

**CORRIGENDUM FOR
'CONDITIONING, UPDATING, AND LOWER PROBABILITY ZERO'**

JASPER DE BOCK AND GERT DE COOMAN

ABSTRACT. This document lists errors in Reference [1] and corrects them.

ERRORS AND THEIR CORRECTIONS

In Section 2.2.4 of Reference [1], we state that conditions C1–C4 can be used to characterise the coherence of a conditional lower prevision $\underline{P}(\cdot|\cdot)$. Although this statement is correct, our explicit formulation of it is not. The correct version goes as follows:

Conditions C1–C4 have a special status because—as the following result by Troffaes and De Cooman establishes—they can be used to characterise coherence.

Proposition 5. (See [32, Theorem 13.33]—[2, Theorem 13.33] in this corrigendum.) *Consider a non-empty subset \mathcal{B} of $\mathcal{P}_0(\Omega)$ that is closed under finite unions and a linear subspace \mathcal{K} of $\mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ such that $\mathbb{1}_B \in \mathcal{K}$ and $f\mathbb{1}_B \in \mathcal{K}$ for all $f \in \mathcal{K}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $\underline{P}(\cdot|\cdot)$ be a conditional lower prevision with domain $\mathcal{C} := \{(f, B) : B \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{K}_B\}$ where, for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{K}_B := \{f \in \mathcal{G}(B) : \mathbb{1}_B f \in \mathcal{K}\}$. Then $\underline{P}(\cdot|\cdot)$ is coherent if and only if it satisfies C1–C4. Furthermore, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $\underline{P}(\cdot|B)$ is coherent if and only if it satisfies C1–C3. Hence, in this particular case, $\underline{P}(\cdot|\cdot)$ is jointly coherent if and only if it is separately coherent and satisfies C4.*

Our formulation in Section 2.2.4 of Reference [1] stated an incorrect variation to this result that imposes less constraints on the domain \mathcal{C} , and wrongly attributed that result to Williams. In Section 2.3 of Reference [1], we state a corollary of Proposition 5 that inherits its problems; it should be adapted similarly. The correct version goes as follows:

Corollary 6. *Consider a non-empty subset \mathcal{B} of $\mathcal{P}_0(\Omega)$ that is closed under finite unions and a linear subspace \mathcal{K} of $\mathcal{G}(\Omega)$ such that $\mathbb{1}_B \in \mathcal{K}$ and $f\mathbb{1}_B \in \mathcal{K}$ for all $f \in \mathcal{K}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $P(\cdot|\cdot)$ be a conditional prevision with domain $\mathcal{C} := \{(f, B) : B \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{K}_B\}$ where, for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{K}_B := \{f \in \mathcal{G}(B) : \mathbb{1}_B f \in \mathcal{K}\}$. Then $P(\cdot|\cdot)$ is coherent if and only if it satisfies P1–P4. Furthermore, for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $P(\cdot|B)$ is coherent if and only if it satisfies P1–P3. Hence, in this particular case, $P(\cdot|\cdot)$ is jointly coherent if and only if it is separately coherent and satisfies P4.*

Given these changes, Footnote 12 in Reference [1] should also be corrected. Instead of “He requires the domain to be of the form in Corollary 6.”, it should state “He requires the domain to be of the form $\{(f, B) : B \in \mathcal{B} \text{ and } f \in \mathcal{K}_B\}$, with \mathcal{B} a non-empty subset of $\mathcal{P}_0(\Omega)$ and, for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$, \mathcal{K}_B a linear subspace of $\mathcal{G}(B)$.”

REFERENCES

- [1] Jasper De Bock and Gert de Cooman. Conditioning, updating and lower probability zero. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 67:1 – 36, 2015.
- [2] Matthias C. M. Troffaes and Gert de Cooman. *Lower Previsions*. Wiley, 2014.