

Errata to:

A Fixed-Point Farrago

February 15, 2018

Page 62 Proof of CLAIM: The second paragraph (proof of the “converse”) does not work since the dot product of $x \in \Pi_M$ with itself need not be 1. The “proof of the converse” should go like this:

“It remains to prove the converse. Write $\Delta := \sum_k \delta_k(x, y)$, and suppose $T_I(x, y) = x$, so that $\Delta(x, y)x = \delta(x, y)$, i.e. that,

$$\Delta(x, y)x_j = \delta_j(x, y) \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, M). \quad (*)$$

We wish to show that x is a best response to y , i.e., that $\delta(x, y)$ is the zero-vector. Suppose this is not the case, so $\delta_i(x, y) > 0$ for some index $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$. Thus $u_I(x, y) < u_I(e_i, y)$, i.e., $xAy^t < e_iAy^t$. Now for all the other indices j we have $u_j(x, y) \geq 0$, i.e., $xAy^t \leq e_jAy^t$, so upon multiplying both sides of this last inequality by x_j , noting that (*) insures $x_j > 0$, and using the fact that $\sum_j x_j = 1$, we see that

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^N x_j e_k \right) Ay^t < xAy^t$$

But the sum in round brackets on the left is just the vector x , hence our assumption that $\delta(x, y) \neq 0$ has led to the contradiction $xAy^t < xAy^t$.”

Page 139 Lemma 11.16 (The Absorption Lemma): Incorrect statement and proof. The last paragraph of the proof does not show that $k = h^{n-m}$, merely that $h^n = k^m$.

Thus the statement of Lemma 11.16 should include the additional assumption on G :

If $g \in G$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ then there are at most countably many $h \in G$ for which $g = h^m$.

The circle group has this property since $g = h^m$ iff h is one of the m -th roots of g , so only m such h 's qualify. □

The Absorption Lemma is used in the proofs of Thm 11.17 on page 139 and Thm. 11.19 on page 140. In both cases there is a line L through the origin such that the group G is the subgroup of rotations of \mathbb{R}^3 about the origin having L as axis of rotation; thus G is (isomorphic to) the circle group.

Thanks to Felix Werdermann and Felix Meitzner of the Free University of Berlin for pointing out this error.

Thanks to Ilja Gogic of University of Zagreb, Croatia for pointing out this error.

Page 139 A perhaps better statement and proof of the Absorption Lemma:

For a group G , let $tG = \{g \in G: g^n = e \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$, the collection of elements of G having finite order. For G commutative, tG is easily seen to be a subgroup of G ; it's called the "torsion subgroup." *Example:* The torsion subgroup of the circle group is the collection of elements $e^{2\pi i q}$ where $q \in \mathbb{R}$ is rational.

Revised Absorption Lemma. *Suppose X is a set, E is a subset of X , and C is a countable subset of E . Let G be a commutative group of self-maps of X that is fixed-point free on C , and for which each element takes C into E . If, in addition, G is uncountable, but its torsion subgroup is not, then E and $E \setminus C$ are G -equidecomposable.*

It's not required that each $g \in G$ take E into itself.

Revised proof. Only the last paragraph of the original proof needs to be modified. We wish to show that the set

$$H = \{g \in G: g^n(C) \cap C \neq \emptyset \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

is at most countable. To this end, note that $g \in H$ iff there exists a triple $(n, c, c') \in \mathbb{N} \times C \times C$ such that $g^n(c) = c'$. In other words, H is the union of the countable collection of sets

$$H_{n,c,c'} = \{g \in G: g^n(c) = c'\} \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}, c \text{ and } c' \in C).$$

Thus it's enough to show that each of the above sets is at most countable. For this, fix $g \in H_{n,c,c'}$. If $h \in H_{n,c,c'}$ we have $g^n(c) = c' = h^n(c)$, so

$$c = g^{-n}h^n(c) = (g^{-1}h)^n(c).$$

The second equality requires the commutativity of G .

We conclude from G 's fixed-point free action on C that $(g^{-1}h)^n$ is the identity element of G , so $g^{-1}h \in tG$, and therefore $h \in g(tG)$. Thus $H_{n,c,c'}$ is a subset of $g(tG)$, so is at most countable, as we wished to show. \square

Page 167 *Statement of Lemma 13.5:* " $K = \overline{\text{conv}} K$ " should read " $K = \overline{\text{conv}} K_0$ ".

Thanks to Christian Fenske for pointing out, in Zbl. Review # 1352.47002, both this error and the bibliography error below.

Page 214 *Bibliography entry [99]:* The volume should be 87 (not 67), and the year should be 1980 (not 2010).