Möhle, Martin (2014) On hitting probabilities of beta coalescents and absorption times of coalescents that come down from infinity. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.* **11**, 141–159.

This file contains corrections concerning the article mentioned above. Moreover, two additional remarks are provided, which could be helpful for the reader.

## Corrections.

1. Page 153, Case 3: The part '(see remark after Lemma 4.4)' should be removed, since there is no such remark. The statement that there exists a constant C such that  $|b_n(k) - 1| \leq Ck/n$  is not correct, since, for k = n - 1,

$$b_n(n-1) = \frac{\Gamma(n)\Gamma(\alpha)}{\Gamma(n+\alpha-1)} \sim \Gamma(\alpha)n^{1-\alpha} \to \infty, \qquad n \to \infty.$$

Therefore, the proof concerning Case 3 has to be modified from page 153, line 12 on as follows. Split the sum  $S := \sum_{k=m-1}^{n-1} b_n(k) a_{k-m+1}/k$  into two parts  $S = S_1 + S_2$ , where

$$S_1 := \sum_{k=m-1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} b_n(k) \frac{a_{k-m+1}}{k} \text{ and } S_2 := \sum_{k=\lfloor n/2 \rfloor+1}^{n-1} b_n(k) \frac{a_{k-m+1}}{k}$$

Since  $\alpha \in (0,1)$  it follows that  $b_n(k) = \prod_{j=1}^k (n-j)/(n-j+\alpha-1)$  is non-decreasing in  $k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$  and, hence,

$$|S_2| \leq \frac{b_n(n-1)}{n/2} \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} |a_{k-m+1}| = 2\alpha \frac{b_n(n-1)}{n} \sim 2\alpha \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)}{n^{\alpha}} \to 0, \qquad n \to \infty.$$

Therefore,  $S_2 \to 0$  as  $n \to \infty$ . It remains to consider  $S_1$ . For  $k \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$  we have

$$1 \leq b_n(k) \leq b_n(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor) = \frac{\Gamma(n)\Gamma(n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor+\alpha-1)}{\Gamma(n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)\Gamma(n+\alpha-1)} \sim \frac{(n-\lfloor n/2 \rfloor)^{\alpha-1}}{n^{\alpha-1}} \sim 2^{1-\alpha}$$

as  $n \to \infty$ . Thus it is allowed to apply dominated convergence to the sum  $S_1$  (interpreted as an integral with respect to the counting measure on  $\{m-1, m, \ldots\}$ ), which yields

$$S_1 = \sum_{k=m-1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} b_n(k) \frac{a_{k-m+1}}{k} \to \sum_{k=m-1}^{\infty} \frac{a_{k-m+1}}{k} = \int_0^1 \frac{t^{m-1}}{L_\alpha(t)} \, \mathrm{d}t, \qquad n \to \infty.$$

2. Page 157: In the last displayed line  $E(\tau)$  should be replaced by  $\mathbb{E}(\tau)$ .

**Remark 1.** Theorem 2.1 on p. 143 provides the main formula (2.2) for the hitting probability h(n,m) of the block counting process of the  $\beta(2 - \alpha, \alpha)$ -coalescent with parameter  $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ . We verify below that (2.2) reduces for  $\alpha = 1$  (Bolthausen–Sznitman coalescent) to the formula (11) in [1].

**Proof.** Clearly, for  $\alpha = 1$ , (2.2) reduces to

$$h(n,m) = (m-1) \sum_{k=m-1}^{n-1} [z^k] \int_0^z \frac{t^{m-1}}{L_1(t)} dt.$$

By (2.3) and (4.11),

$$[z^{k}] \int_{0}^{z} \frac{t^{m-1}}{L_{1}(t)} dt = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k-m+1} (-1)^{j} \sum_{\substack{n_{1},\dots,n_{j} \in \mathbb{N}\\n_{1}+\dots+n_{j}=k-m+1}} \frac{1}{(n_{1}+1)\cdots(n_{j}+1)} = \frac{a_{k-m+1}}{k},$$

where  $a_0, a_1, \ldots$  are the coefficients in the Taylor expansion  $z/L_1(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j z^j$ . Thus,

$$h(n,m) = (m-1) \sum_{k=m-1}^{n-1} \frac{a_{k-m+1}}{k} = (m-1) \sum_{j=0}^{n-m} \frac{a_j}{j+m-1}$$

which is Eq. (11) of [1]. Note that in [1] the alternative representation  $a_j = (-1)^j / j! \int_0^1 (x)_j dx$  for the coefficient  $a_j$  is used (see [1, Lemma 3.1]).

**Remark 2.** On p. 155 at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 3.3 it is stated that  $\tau_{\infty}$  almost surely coincides with  $\tau$ . We verify below the slightly stronger result that  $\tau_{\infty}(\omega) = \tau(\omega)$  for all  $\omega \in \Omega$ .

**Proof.** Fix  $\omega \in \Omega$ . Clearly,  $\{t > 0 : N_t(\omega) = 1\} \subseteq \{t > 0 : N_t^{(n)}(\omega) = 1\}$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and, hence,  $\tau_n(\omega) := \inf\{t > 0 : N_t^{(n)}(\omega) = 1\} \leq \inf\{t > 0 : N_t(\omega) = 1\} =: \tau$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Taking the limit  $n \to \infty$  it follows that  $\tau_{\infty}(\omega) \leq \tau(\omega)$ . Assume now that  $\tau_{\infty}(\omega) < \tau(\omega)$ . Then there exists  $t = t(\omega) \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $\tau_{\infty}(\omega) < t < \tau(\omega)$ .

Assume now that  $\tau_{\infty}(\omega) < \tau(\omega)$ . Then there exists  $t = t(\omega) \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $\tau_{\infty}(\omega) < t < \tau(\omega)$ . Since  $\tau_n(\omega) \leq \tau_{\infty}(\omega)$  it follows that  $\tau_n(\omega) < t$  and hence  $N_t^{(n)}(\omega) = 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . But this implies that  $N_t(\omega) = 1$  and hence  $\tau(\omega) \leq t$  in contradiction to  $t < \tau(\omega)$ . Thus, the assumption is wrong and we have  $\tau_{\infty}(\omega) = \tau(\omega)$ .

## References

 MÖHLE, M. (2014) Asymptotic hitting probabilities for the Bolthausen–Sznitman coalescent. J. Appl. Probab. 51A, 87-97. MR3317352