

Proof. By Theorem 2.8 of [4] it suffices to show $Q \otimes_R Re$ is a Q projective. Now we have $0 \rightarrow Re \rightarrow Q$ exact and Q is flat over R , so $0 \rightarrow Q \otimes Re \rightarrow Q \otimes Q$ is exact. The isomorphism $Q \otimes Q \cong Q$ gives $Q \otimes Re \cong Qe$, and hence is Q projective.

COROLLARY. *For any idempotent $e \in Q$, $Re \cap R$ is a summand of R .*

Proof. The sequence $0 \rightarrow Re \cap R \rightarrow R \rightarrow R(1 - e) \rightarrow 0$ splits.

We can now prove Proposition 3 of [2] for regular FPF rings. If L is a left ideal of R , then L is essential in a summand Qe of Q . Hence L is essential in Re , hence essential in $Re \cap R$, a summand of R .

REFERENCES

1. K. R. Goodeal, *Ring Theory*, Mono. and Text in Pure and Applied Math., **33**, Marcel Dekker, New York.
2. S. Page, *Regular FPF Rings*, Pacific J. Math., **79** (1978), 169-176.
3. ———, *Semi-prime and non-singular FPF rings*, to appear.
4. F. L. Sandomierski, *Nonsingular rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **19** (1968), 225-230.

Correction to

ON EQUISINGULAR FAMILIES OF ISOLATED SINGULARITIES

A. NOBILE

Volume 89 (1980), 151-161

Theorem 3.1 is incorrect. There are families of plane curves which are Zariski equisingular but do not satisfy condition \mathcal{E} . The error is in the proof of Lemma 3.5. In fact, as the example below shows, there are parametrized families of space curves, where the special fiber is not obtained by specializing the values of the parameters, but has embedded points. The arguments of the rest of the section are correct, and they give the following weaker result (we use the notations of the paper).

THEOREM. *Let $(X_0, 0)$ be a germ of a reduced plane curve, with the following property: there is a representative $\mathcal{X} = (\zeta, X_\mu, D_\mu, \sigma)$ of the versal μ -constant deformation of X_0 such that for all $u \in D_\mu$, $f^{-1}(u)$ coincides with the H -transform of $\zeta^{-1}(u)$ where $Z^\pi \rightarrow X_\mu$ is the*