ARCHIVUM MATHEMATICUM (BRNO)
Tomus 51 (2015), 189–190

# A COMPLEMENT TO THE PAPER “ON THE KOLÁŘ CONNECTION” [ARCH. MATH. (BRNO) 49 (2013), 223–240]

W.M. Mikulski

On page 229 of [2], we have the following text

“From Corollary 19.8 in [1], we get immediately the following proposition

**Proposition 1.** *Let $p_Y\colon Y \to M$ be an $\mathcal{FM}_{m,n}$-object and $p_E\colon E \to M$ be a $\mathcal{VB}_{m,n}$-object, $y \in Y_x$, $x \in M$. Let $(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta) \in Con(Y)\times Con^o_{clas}(M)\times Par(Y\times_M E)\times Con_{lin}(E)$. There exists a finite number $r = r(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta,y)$ such that for any $(\Gamma_1,\Lambda_1,\Phi_1,\Delta_1)\in Con(Y)\times Con^o_{clas}(M)\times Par(Y\times_M E)\times Con_{lin}(E)$ we have the following implication*

$$(j^r_y\Gamma_1 = j^r_y\Gamma\,,\ j^r_x\Lambda_1 = j^r_x\Lambda\,,\ j^r_y\Phi_1 = j^r_y\Phi\,,\ j^r_x\Delta_1 = j^r_x\Delta) \Rightarrow A(\Gamma_1,\Lambda_1,\Phi_1,\Delta_1)(y) = A(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta)(y)\ .\text{”}$$

One can show that the above proposition is true but it is not an immediate consequence of Corollary 19.8 in [1]. From Corollary 19.8, it follows immediately the following weaker result.

**Proposition 1’.** *Let $p_Y\colon Y \to M$ be an $\mathcal{FM}_{m,n}$-object and $p_E\colon E \to M$ be a $\mathcal{VB}_{m,n}$-object, $y \in Y_x$, $x \in M$. Let $(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta) \in Con(Y)\times Con^o_{clas}(M)\times Par(Y\times_M E)\times Con_{lin}(E)$. There exists a finite number $r = r(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta,y)$ such that for any $(\Gamma_1,\Lambda_1,\Phi_1,\Delta_1)\in Con(Y)\times Con^o_{clas}(M)\times Par(Y\times_M E)\times Con_{lin}(E)$ we have the following implications*

$$j^r_y\Gamma_1 = j^r_y\Gamma \Rightarrow A(\Gamma_1,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta)(y) = A(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta)(y)\,,$$

$$j^r_x\Lambda_1 = j^r_x\Lambda \Rightarrow A(\Gamma,\Lambda_1,\Phi,\Delta)(y) = A(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta)(y)\,,$$

$$j^r_y\Phi_1 = j^r_y\Phi \Rightarrow A(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi_1,\Delta)(y) = A(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta)(y)\,,$$

$$j^r_x\Delta_1 = j^r_x\Delta \Rightarrow A(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta_1)(y) = A(\Gamma,\Lambda,\Phi,\Delta)(y)\,.$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: primary 53C05; secondary 58A32.
*Key words and phrases*: general connection, linear connection, classical linear connection, vertical parallelism, natural operators.
Received April 20, 2015. Editor I. Kolář.
DOI: 10.5817/AM2015-3-189

One can easily see that by Proposition 1' we get the assumptions (2), (3), (4) and (5) on page 229 in [2]. Namely, by Proposition 1' we can replace $\Gamma$ by $\Gamma_1$ being polynomial. Next by the same argument we can replace $\Lambda$ by $\Lambda_1$ being polynomial. Next, by the same argument we can replace $\Phi$ by $\Phi_1$ being polynomial. Next, by the same argument we can replace $\Delta_1$ being polynomial.

Then using the same arguments as in [2] we obtain Lemma 4.1 of [2]. From Lemma 4.1 of [2] we get immediately Proposition 1.

So, we propose to replace Proposition 1 in [2] by Proposition 1'.

## References

[1] Kolář, I., Michor, P. W., Slovák, J., *Natural Operations in Differential Geometry*, Springer Verlag, 1993.

[2] Mikulski, W.M., *On the Kolář connection*, Arch. Math. (Brno) **49** (2013), 223–240.

Jagiellonian University, Institute of Mathematics,
Lojasiewicza 6, Kraków, Poland
*E-mail*: Wlodzimierz.Mikulski@im.uj.edu