Errata to

Determinantal Probability: Basic Properties and Conjectures

Proc. Intl. Congress Math. 2014

by Russell Lyons

Conjecture 3.2 has been proved by Osada and Osada, as well as by Bufetov, Qiu, and Shamov. A short proof deducing it from the transference principle and Theorem 2.5 is given by R. Lyons, A note on tail triviality for determinantal point processes, *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **23**, no. 72 (2018), 1–3.

Near the end of the proof of Theorem 3.7, the sentence, "This is the same as (3.10) by Theorem 3.4", should read, "This is the same as (3.10) by choice of the sets B_i', C_i'." In the next sentence, "$\mathcal{A}_i \in \overline{\mathscr{U}(A)}$" should read, "$\mathcal{A}_1 \in \overline{\mathscr{U}(A)}$ and $\mathcal{A}_2 \in \overline{\mathscr{U}(E \setminus A)}$".

In Subsection 4.2, the definition of K_x is missing and there are some subtleties regarding Conjecture 4.6. First, since projections are idempotent,

$$K(x,z) = \int_E K(x,y)K(y,z)\,d\mu(y) \quad \mu^2\text{-a.e.}$$

Now redefine K so that this equation holds for all x and z. Writing

$$K_z(x) := K(x,z)\,,$$

we obtain $K_z \in H$. Second, the equation $h(x) = \big(h,\, K_x\big)$ holds μ-a.e., so again we may redefine h so that it holds for all x. With these definitions, Conjecture 4.6 makes sense.

Department of Mathematics, 831 E. 3rd St., Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405-7106
rdlyons@iu.edu
http://rdlyons.pages.iu.edu/

30 Dec. 2025