Some properties of the proper values of a matrix*, pp. 891–899.

On p. 894, line 8: "Note that condition (2.1) is not sufficient for $\lambda_1 < 1$," should read "Note that condition (2.1) is equivalent to the property that every principal submatrix of order $p \leqq n$ in A has at least one column for which the sum of its p elements is less than 1, and is not sufficient for $\lambda_1 < 1$."

On p. 896, line 24, p^{+1} should read $p+1$.

On p. 898, lines 9–10: "Hence $(I-A)^{-1} = (I+Q)E^{-1}(I+P)$, which is non-negative." should read "Hence $(I-A)^{-1} = (I-Q)^{-1}E^{-1}(I$ $P)^{-1}$. From the properties of P and Q, the inverses of $I-P$ and $I-Q$ have only non-negative elements. It follows that $(I-A)^{-1}$ is non-negative."

On p. 898, line 10 from the bottom, add to the last sentence what follows: "We can verify that $e_p = 1 - a_{pp} - c_p$. For a simpler proof, we apply (3.2) to $I - A_{p+1}$ with $L = I - A_p$; then K_p becomes $1 - a_{p+1,p+1}$ $- c_{p+1}$. Thus, if $I - A_p$ has a non-negative inverse, and if (3.4) holds for $k = p+1$, then $I - A_{p+1}$ has a non-negative inverse."