The following corrections should be made to the above mentioned paper:

1. On p. 350, Theorem 5.2, line 3 of the operator $\overset{s}{D}_{(4,p)}$ should be replaced by

$$+\overset{c}{\nabla}_u C^{u\,a\,b}_{\cdot\;\cdot\;\cdot\;i_1}\{a_6\overset{c}{\nabla}_a u_{bi_2\ldots i_p} + a_7\overset{c}{\nabla}_b u_{ai_2\ldots i_p} + a_8\overset{c}{\nabla}_{i_2} u_{abi_3\ldots i_p}\}.$$

2. On p. 354, Theorem 6.1, line 4 of the operator $D^*_{(2,p)}$ should be replaced by

$$+c_3(\overset{c}{\nabla}_u C^{u\;\;\;ab}_{\cdot\;\alpha_1\;\cdot\;\cdot}\overset{c}{\nabla}_{\alpha_2} u_{ab\alpha_3\ldots\alpha_p} + \overset{c}{\nabla}_u C^{ua}_{\cdot\;\cdot\;\alpha_1\alpha_2}\overset{c}{\nabla}^k u_{ka\alpha_3\ldots\alpha_p}).$$

3. On p. 356, line 24: Mclenagan should be replaced by McLenaghan.

4. The referee of the paper for "Mathematical Reviews" observed that the meaning of the expression "leading term " in Theorem 6.2 is not quite clear. The author take this to mean that there is a term $\Box^2$ with non-zero coefficient and all other terms are of lower order. In this meaning Theorem 6.2 is correct. On the other side, if we consider general fourth-order operators on $\wedge^2$, then the following theorem holds:

Theorem 6.3. *If $n = 4$, the operator $\overset{a}{D}_{4,2}$ defined on $\wedge^2$ by*

$$\overset{a}{D}_{4,2}[u]_{\alpha_1\alpha_2} = \overset{c}{\Box}(\overset{c}{d}\overset{c}{\delta} - \overset{c}{\delta}\overset{c}{d})u_{\alpha_1\alpha_2} - 2(\overset{c}{d}\overset{c}{\delta} - \overset{c}{\delta}\overset{c}{d})[C_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}{}^{ab}_{\cdot\;\cdot}\, u_{ab}]$$
$$+ C_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}{}^{ab}_{\cdot\;\cdot}\overset{c}{\Box}\, u_{ab} - 4C_{\alpha_1}{}^{kab}\overset{c}{\nabla}_{(k}\overset{c}{\nabla}_{\alpha_2)} u_{ab}$$

is a fourth-order conformal covariant on $\wedge^2$ with $\omega = -2$ and $\omega_0 = 1$.

The proof of Theorem 6.3 is analogous to that of [40: p. 279/Proposition 3.5] and of Theorems 5.2 and 5.3.

Remark 6.2. The spinor equivalent of (5.4) is

$$\varepsilon_{A_1A_2}\overline{S}_{\dot{A}_1\dot{A}_2} + \varepsilon_{\dot{A}_1\dot{A}_2}S_{A_1A_2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{S}_{\dot{A}_1\dot{A}_2} = {} & 2\overset{c}{\Box}\,\overset{c}{\nabla}{}^E{}_{\dot{A}_1}\overset{c}{\nabla}{}^F{}_{\dot{A}_2} u_{EF} \\ & - 8\overset{c}{\nabla}{}^E{}_{\dot{A}_1}\overset{c}{\nabla}{}^F{}_{\dot{A}_2}[\psi_{EF}{}^{AB}_{\cdot\;\cdot}\, u_{AB}] \\ & + 4\psi_{EF}{}^{AB}_{\cdot\;\cdot}\overset{c}{\nabla}{}^E{}_{\dot{A}_1}\overset{c}{\nabla}{}^F{}_{\dot{A}_2} u_{AB}\end{aligned}$$

and

$$u_{\alpha_1\alpha_2} \leftrightarrow \varepsilon_{A_1A_2}\overline{u}_{\dot{A}_1\dot{A}_2} + \varepsilon_{\dot{A}_1\dot{A}_2}u_{A_1A_2}$$

[see [16] and the paper "*On Conformal Invariants Built from Spinor Fields*" by R. Gerlach and V. Wünsch in Math. Nachr. 223 (2001), 49 – 64]. To prove the property of (5.5) to be conformal covariant is much easier than that one of (5.4).

ISSN 0232-2064 / $ 2.50 © Heldermann Verlag Berlin

Acknowledgement. The author is very grateful to M. Eastwood and R. Gover for various suggestions and observations.

Received 21.03.2002