ERRATA OF
A. C. G. Mennucci.
On asymmetric distances.
Analysis and Geometry in Metric Spaces, 1:200–231, 2013.
DOI: 10.2478/agms-2013-0004.
URL http://cvgmt.sns.it/person/109/

The following are minor corrections in the paper; there is not (yet) an official errata in the journal.
There is also an improvement for Prop.3.18.

In Lemma 2.17 we should also ask that $\gamma \circ \varphi^{-1} \in C_{01}$, otherwise Φ may fail to be invertible.

In Theorem 2.19 point 3 is for when $\gamma \in C$.
(This mistake may actually be due to the fact that, in a version of LaTeX that I was using last year, the $\not\in$ was rendered as $\in$).
A point 5 may be added for the case when γ is not in C , in this case
if γ is a “limit point” for C then $Len^b(\gamma) = \liminf len(\xi)$ for $\xi \in C, \xi \to \gamma$
if γ is not a “limit point” for C, $Len^b(\gamma) = +\infty$.

Lemma 2.24 claims that "φ, φ^{-1} are Lipschitz" but the homeomorphism φ that is defined in the proof is AC and not Lipschitz. Note that φ^{-1} is Lipschitz.
Due to Lemma 2.23, this mistake does not affect the Prop. 2.25

For the same reason, the footnote 12 is to be deleted.

In Lemma 2.24 the homeomorphism φ is increasing (as required by Definition 2.4).

The proof of Proposition 3.18 contains a glitch; it may be the case that the given class C contains curves that have infinite length (this is permitted by the definition of "run-continuous length structure"); in this case obviously C cannot be a subset of C_r . So as a first step in the proof we must ignore all curves of infinite length in C. Since we are interested in the induced distance, this does not affect the result.

Proposition 3.18 can be improved. In point 2 there is no need to assume that the length is lower semi continuous.

Summarizing the abot two remarks, the proof of 3.18 changes as follows.
Proof. Let E be the set of $\gamma \in C$ such that $len(\gamma) < \infty$.
Note that b is also the distance induced by (E, len).
Consider the class C_r in (M, b) and induce b^r from (C_r , Len^b).
Recalling from Theorem 2.19 that $len \ge Len^b$ on E, we obtain that $E \subseteq C_r$.
Consider the class E in (M, b) and b^l the distance induced by (E, Len^b) then (by the point 4 in the aforementioned theorem) $b \equiv b^l$.
Since $E \subseteq C_r$ so $b^l \ge br$; but also $b \le b^r$.
(If moreover len is l.s.c. in the DF topology then len = Lenb on C.)

This new version of Prop.3.18 directly proves the Prop. 3.19

The "General Metric Space" (Definition 3.4) also has the axiom
$\forall x, y \in M, b(x, y) = 0 \Rightarrow x = y$;
(i.e. it is "strongly separated" as defined in [16]).

In example 4.1 the point 2 should be deleted (it is redundant and it points to a non-existent proposition 1.3 that is instead an example); point 7 repeats the same assertion and references the correct proposition.

In example 4.6 the joining of two paths in C_H is not necessarily in C_H, so the pair (C_H,len_5) is not really a length structure; a larger class C_P is needed, that contains all possible joins of paths in C_H (namely, the paths that are continuous and piecewise injective), so (C_P,len_5) is a length structure.
(This change though does not affect the significance of the example).

In the whole of the paper the notation [a,b] was used to define an interval, but this is an abuse of notations since b is also the distance function.
(In [16] I used the interval [a,c])

A. Mennucci