Errata

Publication VI

Equation 5 is ambiguous when referencing previously undefined accounts. Such a reference would not be part of the $\alpha$ set, as an “undefined account” does have a default value (all zeros) in Ethereum. The provided definition could leave such a reference out of the $\alpha$ set as leaving it out does not alter the outcome! This is not, however, the intent. Thus, while equation 5 is slightly incorrect, definition 6 is still correct. Rest of the proof depends on definition 6 (i.e., on the intent) and not on equation 5, and therefore the validity of the proof is not changed.