

Erratum to: Weak Convergence of a Mass-Structured Individual-Based Model

Fabien Campillo · Coralie Fritsch

Published online: 7 March 2015
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2015

Erratum to: Appl Math Optim
DOI 10.1007/s00245-014-9271-3

The author would like to correct the errors in the Original Publication.

1. Before the end of the Sect. 3.2 “Growth Flow”, the following text should be corrected:

$$\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{X}) = \dots$$

should be replaced by

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}) = \dots$$

The online version of the original article can be found under doi:[10.1007/s00245-014-9271-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00245-014-9271-3).

F. Campillo (✉)
INRIA, Montpellier, France
e-mail: Fabien.Campillo@inria.fr

C. Fritsch
Montpellier 2 University and INRA/MIA, Montpellier, France
e-mail: Coralie.Fritsch@supagro.inra.fr

F. Campillo · C. Fritsch
MODEMIC Project-Team, INRA/INRIA, UMR MISTEA, 2 Place Pierre Viala,
34060 Montpellier Cedex 01, France

2. The following text should be corrected of Proposition 4.6:

- Last line of the Proposition 4.6:

$$\dots \text{ and } v \in \mathcal{M}_F(\mathcal{X}).$$

should be replaced by

$$\dots \text{ and } v \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}).$$

- Under Proposition 4.6 first line of proof:

$$\dots \text{ and } v_0 = v \in \mathcal{M}_F(\mathcal{X}).$$

should be replaced by

$$\dots \text{ and } v_0 = v \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}).$$

- Under Proposition 4.6 suppress the second line of proof:

First we suppose that $v \in \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X})$.

- Page 18, suppress the last paragraph of the proof.

3. Remark 5.6, third line from the bottom: something could be added after “ $f \in C^1(\mathcal{X})$.” that is, replace:

and $f \in C^1(\mathcal{X})$. Note that this generator has the same “substrat” part than that of the initial generator (12) which again justifies the Remark 5.1.

by

and $f \in C^1(\mathcal{X})$; $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $v \in \mathcal{M}^n(\mathcal{X}) = \{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{x^i}, ; N \in \mathbb{N}, x^i \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Note that this generator has the same “substrat” part than that of the initial generator (12) which again justifies the Remark 5.1.