ERRATUM

It is not true in general, as claimed in the proof of [Dru19, Proposition 3.1], that the kernel of the morphism $T_X \to \Omega_X^{r-1} \otimes \mathscr{O}_X(-K_{\mathscr{G}})$ given by the contraction with β is a vector bundle $\mathscr{E}$ on X such that $T_X \cong \mathscr{G} \oplus \mathscr{E}$.

The following corrects the proof of *loc. cit.*

The contraction with β gives a morphism $\wedge^{r-1}\mathscr{G} \to \Omega_X^1 \otimes \mathscr{O}_X(-K_{\mathscr{G}})$ such that the composed map $\wedge^{r-1}\mathscr{G} \to \Omega_X^1 \otimes \mathscr{O}_X(-K_{\mathscr{G}}) \to \mathscr{G}^* \otimes \mathscr{O}_X(-K_{\mathscr{G}})$ is an isomorphism since $\beta(v)$ is constant and non-zero. The kernel $\mathscr{E}$ of the induced map $T_X \to (\wedge^{r-1}\mathscr{G})^* \otimes \mathscr{O}_X(-K_{\mathscr{G}})$ then yields a decomposition $T_X \cong \mathscr{G} \oplus \mathscr{E}$ of T_X.

References

[Dru19] Stéphane Druel, *On foliations with semi-positive anti-canonical bundle*, Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **50** (2019), no. 1, 315–321.