Summary of Comments on kearnes-kiss-markup.pdf

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 18/06/2008 5:23:03 PM
tame congruence theory?

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 20/06/2008 2:26:05 PM
are there analogs of Theorems 9.14 and 9.15 from Hobby-McKenzie that could be proved?

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 20/06/2008 10:44:59 AM
quasi-identity and quasi-affine are hyphenated, but quasiorder and quasivariety aren't.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 12:53:08 PM
"the" instead of "a"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 18/06/2008 5:17:16 PM
provide a reference for this, if possible.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 1:21:18 PM
non-empty set

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 20/06/2008 9:24:10 AM
remove

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 1:36:00 PM
remove "by"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 1:36:34 PM
has this notation been defined?

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 1:36:54 PM
remove "of"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 1:46:23 PM
"variables"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 1:46:31 PM

2.14

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 2:03:55 PM

since B(f) is a finite boolean algebra, a lattice filter is the same thing as a principal filter.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 2:06:31 PM
the presentation of the proof of this theorem could be considerably shortened, since much of the proof is elementary and could be left to the reader to work out.

"of" lattices ...

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 3:36:00 PM

w_i, not t_i

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 14/04/2008 3:36:06 PM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 3:36:36 PM

... of the f_i ...

you just use that w_i(p,q,r) \le t for this, not that the quasi-identity holds in L.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 3:44:11 PM
do we need to assume that for these w_i that $w_i(p,q,r) \le t$?

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 3:57:57 PM
perhaps some mention of the origin of these lattices words should be made here. They appear in the work of Czedli, as well as in Hobby-McKenzie, and for all I know in other work.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 5:47:09 PM
should be A(M)

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 14/04/2008 5:47:12 PM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 5:48:08 PM
to be consistent, use "rectangularity" instead of "rectangulation" here.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 14/04/2008 5:48:53 PM
"SR" not "RS"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 15/04/2008 2:06:11 PM

It doesn't follow that if (p,q) is in \tau_n then this matrix is in M(S,T) and so one can't conclude that (p,q) is in \tau_{n+1} from this. I think that you need to argue that the generators of \tau_n all lie in \tau_{n+1} instead.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 15/04/2008 10:30:10 PM
"that"

this should be something other than n, the arity of f.

Page: 56

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 12:05:48 PM
extra ")" here.

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 17/04/2008 12:05:51 PM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 12:07:59 PM
these variable patterns don't match those in 3.19

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 12:07:20 PM
n, not m.

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 17/04/2008 12:08:13 PM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 12:12:14 PM

it is clear that N is supposed to be {1,2, ..., n}, but it would be helpful to mention this, rather than forcing the reader to look ahead to figure this out.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 12:13:20 PM
you might want to ensure that this figure doesn't appear all by itself on a page in the final version.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 3:43:55 PM
"Is" not "If".

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 3:49:33 PM
lattice L for which ...

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 3:52:50 PM
third

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 17/04/2008 3:52:58 PM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 4:15:22 PM
continuous

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 4:52:30 PM

f_j

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 5:18:20 PM
has this notation been defined?

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 17/04/2008 5:39:37 PM
should be lower case, or the start of a new sentence.

Author:		Subject: Callout		Date: 17/04/2008 11:42:07 PM

remind the reader where to find the definition of D_1.

Author: Subject: Callout Date: 18/04/2008 4:01:18 PM
consider labelling this lattice with alpha, beta, gamma, delta. my first attempt didn't work.

Author: Subject: Callout Date: 20/06/2008 11:10:52 AM
in most, or maybe all other instances, the \approx symbol is used instead of = in quasi-identities.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 18/04/2008 5:04:48 PM
I don't think that you get simple lattices in all cases. for example, when G = {a,b,c,d} and a is adjacent to all other elements, and there are no other edges, then L[G] has M_3 as a quotient (I think).

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 18/04/2008 5:05:16 PM
all we know at this point is that a is adjacent to all other vertices. this doesn't make G complete.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 18/04/2008 4:57:28 PM
remove "of"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 18/04/2008 5:05:46 PM
this conclusion is still valid, of course.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 21/04/2008 5:53:49 PM
how does this definition differ from mckenzie's original definition?

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 21/04/2008 5:54:16 PM
i couldn't find line (9) after def. 5.1.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 22/04/2008 11:25:56 AM
remove "it"

Author:　　　Subject: Callout　　　Date: 27/04/2008 4:14:42 PM

theorem

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 27/05/2008 9:58:57 AM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 9:58:36 AM
extra)

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 10:15:38 AM

lower case "i"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 10:15:55 AM

remove "i"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 10:16:09 AM

"i" not "r"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 10:18:52 AM

"b"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 10:19:05 AM

and clearly, (5) implies (2).

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 10:36:36 AM
remove

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 2:55:53 PM
slight mismatch in presentation here and on the next page.

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 27/05/2008 2:56:05 PM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 11:11:46 AM
adjust the spacing here.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 3:22:37 PM

isn't \tau_2 a transversal for E_1? \tau_1 isn't a transversal for E_2. E_2 should be (x,y) and (u,v)

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 3:09:18 PM

this needs to be fixed too and references to h in the proof need to be adjusted, depending on how E_1 and E_2 are defined.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 3:18:36 PM
strictly speaking, p*q is not a member of G, but is rather a \gamma class.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 3:47:54 PM

explain why the term "difference" is used for this kind of term.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 6:03:56 PM
remove

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 6:15:22 PM
remove "a"

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 6:21:55 PM
this should be "meet".

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 6:37:20 PM
is a term...

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 2:08:38 PM

remove

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 2:10:40 PM

\le

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 2:13:54 PM

z, not y

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 2:08:44 PM
proves

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 2:22:21 PM
intervals

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 29/05/2008 2:22:27 PM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 2:30:34 PM
lemma

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 4:03:03 PM
this is pretty much immediate, no need to refer to earlier claims.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 4:15:14 PM

is a ...

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 4:22:39 PM

why distinguish this as a separate claim? this is what is supposed to be proved in the theorem.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 27/05/2008 5:10:07 PM

develop

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 4:29:34 PM

we show that it is possible to ...

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 20/06/2008 11:36:56 AM

it isn't obvious why there are any prime congruences above \theta (unless i've missed something). so, up front, \theta' could be the intersection of the empty set. (which is this equal to 1_A). in any case, the construction of \pi shows that there must be prime congruences \ge \theta. you might want to address this issue in some manner, since others may have the same problem at this point. you could introduce a lemma that shows that if \sigma avoids a congruence then it can be extended to one that is prime and that is still avoided by \sigma. this is used in the next theorem as well.

Author:　　　Subject: Callout　　　　Date: 29/05/2008 4:45:33 PM

\sigma avoids \pi

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 10:03:14 AM
it would be helpful to point the reader to the definition of this. it has been many pages since we last saw this.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 10:35:14 AM
or just I_S.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 11:29:43 AM
I_S

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 12/06/2008 11:29:56 AM

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 12/06/2008 11:29:49 AM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 11:31:30 AM
7.4

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 11:42:13 AM
you could use P/Q/R here.

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 12/06/2008 11:42:17 AM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 1:21:58 PM

is it the case that up until this point, the fact that the intervals are solvability obstructions has not been used? if so, it might be worth mentioning this.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 1:20:59 PM

\nu is any congruence?

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 1:16:05 PM

adjust the spacing here.

at first i thought that this was a typo. consider using the \prime symbol, or some other symbol.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 10:59:23 PM
in a failure

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 29/05/2008 11:00:46 PM
by

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 3:50:55 PM
what assumptions are you making about V in this theorem? that is has a hobby-mckenzie term?

the ordering is reversed here: \beta^{2n-2} \le \beta^{2n-4}

the ordering is reversed here: \beta^{2n-2} \le \beta^{2n-4}

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 4:10:35 PM
2n-4

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 4:35:19 PM
a, not an

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 4:36:12 PM
Con(V)

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 5:04:04 PM

consider pointing out the similarity of this theorem and theorem 9.11 from hobby-mckenzie.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 5:03:01 PM
an idempotent maltsev condition.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 5:07:50 PM
isomorphic

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 20/06/2008 2:04:06 PM
is this similar to any of the configurations used in chapter 10 of Hobby-McKenzie? If so, please indicate which one.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 20/06/2008 2:06:05 PM
consider remarking that this generalizes Theorem 10.4 of Hobby-McKenzie.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 20/06/2008 1:02:06 PM
use a different symbol here.

Author: Subject: Line   Date: 20/06/2008 1:02:10 PM

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 10:46:34 PM
missing accent.

Author: Subject: Callout   Date: 12/06/2008 10:46:54 PM
schmidt