

**CORRIGENDUM TO
“ORDERED RINGS OVER WHICH OUTPUT SETS
ARE RECURSIVELY ENUMERABLE SETS”**

CHRISTIAN MICHAUX

(Communicated by Andreas R. Blass)

The first claim in the section *Remarks* on p. 574 of [2] is wrong as stated there. I should say the following:

From Theorems 1 and 2, we cannot deduce that \mathbb{Q} does not satisfy property $O = R.E.$

In fact, Byerly has recently proved that \mathbb{Q} satisfies property $O = R.E.$ (see [1]).

Note. This left unchanged the rest of the remarks.

REFERENCES

1. R. E. Byerly, *Ordered subrings of the reals in which output sets are recursively enumerable*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear).
2. C. Michaux, *Ordered rings over which output sets are recursively enumerable sets*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **112** (1991), 569–575.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY DE MONS-HAINAUT, B 7000 MONS, BELGIUM
E-mail address: SBOFFA@BMSUEM11.BITNET

Received by the editors January 4, 1992.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 03C10, 03D25, 68Q05.

©1993 American Mathematical Society
0002-9939/93 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page