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

$$\Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\ell}(\vec{n}) := \sum_{\sigma \in S(k)} \prod_{1 \le B < A \le k} \frac{z_{\sigma(A)} - q z_{\sigma(B)}}{z_{\sigma(A)} - z_{\sigma(B)}} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{1 - z_{\sigma(j)}}{1 - \nu z_{\sigma(j)}} \right)^{-n_j},$$

$$\Psi_{\vec{z}}^{r}(\vec{n}) := (-1)^k (1-q)^k q^{\frac{k(k-1)}{2}} \mathfrak{m}_{q,\nu}(\vec{n}) \sum_{\sigma \in S(k)} \prod_{1 \le B < A \le k} \frac{z_{\sigma(A)} - q^{-1} z_{\sigma(B)}}{z_{\sigma(A)} - z_{\sigma(B)}} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \left(\frac{1 - z_{\sigma(j)}}{1 - \nu z_{\sigma(j)}} \right)^{n_j}$$

where $\vec{n} = (n_1 \ge \ldots \ge n_k)$. (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]

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

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

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

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

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

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:

$$\Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\mathrm{ASEP}}(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = \Psi_{-\vec{z}}^{\ell}(x_k, \ldots, x_1)|_{q = \nu^{-1} = \tau},$$

$$(\mathcal{R} \Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\mathrm{ASEP}})(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{x_1 < \ldots < x_k} = (\tau^{-1} - 1)^{-k} \Psi_{-\vec{z}}^{r}(x_k, \ldots, x_1)|_{q = \nu^{-1} = \tau}.$$

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

$$\oint_{\widetilde{\gamma}_{-1}} \ldots \oint_{\widetilde{\gamma}_{-1}} d\mathfrak{m}_{(1^k)}^{(\tau)}(\vec{z}) \prod_{j=1}^{k} \frac{1 - 1/\tau}{(1 + z_j)(1 + z_j/\tau)} \Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\mathrm{ASEP}}(\vec{x}) (\mathcal{R} \Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\mathrm{ASEP}})(\vec{y}) = \mathbf{1}_{\vec{x} = \vec{y}}, \tag{2}$$

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 $\nu = 1/q$ occures 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 $\Psi_{\vec{z}}^{\ell}$ and $\Psi_{\vec{z}'}^{r}$, 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 $q = 1/\nu = \tau$):

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

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 $\nu = \boldsymbol{\theta}$.

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`