**Erratum to 'Y. Akama, S. Berardi, S. Hayashi, U. Kohlenbach: An arithmetical hierarchy of the law of excluded middle and related principles. LICS 2004.'**
**September 12, 2020**

As was recently pointed out in [1], there is an oversight in the proof of Theorem 2.7 and, in fact, part (*ii*) of this theorem (while correct for formulas not containing $\vee$) needs to have a restricted double-negation-shift principle $U_k$-DNS added to the verifying theory which e.g. follows from $\neg\neg(\Pi^0_k \vee \Pi^0_k)$-DNE (see [2] for a detailed study of such principles). This has no consequences for the rest of the paper (in particular Corollaries 2.8,2.9 remain valid) but leaves open the possibility that $E_k$-DNE might be strictly stronger than $\Sigma^0_k$-DNE. In any case, $E_k$-DNE has the same relation to all other principles in Figure 2 as $\Sigma^0_k$-DNE has since it still follows from $\Sigma^0_k$-LEM (which is equivalent to $E_k$-LEM by Corollary 2.9) while it does not imply $\Sigma^0_k$-LLPO (Proof for $k = 1$ : $E_1$-DNE$\subseteq \Sigma_1$-DNE+$U_1$-DNS has a direct (without negative translation) functional interpretation by bar-recursive functionals while $\Sigma^0_1$-LLPO has not (since it has $\Pi^0_3$-consequences without computable Skolem functions).

[1] M. Fujiwara, T. Kurahashi: Prenex normal form theorems in semi-classical arithmetic. arXiv:2009.03485v1, 2020.
[2] M. Fujiwara, U. Kohlenbach: Interrelation between weak fragments of double negation shift and related principles. J. Symb. Logic vol. 83, pp. 991-1012 (2018).