Commun. Math. Phys. 323, 449–450 (2013)
Digital Object Identifier (DOI) 10.1007/s00220-013-1768-0

Communications in
Mathematical Physics

Erratum

Erratum to: Self-Attractive Random Walks: The Case of Critical Drifts

Dmitry Ioffe[1,⋆], **Yvan Velenik**[2,⋆⋆]

[1] Technion, Technion City, Haifa 32000, Israel. E-mail: ieioffe@technion.ac.il
[2] Section de Math., Université de Genève, 2-4 rue du Lièvre, Case Postale 64, 1211 Genève 4, Switzerland. E-mail: Yvan.Velenik@unige.ch

Received: 25 April 2013 / Accepted: 27 June 2013
Published online: 10 July 2013 –

Commun. Math. Phys. **313**, no. 1, 209–235 (2012)

We provide suitably amended versions of part of the statement and the proof of Lemma 1 of [1], which were incorrect. We also use this opportunity to add a couple of comments.

Corrections to Lemma 1. The statement that A is super-multiplicative and the resulting upper bound (8) are incorrect. We should instead consider first the function

$$H(x) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sum_{\gamma:0\to x} a(\gamma)\, \mathbf{1}_{\{\ell_\gamma[x]=1\}}.$$

Since H is super-multiplicative,

$$\xi_H(x) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} -\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log H(\lfloor nx \rfloor)$$

is well-defined and $H(x) \le \mathrm{e}^{-\xi_H(x)}$. Moreover, the elementary bound $H(x) \le e^{-\phi(1)\|x\|}$ shows that ξ_H is a norm on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

The existence of ξ, as stated in Lemma 1, follows from the identity $\xi = \xi_H$, which is obtained along the lines of the proof of Lemma 1 in the following fashion. Let $k_0 \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \sup_{y\neq 0} \xi_H(y)/\|y\|$. Since $A(x) \ge H(x)$ and, by (9),

$$\sum_{k>2k_0} A^{(k)}(x) \lesssim e^{-k_0\phi(1)\|x\|},$$

⋆ Supported by the Israeli Science Foundation grant 817/09.

⋆⋆ Supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation.

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:10.1007/s00220-012-1492-1.

it follows that

$$A(x) \lesssim \sum_{k \le 2k_0} A^{(k)}(x) \le H(x) \sum_{k \le 2k_0} G_{\Lambda_{(k+1)\|x\|}}(x,x) \lesssim C_d(x) H(x),$$

where

$$C_d(x) \stackrel{\triangle}{=} \begin{cases} k_0^3 \|x\|^2, & d = 1, \\ k_0 \log(k_0)\|x\|, & d = 2, \\ k_0, & d \ge 3. \end{cases}$$

The desired identity $\xi = \xi_H$ now follows from $H(x) \le A(x) \lesssim C_d(x)H(x)$.

Note that (8) should be replaced by

$$A(x) \le e^{-\xi(x) + \log C_d(x)}.$$

This, however, has no impact on the coarse-graining estimates of Sect. 2, and consequently on the rest of the arguments in the paper, for the following two reasons: First, we are actually working with the function H rather than A in Sect. 2 (using first exit times from balls) for which (8) holds. Second, the coarse-graining estimates would actually go through with any uniform estimate of the type $A(x) \le e^{-\xi(x)(1-o(1))}$.

Extension of Lemma 1. A closer look at the proof of Lemma 1 (and a slightly more involved argument) reveals that positivity of the critical Lyapunov exponent holds whenever $\phi \ge 0$ and $\phi(1) > 0$ with no additional assumption on monotonicity of ϕ. Note, however, that the monotonicity assumption on ϕ is used in an essential way in the rest of the paper.

Bibliographical complement. The fact that the *quenched* Brownian motion in Poissonian potential undergoes a first order phase transition from a collapsed phase to a stretched phase has been established in [2].

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank A.-S. Sznitman for pointing out reference [2].

References

1. Ioffe, D., Velenik, Y.: Self-attractive random walks: the case of critical drifts. Commun. Math. Phys. **313**(1), 209–235 (2012)
2. Sznitman, A.-S.: Crossing velocities and random lattice animals. Ann. Prob. **23**(3), 1006–1023 (1995)

Communicated by F. L. Toninelli