



Correction

Correction to: On Semi-finite Hexagons of Order $(2, t)$ Containing a Subhexagon

Anurag Bishnoi and Bart De Bruyn

Correction to: Ann. Comb. 20 (2016) 433–452

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00026-016-0315-z>

In Section 4.2 of [1], we showed that there does not exist any infinite near hexagon \mathcal{N} of order $(2, t)$ that contains an isometrically embedded subgeometry \mathcal{H} isomorphic to $H(2)$. The proofs of Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7 in [1] have been spoiled by the same error: points of \mathcal{N} at distance 1 from \mathcal{H} are not necessarily collinear with a unique point of \mathcal{H} (see Page 446, Line –8 and Page 447, Line 2). This is true in case \mathcal{N} is a generalised hexagon, but not if \mathcal{N} is a general near hexagon. Luckily, these errors can be corrected.

The following proof should replace the proof of Lemma 4.6 in [1].

Lemma 1. *There are only finitely many points of type B_1 in \mathcal{N} .*

Proof. Let \mathcal{B} denote the set of those points of \mathcal{N} that have type B_i for some $i \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Then \mathcal{B} is finite by [1, Lemma 4.5]. Let \mathcal{A} denote the set of those points of \mathcal{N} that have type A , i.e., the points of \mathcal{H} . Then the set $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$ is also finite. Let x be a point of type B_1 in \mathcal{N} . Then by [1, Lemma 4.2], x is at distance 1 from \mathcal{H} , and since \mathcal{O}_{f_x} is a singleton, there exists a unique point $\pi(x)$ in \mathcal{H} collinear with x . If x is only collinear with points of type A , B_1 or C , then by the same reasoning as in the proof of [1, Theorem 4.4], we get a contradiction. So, x is collinear with at least one point of \mathcal{B} , and we have already seen that it is collinear with at least one point of \mathcal{A} . Thus x is the common neighbour of two points at distance 2 in the finite set $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. Since each such pair of points at distance 2 in the near polygon \mathcal{N} has finitely many

(at most five) common neighbours, we see that the set of points of type B_1 must be finite; in fact, the cardinality of this set is bounded by five times the number of unordered pairs of points at distance 2 in $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$. \square

The following proof should replace the proof of Lemma 4.7 in [1].

Lemma 2. *There are only finitely many points of type C in \mathcal{N} .*

Proof. Let x be a point of type C in \mathcal{N} . Then the set of points of \mathcal{H} at distance 2 from x is a 1-ovoid of \mathcal{H} and hence it has cardinality 21. Let S_x be the set of common neighbours between x and the elements of \mathcal{O}_{f_x} (the 1-ovoid of \mathcal{H} induced by x). By [1, Lemma 4.2], each element y of S_x has type B_i for some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 5\}$ and hence by [1, Table 3] y is collinear with at most nine points of \mathcal{H} . Therefore, $|S_x| \geq \frac{21}{9}$, and we get two points of the set $\Gamma_1(\mathcal{H})$ at distance 2 from each other having x as a common neighbour. By [1, Lemma 4.5] and Lemma 1, the set $\Gamma_1(\mathcal{H})$ is finite. A similar reasoning as in the proof of Lemma 1 then shows that there are only finitely many points of type C in \mathcal{N} . \square

The rest of the discussion in Section 4.2 of [1] can remain as it is. In the proof of Lemma 4.3, there is however a typo. The condition $d(x, y_1) = d(x, y_2) = d(x, y_3)$ should be replaced with $d(y, x_1) = d(y, x_2) = d(y, x_3)$.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Reference

- [1] Bishnoi, A., De Bruyn, B.: On semi-finite hexagons of order $(2, t)$ containing a subhexagon. *Ann. Comb.* 20(3), 433–452 (2016)

Anurag Bishnoi and Bart De Bruyn
 Department of Mathematics
 Ghent University
 Krijgslaan 281
 9000 Gent
 Belgium
 e-mail: bart.debruyne@ugent.be

Anurag Bishnoi
 e-mail: anurag.2357@gmail.com