



MIT Open Access Articles

Correction to: Spectral Theory for Interacting Particle Systems Solvable by Coordinate Bethe Ansatz

The MIT Faculty has made this article openly available. **Please share** how this access benefits you. Your story matters.

As Published	https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-019-03528-y
Publisher	Springer Berlin Heidelberg
Version	Author's final manuscript
Citable link	https://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/131554
Terms of Use	Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike
Detailed Terms	http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/

Correction to: Spectral Theory for Interacting Particle Systems Solvable by Coordinate Bethe Ansatz

Cite this article as: Alexei Borodin, Ivan Corwin, Leonid Petrov and Tomohiro Sasamoto, Correction to: Spectral Theory for Interacting Particle Systems Solvable by Coordinate Bethe Ansatz, Communications in Mathematical Physics <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-019-03528-y>

This Author Accepted Manuscript is a PDF file of an unedited peer-reviewed manuscript that has been accepted for publication but has not been copyedited or corrected. The official version of record that is published in the journal is kept up to date and so may therefore differ from this version.

Terms of use and reuse: academic research for non-commercial purposes, see here for full terms. <https://www.springer.com/aam-terms-v1>

Author accepted manuscript

ERRATUM TO “SPECTRAL THEORY FOR INTERACTING PARTICLE SYSTEMS SOLVABLE BY COORDINATE BETHE ANSATZ”

ALEXEI BORODIN, IVAN CORWIN, LEONID PETROV, AND TOMOHIRO SASAMOTO

This is a correction to Theorems 7.3 and 8.12 in [1]. These statements claimed to deduce the spatial Plancherel formula (spatial biorthogonality) of the ASEP and XXZ eigenfunctions from the corresponding statements for the eigenfunctions of the q -Hahn system. Such a reduction is wrong. We are grateful to Yier Lin for pointing this out to us.

We have updated the arXiv version of the paper with the necessary corrections [2]. Below is the summary of the issue and the steps we made to correct the presentation of the ASEP and XXZ applications of our results about the q -Hahn eigenfunctions.

q -Hahn spatial biorthogonality. Recall that the q -Hahn left and right eigenfunctions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\ell}(\vec{n}) &:= \sum_{\sigma \in S(k)} \prod_{1 \leq B < A \leq k} \frac{z_{\sigma(A)} - qz_{\sigma(B)}}{z_{\sigma(A)} - z_{\sigma(B)}} \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{1 - z_{\sigma(j)}}{1 - \nu z_{\sigma(j)}} \right)^{-n_j}, \\ \Psi_{\vec{z}}^r(\vec{n}) &:= (-1)^k (1 - q)^k q^{\frac{k(k-1)}{2}} \mathbf{m}_{q,\nu}(\vec{n}) \sum_{\sigma \in S(k)} \prod_{1 \leq B < A \leq k} \frac{z_{\sigma(A)} - q^{-1}z_{\sigma(B)}}{z_{\sigma(A)} - z_{\sigma(B)}} \prod_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{1 - z_{\sigma(j)}}{1 - \nu z_{\sigma(j)}} \right)^{n_j} \end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{n} = (n_1 \geq \dots \geq n_k)$. (Here and below we bring only the essential notation from the original paper [1].) Their spatial biorthogonality written in the small contour form reads [1, Corollary 3.13]

$$\sum_{\lambda \vdash k} \oint_{\gamma_k} \dots \oint_{\gamma_k} d\mathbf{m}_{\lambda}^{(q)}(\vec{w}) \prod_{j=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} \frac{1}{(w_j; q)_{\lambda_j} (\nu w_j; q)_{\lambda_j}} \Psi_{\vec{w} \circ \lambda}^{\ell}(\vec{n}) \Psi_{\vec{w} \circ \lambda}^r(\vec{m}) = \mathbf{1}_{\vec{m}=\vec{n}}, \quad (1)$$

with all integration contours being small positively oriented circles around 1, and where

$$d\mathbf{m}_{\lambda}^{(q)}(\vec{w}) := \frac{(1 - q)^k (-1)^k q^{-\frac{k^2}{2}}}{m_1! m_2! \dots} \det \left[\frac{1}{w_i q^{\lambda_i} - w_j} \right]_{i,j=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} w_j^{\lambda_j} q^{\frac{\lambda_j^2}{2}} \frac{dw_j}{2\pi \mathbf{i}}.$$

Here $\vec{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{\ell(\lambda)}) \in \mathbb{C}^{\ell(\lambda)}$, and m_j is the number of components of λ equal to j (so that $\lambda = 1^{m_1} 2^{m_2} \dots$), and

$$\vec{w} \circ \lambda := (w_1, qw_1, \dots, q^{\lambda_1-1} w_1, w_2, qw_2, \dots, q^{\lambda_2-1} w_2, \dots, w_{\ell(\lambda)}, qw_{\ell(\lambda)}, \dots, q^{\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}-1} w_{\ell(\lambda)}) \in \mathbb{C}^k.$$

ASEP spatial biorthogonality. To obtain the ASEP eigenfunctions from the q -Hahn ones we set $\nu = 1/q = 1/\tau$, where $\tau \in (0, 1)$ is the ASEP asymmetry parameter:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\text{ASEP}}(x_1, \dots, x_k) &= \Psi_{-\vec{z}}^{\ell}(x_k, \dots, x_1)|_{q=\nu^{-1}=\tau}, \\ (\mathcal{R}\Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\text{ASEP}})(x_1, \dots, x_k) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{x_1 < \dots < x_k} &= (\tau^{-1} - 1)^{-k} \Psi_{-\vec{z}}^r(x_k, \dots, x_1)|_{q=\nu^{-1}=\tau}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $x_1 < \dots < x_k$ are the ASEP spatial coordinates. The spatial biorthogonality of the ASEP eigenfunctions reads

$$\oint_{\tilde{\gamma}_{-1}} \dots \oint_{\tilde{\gamma}_{-1}} d\mathbf{m}_{(1^k)}^{(\tau)}(\vec{z}) \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{1 - 1/\tau}{(1 + z_j)(1 + z_j/\tau)} \Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\text{ASEP}}(\vec{x}) (\mathcal{R}\Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\text{ASEP}})(\vec{y}) = \mathbf{1}_{\vec{x}=\vec{y}}, \quad (2)$$

where the integration is performed over sufficiently small positively oriented circles around -1 . This biorthogonality of the ASEP eigenfunctions follows from the paper by Tracy and Widom [4], as we explain in detail in [2, Proof of Theorem 7.3]. Next we discuss the gap in our original argument.

Why (2) does not follow from (1) as claimed. The “proof” of ASEP spatial biorthogonality given in [1] claimed to deduce (2) by plugging $\nu = 1/q$ into (1) before performing the integration. Indeed, identity (2) looks as if one takes the q -Hahn small contour formula (1), removes all terms corresponding to partitions $\lambda \neq (1^k)$, and then plugs in $\nu = 1/q$, $q = \tau$. Formula (2) (following from [4]) *a posteriori* implies that under this specialization, the contribution of all additional terms with $\lambda \neq (1^k)$ vanishes.

First, observe that the substitution $\nu = 1/q$ before the integration might change the value of the integral because of the factors of the form $\frac{1}{1-q\nu w_i}$ in the integrand for $\lambda \neq (1^k)$. Before the substitution $\nu = 1/q$ the residue at $w_i = (q\nu)^{-1}$ was not picked while after the substitution we have $1 - q\nu w_i = 1 - w_i$, so this factor adds an extra pole inside the integration contour.

With the agreement that the substitution $\nu = 1/q$ occurs after the integration, the “proof” of (2) presented in [1] asserted a stronger statement: For each individual $\lambda \neq (1^k)$ and any two permutations $\sigma, \omega \in S(k)$ (coming from Ψ_z^ℓ and Ψ_z^r , respectively) the corresponding term vanishes after setting $\nu = 1/q$. This assertion is wrong.

For example, take $\vec{x} = (10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5)$ and $\vec{y} = (5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0)$. The summand in the integrand in (1) corresponding to $\lambda = (3, 2, 1)$, and permutations $\sigma = 321546$ and $\omega = 645123$ has the form (before setting $q = 1/\nu = \tau$):

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{const} \cdot \frac{(1 - \nu q w_1)^7 (1 - \nu q w_2)^3}{(1 - w_1)^7 (1 - w_2)^3 (1 - w_3)} \\ & \times \frac{(q w_1 - w_2) (q^2 w_1 - w_2)^2 (q^3 w_1 - w_2) (q^2 w_1 - w_3) (q^3 w_1 - w_3) (q w_2 - w_3) (q^2 w_2 - w_3)}{(w_1 - w_2)(w_1 - w_3)(w_2 - w_3)(q w_2 - w_1)^2 (q^2 w_2 - w_1) (q w_3 - w_1)(q w_3 - w_2)} \\ & \times f_1(w_1) f_2(w_2) f_3(w_3). \end{aligned}$$

Here $f_1(w_1)$ is independent of w_2, w_3 and has no zeroes or poles at $w_1 = 1$ and $w_1 = 1/(q\nu)$, and similarly for $f_2(w_2)$ and $f_3(w_3)$. One can check that the residue of this term at $w_3 = 1$, $w_2 = 1$, and $w_1 = 1$ does not vanish when setting $q = 1/\nu$. (Note that the result of the integration depends on the order of taking the residues for individual summands due to the presence of the factors of the form $w_i - w_j$ in the denominators. These factors cancel out after summing over all permutations σ, ω , and each summand indexed by λ is independent of the order of integration because the result of the summation is a function symmetric in the w_i 's.)

Let us mention another (possibly related) subtlety in the spatial biorthogonality of the ASEP eigenfunctions as compared to the general q -Hahn case. Namely, in the q -Hahn situation the contribution of individual permutations coming from the eigenfunctions vanishes, while in the ASEP case this is not the case (see [2, Remark 7.6] for details). The proof of the ASEP statement in [4] employs nontrivial combinatorics to determine cancellations of specific combinations of permutations.

Corrections we made in the new version [2] compared to the published version [1]. We have replaced the incorrect “proof” of Theorem 7.3 (spatial biorthogonality of the ASEP eigenfunctions) by its derivation from the earlier result of Tracy and Widom [4]. We have also removed Theorem 8.12 which claimed a spatial biorthogonality statement of the XXZ eigenfunctions based on a similar incorrect direct substitution $\nu = \theta$.

The same gap in [3]. The claim similar to (1) but with more general $\nu = q^{-I}$, where I is an arbitrary positive integer, is made in [3, Appendix A] (by a subset of the current authors). When $I = 1$, this identity is correct, but does not follow from the general $\nu \in (0, 1)$ formulas (as explained above). Moreover, for $I \geq 2$ the claimed orthogonality does not seem to hold as stated. A separate erratum will be prepared to address the issues in the work [3].

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Borodin, I. Corwin, L. Petrov, and T. Sasamoto, *Spectral theory for interacting particle systems solvable by coordinate Bethe ansatz*, Commun. Math. Phys. **339** (2015), no. 3, 1167–1245.
- [2] ———, *Spectral theory for interacting particle systems solvable by coordinate Bethe ansatz. Updated version*, 2018, arXiv:1407.8534v4 [math-ph]. Available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.8534v4>.
- [3] I. Corwin and L. Petrov, *Stochastic higher spin vertex models on the line*, Commun. Math. Phys. **343** (2016), no. 2, 651–700, arXiv:1502.07374 [math.PR].
- [4] C. Tracy and H. Widom, *Integral formulas for the asymmetric simple exclusion process*, Comm. Math. Phys. **279** (2008), 815–844, arXiv:0704.2633 [math.PR]. Erratum: Commun. Math. Phys., 304:875–878, 2011.

A. BORODIN, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 77 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139-4307, USA, AND INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS, BOLSHOY KARETNY PER. 19, MOSCOW 127994, RUSSIA

Email address: borodin@math.mit.edu

I. CORWIN, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 2990 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, NY 10027, USA

Email address: ivan.corwin@gmail.com

L. PETROV, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 141 CABELL DRIVE, KERCHOF HALL, P.O. BOX 400137, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22904-4137, USA AND INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TRANSMISSION PROBLEMS, BOLSHOY KARETNY PER. 19, MOSCOW, 127994, RUSSIA

Email address: lenia.petrov@gmail.com

T. SASAMOTO, DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS, TOKYO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY 2-12-1 OOKAYAMA, MEGURO-KU, TOKYO, 152-8550, JAPAN

Email address: sasamoto@phys.titech.ac.jp