

A comment

Mirna

October 15, 2010

Volodya Shavrukov pointed out in an email of 11 October 2010, that I should have used a different definition of what a disjunctive lattice is in Section 2, Definition 2.3. This definition should be

Definition 0.1 *A lattice \mathcal{L} is said to be disjunctive if for any $a \neq b$ in \mathcal{L} there is c such that exactly one of $a \wedge c$ and $b \wedge c$ is not 0.*

The definition I had was considered in the literature under the name of *semicomplemented lattices*. Examples distinguishing the two classes are known.

The point is that Claim 2.7 is incorrect with the weaker version of the definition, but correct when the corrected version is used. In fact it is Definition 0.1 that is used in Wallman's original paper and in other literature.

Section 2 of the paper was meant as a survey of Wallman's method, as presented in his paper and e.g. Engelking's book "General Topology". I used a third-hand survey when writing this section and inherited the error.

This error does not influence in any sense the original results of the paper presented in sections 3 and 4. (Except that whenever we say a 'disjunctive lattice' we should be using the definition above.)

We thank Volodya for his comments.