CORRIGENDUM: *THE ASYMPTOTIC FORMULA IN WARING'S PROBLEM*, INTERNAT. MATH. RES. NOTICES (2012), NO. 7, 1485–1504.

TREVOR D. WOOLEY

The author has detected an oversight in the proof of Theorem 2.1 of the paper which is sufficiently subtle that readers might be assisted by an explicit correction. The source of difficulty lies in the fact that, as currently organised, the function $\widetilde{K}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ defined following equation (19) may depend on y, so that the inequality (24) is valid only by carefully checking back through the argument. The most illuminating way to correct this oversight is to reorganise the relation (16) so that $\mathfrak{f}_y(\boldsymbol{\alpha};\gamma)$ and $K_y(\gamma)$ are replaced by

$$\mathfrak{f}_y(\boldsymbol{\alpha};\gamma)=\sum_{1\leqslant x\leqslant 2X} e(\psi(x-y;\boldsymbol{\alpha})+\gamma(x-y))$$

and

$$K(\gamma)=\sum_{1\leqslant z\leqslant X} e(-\gamma z).$$

The subscript y should then be dropped from all future occurrences of $K_y(\gamma)$. The subsequent argument now follows with the following slight modifications. First, in the definition of $\Delta(\theta,\boldsymbol{\gamma},h,y)$ at the top of page 1493, each occurrence of $\gamma_i x_i$ should be replaced by $\gamma_i(x_i-y)$. Also, on the right hand side of the third display following equation (21), and likewise in the first line of the following display, a factor $\omega_{y,\boldsymbol{\gamma}}=e(-(\gamma_1+\ldots+\gamma_s-\gamma_{s+1}-\ldots-\gamma_{2s})y)$ should be inserted. With this reorganisation, one now finds that $\widetilde{K}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ is independent of y, and so it is transparent that the inequality (24) does indeed hold.

School of Mathematics, University of Bristol, University Walk, Clifton, Bristol BS8 1TW, United Kingdom

E-mail address: matdw@bristol.ac.uk

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11P05, 11P55.

Key words and phrases. Waring's problem, Hardy-Littlewood method.