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Abstract


p. v, l. -4: “motivation” should be “motivation”.
p. 5, l. -1: “cover basics” should be “cover the basics”.
p. vi, l. 20: “continuations” should be “continuations”.
p. vi, l. 10: “intuitionistic” should be “intuitionistic”.
p. 1, l. 16: “λ-term(s)” should be “λ-) terms”.
p. 7, l. -15: “computational” should be “computational”.
p. 12, l. 18: delete “if”.
p. 12, l. 12: “v” should be “w”.
p. 13, l. 2: “prerequisites” should be “prerequisites”.
p. 13, l. 6: “an” should be “and”.
p. 13, l. 13: rightmost “ψ” should be “φ”.
p. 19, l. -8: Remark. We abuse notation here and write “0^op = 1 and 1^op = 0”. Of course, we mean is that if 0 is initial in C, then 0^op is terminal in C^op, and that if 1 is terminal in C, then 1^op is initial in C^op.
p. 20, l. -5: “have evident” should be “have the evident”.
p. 21, l. 7: “provide and example” should be “provide an example”
p. 22, l. 4: “is monad” should be “is a monad”.
   p. 22: each “T” in the box surrounding Definition 1.11 should be a “U”.
p. 22, l. -1: “is co-monad” should be “is a co-monad”.
p. 24, l. 8: “constructions” should be “constructions”.
p. 24, l. -10: “motivation” should be “motivation”.
p. 24, l. 19: “regimes” should be “régimes”.
p. 25, l. 1: “intuitionistic” should be “intuitionistic”.
p. 25, l. 10: “continuations” should be “continuations”.
p. 25, l. 18: “intuitionistic” should be “intuitionistic”.
p. 47, Footnote 23: it should be added that the terms t_1 and t_2 arise as reducts of a common term s.
p. 59, l. -2: delete “not”.
p. 87, l. 6: “the type ¬φ” should be “being of the type ¬φ”.
p. 87, l. 11: “continuation ¬φ” to “continuation of type ¬φ”.

p. 101, Table 4.3: the antecedents in this table should be considered to be sets (and so the presence of the Exchange rule is unnecessary).

p. 103, l. 1: insert “and the formula-occurrences affected by R and R’ are distinct” between “... premiss of R” and the full stop.

p. 151, Table 5.1: the antecedents in this table should be considered to be sets (and so the presence of the Exchange rule is unnecessary).

p. 111, l. 20: “Julia” should be “Alan”.

p. 203, Reference 113: “J. Robinson” should be “J.A. Robinson”.