

THE MOTIVIC GALOIS GROUP OF MIXED TATE MOTIVES OVER $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ AND ITS ACTION ON THE FUNDAMENTAL GROUP OF $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \pm 1, \infty\}$

MINORU HIROSE AND NOBUO SATO

ABSTRACT. In this paper we introduce confluence relations for motivic Euler sums (also called alternating multiple zeta values) and show that all linear relations among motivic Euler sums are exhausted by the confluence relations. This determines all automorphisms of the de Rham fundamental groupoid of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \pm 1, \infty\}$ coming from the action of the motivic Galois group of mixed Tate motives over $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$. Moreover, we also discuss other applications of the confluence relations such as an explicit \mathbb{Q} -linear expansion of a given motivic Euler sum by their basis and 2-adic integrality of the coefficients in the expansion.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Basic idea of confluence relations	2
1.2. Confluence relations for real-valued Euler sums and their consequences	2
1.3. Confluence relations for motivic Euler sums and their consequences	3
1.4. Actions of the motivic Galois groups on the fundamental groups	4
1.5. Structure of the article	5
1 Confluence relations for Euler sums	7
2. Definition of confluence relations	7
2.1. Iterated integrals	7
2.2. Iterated integral expression of Euler sums and the distribution relation	7
2.3. Evaluation at $z = 0$	8
2.4. Auxiliary congruences for $\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}$	13
2.5. Confluence relations for Euler sums	14
3. Main theorem	16
3.1. The statement and the proof overview of the main theorem	16
3.2. Step 1: the proof of $X(k, d) \subset Y(k, d) + 2X(k, d)$	16
3.3. Step 2: the proofs of $Y(k, d) \subset X^D(k, d) + 2X(k, d) + \frac{1}{2}X(k, d-1)$ and the main theorem	17
3.4. A minimal family of relations and explicit expansion of an Euler sum by the basis	23
2 Motivicity of confluence relations	25
4. Preliminaries	25
4.1. Tangential base points	25
4.2. Motivic iterated integrals and Goncharov's coaction formula.	25
4.3. Motivic iterated integrals with extended tangential base points	28
4.4. Goncharov's Hopf algebra of formal iterated integrals	29
5. The motivic counterpart of regularized limit of iterated integrals	31
5.1. The behavior of iterated integrals at infinity	31
5.2. The calculation of the regularized limit for regular sequences	32
5.3. The calculation of the regularized limit for admissible sequences	35
5.4. The calculation of the regularized limit for non-admissible sequences	36
5.5. The case of trivial closed paths	36
5.6. The path composition formula for J_{up}	36

Date: February 11, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 11M32, 20F34.

Key words and phrases. Motivic Galois group, mixed Tate motives, fundamental groups, Euler sums, multiple zeta values, iterated integrals, hyperlogarithms, associator, confluence relation.

5.7. The regularized limit for an arbitrary path	39
5.8. The infinitesimal coaction of $J(;;)$	40
6. Motivicity of confluence relations	44
6.1. Basic notations	44
6.2. Key lemmas	45
6.3. The definition of the confluence relation	46
6.4. A combinatorial interpretation for $\psi_{x,y}$	47
6.5. A combinatorial interpretation of $D(\psi_{x,y})$	48
7. Proofs of the main theorems	53
Acknowledgements	55
References	55

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Basic idea of confluence relations. In a previous article of the authors [11], we introduced a class of rational linear relations among multiple zeta values which we call ‘confluence relations’, and discussed their significance. The confluence relations are later proven by Furusho [7] to be equivalent to Drinfeld’s pentagon equation of the KZ-associator. The purpose of this article is to generalize and develop the theory of confluence relations for Euler sums and show that they shed new light on understanding the motivic Galois actions of a class of mixed Tate motives over $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ on the fundamental group of the $\{0, 1, -1, \infty\}$ -punctured projective line.

To give a little more details, we consider a complex function of z defined by

$$I(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z))$$

where I is the iterated integral symbol and p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} are polynomials in z . By making use of Goncharov’s differential formula

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dz} I(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z)) \\ &= \sum_{\varepsilon \in \{1, -1\}} \varepsilon \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ p_i \neq p_{i+\varepsilon}}} \frac{d \log(p_i(z) - p_{i+\varepsilon}(z))}{dz} I(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_{i-1}(z), p_{i+1}(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z)), \end{aligned}$$

for a fixed complex number x , we can expand $I(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z))$ as a \mathbb{C} -linear sum of the functions of the form

$$I(x; a_1, \dots, a_l; z) \quad (a_1, \dots, a_l \in \mathbb{C})$$

in a canonical way. Then, by passing the “limit” z (in some generalized sense) to some point $y \in \mathbb{C}$ of this expansion, we obtain relations among iterated integrals which we refer to as the ‘confluence relations’ (of general type). In a nutshell, confluence relations are the relations of special values of hyperlogarithms that arise from the system of differential equations satisfied by hyperlogarithms. The aforementioned article of the authors [11] studies the simplest case of the confluence relations when $x = 0$, $y = 1$, $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \{0, 1, z\}$ and $p_0 = 0$, $p_{k+1} = 1$. In this article, we focus on the confluence relations for which $x = 0$, $y = 1$, $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \{0, -1, z, -z^2\}$ and $p_0 = 0$, $p_{k+1} = z$. We will prove that these relations actually give all the motivic relations among Euler sums, which also has a significant implication in the Grothendieck-Teichmüller theory. In the rest of this introduction, we will discuss our main results and their significance in three folds.

1.2. Confluence relations for real-valued Euler sums and their consequences. To begin with, we define the set of indices \mathfrak{J} by

$$\mathfrak{J} := \{(k_1, \dots, k_d) \in (\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\})^d \mid d = 0 \text{ or } k_d \neq 1\},$$

and an Euler sum $\zeta(\mathbb{k})$ together with its modified version $\tilde{\zeta}(\mathbb{k})$ by

$$\zeta(\mathbb{k}) := \sum_{0 < m_1 < \dots < m_d} \prod_{j=1}^d \frac{\operatorname{sgn}(k_j)^{m_j}}{m_j^{|k_j|}}$$

and $\tilde{\zeta}(\mathbb{k}) := (-2)^d \zeta(\mathbb{k})$ for $\mathbb{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathfrak{J}$. We call $\text{wt}(\mathbb{k}) = |k_1| + \dots + |k_d|$ the weight and $\text{dep}(\mathbb{k}) = d$ the depth of \mathbb{k} . Also, we put

$$\mathfrak{J}(k, d) := \{\mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J} \mid \text{wt}(\mathbb{k}) = k, \text{dep}(\mathbb{k}) \leq d\}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{J}^D(k, d) := \{(k_1, \dots, k_r) \in \mathfrak{J}(k, d) \mid k_1, \dots, k_{r-1} > 0, k_r < 0, k_2 \equiv \dots \equiv k_r \equiv 1 \pmod{2}\}.$$

Fix $k, d \geq 0$. In Part 1 of this article, we will show by an elementary argument using the confluence relations for Euler sums that

Theorem (see Theorem 3.10). *For any $\mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J}(k, d) \setminus \mathfrak{J}^D(k, d)$, we have*

$$\tilde{\zeta}(\mathbb{k}) = \sum_{\mathbb{k}' \in \mathfrak{J}^D(k, d)} \alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'} \tilde{\zeta}(\mathbb{k}')$$

where $\alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'}$ are certain explicitly given rational numbers with odd denominators.

The above theorem is significant for the following three reasons: First, the theorem gives an upper bound

$$\dim \langle \zeta(\mathbb{k}) \mid \mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J}(k, d) \rangle_{\mathbb{Q}} \leq \#\mathfrak{J}^D(k, d),$$

which was already shown by Deligne [5] (see also [8] where the author considers a closely related alternative for $\{\zeta(\mathbb{k}) \mid \mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J}^D(k, d)\}$) using the motivic framework, but up to now no elementary proof (= does not depend on the theory of mixed Tate motives, Borel's calculation of the K -groups modulo torsion, etc.) has been given. Thus, our result gives the first elementary proof of the above dimension upper bound. Second, by the method in [5], the existence of the rational numbers $\alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'}$ can be proved, while the above theorem tells us more precisely that the denominators of $\alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'}$ are odd. Third, the coefficients $\alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'}$ are given in a completely explicit way, which enables us to obtain lots of new information about $\alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'}$ such as an upper bound of their denominators. It should be emphasized that such precise results (oddness of the denominators of the coefficients, an explicit formula for the coefficients and a calculable bound of the denominator of the coefficients) seem to be unreachable by simply extending the method of [5].

1.3. Confluence relations for motivic Euler sums and their consequences. In Part 2 of this article, we prove that the confluence relations are also satisfied by motivic Euler sums. Here we state three remarkable applications of the confluence relations for motivic Euler sums. For $\mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J}$, let $\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k})$ denote the motivic Euler sum and $\tilde{\zeta}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}) := (-2)^{\text{dep}(\mathbb{k})} \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k})$ its modified version. Our first application is the following theorem.

Theorem (see Theorem 7.4). *For any $\mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J}(k, d) \setminus \mathfrak{J}^D(k, d)$, we have*

$$\tilde{\zeta}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}) = \sum_{\mathbb{k}' \in \mathfrak{J}^D(k, d)} \alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'} \tilde{\zeta}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}')$$

where $\alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'}$ are the same rational numbers as in Theorem 1.2.

Our second application is to fill the “missing final piece” of Brown's decomposition algorithm for motivic multiple zeta values (which also works for motivic Euler sums). In [3], Brown gives an algorithm to decompose a motivic multiple zeta value in terms of a given basis. In [3, p54], he remarked that

“This is only an algorithm in the true sense of the word in so far as it is possible to compute the coefficients c_{ξ} and this is the only transcendental input.”

The determination of c_{ξ} is an inevitable part of Brown's algorithm. By computing c_{ξ} as a real number to many digits, one can guess the numerator and denominator of c_{ξ} , but since a guess is just a guess, its correctness can not be mathematically verified, no matter how many digits one calculates. Our theorem gives the first successful method to determine the numerator and denominator of c_{ξ} definitely. Suppose that we know the existence of c_{ξ} such that $\sum_{\mathbb{k}} q_{\mathbb{k}} \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}) = c_{\xi} \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(k)$ for some \mathbb{Q} -linear combination $\sum_{\mathbb{k}} q_{\mathbb{k}} \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k})$ of motivic Euler sums. Then, we find

$$\sum_{\mathbb{k}} q_{\mathbb{k}} \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}) = \sum_{\mathbb{k}} (-2)^{-\text{dep}(\mathbb{k})} q_{\mathbb{k}} \alpha_{\mathbb{k}, (-k)} \tilde{\zeta}^{\mathfrak{m}}(-k) = \sum_{\mathbb{k}} (-2)^{1-\text{dep}(\mathbb{k})} (2^{1-k} - 1) q_{\mathbb{k}} \alpha_{\mathbb{k}, (-k)} \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(k),$$

and thus we get the following formula for c_{ξ} .

Theorem. *If $\sum_{\mathbb{k}} q_{\mathbb{k}} \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}) = c \cdot \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(k)$ for some $c \in \mathbb{Q}$, then*

$$c = \sum_{\mathbb{k}} (-2)^{1-\text{dep}(\mathbb{k})} (2^{1-k} - 1) q_{\mathbb{k}} \alpha_{\mathbb{k}, (-k)}.$$

Notice that, as a consequence of this theorem (also as a consequence of the previous theorem), we obtain a purely algebraic algorithm of determining the expansion of multiple zeta values by a given basis.

Finally, as our third application, we shall show

Theorem. *The set of relations among motivic Euler sums coincides with the set of confluence relations.*

As we will see in the next section, this theorem has remarkable implications in the Grothendieck-Teichmüller theory.

1.4. Actions of the motivic Galois groups on the fundamental groups. The study of the actions of (various types of) Galois groups on (various types of) fundamental groups of algebraic varieties is one of the most important research topics in the Grothendieck-Teichmüller theory. For example, it is well-known that the absolute Galois group acts on the geometric fundamental torsor of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$:

$$\phi_{\text{abs}} : \text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\pi_1^{\text{geom}}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}, \vec{1}_0, -\vec{1}_1)).$$

A celebrated theorem of Belyi [1] shows that ϕ_{abs} is injective, which says that its kernel is trivial. On the other hand, no concrete description (e.g. via generators, defining equations etc.) of the image $\phi_{\text{abs}}(\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q}))$ is known. It has been shown by Drinfeld [6] that the image $\phi_{\text{abs}}(\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q}))$ is contained in the profinite Grothendieck-Teichmüller group

$$\widehat{\text{GT}} \subset \text{Aut}(\pi_1^{\text{geom}}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}, \vec{1}_0, -\vec{1}_1))$$

which is closely related to Grothendieck's idea in [10]. However, it is not known whether or not $\phi_{\text{abs}}(\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q}))$ coincides with $\widehat{\text{GT}}$ at the moment. As a motivic analog of this, it is known that the motivic Galois group $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z})}$ of mixed Tate motives over \mathbb{Z} acts on the de Rham fundamental torsor of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$:

$$\phi_1 : \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z})} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\pi_1^{\text{dR}}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}, \vec{1}_0, -\vec{1}_1))$$

and a celebrated theorem of Brown [2] states that ϕ_1 is injective. However, in this case again, no concrete description (e.g. via generators, defining equations etc.) of the image $\phi_1(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z})})$ is known. The graded version of the Grothendieck-Teichmüller group

$$\text{GRT} \subset \text{Aut}(\pi_1^{\text{dR}}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}, \vec{1}_0, -\vec{1}_1))$$

which was also proposed by Drinfeld [6] is one of the most famous conjectural combinatorial description of the image $\phi_1(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z})})$, and it is known that

$$\phi_1(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z})}) \subset \text{GRT}.$$

Our main result gives a combinatorial description of $\phi_1(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z})})$. More strongly, we shall give an exact combinatorial description of the image of

$$\phi_2 : \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/2])} \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\pi_1^{\text{dR}}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \pm 1, \infty\}, \vec{1}_0, -\vec{1}_1))$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/2])}$ is the motivic Galois group of mixed Tate motives over $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ ¹, a larger class of mixed Tate motives over the rationals admitting ramification at 2. Let us explain about our description of $\phi_2(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/2])})$ here. Since it is more natural to consider the Galois action on the entire fundamental groupoids rather than the individual fundamental torsors, we will describe the former in what follows.

Let N be either 1 or 2. Then the fundamental groupoids are defined as the union $\bigsqcup_{a,b \in B^{(N)}} {}_a\Pi_b^{(N)}$ of

$${}_a\Pi_b^{(N)} := \pi_1^{\text{dR}}(\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus (B^{(N)} \cup \{\infty\}), a', b') \simeq \text{Spec}(\mathfrak{H}^{(N)}) \quad (a, b \in B^{(N)})$$

where $B^{(1)} = \{0, 1\}$, $B^{(2)} = \{0, 1, -1\}$ and $0', 1', -1'$ denote tangential base points $\vec{1}_0, -\vec{1}_1$ and $\vec{1}_{-1}$, respectively, and $\mathfrak{H}^{(1)} := (\mathbb{Q}\langle e_0, e_1 \rangle, \sqcup)$, (resp. $\mathfrak{H}^{(2)} := (\mathbb{Q}\langle e_0, e_1, e_{-1} \rangle, \sqcup)$) is the commutative ring consisting of non-commutative polynomials in two (resp. three) indeterminates equipped with the shuffle product. Then $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/N])}$ acts on the fundamental groupoid $\bigsqcup_{a,b \in B^{(N)}} {}_a\Pi_b^{(N)}$, and we denote this action by

$$\widehat{\phi}_N : \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/N])} \rightarrow \Gamma^{(N)} := \text{Aut}(\bigsqcup_{a,b \in B^{(N)}} {}_a\Pi_b^{(N)}).$$

The set of \mathbb{Q} -rational points of ${}_a\Pi_b^{(N)}$ can be canonically identified with the set of group-like elements in $R^{(N)}$ where $R^{(1)} := \mathbb{Q}\langle\langle e^0, e^1 \rangle\rangle$ and $R^{(2)} := \mathbb{Q}\langle\langle e^0, e^1, e^{-1} \rangle\rangle$. For a group-like element $p \in R^{(N)}$, we write ${}_a p_b$ for

¹The injectivity of ϕ_2 was proved by Deligne [5].

the corresponding element of ${}_a\Pi_b^{(N)}$. Then an automorphism $\sigma \in \Gamma^{(N)}$ (with respect to the groupoid scheme structure $[g; a, b][h; b, c] = [gh; a, c]$) is completely determined by its action to the elements

$$\begin{aligned} t_0, t_1 \text{ and } {}_01_1 & \quad \text{for } N = 1 \\ t_0, t_1, t_{-1}, {}_01_1, \text{ and } {}_01_{-1} & \quad \text{for } N = 2 \end{aligned}$$

where $t_a := {}_a \exp(e^a)_a$. Then the image of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/N])}$ in $\Gamma^{(N)}$ under $\widehat{\phi}_N$ is equal to

$$\left\{ \sigma_{m,p}^{(N)} \in \Gamma^{(N)} \mid (m, p) \in \mathbb{Q}^\times \times \text{Spec} \left(\mathfrak{H}^{(N)} / (e_1 e_0, \ker(L^m) \cap \mathfrak{H}^{(N)}) \right) \right\}$$

with

$$\sigma_{m,p}^{(1)}(t_a) = t_a^m \quad (a \in \{0, 1\}), \quad \sigma_{m,p}^{(1)}({}_01_1) = {}_0p_1$$

and

$$\sigma_{m,p}^{(2)}(t_a) = t_a^m \quad (a \in \{0, \pm 1\}), \quad \sigma_{m,p}^{(2)}({}_01_1) = {}_0p_1, \quad \sigma_{m,p}^{(2)}({}_01_{-1}) = {}_0\tau(p)_{-1},$$

where $t_a^m = {}_a \exp(me^a)_a$, τ is an automorphism of $\mathfrak{H}^{(2)}$ defined by $\tau(e_a) = e_{-a}$ for $a \in \{0, \pm 1\}$, and L^m is a linear map from $\mathfrak{H}^{(2)}$ to the set \mathcal{H}_2 of motivic Euler sums defined by

$$L^m(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) = I^m(\vec{1}_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; -\vec{1}_1).$$

Thus $\widehat{\phi}_N(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/N])})$ is completely determined by the information of $\ker(L^m)$. In this article, we introduce a submodule $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}} \subset \mathfrak{H}^{(2)}$ with explicit generators, namely, “(the non-admissible extension of) the confluence relations of level two”, and show the following theorem.

Theorem (See Theorem 7.3). *We have*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}} = \ker(L^m).$$

As corollaries of this theorem, we obtain the following descriptions of the images of the motivic Galois groups $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/2])}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z})}$.

Theorem 1.1. *The image $\widehat{\phi}_2(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/2])})$ is given by*

$$\widehat{\phi}_2(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/2])}) = \left\{ \sigma_{m,p}^{(2)} \in \Gamma^{(2)} \mid (m, p) \in \mathbb{Q}^\times \times \text{Spec} \left(\mathfrak{H}^{(2)} / (e_1 e_0, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}}) \right) \right\}.$$

Theorem 1.2. *The image $\widehat{\phi}_1(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z})})$ is given by*

$$\widehat{\phi}_1(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z})}) = \left\{ \sigma_{m,p}^{(1)} \in \Gamma^{(1)} \mid (m, p) \in \mathbb{Q}^\times \times \text{Spec} \left(\mathfrak{H}^{(1)} / (e_1 e_0, \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}} \cap \mathfrak{H}^{(1)}) \right) \right\}.$$

Remark 1.3. The above theorems also determine the images of ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 since

$$\phi_N(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/N])}) = \left\{ \sigma|_{{}_0\Pi_1} \mid \sigma \in \widehat{\phi}_N(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{MT}(\mathbb{Z}[1/N])}) \right\}$$

where $|_{{}_0\Pi_1}$ means the restriction to ${}_0\Pi_1$.

1.5. Structure of the article. This article is organized into two parts of different flavors: Part 1 focuses on (real-valued) Euler sums and their confluence relations, while Part 2 (except for its last section) is devoted to proving the motivicity of the confluence relations. As the contents are mostly independent, for convenience, we will use slightly different conventions for the two parts. Since Part 1 is dedicated to the study of Euler sums, it deals only with very special cases of hyperlogarithms and their limits that are relevant to Euler sums. Part 2, on the other hand, studies the motivic counterpart of hyperlogarithms in a great generality. This is because restricting ourselves to Euler sum case does not simplify the argument greatly, and also because we consider that proving such a fundamental result in a great generality would be useful from the perspective of future applications. We will construct the motivic counterpart of “limits of hyperlogarithms” thereby defining the confluence relations in ultimate generality, and as an upshot prove their motivicity. Using this motivicity theorem, we will derive the aforementioned consequences in the Grothendieck-Teichmüller theory from the results of Part 1 at the end. The proof of the motivicity of (generalized) confluence relation consists of loads of auxiliary lemmas and propositions with loads of notations, which may be painful to read. Therefore, except for those who are interested in the technical details of the proof of the motivicity of the confluence relations are advised to ignore Part 2.

Part 1 consists of two sections, Sections 2 and 3. In Section 2, we give an algebraic set-up analogous to that by Hoffman [12], and make use of the differential formula for hyperlogarithms together with a suitable limiting process called *regularized limit* to define a class of (\mathbb{Q} -linear) relations satisfied by Euler sums denote by \mathcal{I}_{CF} ,

which we call *confluence relations of level two*. Then, in Section 3, we prove Theorems 3.1 and 3.10 as goals of Part 1.

Part 2 consists of four sections, Sections 4, 5, 6, and 7. Section 4 is devoted to preliminaries to the following sections. In Section 5, we define the motivic counterpart of “regularized limits of hyperlogarithms” and prove basic (and desirable) properties satisfied by those “limits”. Then in Section 6, we generalize the notion of the confluence relation to a very general setting and prove the motivicity of the generalized confluence relations using the properties shown in Section 5. Finally, in Section 7, we shall prove the aforementioned main theorems.

Part 1

Confluence relations for Euler sums

In this part, we define confluence relations for Euler sums and study their consequences.

2. DEFINITION OF CONFLUENCE RELATIONS

2.1. Iterated integrals. First of all we give an algebraic and analytic set-up for iterated integrals.

Definition 2.1. For a subset $S \subset \mathbb{C}$, we denote by $\mathcal{V}(S)$ the \mathbb{Z} -module generated by the formal symbols $\{e_a \mid a \in S\}$.

Definition 2.2. For $u \in \mathcal{V}(S)$, we define a rational 1-form ω_u on $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ by the linearity on u and

$$\omega_{e_a}(t) = \frac{dt}{t-a}.$$

Definition 2.3. For $a \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, we define $\mathcal{V}^{(a)}(S) \subset \mathcal{V}(S)$ by

$$\mathcal{V}^{(a)}(S) = \begin{cases} \bigoplus_{t \in S \setminus \{a\}} \mathbb{Z} \cdot e_t & a \in \mathbb{C} \\ \sum_{t, u \in S} \mathbb{Z} \cdot (e_t - e_u) & a = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Note that ω_u is regular at $a \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ if $u \in \mathcal{V}^{(a)}(S)$.

Definition 2.4. For a subset $S \subset \mathbb{C}$, we denote by $\mathcal{A}(S)$ the free non-commutative polynomial ring over \mathbb{Z} generated by the formal symbols $\{e_a \mid a \in S\}$. In other words,

$$\mathcal{A}(S) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{V}(S)^{\otimes k}.$$

Definition 2.5. For a subset $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$, we set

$$\mathcal{A}^{(x,y)}(S) = \mathbb{Z} \oplus (\mathcal{V}^{(x)}(S) \cap \mathcal{V}^{(y)}(S)) \oplus \mathcal{V}^{(x)}(S) \mathcal{A}(S) \mathcal{V}^{(y)}(S).$$

Definition 2.6. Let x and y be usual or tangential base points of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$. We denote by $\pi_S^{x,y}$ the set of homotopy class of paths $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ from x to y such that $\gamma((0, 1)) \subset \mathbb{C} \setminus S$.

Definition 2.7 (Iterated integral). For $x, y \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$, $\gamma \in \pi_S^{x,y}$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}^{(x,y)}(S)$, define $I_\gamma(x; u; y)$ by the linearity for u and

$$I_\gamma(x; v_1 \cdots v_k; y) = \int_{0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k < 1} \omega_{v_1}(\gamma(t_1)) \cdots \omega_{v_k}(\gamma(t_k))$$

for $v_1 \in \mathcal{V}^{(x)}(S)$, $v_2, \dots, v_{k-1} \in \mathcal{V}(S)$, and $v_k \in \mathcal{V}^{(y)}(S)$. Furthermore, we extend the definition of $I_\gamma(x; u; y)$ for tangential base points x and y on $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ and $u \in \mathcal{A}(S)$ in the usual way (see, for example, [4]).

We simply write $I_\gamma(-)$ as $I(-)$ if the choice of γ is obvious from the context.

2.2. Iterated integral expression of Euler sums and the distribution relation.

Definition 2.8. For $x > 0$, define a linear map

$$L_x : \mathcal{A}^{(0,x)}(\mathbb{R} \setminus (0, x)) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} L_x(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) &:= I(0; e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}; x) \\ &= \int_{0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_k < x} \frac{dt_1}{t_1 - a_1} \cdots \frac{dt_k}{t_k - a_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.9. For $S \subset \{0, 1, -1\}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$, we put $\mathcal{A}^0(S) := \mathcal{A}^{(0,1)}(S)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{k,d}(S) &:= \bigoplus_{\substack{a_1, \dots, a_k \in S \\ \#\{i \mid a_i \neq 0\} \leq d}} \mathbb{Z} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \subset \mathcal{A}(S) \\ \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(S) &:= \bigoplus_{\substack{a_1, \dots, a_k \in S \\ \#\{i \mid a_i \neq 0\} \leq d \\ a_1 \neq 0, a_k \neq 1}} \mathbb{Z} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \subset \mathcal{A}^0(S). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 2.10. For $S \subset \{0, 1, -1\}$, define $\text{reg}_{\sqcup} : \mathcal{A}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^0(S)$ as the unique linear map such that

$$\text{reg}_{\sqcup}(e_0^n \sqcup e_1^m \sqcup u) = \begin{cases} u & n = m = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for all $u \in \mathcal{A}^0(S)$.

Definition 2.11. For $\mathbb{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathfrak{J}$, we define $w(\mathbb{k}) \in \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$ and $\tilde{w}(\mathbb{k}) \in \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$ by

$$w(\mathbb{k}) := e_{\epsilon_1} e_0^{|k_1|-1} \cdots e_{\epsilon_d} e_0^{|k_d|-1}$$

and $\tilde{w}(\mathbb{k}) := 2^d w(\mathbb{k})$ where $\epsilon_i = \text{sgn}(k_i) \epsilon_{i+1}$ and $\epsilon_{d+1} = 1$.

Now we can express an Euler sum by L_1 :

$$\zeta(\mathbb{k}) = (-1)^d L_1(w(\mathbb{k})), \quad \tilde{\zeta}(\mathbb{k}) = L_1(\tilde{w}(\mathbb{k})).$$

Definition 2.12. We define a $\text{dist} : \mathcal{A}_{k,d}(\{0, 1\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{k,d}(\{0, 1, -1\})$ as the ring homomorphism such that

$$\text{dist}(e_0) = 2e_0, \quad \text{dist}(e_1) = e_1 + e_{-1}.$$

Definition 2.13. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$, define the subspace $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \subset \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$ by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) = \mathbb{Z} & k = 0 \\ 2\mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) & k > 0. \end{cases}$$

By definition, for $u \in \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1\})$, we have

$$(2.1) \quad \text{dist}(u) \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}).$$

The following equation is well-known.

Lemma 2.14 (Distribution relation). For $u \in \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1\})$,

$$L_1(u) = L_1(\text{dist}(u)).$$

Proof. It follows from the change of variables $t = s^2$ since $\frac{dt}{t} = \frac{2ds}{s}$ and $\frac{dt}{t-1} = \frac{ds}{s-1} + \frac{ds}{s+1}$. \square

2.3. Evaluation at $z = 0$. Let z be a real variable such that $0 < z < 1$. We put

$$\mathcal{B}_{k,d} := \bigoplus_{\substack{a_1, \dots, a_k \in \{0, -1, z, -z^2\} \\ a_1 \neq 0, a_k \neq z \\ \#\{i | a_i \neq 0\} \leq d}} \mathbb{Z} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}$$

and

$$\mathcal{B} := \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{B}_{k,\infty}.$$

Then for $u \in \mathcal{B}$, we can regard $L_z(u)$ as a function on $0 < z < 1$. The limit $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} L_z(u)$ does not necessarily exist, but the following *regularized limit* exists.

Definition 2.15 (Regularized limit). Fix $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $f(z)$ behaves as

$$f(a \pm \epsilon) = c_0 + c_1 \log(\epsilon) + \cdots + c_M \log^M(\epsilon) + O(\epsilon \log^M \epsilon)$$

around a for some $M > 0$ and $c_0, \dots, c_M \in \mathbb{C}$. Then we define the regularized limit $\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow a \pm 0} f(z)$ to be the constant term, i.e.,

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow a \pm 0} f(z) := c_0.$$

Notice that $\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow a \pm 0}$ extends the notion of the limit in the usual sense, since $\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow a \pm 0} f(z) = \lim_{z \rightarrow a \pm 0} f(z)$ if $\lim_{z \rightarrow a \pm 0} f(z)$ exists. In this subsection, we shall define $\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0} : \mathcal{B}_{k,d} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$ which naturally satisfies

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0} L_z(u) = L_1(\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0} u)$$

for $u \in \mathcal{B}_{k,d}$.

Let $u = e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \in \mathcal{B}$. Note that $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} L_z(u) = 0$ if $a_j = -1$ for some j . Thus the computation of $\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0} L_z(u)$ for $u \in \mathcal{B}$ is reduced to the case

$$u \in \mathcal{B}' := \mathcal{B} \cap \mathbb{Z} \langle e_0, e_z, e_{-z^2} \rangle.$$

Put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}'' &:= \mathcal{B}' \cap (\mathbb{Z} \oplus e_z \mathbb{Z} \langle e_0, e_z, e_{-z^2} \rangle), \\ \mathcal{B}''' &:= \mathcal{B}' \cap \mathbb{Z} \langle e_0, e_{-z^2} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have

$$\mathcal{B}'' \otimes \mathcal{B}''' \simeq \mathcal{B}'; \quad u_1 \otimes u_2 \mapsto u_1 \sqcup u_2,$$

the computation of $\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0} L_z(u)$ for $u \in \mathcal{B}'$ is further reduced to the cases $u \in \mathcal{B}''$ and $u \in \mathcal{B}'''$. For $u = e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \in \mathcal{B}''$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} L_z(u) &= \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} L_1(e_{\frac{a_1}{z}} \cdots e_{\frac{a_k}{z}}) \\ &= L_1(\overline{\text{reg}}(u)) \end{aligned}$$

where $\overline{\text{reg}}_{z \rightarrow 0}$ is the ring homomorphism determined by $\overline{\text{reg}}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_0) = \overline{\text{reg}}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{-z^2}) = e_0$ and $\overline{\text{reg}}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_z) = e_1$. Next, for $u = e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \in \mathcal{B}'''$, put $w = w(u) = e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_k} \in \mathcal{C} := \mathbb{Z} \oplus e_1 \mathbb{Z} \langle e_0, e_1 \rangle$ where $b_j = -\frac{a_j}{z^2}$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$. Then

$$L_z(u) = I_{\gamma_z}(0; w; -\frac{1}{z})$$

where γ_z is the straight path from 0 to $-1/z$. Furthermore, by the change of variables $t \mapsto t/(t-1)$, we have

$$I_{\gamma_z}(0; w; -\frac{1}{z}) = I_{\gamma'_z}(0; \varrho(w); \frac{1}{1+z})$$

where ϱ is the automorphism of $\mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$ defined by $\varrho(e_0) = e_0 - e_1$ and $\varrho(e_1) = -e_1$, and γ'_z is the straight path from 0 to $1/(1+z)$. Thus we have

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0} I_{\gamma_z}(0; w; -\frac{1}{z}) = L_1(\text{reg}_{\sqcup}(\varrho(w))).$$

This already gives an expression of $\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0} L_z(u)$ for $u \in \mathcal{B}'''$ in terms of L_1 . However, we further have to rewrite $L_1(\text{reg}_{\sqcup}(\varrho(w)))$ for depth compatibility since $\varrho(\mathcal{A}_{k,d}(\{0, 1\})) \not\subset \mathcal{A}_{k,d}(\{0, 1\})$ in general. Define an anti-automorphism ς of $\mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$ by $\varsigma(e_0) = -e_1$ and $\varsigma(e_1) = -e_0$.

Definition 2.16. Define the linear map $\wp : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$ as follows. For $d \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^d$, define $\theta(\mathbb{k})$ recursively by

$$\theta(k_1, \dots, k_d) = \begin{cases} -\sum_{j=1}^d e_1 e_0^{k_j-1} \cdots e_1 e_0^{k_1-1} \sqcup \theta(k_{j+1}, \dots, k_d) & d > 0 \\ 1 & d = 0, \end{cases}$$

and $\theta_1(\mathbb{k})$ by

$$\theta_1(\mathbb{k}) = \theta'(\mathbb{k}) + 2 \sum_{\substack{\mathbb{k}' = (\mathbb{k}', \{1\}^{2m}) \\ m \geq 1}} e_{-1} e_0^{2m-1} \sqcup \theta'(\mathbb{k}')$$

with $\theta' = \text{dist} \circ \text{reg}_{\sqcup} \circ \varsigma \circ \theta$. Put

$$w^*(\emptyset) = 1,$$

$$w^*(k_1, \dots, k_d) = -e_1 e_0^{k_1-1} (e_0 - e_1) e_0^{k_2-1} \cdots (e_0 - e_1) e_0^{k_d-1}.$$

Note that $\{\varrho(w^*(\mathbb{k}))\}$ is a basis of \mathcal{C} . Thus, we finally define \wp by

$$\wp(\varrho(w^*(k_1, \dots, k_d))) = \theta_1(k_1, \dots, k_d).$$

Lemma 2.17. For $w \in \mathcal{C}$, we have

$$L_1(\text{reg}_{\sqcup}(\varrho(w))) = L_1(\wp(w)).$$


Proof. We prove the lemma using a result in Kaneko-Yamamoto's article [14]. To avoid confusion we will use $E_b = (-1)^b e_b$ instead of e_b for $b \in \{0, \pm 1\}$ throughout this proof, since E_b is the convention used in their article (and denoted as e_b there). We denote by P the set of isomorphism classes of *2-posets*, where a 2-poset means a pair (X, δ_X) where X is a finite partially ordered set and $\delta_X : X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a map. We depict a 2-poset as a Hasse diagram in which an element x with $\delta(x) = 0$ (resp. $\delta(x) = 1$) is represented by \circ (resp. \bullet). Define $W : P \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$ by

$$W((X, \delta)) = \sum_{\substack{f: \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow X \\ \text{bijection}}} \begin{cases} E_{\delta(f(1))} \cdots E_{\delta(f(n))} & \text{if } f^{-1}(x) < f^{-1}(y) \text{ for all } x, y \in X \text{ such that } x < y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $n = \#X$. For $\mathbb{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^d$, we write

$$\bullet - \boxed{\mathbb{k}}$$

for the diagram



Then $W(\bullet - \boxed{\mathbb{k}}) = \theta(k_1, \dots, k_d)$ by induction on d from the case $\mathbf{k} = (k_d, \dots, k_1)$ and $\mathbf{l} = (0)$ of the second formula of [14, Lemma 5.2]. (Strictly speaking, the case $\mathbf{l} = (0)$ is not included in [14, Lemma 5.2], but the proof works also for this case). Let R be a commutative \mathbb{Q} -algebra and $Z : \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1\}) \rightarrow R$ a linear map satisfying the regularized double shuffle relation (see [14]). We extend Z to a map $\mathbb{Z} + E_1 \mathbb{Z} \langle E_0, E_1 \rangle \rightarrow R[T]$ in two ways, namely $Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)}$ and $Z_*^{(T)}$, by the properties

$$Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)}(E_1) = Z_*^{(T)}(E_1) = T,$$

$$Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)}|_{\mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1\})} = Z_*^{(T)}|_{\mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1\})} = Z$$

and

$$Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)}(u \sqcup v) = Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)}(u) Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)}(v), \quad Z_*^{(T)}(u * v) = Z_*^{(T)}(u) Z_*^{(T)}(v),$$

where $*$ is the harmonic product (see [14] for its definition). Furthermore, define \mathbb{Q} -linear maps $\rho_Z, \rho_Z^* : R[T] \rightarrow R[T]$ by the equalities

$$\rho_Z(e^{T\xi}) = \Gamma_Z(\xi) e^{T\xi}, \quad \rho_Z^*(e^{T\xi}) = \Gamma_Z(-\xi)^{-1} e^{T\xi}$$

in $R[T][[\xi]]$ (ρ_Z, ρ_Z^* act coefficient-wisely) where

$$\Gamma_Z(\xi) = \exp \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{Z(E_1 E_0^{n-1})}{n} (-\xi)^n \right) \in R[[\xi]].$$

Then the regularization theorem [13] says that

$$Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)}(u) = \rho_Z(Z_*^{(T)}(u))$$

for $u \in \mathbb{Z} + E_1 \mathbb{Z} \langle E_0, E_1 \rangle$, and the star-regularization theorem ([14, Theorem 4.6]) says that

$$Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)}(W(\bullet - \boxed{\mathbb{k}})) = \rho_Z^*(Z_*^{(T)}(w^*(\mathbb{k})))$$

for $\mathbb{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^d$ since

$$w^*(\mathbb{k}) = E_1 E_0^{k_1-1} (E_1 + E_0) E_0^{k_2-1} \cdots (E_1 + E_0) E_0^{k_d-1}.$$

If we write $\mathbb{k} = (\mathbb{k}', \{1\}^m)$ with an admissible index \mathbb{k}' and $m \geq 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
W(\bullet \text{---} \boxed{\mathbb{k}}) &= W\left(\begin{array}{c} \bullet \text{---} \boxed{\mathbb{k}'} \\ \nearrow^m \end{array}\right) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^m E_1^j \sqcup \text{reg}_{\sqcup} \circ W\left(\begin{array}{c} \bullet \text{---} \boxed{\mathbb{k}'} \\ \nearrow^{m-j} \end{array}\right) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^m E_1^j \sqcup \text{reg}_{\sqcup} \circ W\left(\bullet \text{---} \boxed{(\mathbb{k}', \{1\}^{m-j})}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$W(\bullet \text{---} \boxed{\mathbb{k}}) = \sum_{\mathbb{k}=(\mathbb{k}'', \{1\}^j)} E_1^j \sqcup \text{reg}_{\sqcup} \circ W\left(\bullet \text{---} \boxed{\mathbb{k}''}\right).$$

Thus, by regularization theorem, star-regularization theorem, $Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)} \circ \text{reg}_{\sqcup} = Z_{\sqcup}^{(0)}$ and $Z_{\sqcup}^{(0)} = Z \circ \text{reg}_{\sqcup}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)}(w^*(\mathbb{k})) &= \rho_Z \circ Z_*^{(T)}(w^*(\mathbb{k})) \\
&= \rho_Z \circ (\rho_Z^*)^{-1} \circ Z_{\sqcup}^{(T)}(W(\bullet \text{---} \boxed{\mathbb{k}})). \\
&= \sum_{\mathbb{k}=(\mathbb{k}'', \{1\}^j)} \rho_Z \circ (\rho_Z^*)^{-1} \left(\frac{T^j}{j!} Z_{\sqcup}^{(0)}(W(\bullet \text{---} \boxed{\mathbb{k}''})) \right) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbb{k}=(\mathbb{k}'', \{1\}^j)} \rho_Z \circ (\rho_Z^*)^{-1} \left(\frac{T^j}{j!} \right) \times Z \circ \text{reg}_{\sqcup}(W(\bullet \text{---} \boxed{\mathbb{k}''})).
\end{aligned}$$

Let us calculate $\rho_Z \circ (\rho_Z^*)^{-1} \left(\frac{T^j}{j!} \right)$. By definition

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_Z \circ (\rho_Z^*)^{-1}(e^{T\xi}) &= \Gamma_Z(\xi) \Gamma_Z(-\xi) e^{T\xi} \\
&= \exp \left(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{Z(E_1 E_0^{n-1})}{n} (\xi^n + (-\xi)^n) \right) e^{T\xi} \\
&= \exp \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{Z(E_1 E_0^{2m-1})}{m} \xi^{2m} \right) e^{T\xi},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\exp \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{Z(E_1 E_0^{2m-1})}{m} \xi^{2m} \right)$$

is equal to

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} Z(w^*(\{2\}^m)) \xi^{2m}$$

by harmonic relation. Thus

$$\rho_Z \circ (\rho_Z^*)^{-1}(e^{T\xi}) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} Z(w^*(\{2\}^m)) \xi^{2m} e^{T\xi}$$

From the coefficient of ξ^n , we get

$$\rho_Z \circ (\rho_Z^*)^{-1} \left(\frac{T^n}{n!} \right) = \sum_{m=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} Z(w^*(\{2\}^m)) \xi^{2m} \frac{T^{n-2m}}{(n-2m)!},$$

and thus the constant term of $\rho_Z \circ (\rho_Z^*)^{-1} \left(\frac{T^n}{n!} \right)$ is given by

$$\begin{cases} Z(w^*(\{2\}^{n/2})) & n : \text{even} \\ 0 & n : \text{odd.} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$Z(w^*(\{2\}^{n/2})) = 2(1 - 2^{1-n})Z(E_1 E_0^{n-1})$$

for even $n > 0$ by [16, Theorem 3.13 (2)]. Therefore,

$$Z_{\square}^{(0)}(w^*(\mathbb{k})) = \sum_{\mathbb{k}=(\mathbb{k}'', \{1\}^{2m})} Z \circ \text{reg}_{\square}(W(\bullet - \square^{\mathbb{k}''})) \times \begin{cases} 1 & m = 0 \\ 2(1 - 2^{1-2m})Z(E_1 E_0^{2m-1}) & m > 0. \end{cases}$$

Now, let us prove the lemma. If we put $w = \varrho(w^*(\mathbb{k}))$ then

$$\begin{aligned} L_1(\text{reg}_{\square}(\varrho(w))) &= L_1(\text{reg}_{\square}(w^*(\mathbb{k}))) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbb{k}=(\mathbb{k}'', \{1\}^{2m})} L_1(\text{reg}_{\square}(W(\bullet - \square^{\mathbb{k}''}))) \times \begin{cases} 1 & m = 0 \\ 2(1 - 2^{1-2m})L_1(E_1 E_0^{2m-1}) & m > 0. \end{cases} \\ &= \sum_{\mathbb{k}=(\mathbb{k}'', \{1\}^{2m})} L_1(\text{reg}_{\square}(\theta(\mathbb{k}''))) \times \begin{cases} 1 & m = 0 \\ -2L_1(E_{-1} E_0^{2m-1}) & m > 0 \end{cases} \\ &= L_1 \circ \theta_1(\mathbb{k}) \\ &= L_1(\varphi(\varrho(w^*(\mathbb{k})))) \\ &= L_1(\varphi(w)). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first equality is trivial, the second equality is because L_1 satisfies the double shuffle relation, the third equality is by the distribution relation (Lemma 2.14), the fourth equality is by the duality relation of multiple zeta values and Lemma 2.14, and the last two equalities are by definition. Since any element of \mathcal{C} can be written as a linear sum of $\varrho(w^*(\mathbb{k}))$, we complete the proof. \square

Lemma 2.18. $\varphi(\mathcal{A}_{k,d}(\{0, 1\})) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k,d}(\{0, 1, -1\})$

Proof. Let $k > 0$. It is enough to show that $\varphi(u) \in \mathcal{A}_{k,d}(\{0, 1, -1\})$ for $u = e_1 e_0^{l_1-1} \cdots e_1 e_0^{l_d-1}$ with $l_1 + \cdots + l_d = k$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \varrho(u) &= (-e_1)(e_0 - e_1)^{l_1-1}(-e_1)(e_0 - e_1)^{l_2-1} \cdots (-e_1)(e_0 - e_1)^{l_d-1} \\ &= -e_1(e_0 - e_1)^{l_1-1}((e_0 - e_1) - e_0)(e_0 - e_1)^{l_2-1} \cdots ((e_0 - e_1) - e_0)(e_0 - e_1)^{l_d-1} \end{aligned}$$

can be written as a \mathbb{Q} -linear sum of

$$w^*(k_1, \dots, k_r)$$

with $r \geq k - d + 1$. In other words, u can be written as a \mathbb{Q} -linear sum of

$$\varrho(w^*(k_1, \dots, k_r))$$

with $r \geq k - d + 1$, and thus $\varphi(u)$ can be written as a \mathbb{Q} -linear sum of

$$\varphi(\varrho(w^*(k_1, \dots, k_r))) = \theta_1(k_1, \dots, k_r)$$

with $r \geq k - d + 1$. For any k_1, \dots, k_r with $k_1 + \cdots + k_r = k$, if

$$(k_1, \dots, k_r)$$

has the form

$$(\mathbb{k}', \{1\}^{2m}) \quad (m \geq 0),$$

then

$$\varsigma(\theta(\mathbb{k}')) \in \mathcal{A}_{k-2m, k-r}(\{0, 1\}),$$

and especially if $r \geq k - d + 1$ then

$$\varsigma(\theta(\mathbb{k}')) \in \mathcal{A}_{k-2m, d-1}(\{0, 1\}).$$

By (2.1) and the facts that neither dist nor reg_{\square} change the depth and that taking shuffle product with $e_{-1}e_0^{2m-1}$ increases depth by one, we can now conclude that

$$\varphi(u) \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k,d}(\{0, 1, -1\}). \quad \square$$

Combining the arguments above, we can construct a map $\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$ with desirable properties as follows.

Definition 2.19. Define $\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$ as the composite map

$$\mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{e_{-1} \mapsto 0} \mathcal{B}' \xrightarrow[u \sqcup v \mapsto u \otimes v]{\simeq} \mathcal{B}'' \otimes \mathcal{B}''' \xrightarrow[\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0} \otimes (e_a \mapsto e_{-a/z^2})]{\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}} \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1\}) \otimes \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{u \otimes v \mapsto \text{dist}(u) \sqcup \wp(v)} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}).$$

Here, $e_{-1} \mapsto 0$ in the first arrow denotes the ring homomorphism that annihilates the monomials containing e_{-1} , and $e_a \mapsto e_{-a/z^2}$ in the third map denotes the ring homomorphism that maps e_a to e_{-a/z^2} for $a \in \{0, -z^2\}$. By definition and the arguments above, we have

$$(2.2) \quad \text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow 0} L_z(u) = L_1(\text{reg } u)$$

for $u \in \mathcal{B}$. Furthermore, by the construction and Lemma 2.18, each step preserves the depth filtration. Hence we have

$$(2.3) \quad \text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(\mathcal{B}_{k,d}) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$$

for any k, d .

2.4. Auxiliary congruences for $\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}$. In this section, we will prove the following auxiliary congruences which will be used in the proof of Lemma 3.8.

Lemma 2.20. For $d > 0$ and $k_1, \dots, k_d > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{-z^2} e_0^{k_1-1} \dots e_{-z^2} e_0^{k_d-1}) \\ & \equiv \begin{cases} 2e_{-1} e_0^{k-1} & k \text{ is even} \\ 0 & k \text{ is odd} \end{cases} + \begin{cases} 2(e_1 + e_{-1})^{k-1} e_0 & \mathbb{k} = \{1\}^k \\ 0 & \mathbb{k} \neq \{1\}^k \end{cases} \pmod{4\mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For any monomial u in \mathcal{C} ,

$$\text{dist} \circ \text{reg}_{\sqcup} \circ \wp(u) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & u = 1 \\ (-1)^k 2(e_1 + e_{-1})^{k-1} e_0 & u = e_1 e_0^{k-1} \text{ for some } k > 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

modulo $4\mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$, since if there are more than one e_1 in u then there are more than one e_0 in each monomial that appears in $\text{reg}_{\sqcup} \circ \wp(u)$ and dist maps e_0 to $2e_0$. Thus

$$\theta'(\mathbb{k}) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \mathbb{k} = \emptyset \\ (-1)^{k+1} 2(e_1 + e_{-1})^{k-1} e_0 & \mathbb{k} = (k), k > 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

modulo $4\mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$. Therefore

$$(2.4) \quad \theta_1(\mathbb{k}) \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \mathbb{k} = \emptyset \\ (-1)^{k+1} 2(e_1 + e_{-1})^{k-1} e_0 & \mathbb{k} = (k), k > 1 \\ 2e_{-1} e_0^{2m-1} & \mathbb{k} = \{1\}^{2m}, m > 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

modulo $4\mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$ since

$$2e_{-1} e_0^{2m-1} \sqcup \theta'(\mathbb{k}') \equiv 0 \pmod{4\mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})}$$

if \mathbb{k}' is not empty. Note that

$$\wp(w^*(l_1, \dots, l_r)) = e_1(e_0 - e_1)^{l_1-1} e_0(e_0 - e_1)^{l_2-1} \dots e_0(e_0 - e_1)^{l_r-1}.$$

Now, let us calculate

$$\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{-z^2} e_0^{k_1-1} \dots e_{-z^2} e_0^{k_d-1}) = \wp(e_1 e_0^{k_1-1} \dots e_1 e_0^{k_d-1})$$

modulo $4\mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$. Put $k = k_1 + \dots + k_d$. Assume that $k > 0$. Note that

$$e_1 e_0^{k_1-1} \dots e_1 e_0^{k_d-1} = e_1 e_0^{k_1-1} (e_0 - (e_0 - e_1)) e_0^{k_2-1} \dots (e_0 - (e_0 - e_1)) e_0^{k_d-1}.$$

By expanding this, we can obtain the expression of $e_1 e_0^{k_1-1} \cdots e_1 e_0^{k_d-1}$ as a linear sum of $\varrho(w^*(l_1, \dots, l_r))$. In other words

$$e_1 e_0^{k_1-1} \cdots e_1 e_0^{k_d-1} = \sum_{\mathbf{l}=(l_1, \dots, l_r)} c_{\mathbf{l}} \varrho(w^*(\mathbf{l})) \quad c_{\mathbf{l}} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Then $c_{(k)}$ (the coefficient of $\varrho(w^*(k)) = e_1(e_0 - e_1)^{k-1}$) is equal to

$$\begin{cases} (-1)^{k-1} & k_1 = \cdots = k_d = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and $c_{\{1\}^k}$ (the coefficient of $\varrho(w^*(\{1\}^k)) = e_1 e_0^{k-1}$) is equal to 1 for any k_1, \dots, k_d . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(e_1 e_0^{k_1-1} \cdots e_1 e_0^{k_d-1}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{l}=(l_1, \dots, l_r)} c_{\mathbf{l}} \varphi(\varrho(w^*(\mathbf{l}))) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{l}=(l_1, \dots, l_r)} c_{\mathbf{l}} \theta_1(\mathbf{l}) \\ &\equiv \begin{cases} 2e_{-1} e_0^{k-1} & k \text{ is even} \\ 0 & k \text{ is odd} \end{cases} + \begin{cases} 2(e_1 + e_{-1})^{k-1} e_0 & \mathbb{k} = \{1\}^k \\ 0 & \mathbb{k} \neq \{1\}^k \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

modulo $4\mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$. □

2.5. Confluence relations for Euler sums.

Definition 2.21. Note that any monomial $u = e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_k} \in \mathcal{B}$ can be uniquely expressed in the form

$$u = e_{a_1}^{l_1} \cdots e_{a_r}^{l_r} \quad (a_1 \neq a_2 \neq \cdots \neq a_r, \quad l_1, l_2, \dots, l_r > 0).$$

For $c \in \{0, 1, -1\}$, we define a linear map $\partial_c : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ by

$$\partial_c(e_{a_1}^{l_1} \cdots e_{a_r}^{l_r}) = \sum_{i=1}^r \text{ord}_{z=c} \left(\frac{a_i - a_{i+1}}{a_i - a_{i-1}} \right) e_{a_1}^{l_1} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}}^{l_{i-1}} e_{a_i}^{l_i-1} e_{a_{i+1}}^{l_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_r}^{l_r}$$

with $a_0 = 0$ and $a_{r+1} = z$.

As a special case of the differential formula for a general iterated integral ([17, Lemma 3.3.30]), we obtain

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{d}{dz} L_z(u) = \sum_{c \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \frac{1}{z - c} L_z(\partial_c u)$$

for $u \in \mathcal{B}$. It should be noted that ∂_c maps $\mathcal{B}_{k,d}$ to $\mathcal{B}_{k-1,d-|c|}$ for $c \in \{0, 1, -1\}$.

We define a linear map $L_z^{\sqcup} : \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, -1\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$L_z^{\sqcup}(u) = I(0'; u; z)$$

where $0' = \overrightarrow{1}_0$. Note that

$$(2.6) \quad \text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0} L_z^{\sqcup}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) = \delta_{k,0},$$

$$(2.7) \quad \frac{d}{dz} L_z^{\sqcup}(ue_a) = \frac{1}{z - a} L_z^{\sqcup}(u).$$

Definition 2.22. We define $\varphi_{\otimes} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, -1\})$ by

$$\varphi_{\otimes}(u) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(\partial_{c_1} \cdots \partial_{c_l} u) \otimes e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_l}.$$

Lemma 2.23. For $u \in \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$L_z(u) = (L_1 \otimes L_z^{\sqcup}) \circ \varphi_{\otimes}(u).$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on the degree of u . By (2.6) and (2.2), we have

$$(2.8) \quad \operatorname{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0} (L_1 \otimes L_z^{\sqcup}) \circ \varphi_{\otimes}(u) = L_1(\operatorname{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0} u) = \operatorname{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0} L_z(u).$$

By (2.7), we have

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dz} (L_1 \otimes L_z^{\sqcup}) \circ \varphi_{\otimes}(u) &= \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \frac{1}{z - c_l} (L_1 \otimes L_z^{\sqcup}) \left(\operatorname{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0} (\partial_{c_1} \cdots \partial_{c_l} u) \otimes e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_{l-1}} \right) \\ &= \sum_{c \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \frac{1}{z - c} (L_1 \otimes L_z^{\sqcup}) \circ \varphi_{\otimes}(\partial_c u). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by (2.9), induction hypothesis, and (2.5), we have

$$(2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dz} (L_1 \otimes L_z^{\sqcup}) \circ \varphi_{\otimes}(u) &= \sum_{c \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \frac{1}{z - c} L_z(\partial_c u) \\ &= \frac{d}{dz} L_z(u). \end{aligned}$$

Now the lemma readily follows from (2.8) and (2.10). \square

Definition 2.24. Define $\varphi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$ as the composite map

$$\mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\otimes}} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, -1\}) \xrightarrow{\operatorname{id} \otimes \operatorname{reg}_{\sqcup}} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \xrightarrow{\sqcup} \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}).$$

Since

$$\varphi_{\otimes}(\mathcal{B}_{k,d}) \subset \sum_{\substack{k' + k'' = k \\ d' + d'' = d}} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k',d'}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}_{k'',d''}(\{0, 1, -1\})$$

we have

$$(2.11) \quad \varphi(\mathcal{B}_{k,d}) \subset \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$$

for any $k, d \geq 0$.

Definition 2.25 (Confluence relations of level two). We put

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} := \{u|_{z \rightarrow 1} - \varphi(u) \mid u \in \mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathcal{B}\} \subset \mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$$

where $u|_{z \rightarrow 1}$ is an element of $\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, -1\})$ obtained by replacing all $e_{p(z)}$ in u with $e_{p(1)}$.

Theorem 2.26. *We have*

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} \subset \ker (L_1 : \mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}).$$

Proof. Let $u \in \mathcal{B}$. We prove the theorem by taking the regularized limit $\operatorname{Reg}_{z \rightarrow 1-0}$ of Lemma 2.23:

$$(2.12) \quad \operatorname{Reg}_{z \rightarrow 1-0} L_z(u) = \operatorname{Reg}_{z \rightarrow 1-0} (L_1 \otimes L_z^{\sqcup}) \circ \varphi_{\otimes}(u).$$

For the left-hand side, we have

$$(2.13) \quad \operatorname{Reg}_{z \rightarrow 1-0} L_z(u) = \lim_{z \rightarrow 1-0} L_z(u) = L_1(u|_{z \rightarrow 1})$$

by definition.

Now we compute the right-hand side. We obtain

$$(2.14) \quad \operatorname{Reg}_{z \rightarrow 1-0} L_z^{\sqcup}(w) = L_1 \circ \operatorname{reg}_{\sqcup}(w) \quad (w \in \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, -1\}))$$

by the following properties of $f(w) := \operatorname{Reg}_{z \rightarrow 1-0} L_z^{\sqcup}(w)$:

$$f(w_1 \sqcup w_2) = f(w_1) \times f(w_2), \quad f(e_0) = f(e_1) = 0, \quad f|_{\mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})} = L_1.$$

Here, the first and the third properties are obvious while the second property follows from the expressions $L_z^{\sqcup}(e_0) = \log z$ and $L_z^{\sqcup}(e_1) = \log(1 - z)$. By (2.14), we have

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{Reg}_{z \rightarrow 1-0} (L_1 \otimes L_z^{\sqcup}) \circ \varphi_{\otimes}(u) &= (L_1 \otimes (L_1 \circ \operatorname{reg}_{\sqcup})) \circ \varphi_{\otimes}(u) \\ &= L_1 \circ \varphi(u). \end{aligned}$$

By (2.12), (2.13) and (2.15), we have

$$L_1(u|_{z \rightarrow 1}) = L_1 \circ \varphi(u).$$

Thus

$$u|_{z \rightarrow 1} - \varphi(u) \in \ker(L_1),$$

which proves the theorem. \square

3. MAIN THEOREM

3.1. The statement and the proof overview of the main theorem. We put

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{CF}} := (\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathcal{A}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})) / \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}},$$

and

$$\mathfrak{J}^{\text{D}}(k, d) := \{(k_1, \dots, k_r) \in \mathfrak{J}(k, d) \mid k_1, \dots, k_{r-1} > 0, k_r < 0, k_2 \equiv \dots \equiv k_r \equiv 1 \pmod{2}\}$$

$$X^{\bullet}(k, d) := \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}_{(2)}} \{w(\mathbb{k}) \bmod \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} \mid \mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J}^{\bullet}(k, d)\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{CF}} \quad (\bullet = \emptyset \text{ or } \text{D})$$

$$\tilde{X}^{\bullet}(k, d) := \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}_{(2)}} \{\tilde{w}(\mathbb{k}) \bmod \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} \mid \mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J}^{\bullet}(k, d)\} \subset \mathcal{H}_{\text{CF}} \quad (\bullet = \emptyset \text{ or } \text{D})$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_{(2)} := \{p/q \in \mathbb{Q} \mid p \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in 1 + 2\mathbb{Z}\}$. The purpose of this section is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *For any $k \geq 0$ and $d \geq 0$,*

$$\tilde{X}(k, d) = \tilde{X}^{\text{D}}(k, d).$$

As a restatement of this theorem, we obtain the following.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $k, d \geq 0$, R a \mathbb{Q} -vector space, and $Z : \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \rightarrow R$ a linear map such that $Z(\mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}}) = \{0\}$. Then for $\mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J}(k, d)$, $Z(\tilde{w}(\mathbb{k}))$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ -linear combination of $\{Z(\tilde{w}(\mathbb{k}')) \mid \mathbb{k}' \in \mathfrak{J}^{\text{D}}(k, d)\}$. Especially, for any $\mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J}(k, d)$, $\tilde{\zeta}(\mathbb{k})$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ -linear combination of $\{\tilde{\zeta}(\mathbb{k}') \mid \mathbb{k}' \in \mathfrak{J}^{\text{D}}(k, d)\}$.*

The proof of Theorem 3.1 proceeds as follows. Note that $\text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}}\{w(\mathbb{k}) \mid \mathbb{k} \in \mathfrak{J}(k, d)\} = \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$. In order to reduce $\tilde{X}(k, d)$ to $\tilde{X}^{\text{D}}(k, d)$, we introduce an intermediate space

$$\begin{aligned} Y(k, d) &:= \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}_{(2)}} \{w(k_1, \dots, k_r) \bmod \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} \mid (k_1, \dots, k_r) \in \mathfrak{J}(k, d), k_1, \dots, k_{r-1} > 0, k_r < 0\} \\ &= \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}_{(2)}} \{u \bmod \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} \mid u \in \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, -1\})\} \end{aligned}$$

and consider the two-step reduction, firstly $X(k, d)$ to $Y(k, d)$ and secondly $Y(k, d)$ to $X^{\text{D}}(k, d)$ (modulo 2 and lower depth). More precisely, we will first prove

$$X(k, d) \subset Y(k, d) + 2X(k, d)$$

in the next section (Lemma 3.3) and then in the next next section, we will prove

$$Y(k, d) \subset X^{\text{D}}(k, d) + 2X(k, d) + \frac{1}{2}X(k, d-1)$$

(Lemma 3.9) thereby derive Theorem 3.1 by combining the two inclusions above.

3.2. Step 1: the proof of $X(k, d) \subset Y(k, d) + 2X(k, d)$.

Lemma 3.3. *We have*

$$X(k, d) \subset Y(k, d) + 2X(k, d).$$

Proof. It suffices to prove

$$(3.1) \quad (u \bmod \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}}) \in Y(k, d) + 2X(k, d)$$

for $u := e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \in \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$. We will prove (3.1) using the element $u'|_{z \rightarrow 1} - \varphi(u') \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}}$ for

$$u' := e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_k} \in \mathcal{B}(k, d) \cap \mathbb{Z} \langle e_0, e_{-1}, e_z \rangle$$

where

$$b_j := \begin{cases} a_j & a_j = 0, -1 \\ z & a_j = 1. \end{cases}$$

By definition, we have

$$(3.2) \quad u'|_{z \rightarrow 1} = u.$$

Recall that $\varphi = (\sqcup) \circ (\text{id} \otimes \text{reg}_{\sqcup}) \circ \varphi_{\otimes}$. By definition, we can write

$$\varphi_{\otimes}(u') = \sum_{l=0}^k w_l$$

where

$$w_l \in \sum_{d'+d''=d} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{l,d'}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}_{k-l,d''}(\{0, -1\}).$$

Note that the right side of the tensor symbol is $\mathcal{A}_{k-l,d''}(\{0, -1\})$ rather than $\mathcal{A}_{k-l,d''}(\{0, 1, -1\})$ since $u' \in \mathbb{Z}\langle e_0, e_{-1}, e_z \rangle$. For w_0 , we have

$$(3.3) \quad (\sqcup) \circ (\text{id} \otimes \text{reg}_{\sqcup})(w_0) \in \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, -1\})$$

by definition, while for w_l ($l > 0$), we have

$$(3.4) \quad (\sqcup) \circ (\text{id} \otimes \text{reg}_{\sqcup})(w_l) \in 2\mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \quad (l > 0)$$

by the definition of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{l,d'}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$. Therefore, by (3.3) and (3.4), we find that

$$(3.5) \quad \varphi(u') \in \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, -1\}) + 2\mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}).$$

By (3.2) and (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (u \bmod \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}}) &= (u'|_{z \rightarrow 1} \bmod \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}}) \\ &= (\varphi(u') \bmod \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}}) \\ &\in Y(k, d) + 2X(k, d), \end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.1). \square

3.3. Step 2: the proofs of $Y(k, d) \subset X^{\text{D}}(k, d) + 2X(k, d) + \frac{1}{2}X(k, d-1)$ and the main theorem.

Definition 3.4. For $k \geq 0$ and $d \geq 0$, we define subspaces $M_{k,d}$ and $N_{k,d}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, -1\})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} M_{k,d} &:= \sum_{\substack{k'+k''=k \\ d'+d''=d}} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k',d'}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}_{k'',d''}(\{0, 1, -1\}) \\ N_{k,d} &:= \sum_{\substack{k'+k''=k \\ d'+d''=d \\ k'>0}} \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k',d'}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}_{k'',d''}(\{0, 1, -1\}) = 2 \sum_{\substack{k'+k''=k \\ d'+d''=d \\ k'>0}} \mathcal{A}_{k',d'}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}_{k'',d''}(\{0, 1, -1\}). \end{aligned}$$

We introduce “cutting-off lower depth version” $\bar{\partial}_c$ (resp. $\bar{\varphi}_{\otimes}$) and “mod 2 version” $\bar{\bar{\partial}}_c$ (resp. $\bar{\bar{\varphi}}_{\otimes}$) of ∂_c (resp. φ_{\otimes}) as follows. Note that ∂_c can also be written as

$$\partial_c(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) := \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}} e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_k} \times \sum_{p \in \{1, -1\}} p \cdot \text{ord}_{z-c}(a_{i+p} - a_i),$$

where we have put $\text{ord}_{z-c}(0) := 0$.

Definition 3.5. For $c \in \{0, 1, -1\}$, we define linear maps $\bar{\partial}_c, \bar{\bar{\partial}}_c : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}_c(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) &:= \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}} e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_k} \times \sum_{p \in \{1, -1\}} \begin{cases} 0 & c = 0 \text{ and } a_i \neq 0 \\ p \cdot \text{ord}_{z-c}(a_{i+p} - a_i) & c \neq 0 \text{ or } a_i = 0 \end{cases} \\ \bar{\bar{\partial}}_c(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) &:= \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}} e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_k} \times \sum_{p \in \{1, -1\}} \begin{cases} 0 & c = 0 \text{ and } a_i \neq 0 \\ p \cdot (\text{ord}_{z-c}(a_{i+p} - a_i) \bmod 2) & c \neq 0 \text{ or } a_i = 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

with $a_0 = 0$ and $a_{k+1} = z$. Here, $(x \bmod 2)$ is considered to be an element of $\{0, 1\}$. By definition, $\partial_c = \bar{\partial}_c = \bar{\bar{\partial}}_c$ if $|c| = 1$.

Definition 3.6. We define $\bar{\varphi}_\otimes, \bar{\bar{\varphi}}_\otimes : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, -1\})$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\varphi}_\otimes(u) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \operatorname{reg}(\bar{\partial}_{c_1} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_l} u) \otimes e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_l}, \\ \bar{\bar{\varphi}}_\otimes(u) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \operatorname{reg}(\bar{\bar{\partial}}_{c_1} \cdots \bar{\bar{\partial}}_{c_l} u) \otimes e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_l}.\end{aligned}$$

By definition,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\partial}_c(u) &\equiv \partial_c(u) \pmod{\mathcal{B}_{k-1, d-1-|c|}} \\ \bar{\bar{\partial}}_c(u) &\equiv \partial_c(u) \pmod{\mathcal{B}_{k-1, d-1-|c|} + 2\mathcal{B}_{k-1, d-|c|}}\end{aligned}$$

for $u \in \mathcal{B}_{k,d}$. Thus we have

$$(3.6) \quad \bar{\varphi}_\otimes(u) \equiv \varphi_\otimes(u) \pmod{M_{k,d-1}}$$

$$(3.7) \quad \bar{\bar{\varphi}}_\otimes(u) \equiv \varphi_\otimes(u) \pmod{2M_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}}$$

for $u \in \mathcal{B}_{k,d}$.

Lemma 3.7. For all $u \in \mathcal{B}_{k,d} \cap \mathbb{Z}\langle e_0, e_{-1}, e_{-z^2} \rangle$, we have

$$\varphi_\otimes(u) \equiv 1 \otimes u|_{z \rightarrow 1} \pmod{N_{k,d} + 2M_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}}.$$

Proof. Since

$$\varphi_\otimes(u) \equiv \bar{\bar{\varphi}}_\otimes(u) \pmod{2M_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}}$$

by (3.7) and

$$\bar{\bar{\varphi}}_\otimes(u) \equiv \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_k \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \bar{\bar{\partial}}_{c_1} \cdots \bar{\bar{\partial}}_{c_k} u \otimes e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_k} \pmod{N_{k,d}}$$

by definition of $N_{k,d}$ and $\bar{\bar{\varphi}}_\otimes$, the claim is equivalent to

$$\sum_{c_1, \dots, c_k \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \bar{\bar{\partial}}_{c_1} \cdots \bar{\bar{\partial}}_{c_k} u \otimes e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_k} \equiv 1 \otimes u|_{z \rightarrow 1} \pmod{N_{k,d} + 2M_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}}$$

for $u \in \mathcal{B}_{k,d} \cap \mathbb{Z}\langle e_0, e_{-1}, e_{-z^2} \rangle$. In fact, we shall prove a more precise equality

$$(3.8) \quad \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_k \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \bar{\bar{\partial}}_{c_1} \cdots \bar{\bar{\partial}}_{c_k} u \otimes e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_k} = 1 \otimes u|_{z \rightarrow 1}$$

by induction on k . The $k = 0$ case is obvious. Assume that $k > 0$. It is sufficient to consider the case where u is a monomial. Define $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \{0, -1, -z^2\}$ and $a'_1, \dots, a'_k \in \{0, -1\}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} &= u, \\ e_{a'_1} \cdots e_{a'_k} &= u|_{z \rightarrow 1}.\end{aligned}$$

By definition of $\bar{\bar{\partial}}_c$, we have

$$\bar{\bar{\partial}}_c u = |c| \cdot u' + \delta_{c, a'_k} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{k-1}}$$

where

$$u' = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k-1 \\ \{a_i, a_{i+1}\} = \{-1, -z^2\}}} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}} (e_{a_{i+1}} - e_{a_i}) e_{a_{i+2}} \cdots e_{a_k}.$$

Thus, by induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_k \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \bar{\partial}_{c_1} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_k} u \otimes e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_k} \\
&= \sum_{c \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_{k-1} \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \bar{\partial}_{c_1} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_{k-1}} \left(|c| \cdot u' + \delta_{c, a'_k} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{k-1}} \right) \otimes e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_{k-1}} e_c \\
&= \sum_{c \in \{0, 1, -1\}} 1 \otimes \left(|c| \cdot u' + \delta_{c, a'_k} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{k-1}} \right) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 1} e_c \\
&= \sum_{c \in \{0, 1, -1\}} 1 \otimes \delta_{c, a'_k} e_{a'_1} \cdots e_{a'_{k-1}} e_c \\
&= 1 \otimes u \Big|_{z \rightarrow 1},
\end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.8). \square

Lemma 3.8. *Let $d \geq 1$, $k_1, \dots, k_d \geq 1$, and $b_1, \dots, b_d \in \{-1, -z^2\}$ such that $b_1 = -1$ or $k_1 = 1$. Put*

$$u := e_{b_1} e_0^{k_1-1} \cdots e_{b_d} e_0^{k_d-1} \in \mathcal{B}_{k,d}$$

where $k := k_1 + \cdots + k_d$. Assume that e_{-1} and e_{-z^2} are not adjacent in u , i.e., $k_i > 1$ for all i such that $b_i \neq b_{i+1}$. Then we have

$$\varphi_{\otimes}(u) \equiv 1 \otimes \left(2 \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq d \\ b_i \neq b_{i+1} \\ k_j \in 1+2\mathbb{Z}}} w^-(\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}) + \left(1 + 2 \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq d \\ b_j = -z^2 \\ k_j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} 1 \right) w^-(\mathbb{k}) \right) \pmod{2N_{k,d} + 4M_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}}$$

where we put

$$\mathbb{k} := (k_1, \dots, k_d),$$

$$\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)} := (k_1, \dots, k_{i-1}, k_i - 1, k_{i+1}, \dots, k_{j-1}, k_j + 1, k_{j+1}, \dots, k_d),$$

and

$$w^-(l_1, \dots, l_d) := w(l_1, \dots, l_{d-1}, -l_d) = e_{-1} e_0^{l_1-1} \cdots e_{-1} e_0^{l_d-1}$$

for positive integers l_1, \dots, l_d .

Proof. Define $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \{0, -1, -z^2\}$ and $a'_1, \dots, a'_k \in \{0, -1\}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} &= u, \\
e_{a'_1} \cdots e_{a'_k} &= u \Big|_{z \rightarrow 1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.6), we have

$$(3.9) \quad \varphi_{\otimes}(u) \equiv \bar{\varphi}_{\otimes}(u) \pmod{M_{k,d-1}}.$$

The difference of $\bar{\partial}_c$ and $\bar{\partial}_c$ is expressed as

$$\bar{\partial}_c - \bar{\partial}_c = 2D_c$$

where D_c is a linear map defined by $D_{\pm 1} := 0$ and

$$D_0(e_{x_1} \cdots e_{x_l}) := \sum_{i=1}^l e_{x_1} \cdots e_{x_{i-1}} e_{x_{i+1}} \cdots e_{x_l} \times \sum_{p \in \{1, -1\}} p \cdot \begin{cases} 1 & (x_i, x_{i+p}) = (0, -z^2) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.10) \quad \bar{\varphi}_{\otimes}(u) &= \sum_{l=0}^k \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \operatorname{reg}(\bar{\partial}_{c_1} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_l} u) \otimes e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_l} \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^k \sum_{c_{s+1}, \dots, c_k \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \operatorname{reg}(\bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_k} u) \otimes e_{c_{s+1}} \cdots e_{c_k} \quad (s = k-l) \\
&= 2F_1 + F_2
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_1 = \sum_{0 \leq s < t \leq k} \sum_{c_{s+1}, \dots, c_k \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \operatorname{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(\bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_{t-1}} D_{c_t} \bar{\partial}_{c_{t+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_k} u) \otimes e_{c_{s+1}} \cdots e_{c_k}$$

and

$$F_2 = \sum_{s=0}^k \sum_{c_{s+1}, \dots, c_k \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \operatorname{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(\bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_k} u) \otimes e_{c_{s+1}} \cdots e_{c_k},$$

which is obtained by expanding as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_k} &= 2\bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_{k-1}} D_{c_k} + \bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_{k-1}} \bar{\partial}_{c_k} \\ &= 2\bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_{k-1}} D_{c_k} + 2\bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_{k-2}} D_{c_{k-1}} \bar{\partial}_{c_k} + \bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_{k-2}} \bar{\partial}_{c_{k-1}} \bar{\partial}_{c_k} \\ &= \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we can easily check that

$$\bar{\partial}_{c_{t+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_k} u = \begin{cases} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_t} & c_j = a'_j \text{ for all } t+1 \leq j \leq k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

by the assumption that e_{-1} and e_{-z^2} are not adjacent in u . Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \sum_{0 \leq s < t \leq k} \sum_{c_{s+1}, \dots, c_t \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \operatorname{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(\bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_{t-1}} D_{c_t}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_t})) \otimes e_{c_{s+1}} \cdots e_{c_t} e_{a'_{t+1}} \cdots e_{a'_k} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq s < t \leq k} \left(\sum_{c_{s+1}, \dots, c_{t-1} \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \operatorname{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(\bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_{t-1}} D_0(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_t})) \otimes e_{c_{s+1}} \cdots e_{c_{t-1}} \right) \times (1 \otimes e_0 e_{a'_{t+1}} \cdots e_{a'_k}) \\ &= \sum_{0 < t \leq k} \bar{\varphi}_{\otimes}(D_0(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_t})) \times (1 \otimes e_0 e_{a'_{t+1}} \cdots e_{a'_k}) \\ (3.11) \quad &= \sum_{\substack{u'=u'u'' \\ u', u'': \text{monomial}}} \bar{\varphi}_{\otimes}(D_0(u')) \times (1 \otimes e_0 u''|_{z \rightarrow 1}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.7, we have

$$(3.12) \quad \sum_{\substack{u'=u'u'' \\ u', u'': \text{monomial}}} \bar{\varphi}_{\otimes}(D_0 u') \times (1 \otimes e_0 u''|_{z \rightarrow 1}) \equiv 1 \otimes \left(\sum_{\substack{u'=u'u'' \\ u', u'': \text{monomial}}} (D_0(u') e_0 u'')|_{z \rightarrow 1} \right) \pmod{N_{k,d} + 2M_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}}.$$

Furthermore, $\sum_{\substack{u'=u'u'' \\ u', u'': \text{monomial}}} (D_0(u') e_0 u'')|_{z \rightarrow 1} = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} G_j$ where

$$\begin{aligned} G_j &= \sum_{s=0}^{k_j-1} \left(D_0(e_{b_1} e_0^{k_1-1} \cdots e_{b_{j-1}} e_0^{k_{j-1}-1} e_{b_j} e_0^s) \right) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 1} e_0(e_0^{k_j-1-s} e_{-1} e_0^{k_{j+1}-1} \cdots e_{-1} e_0^{k_d-1}) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^{k_j-1} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \\ k_i \neq 1}} (\delta_{b_{i+1}, -z^2} - \delta_{b_i, -z^2}) \\ &\quad \times \left(e_{b_1} e_0^{k_1-1} \cdots e_{b_i} e_0^{k_i-2} \cdots e_{b_{j-1}} e_0^{k_{j-1}-1} e_{b_j} e_0^s \right) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 1} e_0^{k_j-s} e_{-1} e_0^{k_{j+1}-1} \cdots e_{-1} e_0^{k_d-1} \\ &\quad - \sum_{s=1}^{k_j-1} \delta_{b_j, -z^2} \left(e_{b_1} e_0^{k_1-1} \cdots e_{b_{j-1}} e_0^{k_{j-1}-1} e_{b_j} e_0^{s-1} \right) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 1} e_0^{k_j-s} e_{-1} e_0^{k_{j+1}-1} \cdots e_{-1} e_0^{k_d-1} \\ &= k_j \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \\ k_i \neq 1}} (\delta_{b_{i+1}, -z^2} - \delta_{b_i, -z^2}) w^-(\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}) - (k_j - 1) \delta_{b_j, -z^2} w^-(\mathbb{k}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$(3.13) \quad \sum_{\substack{u=u'u'' \\ u', u'': \text{monomial}}} (D_0(u')e_0u'')|_{z \rightarrow 1} \equiv \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq d \\ b_i \neq b_{i+1} \\ k_j \in 1+2\mathbb{Z}}} w^-(\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}) + \left(\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq d \\ b_j = -z^2 \\ k_j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} 1 \right) w^-(\mathbb{k}) \pmod{2\mathcal{A}_{k,d}(\{0, 1, -1\})}.$$

By (3.11), (3.12) and (3.13), we have

$$(3.14) \quad F_1 \equiv 1 \otimes \left(\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq d \\ b_i \neq b_{i+1} \\ k_j \in 1+2\mathbb{Z}}} w^-(\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}) + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq d \\ b_j = -z^2 \\ k_j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} w^-(\mathbb{k}) \right) \pmod{N_{k,d} + 2M_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_2 &= \sum_{s=0}^k \sum_{c_{s+1}, \dots, c_k \in \{0, 1, -1\}} \text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(\bar{\partial}_{c_{s+1}} \cdots \bar{\partial}_{c_k} u) \otimes e_{c_{s+1}} \cdots e_{c_k} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^k \text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_s}) \otimes e_{a'_{s+1}} \cdots e_{a'_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_s}) = 0$ except when $a_1, \dots, a_s \in \{0, -z^2\}$. On the other hand, if $a_1, \dots, a_s \in \{0, -z^2\}$ and $s > 0$, we have

$$\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_s}) \equiv \begin{cases} 2e_{-1}e_0^{s-1} & s \text{ is even} \\ 0 & s \text{ is odd} \end{cases} + \begin{cases} 2(e_1 + e_{-1})^{s-1}e_0 & a_1 = \cdots = a_s = -z^2 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

modulo $4\mathcal{A}_{s,d'}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$ with $d' = \#\{1 \leq j \leq s \mid a_j = -z^2\}$ by Lemma 2.20. Furthermore,

$$2e_{-1}e_0^{s-1} \in \mathcal{A}_{s,d'-1}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$$

if $d' > 1$, and if $a_1 = \cdots = a_s = -z^2$ then

$$2(e_1 + e_{-1})^{s-1}e_0 \in \mathcal{A}_{s,d'-1}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})$$

since $d' = s$ in this case. Thus for any $a_1, \dots, a_s \in \{0, -z^2\}$

$$\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_s}) \otimes e_{a'_{s+1}} \cdots e_{a'_k}$$

is congruent to

$$\begin{cases} 2e_{-1}e_0^{s-1} \otimes e_{a'_{s+1}} \cdots e_{a'_k} & s \leq k_1 \text{ and } s \text{ is even} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

modulo $2N_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} (3.15) \quad F_2 &\equiv 1 \otimes e_{a'_1} \cdots e_{a'_k} + \delta_{b_1, -z^2} \sum_{\substack{2 \leq s \leq k_1 \\ s: \text{even}}} 2e_{-1}e_0^{s-1} \otimes e_{a'_{s+1}} \cdots e_{a'_k} \\ &\equiv 1 \otimes w^-(\mathbb{k}) + 2\delta_{b_1, -z^2} \sum_{\substack{2 \leq s \leq k_1 \\ s: \text{even}}} e_{-1}e_0^{s-1} \otimes e_0^{k_1-s} w^-(k_2, \dots, k_d) \end{aligned}$$

modulo $2N_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}$. Finally, putting (3.9), (3.10), (3.14) and (3.15) together, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\otimes}(u) &\equiv 1 \otimes \left(2 \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i < j \leq d \\ b_i \neq b_{i+1} \\ k_j \in 1+2\mathbb{Z}}} w^-(\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}) + (1 + 2 \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq d \\ b_j = -z^2 \\ k_j \in 2\mathbb{Z}}} 1) w^-(\mathbb{k}) \right) \\ &\quad + 2\delta_{b_1, -z^2} \sum_{\substack{2 \leq s \leq k_1 \\ s: \text{even}}} e_{-1}e_0^{s-1} \otimes e_0^{k_1-s} w^-(k_2, \dots, k_d) \pmod{2N_{k,d} + 4M_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

and since the second term

$$2\delta_{b_1, -z^2} \sum_{\substack{2 \leq s \leq k_1 \\ s: \text{even}}} e_{-1}e_0^{s-1} \otimes e_0^{k_1-s} w^-(k_2, \dots, k_d)$$

vanishes by the assumption $b_1 = -1$ or $k_1 = 1$, this proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.9. *We have*

$$Y(k, d) \subset X^D(k, d) + 2X(k, d) + \frac{1}{2}X(k, d-1).$$

Proof. It suffices to show

$$(3.16) \quad (w^-(k_1, \dots, k_d) \bmod \mathcal{I}_{CF}) \in X^D(k, d) + 2X(k, d) + \frac{1}{2}X(k, d-1)$$

for positive integers k_1, \dots, k_d such that $k_1 + \dots + k_d = k$ where $w^-(k_1, \dots, k_d)$ is the notation used in Lemma 3.8. Put $\mathbb{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d)$. If k_j is odd for all $2 \leq j \leq d$, then $w^-(\mathbb{k}) \in X^D(k, d)$ by definition of X^D . Therefore, we may assume that k_j is even for some $2 \leq j \leq d$. Suppose that j_{\max} is the maximal such j , so that $k_{j'}$ are odd for $j' > j_{\max}$, and $i = i(k_1, \dots, k_d)$ is the minimal non-negative integer such that $i < j_{\max}$ and $k_{i+1} = k_{i+2} = \dots = k_{j_{\max}-1} = 1$. Then we put

$$u := e_{-1}e_0^{k_1-1} \dots e_{-1}e_0^{k_i-1}e_{-z^2}e_0^{k_{i+1}-1} \dots e_{-z^2}e_0^{k_d-1}.$$

Notice that by the choice of i , u satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 3.8, i.e., e_{-1} and e_{-z^2} are not adjacent in u , and u starts with e_{-1} or else $k_1 = 1$. Now, let us calculate the element $u|_{z \rightarrow 1} - \varphi(u) \in \mathcal{I}_{CF}$. By definition,

$$(3.17) \quad u|_{z \rightarrow 1} = w^-(\mathbb{k}).$$

For $\varphi(u)$, we have

$$\varphi_{\otimes}(u) \equiv 1 \otimes \left(2 \sum_{\substack{i < j \leq d \\ k_j \in 1+2\mathbb{Z}}} w^-(\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}) - w^-(\mathbb{k}) \right) \pmod{2N_{k,d} + 4M_{k,d} + M_{k,d-1}}$$

by Lemma 3.8 (we regard $w^-(\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}) = 0$ if $i = 0$) and thus

$$(3.18) \quad \varphi(u) \equiv 2 \sum_{\substack{i < j \leq d \\ k_j \in 1+2\mathbb{Z}}} w^-(\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}) - w^-(\mathbb{k}) \pmod{4\mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) + \mathcal{A}_{k,d-1}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})}.$$

By (3.17) and (3.18), we have

$$w^-(\mathbb{k}) \equiv 2 \sum_{\substack{i < j \leq d \\ k_j \in 1+2\mathbb{Z}}} w^-(\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}) - w^-(\mathbb{k}) \pmod{\mathcal{I}_{CF} + 4\mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) + \mathcal{A}_{k,d-1}^0(\{0, 1, -1\})},$$

by which we find that

$$(3.19) \quad (w^-(\mathbb{k}) \bmod \mathcal{I}_{CF}) - \sum_{\substack{i < j \leq d \\ k_j \in 1+2\mathbb{Z}}} (w^-(\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}) \bmod \mathcal{I}_{CF}) \in 2X(k, d) + \frac{1}{2}X(k, d-1).$$

Since $\mathbb{k}^{(i,j)}$ is always smaller than \mathbb{k} in lexicographic order, (3.16) now follows by using (3.19) repeatedly. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1. By Lemmas 3.3 and 3.9, we have

$$X(k, d) \subset X^D(k, d) + 2X(k, d) + \frac{1}{2}X(k, d-1).$$

Equivalently,

$$\tilde{X}(k, d) \subset \tilde{X}^D(k, d) + \tilde{X}(k, d-1) + 2\tilde{X}(k, d).$$

Therefore by Nakayama's Lemma, we have

$$(3.20) \quad \tilde{X}(k, d) \subset \tilde{X}^D(k, d) + \tilde{X}(k, d-1).$$

By using (3.20) repeatedly, we obtain

$$\tilde{X}(k, d) \subset \tilde{X}^D(k, d),$$

which is the desired conclusion. \square

3.4. A minimal family of relations and explicit expansion of an Euler sum by the basis. By the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can obtain the explicit version of Corollary 3.2. Put $\mathcal{J}^Y(k, d) = \{(k_1, \dots, k_r) \in \mathcal{J}(k, d) \mid k_1, \dots, k_{r-1} > 0, k_r < 0\}$. Fix $k, d \geq 0$. Define the total order structure \prec of $\mathcal{J}(k, d)$ by

- (1) If $\mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)$ and $\mathbb{k}' \notin \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)$, then $\mathbb{k} \prec \mathbb{k}'$.
- (2) If $\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}' \notin \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)$ and $\text{dep}(\mathbb{k}) \prec \text{dep}(\mathbb{k}')$, then $\mathbb{k} \prec \mathbb{k}'$.
- (3) If $\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}' \notin \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)$, $\text{dep}(\mathbb{k}) = \text{dep}(\mathbb{k}')$, $\mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{J}^Y(k, d)$, and $\mathbb{k}' \notin \mathcal{J}^Y(k, d)$ then $\mathbb{k} \prec \mathbb{k}'$.
- (4) For the pair of indices \mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}' whose order can not be determined by (1), (2) and (3) above, we define their order according to their lexicographical order.

For each $\mathbb{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r) \in \mathcal{J}(k, d) \setminus \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)$, define $f(\mathbb{k}) \in \mathcal{B}_{k,d}$ by

$$f(\mathbb{k}) := \begin{cases} \tilde{w}(\mathbb{k})|_{1 \rightarrow z} & \mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{J}(k, d) \setminus \mathcal{J}^Y(k, d) \\ 2^{d-1}e_{-1}e_0^{|k_1|-1} \dots e_{-1}e_0^{|k_i|-1}e_{-z^2}e_0^{|k_{i+1}|-1} \dots e_{-z^2}e_0^{|k_d|-1} & \mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{J}^Y(k, d) \setminus \mathcal{J}^D(k, d) \end{cases}$$

where the map $u \mapsto u|_{1 \rightarrow z}$ is the ring homomorphism defined by $e_0|_{1 \rightarrow z} := e_0$, $e_{-1}|_{1 \rightarrow z} := e_{-1}$, $e_1|_{1 \rightarrow z} := e_z$ and $i = i(\mathbb{k})$ is as in the proof of Lemma 3.9. For $\mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{J}(k, d) \setminus \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)$ and $\mathbb{k}' \in \mathcal{J}(k, d)$, define $c_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'} \in \mathbb{Z}$ as the coefficient of $\tilde{w}(\mathbb{k}')$ in $f(\mathbb{k})|_{z \rightarrow 1} - \varphi(f(\mathbb{k})) \in \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}}$, i.e.,

$$f(\mathbb{k})|_{z \rightarrow 1} - \varphi(f(\mathbb{k})) = \sum_{\mathbb{k}' \in \mathcal{J}(k, d)} c_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'} \tilde{w}(\mathbb{k}').$$

Then we have $c_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}} \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ and $c_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ if $\mathbb{k} < \mathbb{k}'$ (see the explicit reduction process in the proof of Lemmas 3.3 and 3.9). Therefore the matrix

$$C := (c_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'})_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}' \in \mathcal{J}(k, d) \setminus \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)}$$

is congruent to a lower unitriangular matrix modulo 2, and hence invertible. Put

$$C' := (c_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'})_{\mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{J}(k, d) \setminus \mathcal{J}^D(k, d), \mathbb{k}' \in \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)}.$$

Then we get the following theorem.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $k, d \geq 0$, R a \mathbb{Q} -vector space, and $Z : \mathcal{A}_{k,d}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) \rightarrow R$ a linear map such that $Z(\mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}}) = \{0\}$. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'})_{\mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{J}(k, d) \setminus \mathcal{J}^D(k, d), \mathbb{k}' \in \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)}$ be a matrix defined by*

$$\alpha = -C^{-1}C'.$$

Then, for $\mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{J}(k, d) \setminus \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)$, we have

$$Z(\tilde{w}(\mathbb{k})) = \sum_{\mathbb{k}' \in \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)} \alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'} Z(\tilde{w}(\mathbb{k}')).$$

In particular,

$$\tilde{\zeta}(\mathbb{k}) = \sum_{\mathbb{k}' \in \mathcal{J}^D(k, d)} \alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'} \tilde{\zeta}(\mathbb{k}').$$

Remark 3.11. Furthermore, by the motivicity of the confluence relations proved in later sections and by the dimensional bound given by the motivic theory, we can show that

$$\bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} \{f(\mathbb{k})|_{z \rightarrow 1} - \varphi(f(\mathbb{k})) \mid \mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{J}(k, \infty) \setminus \mathcal{J}^D(k, \infty)\}$$

forms a \mathbb{Q} -basis of \mathcal{I}_{CF} . Nevertheless, the authors are not sure if this fact may be derived without the motivic theory at the moment.

Example 3.12. Let us consider the case $(k, d) = (3, 3)$. To save space, we write \bar{n} for $-n$ in an index (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r) of $\mathcal{J}(k, d)$, e.g. $(-1, 2, -3)$ is denoted as $(\bar{1}, 2, \bar{3})$. Then

$$\mathcal{J}^D(k, d) = \{(\bar{3}) \prec (1, 1, \bar{1}) \prec (2, \bar{1})\},$$

$$\mathcal{J}(k, d) \setminus \mathcal{J}^D(k, d) = \{(3) \prec (1, \bar{2}) \prec (\bar{2}, \bar{1}) \prec (\bar{1}, \bar{2}) \prec (\bar{1}, 2) \prec (1, 2) \prec (\bar{1}, \bar{1}, \bar{1}) \prec (\bar{1}, 1, \bar{1}) \prec (1, \bar{1}, \bar{1})\}$$

and the matrices C, C' are given by

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} -4 & 0 & 0 \\ 5 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & -2 \\ 4 & 0 & 1 \\ -2 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -4 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C' = \begin{pmatrix} -3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -3 & -1 & -2 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -4 & -2 & -2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 & -2 & -2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The confluence relations of $f(\mathbb{k})$'s say

$$C \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{3}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(1, 1, \bar{1}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(2, \bar{1}) \end{pmatrix} + C' \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\zeta}(3) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(1, \bar{2}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{2}, \bar{1}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{1}, \bar{2}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{1}, 2) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(1, 2) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{1}, \bar{1}, \bar{1}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{1}, 1, \bar{1}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(1, \bar{1}, \bar{1}) \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

Notice that the matrix C' is indeed congruent to a lower unitriangular matrix modulo 2 and hence invertible. More explicitly, $\det(C') = -3$ and

$$(C')^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{4}{3} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{20}{3} & -5 & -1 & -2 & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{20}{3} & 5 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{16}{3} & -4 & -2 & -2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{16}{3} & -4 & 0 & -2 & -2 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{10}{3} & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{10}{3} & -2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\zeta}(3) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(1, \bar{2}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{2}, \bar{1}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{1}, \bar{2}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{1}, 2) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(1, 2) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{1}, \bar{1}, \bar{1}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{1}, 1, \bar{1}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(1, \bar{1}, \bar{1}) \end{pmatrix} = -(C')^{-1} C \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{3}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(1, 1, \bar{1}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(2, \bar{1}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{4}{3} & 0 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{3} & 0 & 3 \\ 0 & -3 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -2 \\ -\frac{1}{3} & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{10}{3} & 1 & -2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\zeta}(\bar{3}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(1, 1, \bar{1}) \\ \tilde{\zeta}(2, \bar{1}) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The determinant of the C' clearly gives an upper bound of the LCM of the denominators of the coefficients $\alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'}$, and they actually coincide in the example above. However, it is not the case in general. For example, if $(k, d) = (7, 3)$ then the LCM is $3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7^2 \cdot 17 \cdot 31 \cdot 61$ whereas the determinant of C' is $-3^{30} \cdot 5^{18} \cdot 7^5 \cdot 17 \cdot 31^6 \cdot 41 \cdot 61 \cdot 107 \cdot 176779$. It would be interesting to seek for a better upper bound of the denominator of the coefficients $\alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'}$.

Part 2

Motivicity of confluence relations

In this part, we will prove the motivicity of the confluence relations i.e., $\mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} \subset \ker L^{\text{m}}$. Basically, there are two possible approaches to this problem.

The first approach is the following. The confluence relations for (real-valued) Euler sums are proved by using the differential formula for iterated integrals. These differential formula can be proved by the combination of simple properties, and so the confluence relations can be proved by a combination of the rules in [15]; additivity, change of variables, Newton-Leibniz formula. Thus one can possibly prove the lift of confluence relations to the identity between the periods of Nori motives. However, in the proof of confluence relations, very complicated integrals of the rational functions whose poles lie in the boundaries of the domains of integration appear, so it does not fit to the definition of formal periods which requires the regularity of the differential forms. One might be able to avoid such “singular” integrals by blowing-up the singular locus, however, the authors are not successful in this approach so far.

The second approach is to use Brown’s lemma. We employ this approach in this article.

First, we generalize the confluence relations to a more general setting. Recall that the confluence relations are relations by considering the limit of the expansion of iterated integrals $I(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z))$ where $p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z) \in \{0, -1, z, -z^2\}$, $p_0(z) = 0$, $p_{k+1}(z) = z$. In this section, we will treat a more general case where $p_0(z), \dots, p_{k+1}(z) \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$ with some additional conditions. To define the confluence relation, we need a map which we call the evaluation map. The proof proceeds by the following steps:

- (1) Define the general evaluation map.
 - (a) Introduce the notions of motivic iterated integrals with tangential vectors containing an indeterminate, and prove their fundamental properties.
 - (b) Calculate limits of (complex-valued) iterated integrals for simple case.
 - (c) Construct the “evaluation map” which is a motivic lift of the limiting map in (b)
 - (d) Extend the definition of the evaluation map to general case.
- (2) Prove fundamental properties of the general evaluation map.
- (3) Calculate the motivic coproduct of confluence relations combinatorially with the help of the fundamental properties of general evaluation map, by which we prove the motivicity of confluence relations.

Except for the very last section, the contents of Part 2 is completely independent of Part 1 where the theorems are stated in a very general framework. For this reason, we employ slightly different setup from that in Part 1, which is closely related to Goncharov’s setup. Also, the notations used in Part 2 except in Section 7 are completely unrelated from those in Part 1 and we do not care about possible overlaps.

4. PRELIMINARIES

4.1. Tangential base points. Let $F = \mathbb{Q}$ or \mathbb{C} , and t be a standard coordinate of $\mathbb{P}^1(F)$. For $x \in \mathbb{P}^1(F)$ and $v \in \mathbb{Q}^\times$, we denote by \vec{v}_x the tangential base point at x with the tangential vector

$$\vec{v} := \begin{cases} v \frac{d}{dt} & x \neq \infty \\ v \frac{d}{d(\frac{1}{t})} & x = \infty. \end{cases}$$

For $X \subset \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$, let

$$T^\times X := \{\vec{v}_a \mid v \in \mathbb{Q}^\times, a \in X\},$$

be the set of tangential base points. For tangential base point $x = \vec{v}_a$, we put $\bar{x} = a$ and $\text{vec}(x) = v$.

4.2. Motivic iterated integrals and Goncharov’s coaction formula. Let $\mathcal{H} := \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{H}_k$ be the graded ring of effective motivic periods of mixed Tate motives over \mathbb{Q} . For $k \geq 0$, $a_0, a_{k+1} \in T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$, $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$, and a path γ from a_0 to a_{k+1} on $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}) \setminus \{\infty, a_1, \dots, a_k\}$, we denote by

$$I_\gamma^{\text{m}}(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{H}_k$$

the associated *motivic iterated integral*. Here we understand $I_\gamma^{\text{m}}(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) = 0$ if one of a_1, \dots, a_k is ∞ . We define $\mathfrak{A} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^\infty \mathfrak{A}_k$ by $\mathfrak{A} := \mathcal{H}/\mu\mathcal{H}$ where $\mu \in \mathcal{H}_1$ is the motivic $2\pi\sqrt{-1}$, i.e., $\mu = I_\gamma^{\text{m}}(1; 0; 1)$ where $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times; t \mapsto \exp(2\pi it)$ is a unit circle. Furthermore, define $\mathfrak{L} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^\infty \mathfrak{L}_k$ by $\mathfrak{L} := \mathfrak{A}_{>0}/(\mathfrak{A}_{>0} \cdot \mathfrak{A}_{>0})$. We denote by

$$I^{\text{a}}(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) \in \mathfrak{A}_k$$

and

$$I^l(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) \in \mathfrak{L}_k$$

the images of $I_\gamma^m(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1})$ in \mathfrak{A}_k and \mathfrak{L}_k respectively, which are independent of the choice of γ . It is known that \mathfrak{A} is equipped with the graded Hopf algebra structure, whose coproduct is denoted by

$$\Delta : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathfrak{A},$$

and \mathcal{H} becomes a graded \mathfrak{A} -comodule, whose coaction is also denoted by

$$\Delta : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{H}.$$

If the tangential base points appear in the central argument (= not as the endpoints) of iterated integral symbol, we interpret them by the obvious way, e.g., for $a_0, \dots, a_{k+1} \in T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$, the symbol $I(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1})$ means $I(a_0; \overline{a_1}, \dots, \overline{a_k}; a_{k+1})$. We give a coproduct formula for the motivic iterated integral which slightly generalizes² a formula given by Goncharov [9] and Brown [2].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $k \geq 0$, $a_0, a_{k+1} \in T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$, $a_1, \dots, a_k \in T^\times \mathbb{Q}$, and γ a path from a_0 to a_{k+1} . If $\#\{a_1, \dots, a_k\} = \#\{\overline{a_1}, \dots, \overline{a_k}\}$ (i.e., the same point has the same tangential vector) then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta I_\gamma^m(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) \\ := \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{0=i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_r < i_{r+1}=k+1} \prod_{j=0}^r I^a(a_{i_j}; a_{i_j+1}, \dots, a_{i_{j+1}-1}; a_{i_{j+1}}) \otimes I_\gamma^m(a_{i_0}; a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_r}; a_{i_{r+1}}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For any $x, y \in T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$, we denote by ${}_x\Pi_y$ the de Rham fundamental torsor of paths on $X = \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}) \setminus \{\infty, \overline{a_1}, \dots, \overline{a_k}\}$ from x to y . Then the affine ring $\mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y)$ is identified with the free non-commutative ring $\mathbb{Q}\langle e_s \mid s \in \{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \rangle$ equipped with the shuffle product. Here each e_s corresponds to the 1-form $\frac{dt}{t-s}$. Let \mathcal{U} be the prounipotent part of the motivic Galois group of mixed Tate motives over \mathbb{Q} . Then \mathfrak{A} can be identified with $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U})$. For each $x, y \in T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$ and a path γ from x to y on X , we denote by $L_\gamma : \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ the linear map defined by $L_\gamma(e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_n}) = I_\gamma^m(x; b_1, \dots, b_n; y)$. The action of the motivic Galois group

$$\mathcal{U} \times {}_x\Pi_y \rightarrow {}_x\Pi_y$$

gives rise to the coaction

$$\delta_{x,y} : \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y) \rightarrow \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y).$$

Let us recall the following properties of $\delta_{x,y}$:

- (1) For any $x, y \in T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$ and a path γ from x to y on X , the following diagram is commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y) & \xrightarrow{\delta_{x,y}} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y) \\ \downarrow L_\gamma & & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes L_\gamma \\ \mathcal{H} & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{H} \end{array}$$

- (2) The action of \mathcal{U} preserves the groupoid structure of $({}_x\Pi_y)_{x,y \in T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})}$, i.e., for any $x, y, z \in T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$, the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_z) & \xrightarrow{\delta_{x,y}} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_z) & & \\ \downarrow \text{dec} & & \searrow \text{id} \otimes \text{dec} & & \\ \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y) \otimes \mathcal{O}({}_y\Pi_z) & \xrightarrow{\delta_{x,y} \otimes \delta_{y,z}} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y) \otimes \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}({}_y\Pi_z) & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y) \otimes \mathcal{O}({}_y\Pi_z) \end{array}$$

Here, dec is the deconcatenation map and λ is the linear map given by $\lambda(a \otimes b \otimes c \otimes d) = ac \otimes b \otimes d$

- (3) Let $\text{const} : \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y) = \mathbb{Q}\langle e_s \mid s \in \{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ be the map which sends u to the constant term of u . Then

$$(\text{id} \otimes \text{const}) \circ \delta_{x,y}(e_{s_1} \cdots e_{s_n}) = I^a(x; s_1, \dots, s_n; y)$$

for any $e_{s_1} \cdots e_{s_n} \in \mathcal{O}({}_x\Pi_y)$.

²In our formula, ∞ is allowed to be the endpoints of the integral. The authors have not checked in detail, but probably our proof of Proposition 4.1 is essentially just a trace of known proof for the case of non-infinite endpoints.

- (4) Let $x \in \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ and $p : \mathcal{O}(x \Pi_x) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} \langle e_x \rangle$ be the projection map which sends e_x to e_x and e_s to 0 for $s \neq x$. Then the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}(x \Pi_x) & \xrightarrow{\delta_{x,x}} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}(x \Pi_x) \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes p \\ \mathbb{Q} \langle e_x \rangle & \xrightarrow{v \mapsto 1 \otimes v} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathbb{Q} \langle e_x \rangle \end{array}$$

Put $w = e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}$. Then by (1), we have

$$\Delta I_\gamma^m(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) = \Delta L_\gamma(w) = \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{O}(a_0 \Pi_{a_{k+1}}) \\ u: \text{word}}} c(u) \otimes L_\gamma(u)$$

where $c(u)$ is given by

$$\delta_{a_0, a_{k+1}}(w) = \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathcal{O}(a_0 \Pi_{a_{k+1}}) \\ u: \text{word}}} c(u) \otimes u.$$

Let us calculate $c(u)$. Put $u = e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_n}$. By using (2) repeatedly, we have the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}(a_0 \Pi_{a_{k+1}}) & \xrightarrow{\delta_{a_0, a_{k+1}}} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}(a_0 \Pi_{a_{k+1}}) \\ \downarrow \text{dec} & & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes \text{dec} \\ R & \xrightarrow{\delta'} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes R \end{array}$$

where

$$R = \bigotimes_{j=0}^{2n} \mathcal{O}(x_j \Pi_{x_{j+1}}),$$

$(x_0, \dots, x_{2n+1}) = (a_0, \{b_1\}^2, \{b_2\}^2, \dots, \{b_n\}^2, a_{k+1})$, dec is the deconcatenation coproduct, and δ' is the map induced from $\delta_{x_0, x_1}, \dots, \delta_{x_{2n}, x_{2n+1}}$. Furthermore, let $f : \mathcal{O}(a_0 \Pi_{a_{k+1}}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ be the map which takes the coefficient of u of the element of $\mathcal{O}(a_0 \Pi_{a_{k+1}})$, and $f' : R \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ be the map which takes the coefficient of $1 \otimes e_{b_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes 1 \otimes e_{b_n} \otimes 1$ of the element of R . Then we have $f = f' \circ \text{dec}$. Thus we get the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{O}(a_0 \Pi_{a_{k+1}}) & \xrightarrow{\delta_{a_0, a_{k+1}}} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}(a_0 \Pi_{a_{k+1}}) & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes f} & \mathfrak{A} \\ \downarrow \text{dec} & & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes \text{dec} & \nearrow \text{id} \otimes f' & \\ R & \xrightarrow{\delta'} & \mathfrak{A} \otimes R & & \end{array}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} c(u) &= (\text{id} \otimes f) \circ \delta_{a_0, a_{k+1}}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) \\ &= (g_0 \otimes g_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes g_{2n}) \circ \text{dec}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) \end{aligned}$$

where $g_j : \mathcal{O}(x_j \Pi_{x_{j+1}}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}$ is the composite map

$$\mathcal{O}(x_j \Pi_{x_{j+1}}) \xrightarrow{\delta_{x_j, x_{j+1}}} \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{O}(x_j \Pi_{x_{j+1}}) \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes f_j} \mathfrak{A}$$

where f_j is the map which takes the coefficient of 1 (resp. $e_{b_{(j+1)/2}}$) of the element of $\mathcal{O}(x_j \Pi_{x_{j+1}})$ for an even (resp. odd) j . Then we have

$$g_{2j}(e_{s_1} \cdots e_{s_m}) = I^a(x_{2j}; s_1, \dots, s_m; x_{2j+1})$$

by (3) and

$$g_{2j-1}(e_{s_1} \cdots e_{s_m}) = \begin{cases} 1 & e_{s_1} \cdots e_{s_m} = e_{b_j} \\ 0 & e_{s_1} \cdots e_{s_m} \neq e_{b_j} \end{cases}$$

by (4). Thus we have

$$c(u) = \sum_{\substack{0=i_0 < i_1 < \cdots < i_n < i_{n+1}=k+1 \\ a_{i_1}=b_1, \dots, a_{i_n}=b_n}} \prod_{j=0}^n I^a(a_{i_j}; a_{i_{j+1}}, \dots, a_{i_{j+1}-1}; a_{i_{j+1}}).$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

For $r > 0$, Brown's infinitesimal coaction

$$D_r : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_r \otimes \mathcal{H}$$

is defined as the composite map

$$\mathcal{H} \xrightarrow{\Delta} \mathfrak{A} \otimes \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_r \otimes \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_r \otimes \mathcal{H}.$$

We put $D = \bigoplus_{r=1}^{\infty} D_r$. Let $\text{per} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the period map. The following criterion is well-known (see [2, Lemma 2.7]).

Lemma 4.2. *Let $u \in \mathcal{H}_k$. If $\text{per}(u) = 0$ and $D_r(u) = 0$ for all $r < k$ then $u = 0$.*

As a corollary of Proposition 4.1, we obtain the following explicit formula for D_r of motivic iterated integrals.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $k \geq 0$, $a_0, a_{k+1} \in T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$, $a_1, \dots, a_k \in T^\times \mathbb{Q}$, and γ a path from a_0 to a_{k+1} . If $\#\{a_1, \dots, a_k\} = \#\{\overline{a_1}, \dots, \overline{a_k}\}$ then we have*

$$D_r(I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1})) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-r} I^l(a_i; a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{i+r}; a_{i+r+1}) \otimes I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_i, a_{i+r+1}, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}).$$

4.3. Motivic iterated integrals with extended tangential base points. For a subset $X \subset \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ of $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\#(\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C}) \setminus X) < \infty$, $a, a' \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$, $v, v' \in \mathbb{R}^\times$ and $c, c' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, there exists a canonical one-to-one correspondence

$$\Phi : \pi_1(X, \overrightarrow{v}_a, \overrightarrow{v}_{a'}) \simeq \pi_1(X, \overrightarrow{cv}_a, \overrightarrow{c'v}_{a'}).$$

If there is no risk of confusion, we identify $\pi_1(X, \overrightarrow{v}_a, \overrightarrow{v}_{a'})$ with $\pi_1(X, \overrightarrow{cv}_a, \overrightarrow{c'v}_{a'})$, and we simply write $\Phi(\gamma)$ as γ . Let T be an indeterminate and $\widehat{\mathbb{Q}^\times} := \{v \exp(mT) \mid v \in \mathbb{Q}^\times, m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. For $X \subset \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})$, we define the set of *extended tangential base points* by

$$\widehat{T^\times X} := \{(x, v) \mid v \in \widehat{\mathbb{Q}^\times}, x \in X\}$$

and denote its element (x, v) as \overrightarrow{v}_x just like a usual tangential base point. For $s \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, we define

$$\iota_s : \widehat{T^\times X} \rightarrow T^\times X$$

by

$$\iota_s(\overrightarrow{v \exp(mT)}_a) = \overrightarrow{vs^m}_a.$$

We define a path from $x \in \widehat{T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})}$ to $y \in \widehat{T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})}$ to be the path from $\iota_1(x)$ to $\iota_1(y)$. Note that this is equivalent to the path from $\iota_s(x)$ to $\iota_{s'}(y)$ with arbitrary choice of $s, s' \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ by the aforementioned identification Φ of the fundamental torsors. We put $\log^{\mathfrak{m}}(x) := I_{\text{dch}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(1; 0; x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ where the dch is the straight path,

Definition 4.4. For $k \geq 0$ and $a_0, a_{k+1} \in \widehat{T^\times \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})}$, $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Q}$, and a path γ from a_0 to a_{k+1} on $\mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}) \setminus \{\infty, a_1, \dots, a_k\}$, we denote by

$$I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1})$$

the unique polynomial $p(T) \in \mathcal{H}[T]$ such that

$$p(\log^{\mathfrak{m}}(s)) = I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(\iota_s(a_0); a_1, \dots, a_k; \iota_s(a_{k+1}))$$

for $s \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$.

The definition above requires the existence as well as the uniqueness of $p(T)$, which can be proved as follows.

Proof of the existence and the uniqueness of $p(T)$. The uniqueness is obvious since \mathcal{H} is an integral domain. So let us prove the existence by an explicit construction. We put $\overrightarrow{v \exp(mT)}_x = a_0$ and $\overrightarrow{v' \exp(m'T)}_y = a_{k+1}$. Then $\iota_s(a_0) = \overrightarrow{vs^m}_x$ and $\iota_s(a_{k+1}) = \overrightarrow{v's^m}_y$. The path composition formula gives

$$I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(\overrightarrow{vs^m}_x; a_1, \dots, a_k; \overrightarrow{v's^m}_y) := \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j \leq k} c_i c'_j I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(\overrightarrow{v}_x; a_{i+1}, \dots, a_j; \overrightarrow{v'}_y)$$

for $s, s' \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ where

$$c_i = I_{\text{triv}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\overrightarrow{vs^m_x}; a_1, \dots, a_i; \overrightarrow{v_x}) = \frac{\log^{\mathfrak{m}}(1/s^m)^i}{i!} \prod_{l=1}^i \text{res}(a_l, x)$$

$$c'_j = I_{\text{triv}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\overrightarrow{v's^{m'}_y}; a_{j+1}, \dots, a_k; \overrightarrow{v_y}) = \frac{\log^{\mathfrak{m}}(s^{m'})^{k-j}}{(k-j)!} \prod_{l=j+1}^k \text{res}(a_l, y)$$

where triv is the trivial path, and

$$\text{res}(a, b) := \left(\text{residue of } \frac{dt}{t-a} \text{ at } t=b \right) = \begin{cases} -1 & b = \infty \\ 1 & a = b \in \mathbb{Q} \\ 0 & a \neq b \in \mathbb{Q}. \end{cases}$$

Thus

$$p(T) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j \leq k} \tilde{c}_i \tilde{c}'_j I_{\gamma}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\overrightarrow{v_x}; a_{i+1}, \dots, a_j; \overrightarrow{v_y}) \in \mathcal{H}[T]$$

with

$$\tilde{c}_i := \frac{(-mT)^i}{i!} \prod_{l=1}^i \text{res}(a_l, x), \quad \tilde{c}'_j := \frac{(m'T)^{k-j}}{(k-j)!} \prod_{l=j+1}^k \text{res}(a_l, y)$$

satisfies the condition

$$p(\log^{\mathfrak{m}}(s)) = I_{\gamma}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\iota_s(a_0); a_1, \dots, a_k; \iota_s(a_{k+1})). \quad \square$$

Note that the shuffle product formula, the path decomposition formula, and the coproduct formula are naturally generalized to the motivic iterated integrals with extended tangential base-points above. By regarding the weight of T as 1 and defining

$$\Delta(T) := 1 \otimes T + T \otimes 1,$$

one can equip $\mathfrak{A}^{(T)} := \mathfrak{A}[T]$ with a structure of graded Hopf algebra, and $\mathcal{H}[T]$ with a structure of graded $\mathfrak{A}^{(T)}$ -comodule. We thus extend D_r to

$$\mathcal{H}[T] \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_r^{(T)} \otimes \mathcal{H}[T]$$

by the composite map

$$\mathcal{H}[T] \xrightarrow{\Delta} \mathfrak{A}^{(T)} \otimes \mathcal{H}[T] \rightarrow \mathfrak{A}_r^{(T)} \otimes \mathcal{H}[T] \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_r^{(T)} \otimes \mathcal{H}[T]$$

where $\mathfrak{L}^{(T)} = \mathfrak{A}_{>0}^{(T)} / (\mathfrak{A}_{>0}^{(T)} \cdot \mathfrak{A}_{>0}^{(T)}) \simeq \mathfrak{L} \oplus \mathbb{Q}T$.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $k \geq 0$, $a_0, a_{k+1} \in \widehat{T^{\times} \mathbb{P}^1}(\mathbb{Q})$, $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \widehat{T^{\times} \mathbb{Q}}$, and γ a path from a_0 to a_{k+1} . If $\#\{a_1, \dots, a_k\} = \#\{\overline{a_1}, \dots, \overline{a_k}\}$ then we have*

$$\Delta I_{\gamma}^{\mathfrak{m}}(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) := \sum_{r=0}^k \sum_{0=i_0 < i_1 < \dots < i_{r+1}=k+1} \prod_{j=0}^r I^{\mathfrak{a}}(a_{i_j}; a_{i_j+1}, \dots, a_{i_{j+1}-1}; a_{i_{j+1}}) \otimes I_{\gamma}^{\mathfrak{m}}(a_{i_0}; a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_r}; a_{i_{r+1}}).$$

In particular,

$$D_r(I_{\gamma}^{\mathfrak{m}}(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1})) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-r} I^{\mathfrak{l}}(a_i; a_{i+1}, \dots, a_{i+r}; a_{i+r+1}) \otimes I_{\gamma}^{\mathfrak{m}}(a_0; a_1, \dots, a_i, a_{i+r+1}, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}).$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 4.1 and the definition of the motivic iterated integrals with extended tangential base-points. \square

4.4. Goncharov's Hopf algebra of formal iterated integrals. Let S be a set. In this section we review the Hopf algebra $\mathcal{I}_{\bullet}(S)$ of formal iterated integrals introduced by Goncharov [9]. Following Goncharov, we define the commutative graded Hopf algebra $\mathcal{I}_{\bullet}(S)$ over \mathbb{Q} as follows. As a commutative algebra, $\mathcal{I}_{\bullet}(S)$ is generated by the formal symbols

$$\mathbb{I}(s_0; s_1, \dots, s_m; s_{m+1}) \quad (m \geq 0, s_0, \dots, s_{m+1} \in S)$$

whose degree is defined to be homogeneous of $\deg \mathbb{I}(s_0; s_1, \dots, s_m; s_{m+1}) := m$, with the following relations among the generators:

- (1) The unit: for $a, b \in S$, $\mathbb{I}(a; b) := \mathbb{I}(a; \emptyset; b) := 1$.

(2) The shuffle product formula: for $m, n \geq 0$ and $a, b, s_1, \dots, s_{m+n} \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}(a; s_1, \dots, s_m; b) \mathbb{I}(a; s_{m+1}, \dots, s_{m+n}; b) &= \mathbb{I}(a; (s_1, \dots, s_m) \sqcup (s_{m+1}, \dots, s_{m+n}); b) \\ &:= \sum_{\sigma \in \sum_{n,m}} \mathbb{I}(a; s_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, s_{\sigma(n+m)}; b) \end{aligned}$$

where $\sum_{n,m} \subset \mathfrak{S}_{n+m}$ denotes the set of all shuffles of $(1, \dots, m)$ and $(m+1, \dots, m+n)$.

(3) The path composition formula: for $m \geq 0$ and $a, b, c, s_1, \dots, s_m \in S$,

$$\mathbb{I}(a; s_1, \dots, s_m; c) = \sum_{i=0}^m \mathbb{I}(a; s_1, \dots, s_i; b) \mathbb{I}(b; s_{i+1}, \dots, s_m; c).$$

(4) For $m > 0$ and $a, s_1, \dots, s_m \in S$, $\mathbb{I}(a; s_1, \dots, s_m; a) = 0$.

Next, define the \mathbb{Q} -linear map $\Delta^{(S)} : \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S) \otimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)$ by

$$\Delta^{(S)} \mathbb{I}(s_0; s_1, \dots, s_m; s_{m+1}) := \sum_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ 0=i_0 < \dots < i_{k+1}=m+1}} \mathbb{I}(s_0; s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_k}; s_{m+1}) \otimes \prod_{p=0}^k \mathbb{I}(s_{i_p}; s_{i_p+1}, \dots, s_{i_{p+1}-1}; s_{i_{p+1}})$$

Then, $\Delta^{(S)}$ is co-associative. Moreover, Goncharov proved the following.

Theorem 4.6 ([9, Proposition 2.2]). $\Delta^{(S)}$ is a well-defined coproduct on $\mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)$, which provides $\mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)$ with the structure of a commutative, graded Hopf algebra.

For a graded algebra A , we denote by A_r its homogeneous degree r part, and define the “linearized version” A^l to be

$$A^l := A_{>0} / (A_{>0} \times A_{>0})$$

where $A_{>0} := \bigoplus_{r>0} A_r$. Under these notations, we denote by $x^l \in A^l$ the image of $x \in A_{>0}$ under the quotient map, and for $r > 0$, define the infinitesimal version $D_r^{(S)} : \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)_r^l \otimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)$ of $\Delta^{(S)}$ by the composition

$$\mathcal{I}_\bullet(S) \xrightarrow{\Delta^{(S)}} \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S) \otimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S) \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_r \otimes \text{id}} \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)_r \otimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S) \xrightarrow{(x \mapsto x^l) \otimes \text{id}} \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)_r^l \otimes \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)$$

where pr_r is the projection to the degree r part.

For a graded \mathbb{Q} -algebra homomorphism $\varphi : \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}[T]$ and a sequence $\mathbf{s} = (s_0; s_1, \dots, s_m; s_{m+1})$ of the elements of S , the condition

$$D_r(\varphi(\mathbb{I}(s_0; s_1, \dots, s_m; s_{m+1}))) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-r} \varphi^l(\mathbb{I}(s_i; s_{i+1}, \dots, s_{i+r}; s_{i+r+1})) \otimes \varphi(\mathbb{I}(s_0; s_1, \dots, s_i, s_{i+r+1}, \dots, s_m; s_{m+1}))$$

where φ^l is the composite map $\mathcal{I}_\bullet(S) \xrightarrow{\varphi} \mathcal{H}[T] \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}^{(T)}$, is equivalent to

$$D_r(\varphi(x)) = (\varphi^l \otimes \varphi) \circ D_r^{(S)}(x)$$

where $x := \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s})$.

Lemma 4.7. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{I}_\bullet(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}[T]$ be a homomorphism of graded \mathbb{Q} -algebras and x, y elements of $\mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)$. If $D_r(\varphi(x)) = (\varphi^l \otimes \varphi) \circ D_r^{(S)}(x)$ and $D_r(\varphi(y)) = (\varphi^l \otimes \varphi) \circ D_r^{(S)}(y)$ then

$$D_r(\varphi(xy)) = (\varphi^l \otimes \varphi) \circ D_r^{(S)}(xy).$$

Proof. It follows from the following calculation.

$$\begin{aligned} D_r(\varphi(xy)) &= D_r(\varphi(x) \cdot \varphi(y)) \\ &= D_r(\varphi(x)) \cdot (1 \otimes \varphi(y)) + D_r(\varphi(y)) \cdot (1 \otimes \varphi(x)) \\ &= ((\varphi^l \otimes \varphi) \circ D_r^{(S)}(x)) \cdot (1 \otimes \varphi(y)) + ((\varphi^l \otimes \varphi) \circ D_r^{(S)}(y)) \cdot (1 \otimes \varphi(x)) \\ &= (\varphi^l \otimes \varphi) (D_r^{(S)}(x) \cdot (1 \otimes y)) + (\varphi^l \otimes \varphi) (D_r^{(S)}(y) \cdot (1 \otimes x)) \\ &= (\varphi^l \otimes \varphi) \circ D_r^{(S)}(xy). \end{aligned}$$

□

5. THE MOTIVIC COUNTERPART OF REGULARIZED LIMIT OF ITERATED INTEGRALS

For $X \subset \mathbb{Q}(z)$ we define the set of tangential base points with a variable z by

$$T_z^\times X := \{(x, v) \mid v \in \mathbb{Q}(z)^\times, x \in X\},$$

and denote its element (x, v) as \vec{v}_x just like a usual tangential base point. For $p = \vec{v}_x \in T_z^\times X$, we continue to use the notations $\bar{p} = x$ and $\text{vec}(p) = v$.

Let $z > 0$ be a real variable which is assumed to be sufficiently small. For $a(z), b(z) \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ and $X \subset \mathbb{Q}(z)$, a “path $\gamma(z)$ from $a(z)$ to $b(z)$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus X$ ” is defined as follows. For a fixed z , $\gamma(z)$ is a homotopy class of paths from $a(z)$ to $b(z)$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{p(z) \mid p \in X\}$ and when z varies $z \mapsto \gamma(z)$ is a continuous function.

Now, let $k \geq 0$, $p_0 = p_0(z), \dots, p_{k+1} = p_{k+1}(z) \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ and $\gamma = \gamma(z)$ be a path from $p_0(z)$ to $p_{k+1}(z)$ on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{\overline{p_1(z)}, \dots, \overline{p_k(z)}\}$. Then,

$$\rho(z) = I_{\gamma(z)}(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z))$$

becomes a function of z . Then, we can show that there exists a polynomial $P(T) \in \mathbb{C}[T]$ such that

$$\rho(z) = P(\log z) + O(z(\log z)^M) \quad (z \rightarrow +0)$$

for sufficiently large $M > 0$. Such a $P(T)$ is denoted as

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} (I_{\gamma(z)}(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z))) .$$

The purpose of this section is to construct an element of $\mathcal{H}[T]$ denote by

$$(5.1) \quad J_{\gamma(z)}(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z))$$

such that

$$\text{per} (J_{\gamma(z)}(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z))) = P(T)$$

where $\text{per} : \mathcal{H}[T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}[T]$ is the natural extension of the period map $\text{per} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, based on the idea explained in [17, Section 3.3.3], and investigate its properties. As the quantity $J_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ is the motivic counterpart of the regularized limit $\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} (I_{\gamma(z)}(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z)))$ of a complex-valued iterated integral, those objects should satisfy the same algebraic properties. From this perspective, we define $J_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ by reducing it to special cases. First of all, we introduce the simplest path called the *upper path* as follows.

Definition 5.1. We call γ the upper path if γ lies on the set $\{s \in \mathbb{C} \mid \Im(s) \geq 0\}$, i.e., the upper half plane including the real axis. Note that once two points $p, q \in \mathbb{R}$ and $Y \subset \mathbb{R}$ are given, the upper path from p to q on $\mathbb{C} \setminus Y$ is unique up to the homotopy equivalence and so we denote it by “up”.

The most general definition of $J_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ (for a general sequence $p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{k+1} \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ and a general path γ) is not given by a simple formula, and so we break down the definition into several steps. Here we give an overview of the contents of this Section. Throughout (sub-)sections 5.1–5.6, we specify ourselves to the case where γ is the upper path. In Section 5.1, we discuss the behavior of the complex-valued iterated integral I_{up} with a tangential point at infinity, and in Section 5.2, we show that $\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} (I_{\gamma(z)}(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z)))$ can be calculated simply by “substitution of $z = 0$ ” if the sequence $(p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{k+1})$ satisfy a certain regularity condition, and thus define $J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ for a regular sequence $(p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{k+1})$. Then by certain decomposition techniques using the shuffle product formula, we define $J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ for a general admissible sequence with different endpoints (Section 5.3), a general sequence with different endpoints (Section 5.4), and a general sequence with the same endpoints (Section 5.5). We then prove that the quantity $J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ that we have defined satisfy the path composition formula (Section 5.6), and by extending this property for general path we define $J_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ for arbitrary path γ (Section 5.7). Furthermore, we shall prove that $J_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ thus defined enjoys the infinitesimal coaction just as the motivic iterated integrals do (Section 5.8).

5.1. The behavior of iterated integrals at infinity.

Proposition 5.2. For $a_1, \dots, a_{k+1} \in T^\times \mathbb{Q}$,

$$I_{\text{up}}(y^{-1}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) = I_{\text{up}}(\vec{y}_\infty; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) + O(y(\log y)^{k+1})$$

as y goes to $+0$.

Proof. Let $P(T)$ be a polynomial such that $I_{\text{up}}((y\epsilon)^{-1}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) = P(\log \epsilon) + O(\epsilon(\log \epsilon)^{k+1})$ for $\epsilon \rightarrow +0$. By definition

$$I_{\text{up}}(\overrightarrow{y}_{\infty}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) = P(0).$$

Let $Q(T)$ be a polynomial such that $I_{\text{up}}(s^{-1}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) = Q(\log s) + O(s(\log s)^{k+1})$ for $s \rightarrow +0$. Then, by putting $s = y\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\log y + \log \epsilon) &= I_{\text{up}}((y\epsilon)^{-1}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) + O(\epsilon(\log \epsilon)^{k+1}) \\ &= P(\log \epsilon) + O(\epsilon(\log \epsilon)^{k+1}) \end{aligned}$$

for $\epsilon \rightarrow +0$. Thus as a polynomial $P(T) = Q(T + \log y)$. Now that $Q(\log y) = P(0) = I_{\text{up}}(\overrightarrow{y}_{\infty}, a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1})$, it readily follows that

$$I_{\text{up}}(y^{-1}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) = I_{\text{up}}(\overrightarrow{y}_{\infty}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) + O(y(\log y)^{k+1}). \quad \square$$

Now consider the case where $y = y(z) = cz^m(1 + p(z))$ with $c \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $p(z) \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$ with $p(0) = 0$ in Proposition 5.2. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{up}}(y(z)^{-1}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) &= I_{\text{up}}(\overrightarrow{y(z)}_{\infty}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) + O(z(\log z)^{k+1}) \\ &= I_{\text{up}}(\overrightarrow{cz^m}_{\infty}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) + O(z(\log z)^{k+1}) \\ &= I_{\text{up}}(\overrightarrow{ce^{mT}}_{\infty}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) \Big|_{T=\log z} + O(z(\log z)^{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we find that $\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} I_{\text{up}}(y(z)^{-1}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) = I_{\text{up}}(\overrightarrow{ce^{mT}}_{\infty}; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1})$, which leads us to the following definition of the limit as $z \rightarrow +0$ of a tangential base point with a variable.

Definition 5.3. For $p = \overrightarrow{v}_x \in T_z^{\times} \mathbb{Q}(z)$, we define $p[0] \in \widehat{T^{\times} \mathbb{P}^1}(\mathbb{Q})$ by $\overline{p[0]} := x(0)$ and

$$\text{vec}(p[0]) := \begin{cases} \hat{v} & \text{if } x(0) \neq \infty \\ \hat{x}^{-1} & \text{if } x(0) = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Here, for $x \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$, we set $\hat{x} := x'(0)e^{mT} \in \mathbb{Q}[[T]]$ if $x = x'z^m$ with $m = \text{ord}_z x \in \mathbb{Z}$.

By this notation, the above identity can be written simply as

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} I_{\text{up}}(p(z); a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1}) = I_{\text{up}}(p[0]; a_1, \dots, a_k; a_{k+1})$$

if $p(0) = \infty$ and $a_1, \dots, a_{k+1} \in T^{\times} \mathbb{Q}$. In fact, we can show more generally that

$$(5.2) \quad \text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} I_{\text{up}}(p(z); a_1, \dots, a_k; q(z)) = I_{\text{up}}(p[0]; a_1, \dots, a_k; q[0])$$

for $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Q}$ (here, we don't even need the conditions $p(0) \neq a_1$ and $q(0) \neq a_k$).

5.2. The calculation of the regularized limit for regular sequences. For $k \geq 0$, the sequence $(p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) \in \mathbb{Q}(z)^{k+2}$ of length $k+2$ is called empty if $k=0$ and admissible if $k=0$ or $p_0 \neq p_1$ and $p_k \neq p_{k+1}$.

Definition 5.4. Let $k > 0$ and $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$. We say that the admissible sequence (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) is *very regular* if and only if $p_0 \neq p_{k+1}$, $p_0(0) \neq p_1(0)$, $p_k(0) \neq p_{k+1}(0)$, and for $t \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ neither $p_0(0) = p_t(0) = \infty$ nor $p_{k+1}(0) = p_t(0) = \infty$ occurs.

We say that $(p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) \in (T_z^{\times} \mathbb{Q}(z))^{k+2}$ is very regular (resp. admissible) if $(\overline{p_0}, \dots, \overline{p_{k+1}}) \in \mathbb{Q}(z)^{k+2}$ is very regular (resp. admissible).

Lemma 5.5. Let $k > 0$ and $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in T_z^{\times} \mathbb{Q}(z)$. If (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) is very regular then

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} (I_{\text{up}}(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z))) = I_{\text{up}}(p_0[0]; p_1[0], \dots, p_k[0]; p_{k+1}[0]).$$

The proof easily follows from equation (5.2) and the theorem of dominated convergence (c.f. [17, Lemma 3.3.35]).

Now, let us consider the affine transformation of an iterated integral. For $p = (x, v) \in T_z^{\times} \mathbb{Q}(z)$, we define a multiplication by $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(z)^{\times}$ by $\alpha \cdot p := (\alpha x, \alpha v) \in T_z^{\times} \mathbb{Q}(z)$ and an addition by $y \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$ by $p + y := (x + y, v) \in T_z^{\times} \mathbb{Q}(z)$.

Definition 5.6. Let $k \geq 0$ and $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}, q_0, \dots, q_{k+1} \in M$ where $M = T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ or $\mathbb{Q}(z)$. We say that (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) and (q_0, \dots, q_{k+1}) are *affine-equivalent* if there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $y \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$ such that $q_i = z^m \cdot p_i + y$ for all $0 \leq i \leq k+1$.

Note that

$$I_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = I_{\text{up}}(q_0; q_1, \dots, q_k; q_{k+1})$$

if (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) and (q_0, \dots, q_{k+1}) are affine-equivalent.

Definition 5.7. Let $k \geq 0$ and $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$. We say that the admissible sequence (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) is *regular* if it is affine-equivalent to a very regular sequence.

Here again, we say that $(p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) \in (T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z))^{k+2}$ is regular if $(\overline{p_0}, \dots, \overline{p_{k+1}}) \in \mathbb{Q}(z)^{k+2}$ is regular.

For $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$, define a distance³ of p and q by

$$d(p, q) = \begin{cases} 2^{-\text{ord}_z(p-q)} & p \neq q \\ 0 & p = q. \end{cases}$$

Now we can classify all regular sequences to three patterns. For $m \geq 1$, we denote by \mathcal{R}_m the set of non-empty admissible sequences (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) of rational functions such that $d(p_0, p_i) \leq d(p_0, p_1) = 2^{-m}d(p_0, p_{k+1}) \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. For $m \geq 1$, we denote by \mathcal{R}_{-m} the set of non-empty admissible sequences (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) of rational functions such that $d(p_{k+1}, p_i) \leq d(p_{k+1}, p_k) = 2^{-m}d(p_0, p_{k+1}) \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. We denote by \mathcal{R}_0 the set of non-empty admissible sequences (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) of rational functions such that $d(p_0, p_1), d(p_k, p_{k+1}) \geq d(p_0, p_{k+1}) \neq 0$.

Lemma 5.8. *The set of regular sequences of rational functions can be decomposed as $\bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{R}_n$.*

Proof. First let us check disjointness of $(\mathcal{R}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Put $\mathbf{p} = (p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$. Then $(\mathcal{R}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are disjoint since

- if $\mathbf{p} \in \bigsqcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_m$ then $d(p_0, p_1) < d(p_0, p_{k+1})$ and $d(p_k, p_{k+1}) = d(p_0, p_{k+1})$;
- if $\mathbf{p} \in \bigsqcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_{-m}$ then $d(p_0, p_1) = d(p_0, p_{k+1})$ and $d(p_k, p_{k+1}) < d(p_0, p_{k+1})$;
- if $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_0$ then $d(p_0, p_1) \geq d(p_0, p_{k+1})$ and $d(p_k, p_{k+1}) \geq d(p_0, p_{k+1})$.

Let us show $\mathbf{p} \in \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{R}_n$ for all regular sequence $\mathbf{p} = (p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$. Since each \mathcal{R}_n is invariant under the affine transformation, we can assume that \mathbf{p} is very regular. Note that if $p_0(0) = p_{k+1}(0) = \infty$ then $(zp_0; zp_1, \dots, zp_k; zp_{k+1})$ is also very regular. Thus, by multiplying z^m with some positive m , we can assume, without loss of generality, that at least one of $p_0(0)$ or $p_{k+1}(0)$ is finite. If $p_0(0) \neq \infty$ and $p_{k+1}(0) = \infty$ then we have $d(p_0, p_{k+1}) > 1$, $d(p_0, p_1) = 1$, and $d(p_0, p_i) \leq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and thus $\mathbf{p} \in \bigsqcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_m$. Similarly, if $p_0(0) = \infty$ and $p_{k+1}(0) \neq \infty$ then $\mathbf{p} \in \bigsqcup_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_{-m}$. If $p_0(0) \neq \infty$ and $p_{k+1}(0) \neq \infty$ then $d(p_0, p_{k+1}) \leq 1$, $d(p_0, p_1) \geq 1$ and $d(p_k, p_{k+1}) \geq 1$, and thus $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_0$.

Conversely, let us show that any $\mathbf{p} \in \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{R}_n$ is a regular sequence. Let $m > 0$. Let us show $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_m$ is a regular sequence. Since $p_0 \neq p_1$, we may assume without loss of generality that $p_0 = 0$ and $d(p_0, p_1) = 1$. Then, by definition, $d(p_0, p_{k+1}) = 2^m$ and $d(p_0, p_i) \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus $p_0(0) = 0$, $p_1(0) \neq 0$, and $p_i(0) \neq \infty$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $p_{k+1}(0) = \infty$. Thus \mathbf{p} is very regular. Similarly, $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_{-m}$ is also a regular sequence. Now, assume that $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_0$. Since $p_0 \neq p_{k+1}$, we may assume without loss of generality that $p_0 = 0$ and $d(p_0, p_{k+1}) = 1$. Since $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{R}_0$, we have $d(p_0, p_1) \geq 1$ and $d(p_k, p_{k+1}) \geq 1$. Thus $p_0(0) = 0 \neq \infty$, $p_{k+1}(0) \neq \infty$, $p_0(0) \neq p_1(0)$, and $p_k(0) \neq p_{k+1}(0)$, and hence \mathbf{p} is very regular. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Definition 5.9. Let $k > 0$ and $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$. Assume that (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) is regular. Then we define $J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{H}[T]$ by

$$J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) := I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p'_0[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; p'_{k+1}[0])$$

where (p'_0, \dots, p'_{k+1}) is a very regular sequence which is affine-equivalent to (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) .

Let us check well-definedness of Definition 5.9. i.e.,

$$I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1[0], \dots, p_k[0]; p_{k+1}[0]) = I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p'_0[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; p'_{k+1}[0])$$

for affine-equivalent very regular sequences $(p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}), (p'_0, \dots, p'_{k+1}) \in (T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z))^{k+2}$ for $k > 0$.

³The number “2” in the definition of $d(p, q)$ is not important. One may use any distance function where 2 is replace by some real number $\varepsilon > 1$, and the following argument goes just parallelly.

Lemma 5.10. *Let $k > 0$, $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$, and $y \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$. Put $p'_i = p_i + y$ for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$. If (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) and (p'_0, \dots, p'_{k+1}) are very regular sequences then*

$$I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1[0], \dots, p_k[0]; p_{k+1}[0]) = I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p'_0[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; p'_{k+1}[0]).$$

Proof. The case $y(0) \neq \infty$ is obvious since

$$I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p'_0[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; p'_{k+1}[0]) = I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0] + y(0), p_1[0] + y(0), \dots, p_k[0] + y(0); p_{k+1}[0] + y(0)).$$

Assume that $y(0) = \infty$. Then $\overline{p_0}(0) = \infty$ or $\overline{p'_0}(0) = \infty$. By symmetry, we can assume that $\overline{p_0}(0) = \infty$. Since (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) is very regular, $\overline{p_i}(0) \neq \infty$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Thus $\overline{p'_i}(0) = \infty$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Since (p'_0, \dots, p'_{k+1}) is very regular, we have

$$\overline{p'_0}(0) \neq \infty, \overline{p'_{k+1}}(0) \neq \infty.$$

By $\overline{p'_0}(0) \neq \infty$, $\overline{p'_{k+1}}(0) \neq \infty$, we can easily check $p_0[0] = p_{k+1}[0]$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p'_0[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; p'_{k+1}[0]) &= I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p'_0[0]; \infty, \dots, \infty; p'_{k+1}[0]) = 0 \\ I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1[0], \dots, p_k[0]; p_{k+1}[0]) &= I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1[0], \dots, p_k[0]; p_0[0]) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.11. *Definition 5.9 does not depend on the choice of very regular sequences.*

Proof. Recall that the affine-equivalence of two sequence $(p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}), (p'_0, \dots, p'_{k+1}) \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ means that there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}, y \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$ such that $p'_i = z^m p_i + y$ for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$. By symmetry, we may assume that $m \geq 0$. As we have already treated the case for $m = 0$, we assume that $m > 0$. So let $(p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}), (p'_0, \dots, p'_{k+1}) \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ be two very-regular sequences such that $p'_i = z^m p_i + y$ for $0 \leq i \leq k+1$ with some $m > 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{Q}(z)$. It suffices to prove that

$$I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1[0], \dots, p_k[0]; p_{k+1}[0]) = I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p'_0[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; p'_{k+1}[0]).$$

Let us first consider the case $\overline{p_0}(0) \neq \infty$ and $\overline{p_{k+1}}(0) \neq \infty$. Then $p'_0[0] = p'_{k+1}[0]$. Since $\overline{p'_0}(0) \neq \overline{p'_1}(0)$, $\overline{p_1}(0) = \infty$. Thus

$$I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1[0], \dots, p_k[0]; p_{k+1}[0]) = 0 = I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p'_0[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; p'_{k+1}[0]).$$

Next, let us consider the case $\overline{p_0}(0) \neq \infty$ and $\overline{p_{k+1}}(0) = \infty$. Then $\overline{p_1}(0) \neq \infty$ by the very-regularity of (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) . Thus $p'_0[0] = p'_1[0]$, which contradicts with the very-regularity of (p'_0, \dots, p'_{k+1}) . By the same reasoning, $\overline{p_0}(0) = \infty$ and $\overline{p_{k+1}}(0) \neq \infty$ contradicts with the assumption.

Finally, let us consider the case $\overline{p_0}(0) = \infty$ and $\overline{p_{k+1}}(0) = \infty$. Since (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) is very regular, $\overline{p_1}(0), \dots, \overline{p_k}(0) \in \mathbb{Q}$. Thus if $(z^m p_0, \dots, z^m p_{k+1})$ is not very regular then $(z^m p_0, \dots, z^m p_{k+1})|_{z=0} = (0, \dots, 0)$ and thus $(z^m p_0 + y, \dots, z^m p_{k+1} + y)$ is also not very regular. This in turn says that if (p'_0, \dots, p'_{k+1}) is very regular, $(z^m p_0, \dots, z^m p_{k+1})$ is already very regular and so by Lemma 5.10, it is sufficient to consider the case $y = 0$. Put $n_1 := -\text{ord}_{z=0}(p_0)$, $a_1 := \lim_{z \rightarrow 0}(p_0 z^{n_1})$, $n_2 := -\text{ord}_{z=0}(p_{k+1})$, $a_2 := \lim_{z \rightarrow 0}(p_{k+1} z^{n_2})$. Then $(z^m p_0, \dots, z^m p_{k+1})$ is very regular iff $m \leq \min(n_1, n_2)$. For example, if $n_1 = m < n_2$ and $a_2/a_1 > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1[0], \dots, p_k[0]; p_{k+1}[0]) &= I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\overrightarrow{a_1^{-1} e^{-mT}}_\infty; \overrightarrow{p_1(0)}, \dots, \overrightarrow{p_k(0)}; \overrightarrow{a_2^{-1} e^{-n_2 T}}_\infty) \\ &= \frac{\left(\log^{\mathfrak{m}}\left(\frac{a_2}{a_1}\right) + (n_2 - m)T \right)^k}{k!} \end{aligned}$$

since the residue of $\frac{dt}{t-p_i}$ at ∞ is -1 , and

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p'_0[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; p'_{k+1}[0]) &= I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(a_1; \{0\}^k; \overrightarrow{a_2^{-1} e^{-(n_2-m)T}}_\infty) \\ &= (-1)^k I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(a_1^{-1}; \{0\}^k; \overrightarrow{a_2^{-1} e^{-(n_2-m)T}}_0) \\ &= (-1)^k I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}((a_2/a_1) e^{(n_2-m)T}; \{0\}^k; \overrightarrow{1}_0) \\ &= I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\overrightarrow{1}_0; \{0\}^k; (a_2/a_1) e^{(n_2-m)T}) \\ &= \frac{\left(\log^{\mathfrak{m}}\left(\frac{a_2}{a_1}\right) + (n_2 - m)T \right)^k}{k!}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we use Möbius transformation $t \mapsto t^{-1}$ for the second equality. The other cases also follow from similar calculations. \square

5.3. The calculation of the regularized limit for admissible sequences. Put $\Sigma := \bigsqcup_{k \geq 0} T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)^k$ and for a subset I of Σ , we define $\mathbb{Q}I$ to be the formal \mathbb{Q} -span of I . Fix $p, q \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ such that $\bar{p} \neq \bar{q}$. We put

$$I_{\text{adm}}^{(p,q)} = I_{\text{adm}} := \{(p_1, \dots, p_k) \in \Sigma \mid (p, p_1, \dots, p_k, q) \text{ is admissible}\}.$$

For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we put

$$I_n := \{(p_1, \dots, p_k) \in \Sigma \mid k = 0 \text{ or } (p, p_1, \dots, p_k, q) \in \mathcal{R}_n\}.$$

Then the map

$$(5.3) \quad \sqcup : \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}I_n \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}I_{\text{adm}}$$

is isomorphic. Thus, we can calculate

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} (I_{\text{up}}(p_0(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); p_{k+1}(z)))$$

for any admissible sequence (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) .

Example 5.12. Let us calculate

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} (I_{\text{up}}(0; z, 1; 2)).$$

Then sequence $(0; z, 1; 2)$ is not regular, but by (5.3), we can write

$$(z, 1) = (z) \sqcup (1) - (1, z).$$

Thus

$$I_{\text{up}}(0; z, 1; 2) = I_{\text{up}}(0; z; 2)I_{\text{up}}(0; 1; 2) - I_{\text{up}}(0; 1, z; 2)$$

where the sequences

$$(0, z, 2) \in \mathcal{R}_1, (0, 1, 2) \in \mathcal{R}_0, (0, 1, z, 2) \in \mathcal{R}_0$$

are all regular. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} I_{\text{up}}(0; z; 2) &= \text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} I_{\text{up}}(0; 1; \frac{2}{z}) = I_{\text{up}}(0; 1; \overrightarrow{\exp(T)/2_\infty}) \\ \text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} I_{\text{up}}(0; 1; 2) &= I_{\text{up}}(0; 1; 2) \\ \text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} I_{\text{up}}(0; 1, z; 2) &= I_{\text{up}}(0; 1, 0; 2), \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} (I_{\text{up}}(0; z, 1; 2)) = I_{\text{up}}(0; 1; \overrightarrow{\exp(T)/2_\infty})I_{\text{up}}(0; 1; 2) - I_{\text{up}}(0; 1, 0; 2).$$

Based on this calculation, we define $J_{\text{up}}(; ;)$ for admissible sequences as follows.

Definition 5.13. We define a map $F_{p,q} : \mathbb{Q}I_{\text{adm}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}[T]$ by the composition

$$\mathbb{Q}I_{\text{adm}} \xrightarrow{(\sqcup)^{-1}} \bigotimes_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}I_n \xrightarrow{(p_1 \otimes \dots \otimes p_r) \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^r J_{\text{up}}(p; p_i; q)} \mathcal{H}[T]$$

where $J_{\text{up}}(p; p_i; q)$ is defined in Definition 5.9 since (p, p_i, q) 's are regular sequences.

Definition 5.14. For $(p_1, \dots, p_k) \in I_{\text{adm}}$, we define

$$J_{\text{up}}(p; p_1, \dots, p_k; q) := F_{p,q}((p_1, \dots, p_k)) \in \mathcal{H}[T].$$

Example 5.15. $J_{\text{up}}(0; z, 1; 2)$ is obtained by replacing (complex-valued) iterated integrals with the corresponding motivic iterated integral in the result of Example 5.12, i.e.,

$$J_{\text{up}}(0; z, 1; 2) = I_{\text{up}}^{\text{m}}(0; 1; \overrightarrow{\exp(T)/2_\infty})I_{\text{up}}^{\text{m}}(0; 1; 2) - I_{\text{up}}^{\text{m}}(0; 1, 0; 2).$$

5.4. The calculation of the regularized limit for non-admissible sequences. Fix $p, q \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ such that $\bar{p} \neq \bar{q}$. For $r \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$, we put $I_r := \{(r_1, \dots, r_k) \in (T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z))^k \mid k \geq 0, \bar{r}_1 = \dots = \bar{r}_k = \bar{r}\}$. Then

$$(5.4) \quad \sqcup : \mathbb{Q}I_p \otimes \mathbb{Q}I_q \otimes \mathbb{Q}I_{\text{adm}}^{(p,q)} \simeq \mathbb{Q}\Sigma.$$

Now for $(p_1, \dots, p_k) \in I_p \cup I_q$, we have

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} (I_{\text{up}}(p(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); q(z))) = I_{\text{up}}(p'[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; q'[0])$$

where $(p', p'_1, \dots, p'_k, q')$ is a sequence which is affine-equivalent to (p, p_1, \dots, p_k, q) satisfying $\{\bar{p}(0), \bar{q}(0), \infty\} = 3$. Therefore, by the isomorphism (5.4) we can calculate $\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} (I_{\text{up}}(p(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); q(z)))$ for $(p_1, \dots, p_k) \in \Sigma$.

Keeping this calculation in mind, we define

$$J_{\text{up}}(p; p_1, \dots, p_k; q) \in \mathcal{H}[T]$$

for $(p_1, \dots, p_k) \in \Sigma$ as follows. For $(p_1, \dots, p_k) \in I_p \cup I_q$, we set

$$J_{\text{up}}(p; p_1, \dots, p_k; q) := I_{\text{up}}^{\text{m}}(p'[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; q'[0])$$

where $(p', p'_1, \dots, p'_k, q')$ is a sequence which is affine-equivalent to (p, p_1, \dots, p_k, q) satisfying $\{\bar{p}(0), \bar{q}(0), \infty\} = 3$. Hence, by (5.4), we employ the following definition.

Definition 5.16. We define $J_{\text{up}}(p; p_1, \dots, p_k; q)$ for $(p_1, \dots, p_k) \in \Sigma$ as the composed map

$$\mathbb{Q}\Sigma \xrightarrow{(\sqcup)^{-1}} \mathbb{Q}I_p \otimes \mathbb{Q}I_q \otimes \mathbb{Q}I_{\text{adm}}^{(p,q)} \xrightarrow{(p_1 \otimes p_2 \otimes p_3) \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^3 J_{\text{up}}(p; p_i; q)} \mathcal{H}[T].$$

5.5. The case of trivial closed paths. Fix $p, q \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ such that $\bar{p} = \bar{q}$. In this case, one can show for $(p_1, \dots, p_k) \in \Sigma$ that

$$\text{Reg}_{z \rightarrow +0}^{(T)} (I_{\text{up}}(p(z); p_1(z), \dots, p_k(z); q(z))) := \begin{cases} I_{\text{up}}(p'[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; q'[0]) & \bar{p} = \bar{p}_1 = \dots = \bar{p}_k (= \bar{q}) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $(p', p'_1, \dots, p'_k, q')$ is a sequence which is affine-equivalent to (p, p_1, \dots, p_k, q) satisfying $\bar{p}'(0) \neq \infty$. Noting this, we define the value of J_{up} with the same endpoints as follows.

Definition 5.17. With the same $(p', p'_1, \dots, p'_k, q')$ as above, we define

$$J_{\text{up}}(p; p_1, \dots, p_k; q) := \begin{cases} I_{\text{up}}^{\text{m}}(p'[0]; p'_1[0], \dots, p'_k[0]; q'[0]) & \bar{p} = \bar{p}_1 = \dots = \bar{p}_k (= \bar{q}) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

5.6. The path composition formula for J_{up} . In this section we will show that the ring-homomorphism $\mathcal{I}_\bullet(T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}[T]$ which maps $\mathbb{I}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ to $J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ is well-defined. In other words, J satisfies the same relations as the defining relations (1)–(4) of \mathbb{I} stated in Section 4.4. Out of the four relations, (1), (2) and (4) are trivial by definition. Therefore, we shall prove the property (3) for J . Firstly, we state the following two lemmas which are straightforward by definition.

Lemma 5.18. $J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = 0$ if there exists $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $d(p_0, p_{k+1}) < d(p_0, p_i)$.

Lemma 5.19. If $d(q, q') < d(q, p_1)$ then

$$J_{\text{up}}(q; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = J_{\text{up}}(q'; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}).$$

Proposition 5.20. We have

$$\sum_{i=0}^k J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i; q) J_{\text{up}}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}).$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on k . Since the case $k = 0$ is obvious, we can assume that $k > 0$. There are two possibilities about the configurations of p_0, p_{k+1}, q : the case $d(p_0, p_{k+1}) < d(p_0, q)$ and $d(p_0, p_{k+1}) \geq$

$d(p_0, q)$. In fact, the first case follows from the second case since if we assume that the claim holds for all second cases then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^k J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i; q) J_{\text{up}}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{j=i}^k J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i; q) J_{\text{up}}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_j; p_0) J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_{j+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\sum_{i=0}^j (-1)^{j-i} J_{\text{up}}(p_0; (p_1, \dots, p_i) \sqcup (p_j, \dots, p_{i+1}); q) \right) J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_{j+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^k \delta_{j,0} J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_{j+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\
&= J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus it is enough to only consider the case $d(p_0, p_{k+1}) \geq d(p_0, q)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the sequence (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) is very regular since the general case follows from these special cases, the shuffle product formula for $J_{\text{up}}(; ;)$, and the compatibility of the shuffle product and the deconcatenation coproduct.

If $p_i(0) = \infty$ for some $1 \leq i \leq k$ then $p_0(0) \neq \infty$ and $p_{k+1}(0) \neq \infty$. Furthermore, by assumption $d(p_0, p_{k+1}) \geq d(p_0, q)$, $q(0) \neq \infty$. Thus both hand sides of the claim vanish.

Thus we can assume that $p_i(0) \neq \infty$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. If $p_0(0) = \infty$, $d(p_0, p_i) = d(p_0, p_1)$ and if $p_0(0) \neq \infty$, $d(p_0, p_i) \leq d(p_0, p_1) = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Therefore, $d(p_0, p_i) \leq d(p_0, p_1)$ and by the same argument $d(p_{k+1}, p_i) \leq d(p_{k+1}, p_k)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. If $d(p_0, q) < d(p_0, p_1)$ then the claim holds since we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^k J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i; q) J_{\text{up}}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^k \delta_{i,0} J_{\text{up}}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\
&= J_{\text{up}}(q; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\
&= J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemmas 5.18 (the first equality) and 5.19 (the last equality). Thus we can assume that

$$d(p_0, p_1) \leq d(p_0, q).$$

Similarly, we can also assume that

$$d(p_{k+1}, p_k) \leq d(q, p_{k+1}).$$

Now recall that the conditions $d(p_0, p_i) \leq d(p_0, p_1) \leq d(p_0, q) \leq d(p_0, p_{k+1})$ and $d(p_{k+1}, p_i) \leq d(p_{k+1}, p_k) \leq d(p_{k+1}, q) \leq d(p_0, p_{k+1})$ are invariant under affine-equivalence. Our proof uses only these conditions and does not use the very-regularity condition on the sequence (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) , and thus we pass from one sequence to another affine-equivalent sequence at our convenience hereafter in the proof. Put $a := \min\{d(p_0, p_1), d(p_k, p_{k+1})\}$ and $U := \{p \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z) \mid d(p, p_1) \leq a\}$. Then $p_1, \dots, p_k \in U$. If $\overline{p_1} = \dots = \overline{p_k}$ then the claim follows by a straight forward calculation. Thus, hereafter we assume that $\{\overline{p_1}, \dots, \overline{p_k}\} > 1$. Note that this condition implies $a \neq 0$ and $\max\{d(q, p_j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq k\} \neq 0$. Now we split the case into two cases, the case $q \notin U$ and the case $q \in U$.

Let us first discuss the case $q \notin U$. By affine-equivalence we may pass to the case where $0 \in U$ and $a = 1$ without loss of generality. Now that $p_1, \dots, p_k \in U$ we have $\overline{p_1}(0), \dots, \overline{p_k}(0) \in \mathbb{Q}$, and by definition of a , we also have $\overline{p_0}(0) \neq \overline{p_1}(0)$, $\overline{p_k}(0) \neq \overline{p_{k+1}}(0)$. Moreover, since $q \notin U$ we have $\overline{q}(0) = \infty$. Thus, by definition of J

for a very regular sequence and the path composition formula for extended motivic iterated integral,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^k J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i; q) J_{\text{up}}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^k I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_i(0); q[0]) I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(q[0]; p_{i+1}(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0]) \\
&= I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0]) \\
&= J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}),
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim for the case $q \notin U$.

To discuss the case $q \in U$, we introduce the quantity denoted by Θ as follows. For a set X , we denote by Σ_X the set of (possibly empty) sequences of the elements of X , and for $I \subset \Sigma_X$, we define $\mathbb{Q}I$ to be the formal \mathbb{Q} -span of the elements in I . For $\mathbf{Q} = (Q_1, \dots, Q_r)$, $\mathbf{Q}' = (Q'_1, \dots, Q'_s)$, $\mathbf{Q}'' = (Q''_1, \dots, Q''_t) \in \Sigma_X$, define $\Theta(\mathbf{Q}; \mathbf{Q}'', \mathbf{Q}')$ as the unique element of $\mathbb{Q}\Sigma_X$ satisfying the property

$$\sum_{i=0}^r \sum_{j=0}^s (Q_1, \dots, Q_i) \sqcup \Theta(Q_{i+1}, \dots, Q_r; \mathbf{Q}'', Q'_1, \dots, Q'_j) \sqcup (Q'_{j+1}, \dots, Q'_s) = (\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{Q}'', \mathbf{Q}').$$

We can check that $\Theta(\mathbf{Q}; \mathbf{Q}'', \mathbf{Q}')$ is an element of $\mathbb{Q}I$ where $I \subset \Sigma_X$ is the set of the sequences (R_1, \dots, R_m) such that

- (R_1, \dots, R_m) is a permutation of $(Q_1, \dots, Q_r, Q''_1, \dots, Q''_t, Q'_1, \dots, Q'_s)$,
- $R_1 \in \{Q''_1, Q'_1, \dots, Q'_s\}$ if $t > 0$ and $R_1 \in \{Q'_1, \dots, Q'_s\}$ if $t = 0$,
- $R_m \in \{Q''_t, Q_1, \dots, Q_r\}$ if $t > 0$ and $R_m \in \{Q_1, \dots, Q_r\}$ if $t = 0$.

Now let us discuss the case $q \in U$. By an affine transformation, we can pass to the case where $\max\{d(q, p_j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq k\} = 1$ and $\overline{q}(0) \in \mathbb{Q}$ without loss of generality. Note that $a \geq 1$ since $a \geq \max\{d(q, p_j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq k\} = 1$. Recall that by assumption, $\overline{p_1}(0), \dots, \overline{p_k}(0) \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\overline{p_0}(0) \neq \overline{p_1}(0)$, $\overline{p_k}(0) \neq \overline{p_{k+1}}(0)$. Thus the sequence (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) is very regular, but the sequences (p_0, \dots, p_i, q) or $(q, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{k+1})$ may not be very regular because $d(q, p_i)$ or $d(q, p_{i+1})$ may be smaller than 1. Put

$$\Gamma := \{1 \leq j \leq k \mid d(q, p_j) < 1\}.$$

For each $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, let $l(i)$ be the minimum integer between 0 and i such that $\{l(i) + 1, \dots, i\} \subset \Gamma$, and $r(i)$ be the maximal integer between i and k such that $\{i + 1, \dots, r(i)\} \subset \Gamma$. By definition of Θ and the shuffle product formula for J_{up} , we have

$$J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i; q) = \sum_{l(i) \leq i' \leq i} J_{\text{up}}(p_0; \Theta(\emptyset; p_1, \dots, p_{l(i)}; p_{l(i)+1}, \dots, p_{i'}); q) J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_{i'+1}, \dots, p_i; q)$$

and

$$J_{\text{up}}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = \sum_{i \leq i'' \leq r(i)} J_{\text{up}}(q; \Theta(p_{i''+1}, \dots, p_{r(i)}; p_{r(i)+1}, \dots, p_{i''}; \emptyset); p_{k+1}) J_{\text{up}}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i''}; p_{k+1}).$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=0}^k J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i; q) J_{\text{up}}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\
(5.5) \quad &= \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i' \leq i \leq i'' \leq k \\ \{i'+1, \dots, i''\} \subset \Gamma}} A_{i'} B_{i''} J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_{i'+1}, \dots, p_i; q) J_{\text{up}}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i''}; p_{k+1})
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{i'} &:= J_{\text{up}}(p_0; \Theta(\emptyset; p_1, \dots, p_{l(i')}; p_{l(i')+1}, \dots, p_{i'}); q) \\
B_{i''} &:= J_{\text{up}}(q; \Theta(p_{i''+1}, \dots, p_{r(i'')}; p_{r(i'')+1}, \dots, p_k; \emptyset); p_{k+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\max\{d(q, p_j) \mid 1 \leq j \leq k\} = 1$, there exists $1 \leq j \leq k$ such that $j \notin \Gamma$ and so the term $(i', i'') = (0, k)$ cannot happen. Thus, we may apply the induction hypothesis and (5.5) equals

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \leq i' \leq i'' \leq k \\ \{i'+1, \dots, i''\} \subset \Gamma}} A_{i'} B_{i''} C_{i', i''}$$

where $C_{i', i''} := J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_{i'+1}, \dots, p_{i''}; p_{k+1})$. Then for any $j \in \Gamma$, we have

$$d(p_0, p_j) \geq 1$$

since $d(p_0, q) \geq d(p_0, p_1) \geq a \geq 1$ and $d(q, p_j) < 1$. Hence $\overline{p_0}(0) \neq \overline{p_j}(0)$ for $l(i') + 1 \leq j \leq i'$. Note that we also have $\overline{p_0}(0) \neq \overline{p_1}(0), \overline{p_1}(0), \dots, \overline{p_{i'}}(0) \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\overline{p_{l(i')}}(0) \neq \overline{q}(0)$. Thus for any sequence $(R_1, \dots, R_m) \in \Sigma_{T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)}$ that appear in $\Theta(\emptyset; p_1, \dots, p_{l(i')}; p_{l(i')+1}, \dots, p_{i'})$, the sequence $(p_0, R_1, \dots, R_m, q)$ is very regular. Therefore,

$$A_{i'} = I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p_0[0]; \Theta(\emptyset; p_1(0), \dots, p_{l(i')}(0); p_{l(i')+1}(0), \dots, p_{i'}(0)); q[0]).$$

Similarly, we have

$$B_{i''} = I^{\mathbf{m}}(q[0]; \Theta(p_{i''+1}(0), \dots, p_{r(i'')}(0); p_{r(i'')+1}(0), \dots, p_k(0); \emptyset); p_{k+1}[0]).$$

Furthermore, since $i' + 1, i'' \in \Gamma$ we have $d(p_0, p_{i'+1}), d(p_{i''}, p_{k+1}) \geq 1$ and thus $(p_0, p_{i'+1}, \dots, p_{i''}, p_{k+1})$ is very regular. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_{i', i''} &= I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p_0[0]; p_{i'+1}(0), \dots, p_{i''}(0); p_{k+1}[0]) \\ &= \sum_{i' \leq i \leq i''} I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p_0[0]; p_{i'+1}(0), \dots, p_i(0); q[0]) \cdot I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(q[0]; p_{i+1}(0), \dots, p_{i''}(0); p_{k+1}[0]). \end{aligned}$$

It now readily follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i' \leq i'' \leq k \\ \{i'+1, \dots, i''\} \subset \Gamma}} A_{i'} B_{i''} C_{i', i''} &= \sum_{i=0}^k I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_i(0); q[0]) \cdot I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(q[0]; p_{i+1}(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0]) \\ &= I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0]) \\ &= J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim for the case $q \in U$. \square

By Proposition 5.20, we arrive at our desired consequence:

Lemma 5.21. *The ring homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}_\bullet(T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z))$ to $\mathcal{H}[T]$ which maps $\mathbb{I}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ to $J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ is well-defined.*

5.7. The regularized limit for an arbitrary path. Now we define $J_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ for a general path γ . For a path γ from $p_0(z)$ to $p_{k+1}(z)$, we define $J_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \in \mathcal{H}[T]$ to be the unique element satisfying the following properties.

- (1) If γ is the upper path, $J_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) := J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$.
- (2) If $p_0(z) = p_{k+1}(z)$ ($= p(z)$) and γ is a path that encircles the point $\overline{p}(z)$ counter-clockwisely $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ times, then

$$J_\gamma(p; p_1, \dots, p_k; p) := \begin{cases} \frac{(r\mu)^k}{k!} & \text{if } \overline{p_1} = \dots = \overline{p_k} = \overline{p} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (3) For any paths γ from $p_0(z)$ to $q(z)$ and γ' from $q(z)$ to $p_{k+1}(z)$,

$$J_{\gamma\gamma'}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^k J_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i; q) J_{\gamma'}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$$

where $\gamma\gamma'$ denotes the composed path of γ and γ' from $p_0(z)$ to $p_{k+1}(z)$.

Note that the existence and the uniqueness of such J_γ follows from the path composition formula for upper paths (Proposition 5.20) because any path can be decomposed into upper paths and the paths that encircle a point (the paths of the type (2) above).

Finally, let us check that the J_γ thus defined can also be related with Goncharov's Hopf algebra $\mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)$. Let X be a finite subset of $T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ and put $\overline{X} := \{\overline{p} \mid p \in X\} \subset \mathbb{Q}(z)$. Fix an element q of $T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ and let S be the set of pair (p, γ) of an element of $p \in X$ and a path γ from q to p on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \overline{X}$. For $\mathbf{p} = (p, \gamma) \in S$, we denote by $\check{\mathbf{p}}$

its first component p and by $\text{path}(\mathbf{p})$ its second component γ . Then, by Lemma 5.21, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 5.22. *Let S be as above. Then the ring homomorphism from $\mathcal{I}_\bullet(S)$ to $\mathcal{H}[T]$ which maps $\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{p}_0; \mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_k; \mathbf{p}_{k+1})$ to $J_\gamma(\check{\mathbf{p}}_0; \check{\mathbf{p}}_1, \dots, \check{\mathbf{p}}_k; \check{\mathbf{p}}_{k+1})$ where γ is the path from $\check{\mathbf{p}}_0$ to $\check{\mathbf{p}}_{k+1}$ given by $\text{path}(\mathbf{p}_0)^{-1} \cdot \text{path}(\mathbf{p}_{k+1})$ is well-defined.*

5.8. The infinitesimal coaction of $J(; ;)$. For $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$, we denote by $J^l(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ the image of $J_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ in $\mathfrak{L}^{(T)}$ (note that the image does not depend on the choice of γ). In this section our goal is to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 5.23. *Let $k \geq l > 0$, $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$ and γ a path from p_0 to p_{k+1} on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$. Assume that $\#\{p_1, \dots, p_k\} = \#\{\overline{p_1}, \dots, \overline{p_k}\}$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} D_l(J_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})) \\ = \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) \otimes J_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i, p_{i+l+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 4.7 and Proposition 5.22, Proposition 5.23 can be reduced to the case where γ is the upper path. Therefore, in what follows, we shall prove Proposition 5.23 for the case when γ is the upper path.

Lemma 5.24. *Let $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$. Suppose that $p_1(0), \dots, p_k(0) \in \mathbb{Q}$. If neither $p_0(0) = \dots = p_k(0)$ nor $p_1(0) = \dots = p_{k+1}(0)$ holds,*

$$J^l(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = I^l(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0]).$$

Proof. If $\overline{p_0}(0) = \overline{p_{k+1}}(0) \in \mathbb{Q}$, then there exists $1 \leq j \leq k$ such that $\overline{p_j}(0) \neq \overline{p_0}(0)$ by the assumption of the lemma, and thus

$$J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = 0 = I_{\text{up}}^m(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0]).$$

by Lemma 5.18. If $\overline{p_0}(0) = \overline{p_{k+1}}(0) = \infty$, then

$$J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = I_{\text{up}}^m(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0])$$

by definition. Thus, we may assume that $\overline{p_0}(0) \neq \overline{p_{k+1}}(0)$. Put

$$M := \{(q_1, \dots, q_l) \mid l \geq 0, q_1, \dots, q_l \in \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}\}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} &= \{(q_1, \dots, q_l) \in M \mid l \geq 0, p_0(0) = q_1(0) = \dots = q_l(0)\}, \\ \mathcal{P}' &= \{(q_1, \dots, q_l) \in M \mid l \geq 0, q_1(0) = \dots = q_l(0) = p_{k+1}(0)\}, \\ \mathcal{Q} &= \{(q_1, \dots, q_l) \in M \mid l \geq 0, q_1(0) \neq p_0(0), q_l(0) \neq p_{k+1}(0)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now that (p_1, \dots, p_k) can be expressed as

$$(p_1, \dots, p_k) = \sum_j c_j P_j \sqcup P'_j \sqcup Q_j$$

with $c_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $P_j \in \mathcal{P}$, $P'_j \in \mathcal{P}'$, $Q_j \in \mathcal{Q}$ (N.B. the length of P_j nor P'_j never happens to be k by the assumption of the lemma). Then by definition

$$J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = \sum_j c_j J_{\text{up}}(p_0; P_j; p_{k+1}) J_{\text{up}}(p_0; P'_j; p_{k+1}) J_{\text{up}}(p_0; Q_j; p_{k+1}),$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} J^l(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) &= \sum_{\text{len}(Q_j)=k} c_j J^l(p_0; Q_j; p_{k+1}) \\ &= \sum_{\text{len}(Q_j)=k} c_j I^l(p_0[0]; Q_j(0); p_{k+1}[0]). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0]) \\ = \sum_j c_j I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; P_j(0); p_{k+1}[0]) \cdot I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; P'_j(0); p_{k+1}[0]) \cdot I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(p_0[0]; Q_j(0); p_{k+1}[0]), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$I^l(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0]) = \sum_{\text{len}(Q_j)=k} c_j I^l(p_0[0]; Q_j(0); p_{k+1}[0]).$$

Thus the lemma is proved. \square

Lemma 5.25. *Let $k \geq 0$ and $b_0, \dots, b_{k+1} \in \widehat{T^\times} \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q})$. Assume that $\overline{b_0} = \overline{b_{k+1}} = \infty$ and $\overline{b_1}, \dots, \overline{b_k} \in \mathbb{Q}$, and $\#\{b_1, \dots, b_k\} = \#\{\overline{b_1}, \dots, \overline{b_k}\}$. Then for $0 < l \leq k$, we have*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-l} I^l(b_i; b_{i+1}, \dots, b_{i+l}; b_{i+l+1}) = I^l(b_0; \{x\}^l; b_{k+1})$$

where $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ is any element.

Proof. Let γ be any path from b_0 to b_{k+1} contained in a sufficiently small neighborhood of ∞ such that $I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; x; b_{k+1}) \neq 0$. Noting

$$I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; b_1, \dots, b_k; b_{k+1}) = \frac{I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; \{x\}; b_{k+1})^k}{k!},$$

its coaction is easily computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; b_1, \dots, b_k; b_{k+1}) &= \frac{(\Delta I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; \{x\}; b_{k+1}))^k}{k!} \\ &= \frac{(1 \otimes I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; x; b_{k+1}) + I^l(b_0; x; b_{k+1}) \otimes 1)^k}{k!} \\ &= \sum_{l+l'=k} \frac{I^l(b_0; x; b_{k+1})^l}{l!} \otimes \frac{I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; x; b_{k+1})^{l'}}{l'!} \\ &= \sum_{l+l'=k} I^l(b_0; \{x\}^l; b_{k+1}) \otimes I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; \{x\}^{l'}; b_{k+1}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus we have

$$(5.6) \quad D_l(I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; b_1, \dots, b_k; b_{k+1})) = I^l(b_0; \{x\}^l; b_{k+1}) \otimes I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; \{x\}^{k-l}; b_{k+1}).$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 4.5, we have

$$(5.7) \quad D_l(I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; b_1, \dots, b_k; b_{k+1})) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} I^l(b_i; b_{i+1}, \dots, b_{i+l}; b_{i+l+1}) \otimes I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(b_0; \{x\}^{k-l}; b_{k+1}).$$

The lemma now readily follows by comparing (5.6) and (5.7). \square

Lemma 5.26. *Let $k \geq l \geq 1$, $x \in \mathbb{Q}$, and $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$. Assume that $p_0(0) \neq x = p_1(0) = \dots = p_k(0) \neq p_{k+1}(0)$ and $\#\{p_1, \dots, p_k\} = \#\{\overline{p_1}, \dots, \overline{p_k}\}$. Then,*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-l} J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) = I^l(p_0[0]; \{x\}^l; p_{k+1}[0]).$$

Proof. We fix l and prove the claim by induction on k . If $p_1 = \dots = p_k$, the claim follows by definition (Definitions 5.16 and 5.17). Suppose that $\#\{p_1, \dots, p_k\} > 1$. Note that this implies $\#\{\overline{p_1}, \dots, \overline{p_k}\} > 1$ by the assumption of the lemma. Let $m \geq 1$ be the maximal integer such that

$$\overline{p_1} \equiv \dots \equiv \overline{p_k} \pmod{z^m}$$

and $q \in \mathbb{Q}[z]$ any polynomial such that $q \equiv \overline{p_1} \equiv \dots \equiv \overline{p_k} \pmod{z^m}$. Then, by definition, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-l} J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} f_i$$

where

$$f_i := J^l(p'_i; p'_{i+1}, \dots, p'_{i+l}; p'_{i+l+1}),$$

$p'_i = (p_i - q)/z^m$. We decompose $\{0 \leq i \leq k-l\}$ as

$$\{0 \leq i \leq k-l\} = W \sqcup X \sqcup X' \sqcup Y$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \{i \mid p'_i(0) \neq p'_{i+1}(0) = \dots = p'_{i+l}(0) = p'_{i+l+1}(0)\} \\ X' &= \{i \mid p'_i(0) = p'_{i+1}(0) = \dots = p'_{i+l}(0) \neq p'_{i+l+1}(0)\} \\ Y &= \{i \mid p'_i(0) = p'_{i+1}(0) = \dots = p'_{i+l}(0) = p'_{i+l+1}(0)\} \\ W &= \{0 \leq i \leq k-l\} \setminus (X \sqcup X' \sqcup Y). \end{aligned}$$

Define $\lambda : \{0 \leq i \leq k-l\} \rightarrow \{X, X', Y, W\}$ by setting $\lambda(i)$ to be the set where i belongs to. By definition, $(\lambda(0), \dots, \lambda(k-l))$ takes the form

$$(\{W\}^{s_1}, X, \{Y\}^{s_2}, X', \dots, \{W\}^{s_{2m-1}}, X, \{Y\}^{s_{2m}}, X', \{W\}^{s_{2m+1}})$$

with some $m \geq 0$ and $s_1, \dots, s_{2m+1} \geq 0$. On one hand, for $i \in W$, we have

$$f_i = I^l(p'_i[0]; p'_{i+1}(0), \dots, p'_{i+l}(0); p'_{i+l+1}[0])$$

by Lemma 5.24. On the other hand, for $i < i'$ such that $(\lambda(i), \dots, \lambda(i')) = (X, \{Y\}^s, X')$, we have, by induction hypothesis,

$$(5.8) \quad \sum_{j=i}^{i'} f_j = I^l(p'_i[0]; \{y\}^l; p'_{i'+l+1}[0])$$

where $y := p'_{i+1}[0] = p'_{i+2}[0] = \dots = p'_{i'+l}[0]$ ⁴. Then, by the path composition formula, (5.8) equals

$$\begin{aligned} I^l(p'_i[0]; \{y\}^l; p'_{i'+l+1}[0]) &= I^l(p'_i[0]; \{y\}^l; y) + I^l(y; \{y\}^l; p'_{i'+l+1}[0]) \\ &= \sum_{j=i}^{i'} I^l(p'_j[0]; p'_{j+1}(0), \dots, p'_{j+l}(0); p'_{j+l+1}[0]) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is because $I^l(p'_j[0]; p'_{j+1}(0), \dots, p'_{j+l}(0); p'_{j+l+1}[0]) = 0$ for $i < j < i'$. Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k-l} f_i = \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} I^l(p'_i[0]; p'_{i+1}(0), \dots, p'_{i+l}(0); p'_{i+l+1}[0]).$$

Now by Lemma 5.25, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} f_i &= I^l(p'_0[0]; \{x'\}^l; p'_{k+1}[0]) \quad (x' \text{ is any element of } \mathbb{Q}) \\ &= J^l(p_0; \{q + z^m x'\}^l; p_{k+1}) \\ &= I^l(p_0[0]; \{x\}^l; p_{k+1}[0]). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5.27. *Let $k \geq l > 0$ and $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in T_z^\times \mathbb{Q}(z)$. Assume that $\#\{p_1, \dots, p_k\} = \#\{\overline{p_1}, \dots, \overline{p_k}\}$. Then we have*

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} D_l(J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})) \\ = \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) \otimes J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i, p_{i+l+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

⁴It should be noted that if $(\lambda(0), \dots, \lambda(k-l))$ is of the form $(X, \{Y\}^s, X')$, the induction hypothesis cannot be applied, but such a case never occurs since $\#\{\overline{p_1}, \dots, \overline{p_k}\} > 1$ by definition.

Proof. It is enough to only consider the case where (p_0, \dots, p_{k+1}) is very regular sequence. If there exists $s \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $p_s(0) = \infty$ then $p_0(0) \neq \infty$, $p_{k+1}(0) \neq \infty$ by the definition of very regular sequence and $J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = 0$, and

$$J_{\text{up}}(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) \otimes J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i, p_{i+l+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = 0$$

for $0 \leq i \leq k-l$, and thus (5.9) holds. Thus it is enough to only consider the case where $p_i(0) \neq \infty$ for all i . First we have

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) \otimes J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i, p_{i+l+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) \otimes I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_i(0), p_{i+l+1}(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0]) \end{aligned}$$

since

$$J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i, p_{i+l+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_i(0), p_{i+l+1}(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0])$$

except for the case

$$(i = 0 \wedge \overline{p_0}(0) = \overline{p_{l+1}}(0)) \vee (i = k-l \wedge \overline{p_{k-l}}(0) = \overline{p_{k+1}}(0)),$$

and for such exceptional cases, we have

$$J_{\text{up}}(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) = 0.$$

Now as before we decompose $\{0 \leq i \leq k-l\}$ as

$$\{0 \leq i \leq k-l\} = W \sqcup X \sqcup X' \sqcup Y$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} X &= \{i \mid p_i(0) \neq p_{i+1}(0) = \dots = p_{i+l}(0) = p_{i+l+1}(0)\} \\ X' &= \{i \mid p_i(0) = p_{i+1}(0) = \dots = p_{i+l}(0) \neq p_{i+l+1}(0)\} \\ Y &= \{i \mid p_i(0) = p_{i+1}(0) = \dots = p_{i+l}(0) = p_{i+l+1}(0)\} \\ W &= \{0 \leq i \leq k-l\} \setminus (X \sqcup X' \sqcup Y). \end{aligned}$$

Define $\lambda : \{0 \leq i \leq k-l\} \rightarrow \{X, X', Y, W\}$ by setting $\lambda(i)$ to be the set where i belongs to. By definition, $(\lambda(0), \dots, \lambda(k-l))$ takes the form

$$(\{W\}^{s_1}, X, \{Y\}^{s_2}, X', \dots, \{W\}^{s_{2m-1}}, X, \{Y\}^{s_{2m}}, X', \{W\}^{s_{2m+1}})$$

with some $m \geq 0$ and $s_1, \dots, s_{2m+1} \geq 0$. On one hand, for $i \in W$, we have

$$J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) = I^l(p_i[0]; p_{i+1}(0), \dots, p_{i+l}(0); p_{i+l+1}[0]).$$

by Lemma 5.24. On the other hand, for $j < j'$ such that $(\lambda(j), \dots, \lambda(j')) = (X, \{Y\}^s, X')$, the sequence

$$\sigma := (p_1(0), \dots, p_i(0), p_{i+l+1}(0), \dots, p_k(0))$$

does not depend on the choice of $i \in \{j, j+1, \dots, j'\}$ since $p_{j+1}(0) = p_{j+2}(0) = \dots = p_{j'+l}(0)$. Thus, the partial sum

$$\sum_{i=j}^{j'} J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) \otimes I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_i(0), p_{i+l+1}(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0])$$

of equation (5.10) equals

$$\left(\sum_{i=j}^{j'} J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) \right) \otimes I_{\text{up}}^{\mathbf{m}}(p_0[0]; \sigma; p_{k+1}[0]).$$

By Lemma 5.26,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=j}^{j'} J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) &= I^l(p_j[0]; \{p_{j+1}(0)\}^l; p_{j'+l+1}[0]) \\ &= \sum_{i=j}^{j'} I^l(p_i[0]; p_{i+1}(0), \dots, p_{i+l}(0); p_{i+l+1}[0]) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from the path composition formula. Putting together, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=0}^{k-l} J^l(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) \otimes J_{\text{up}}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i, p_{i+l+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} I^l(p_i[0]; p_{i+1}(0), \dots, p_{i+l}(0); p_{i+l+1}[0]) \otimes I_{\text{up}}^m(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_i(0), p_{i+l+1}(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0]) \\ &= D_l(I_{\text{up}}^m(p_0[0]; p_1(0), \dots, p_k(0); p_{k+1}[0])) \\ &= D_l(J_{\text{up}}((p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}))). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

As explained at the beginning of this section, we can now conclude that Proposition 5.23 is true by Lemma 5.27.

6. MOTIVICITY OF CONFLUENCE RELATIONS

6.1. Basic notations. Throughout Section 6, we fix a finite subsets $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{Q}[z]$ and $S \subset \mathbb{Q}$ such that for all distinct pair $p(z), q(z) \in \mathcal{P}$, all zeros of $p(z) - q(z)$ lie in S . We also fix a base point $z_0 \in Y := \mathbb{C} \setminus S$ and let \tilde{Y} be a universal covering space of Y with the base point z_0 . For each $a \in S$, we fix $v(a) \in \mathbb{Q}^\times$, and write \hat{a} for the tangential base point $\overrightarrow{v(a)}_a$. Similarly, for each $p = p(z) \in \mathcal{P}$, we fix $v'(p) \in \mathbb{Q}^\times$, and for $a \in \mathbb{C}$ we write $\hat{p}(a)$ for the tangential base point $\overrightarrow{v'(p)}_{p(a)}$. Note that \tilde{Y} is defined as the set of pairs (a, γ) where $a \in Y$ and γ is a homotopy class of paths from z_0 to a on Y . We denote by \tilde{S} the set of pairs (a, γ) where $a \in S$ and γ is a homotopy class of paths from z_0 to \hat{a} on Y . For $a \in \mathbb{C}$, we put

$$X_a := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{p(a) \mid p \in \mathcal{P}\}.$$

Furthermore, for $x, y \in \tilde{S}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_k \in S$, we denote by

$$I^m(x; a_1, \dots, a_k; y)$$

the motivic iterated integral

$$I_\gamma^m(\widehat{\text{pr}(x)}; a_1, \dots, a_k; \widehat{\text{pr}(y)}) \in \mathcal{H}$$

where $\text{pr} : \tilde{Y} \sqcup \tilde{S} \rightarrow Y \sqcup S$ is the natural projection and $\gamma \in \pi_1^{\text{top}}(Y; \widehat{\text{pr}(x)}, \widehat{\text{pr}(y)})$ is the natural path determined by x and y .

Definition 6.1. For $p = p(z), q = q(z) \in \mathcal{P}$, we put

$$\pi(p, q) := \pi_1^{\text{top}}(X_{z_0}; \hat{p}(z_0), \hat{q}(z_0)).$$

For each $\gamma \in \pi(p, q)$ and $\tilde{a} = (a, \gamma') \in \tilde{Y}$, we define

$$\gamma(\tilde{a}) \in \pi_1^{\text{top}}(X_a; \hat{p}(a), \hat{q}(a))$$

to be the continuous deformation of γ along γ' , which is well-defined since for $a \in Y$ the map $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ given by $p \mapsto p(a)$ is injective.

Definition 6.2. We denote by \mathcal{B} the commutative \mathbb{Q} -algebra generated by the formal symbols

$$\mathbb{I}_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$$

where $k \geq 0$, $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}$, and $\gamma \in \pi(p_0, p_{k+1})$ with the relations (see also [9, Section 2.1]):

(1) the unit:

$$\mathbb{I}_\gamma(p; q) := \mathbb{I}_\gamma(p; \emptyset; q) = 1;$$

(2) the shuffle product formula:

$$\mathbb{I}_\gamma(p; p_1, \dots, p_{r+1}; q) \mathbb{I}_\gamma(p; p_{r+1}, \dots, p_s; q) = \mathbb{I}_\gamma(p; (p_1, \dots, p_r) \sqcup (p_{r+1}, \dots, p_s); q);$$

(3) the path composition formula:

$$\mathbb{I}_{\gamma_1 \gamma_2}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = \sum_{i=0}^k \mathbb{I}_{\gamma_1}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i; q) \mathbb{I}_{\gamma_2}(q; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1});$$

(4) the trivial path: For $k > 0$ and a trivial path $\gamma \in \pi(q, q)$,

$$\mathbb{I}_\gamma(q; p_1, \dots, p_k; q) = 0.$$

Then we can view \mathcal{B} as a graded ring $\bigoplus_{k=0}^\infty \mathcal{B}_k$ by setting the degree of $\mathbb{I}_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ as k .

Definition 6.3. We define $\mathcal{B}^a := \mathcal{B}/I$ where I is the ideal of \mathcal{B} generated by

$$\{\mathbb{I}_\gamma(q; p_1, \dots, p_k; q) \mid k > 0, \gamma \in \pi(q, q)\}.$$

Notice that the image of $\mathbb{I}_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$ in \mathcal{B}^a does not depend on the choice of γ . Therefore, \mathcal{B}^a is naturally identified with the Goncharov's Hopf algebra $I_\bullet(\mathcal{P})$ as a commutative ring by the obvious correspondence $\mathbb{I}_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \mapsto \mathbb{I}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$. Let $\bigoplus_{k=0}^\infty \mathcal{B}_k^a := \mathcal{B}^a$ be the grading of \mathcal{B}^a induced by that of \mathcal{B} .

Definition 6.4. For $a \in \tilde{S}$ we define a ring homomorphism $\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{m},(T)} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}[T]$ by

$$\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{m},(T)}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})) := J_{\gamma'}(p'_0; p'_1, \dots, p'_k; p'_{k+1})$$

where $\gamma'(z) := \gamma(a + v(\text{pr}(a))z)$ and $p'_j(z) := p_j(\text{pr}(a) + v(\text{pr}(a))z)$ for $0 \leq j \leq k+1$, and $\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{m}}$ as the composed map $\mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{m},(T)}} \mathcal{H}[T] \xrightarrow{T=0} \mathcal{H}$. Here, $a + v(\text{pr}(a))z$ denotes the element of \tilde{Y} (whose projection on Y is $\text{pr}(a) + v(\text{pr}(a))z$) defined in a natural way for a sufficiently small $z > 0$.

The well-definedness of $\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{m},(T)}$ is clear by Proposition 5.22. Note that the composite maps $\mathcal{B}_{>0} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{m},(T)}} \mathcal{H}[T] \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}^{(T)}$ (resp. $\mathcal{B}_{>0} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{m}}} \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}$) factors through $\mathcal{B}_{>0}^a$ and we thus define $\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{l},(T)} : \mathcal{B}_{>0}^a \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}^{(T)}$ (resp. $\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{l}} : \mathcal{B}_{>0}^a \rightarrow \mathfrak{L}$) as the induced map. One can check that $\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{l},(T)}$ depends only on $\text{pr}(a) \in S$ and does not depend on the path to $\widehat{\text{pr}(a)}$ and so we sometimes abuse the notation $\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{l},(T)}$ for $a \in S$ if there is no risk of confusion.

6.2. Key lemmas. As corollaries of Proposition 5.23, we can now show the following key lemmas which will take crucial roles in the proof of the motivicity of confluence relations.

Lemma 6.5. For $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}$, $a \in \tilde{S}$, $0 < l \leq k$ and a path $\gamma \in \pi(p_0, p_{k+1})$,

$$D_l(\text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{m}} \mathbb{I}_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})) = \sum_{i=0}^{k-l} \text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{l}} \mathbb{I}(p_i; p_{i+1}, \dots, p_{i+l}; p_{i+l+1}) \otimes \text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{m}} \mathbb{I}_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_i, p_{i+l+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}).$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Proposition 5.23. \square

Lemma 6.6. For $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $a \in S$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^k (\text{ord}_{z-a}(p_i - p_{i+1}) - \text{ord}_{z-a}(p_i - p_{i-1})) \text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{l}} \mathbb{I}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\ &= (\text{ord}_{z-a}(p_1 - p_{k+1}) - \text{ord}_{z-a}(p_1 - p_0)) \text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{l}} \mathbb{I}(p_1; p_2, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\ &+ (\text{ord}_{z-a}(p_k - p_{k+1}) - \text{ord}_{z-a}(p_k - p_0)) \text{ev}_a^{\mathfrak{l}} \mathbb{I}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}; p_k) \end{aligned}$$

where we define $\text{ord}_{z-a}(0) := 0$ as before.

Proof. Fix a lift $\tilde{a} \in \tilde{S}$ of $a \in S$ and a path $\gamma \in \pi(p_0, p_{k+1})$ and put

$$\text{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathfrak{m},(T)} \mathbb{I}_\gamma(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) = \sum_{j=0}^k s_j T^j \in \mathcal{H}[T]$$

where $s_0, \dots, s_k \in \mathcal{H}$ with $\deg s_j = k - j$. By the Leibniz rule $D_l(xy) = D_l(x) \cdot (1 \otimes y) + D_l(y) \cdot (1 \otimes x)$, we have

$$(6.1) \quad \begin{aligned} D_1(\mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{m},(T)} \mathbb{I}_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})) &= \sum_{j=0}^k (D_1(s_j) \cdot (1 \otimes T^j) + D_1(T^j) \cdot (1 \otimes s_j)) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^k D_1(s_j) \cdot (1 \otimes T^j) + \sum_{j=1}^k jT \otimes s_j T^{j-1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(6.2) \quad \begin{aligned} D_{k-1}(\mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{m},(T)} \mathbb{I}_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})) &= \sum_{j=0}^k (D_{k-1}(s_j) \cdot (1 \otimes T^j) + D_{k-1}(T^j) \cdot (1 \otimes s_j)) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^1 D_{k-1}(s_j) \cdot (1 \otimes T^j) + \sum_{j=k-1}^k D_{k-1}(T^j) \cdot (1 \otimes s_j) \\ &= (D_{k-1}(s_0) + s_1 \otimes T + \delta_{1,k} T \otimes s_1). \end{aligned}$$

since $D_{k-1}(s_1) = s_1 \otimes 1$ and $D_l(T^j) = j\delta_{1,l} T \otimes T^{j-1}$. On the other hand, by Proposition 5.23, we have

$$(6.3) \quad D_1(\mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{m},(T)} \mathbb{I}_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})) = \sum_{i=1}^k \mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{l},(T)} \mathbb{I}(p_{i-1}; p_i; p_{i+1}) \otimes \mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{m},(T)} \mathbb{I}_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}).$$

By comparing the coefficient of $T \otimes 1$ in (6.1) and (6.3), we have

$$(6.4) \quad s_1 = \sum_{i=1}^k (\mathrm{ord}_{z-a}(p_i - p_{i+1}) - \mathrm{ord}_{z-a}(p_i - p_{i-1})) \mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{m}} \mathbb{I}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})$$

since $\mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{l},(T)} \mathbb{I}(p_{i-1}; p_i; p_{i+1}) = (\mathrm{ord}_{z-a}(p_i - p_{i+1}) - \mathrm{ord}_{z-a}(p_i - p_{i-1})) T + (\text{Const. term})$.

Similarly, by Proposition 5.23, we have

$$(6.5) \quad \begin{aligned} D_{k-1}(\mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{m},(T)} \mathbb{I}_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})) &= \mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{l},(T)} \mathbb{I}(p_1; p_2, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \otimes \mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{m},(T)} \mathbb{I}_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1; p_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + \mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{l},(T)} \mathbb{I}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}; p_k) \otimes \mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{m},(T)} \mathbb{I}_{\gamma}(p_0; p_k; p_{k+1}). \end{aligned}$$

By comparing the coefficient of $1 \otimes T$ in (6.2) and (6.5), we have

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{aligned} (\text{Image of } s_1 \text{ in } \mathfrak{L}) &= (\mathrm{ord}_{z-a}(p_1 - p_{k+1}) - \mathrm{ord}_{z-a}(p_1 - p_0)) \mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{l}} \mathbb{I}(p_1; p_2, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}) \\ &\quad + (\mathrm{ord}_{z-a}(p_k - p_{k+1}) - \mathrm{ord}_{z-a}(p_k - p_0)) \mathrm{ev}_{\tilde{a}}^{\mathbf{l}} \mathbb{I}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_{k-1}; p_k). \end{aligned}$$

Now, the lemma readily follows by comparing (6.4) and (6.6). \square

6.3. The definition of the confluence relation.

Definition 6.7. For $c \in S$, define a linear map $\partial_c : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ by

$$\partial_c(uv) = \partial_c(u)v + u\partial_c(v)$$

and

$$\partial_c(\mathbb{I}_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1})) = \sum_{i=1}^k (\mathrm{ord}_{z-c}(p_i - p_{i+1}) - \mathrm{ord}_{z-c}(p_i - p_{i-1})) \mathbb{I}_{\gamma}(p_0; p_1, \dots, \widehat{p}_i, \dots, p_k; p_{k+1}).$$

Definition 6.8. For $x, y \in \tilde{S}$, we define $\psi_{x,y} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by

$$\psi_{x,y}(u) = -\mathrm{ev}_y^{\mathbf{m}}(u) + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in S} \mathrm{ev}_x^{\mathbf{m}}(\partial_{c_1} \cdots \partial_{c_l} u) \cdot I^{\mathbf{m}}(x; c_1, \dots, c_l; y).$$

Proposition 6.9 (Confluence relation for complex-valued iterated integrals). *For $x, y \in \tilde{S}$ and $u \in \mathcal{B}$,*

$$\mathrm{per}(\psi_{x,y}(u)) = 0.$$

This theorem is proved just in the same way as the proof of Theorem 2.26 by using the general differential formula

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dz} I_\gamma(\widehat{p_0}; p_1, \dots, p_k; \widehat{p_{k+1}}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ p_i \neq p_{i+1}}} \frac{d \log(p_i - p_{i+1})}{dz} I_\gamma(\widehat{p_0}; p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; \widehat{p_{k+1}}) \\ & \quad - \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ p_i \neq p_{i-1}}} \frac{d \log(p_i - p_{i-1})}{dz} I_\gamma(\widehat{p_0}; p_1, \dots, p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_k; \widehat{p_{k+1}}) \end{aligned}$$

for $p_0, \dots, p_{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}$.

The purpose of Section 6 is to prove $\psi_{x,y}(u) = 0$ for any x, y and u . We will prove this by induction on the degree of u . For convenience, we call the statement:

$$\left[\text{For } x, y \in \tilde{S}, l \leq k \text{ and } u \in \mathcal{B}_l, \psi_{x,y}(u) = 0. \right]$$

as Hyp(k).

6.4. A combinatorial interpretation for $\psi_{x,y}$. Fix a finite totally-ordered set P and a map $\iota : P \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$. We identify a strictly increasing sequence $a_1 < \dots < a_k$ of the elements in P and a subset $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ of P . For $k \geq 0$, we put

$$B_k := \{U \subset P \mid \#U = 2 + k\}$$

and $B = \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} B_k$. For $S_1, S_2 \in B$, we write $S_1 \prec S_2$ (resp. $S_1 \not\prec S_2$) if and only if $S_1 \subset S_2$ (resp. $S_1 \subsetneq S_2$), $\min(S_1) = \min(S_2)$ and $\max(S_1) = \max(S_2)$.

Definition 6.10. Let $U_0, \dots, U_m \in B$, and $(p_1, p'_1), \dots, (p_m, p'_m) \in P^2$. For $S_1 \prec S_2$, we call the pair

$$((U_0, \dots, U_m); (p_1, p'_1), \dots, (p_m, p'_m))$$

a *history* from S_1 to S_2 if the following conditions are satisfied:

- $p_i < p'_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$,
- $S_1 = U_0 \subset \dots \subset U_m = S_2$,
- $\#U_i = \#U_{i-1} + 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$,
- $U_i = U_{i-1} \cup \{p_i, p'_i\}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$,
- $q \notin U_i$ for all q such that $p_i < q < p'_i$.

We write a history $((U_0, \dots, U_m); (p_1, p'_1), \dots, (p_m, p'_m))$ as

$$U_0 \xrightarrow{p_1 p'_1} U_1 \xrightarrow{p_2 p'_2} \dots \xrightarrow{p_m p'_m} U_m.$$

Definition 6.11. For $S_1 \prec S_2$, we denote by $\mathcal{F}(S_1, S_2)$ the set of histories from S_1 to S_2 . Furthermore, if $\#S_1 = 2$, we write $\mathcal{F}(S_2)$ for $\mathcal{F}(S_1, S_2)$.

Example 6.12. Let $P = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. We denote a subset $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ of P simply as $a_1 \dots a_k$. Then $\mathcal{F}(0123)$ consists of the following eight elements:

$$\begin{aligned} & 03 \xrightarrow{01} 013 \xrightarrow{12} 0123, 03 \xrightarrow{01} 013 \xrightarrow{23} 0123, 03 \xrightarrow{13} 013 \xrightarrow{12} 0123, 03 \xrightarrow{13} 013 \xrightarrow{23} 0123 \\ & 03 \xrightarrow{02} 023 \xrightarrow{01} 0123, 03 \xrightarrow{02} 023 \xrightarrow{12} 0123, 03 \xrightarrow{23} 023 \xrightarrow{01} 0123, 03 \xrightarrow{23} 023 \xrightarrow{12} 0123. \end{aligned}$$

For $U = \{b_0 < \dots < b_{k+1}\} \in B_k$ and $\gamma \in \pi(\iota(b_0), \iota(b_{k+1}))$, we put

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_\gamma(U) &:= \mathbb{I}_\gamma(\iota(b_0); \iota(b_1), \dots, \iota(b_k); \iota(b_{k+1})) \in \mathcal{B}_k, \\ \mathbb{I}(U) &:= \mathbb{I}(\iota(b_0); \iota(b_1), \dots, \iota(b_k); \iota(b_{k+1})) \in \mathcal{B}_k^a. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 6.13. For a history

$$f = \left(U_0 \xrightarrow{p_1 p'_1} U_1 \xrightarrow{p_2 p'_2} \dots \xrightarrow{p_m p'_m} U_m \right) \in \mathcal{F}(U_0, U_m),$$

define the sign of f as

$$\text{sgn}(f) := (-1)^{t(f)}$$

where $t(f)$ is the number of j such that $U_j = U_{j-1} \cup \{p'_j\}$.

Definition 6.14. For a history

$$f = \left(U_0 \xrightarrow{p_1 p'_1} U_1 \xrightarrow{p_2 p'_2} \dots \xrightarrow{p_m p'_m} U_m \right) \in \mathcal{F}(U_0, U_m),$$

and $x, y \in \tilde{S}$, define $T_{x,y}(f) \in \mathcal{H}$ by

$$T_{x,y}(f) := \text{sgn}(f) \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_m \in S} \left(\prod_{i=1}^m \text{ord}_{z-c_i} (\iota(p_i) - \iota(p'_i)) \right) I^{\mathfrak{m}}(x; c_1, \dots, c_m; y).$$

Then by definition we have

$$(6.7) \quad \psi_{x,y}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U)) = -\text{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U)) + \sum_{V \prec U} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,U)} \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V)) T_{x,y}(f).$$

6.5. A combinatorial interpretation of $D(\psi_{x,y})$. Let

$$f := \left(U_0 \xrightarrow{p_1 p'_1} U_1 \xrightarrow{p_2 p'_2} \dots \xrightarrow{p_m p'_m} U_m \right)$$

be a history. Assume that $m > 0$. Then

$$(6.8) \quad D(T_{x,y}(f)) = \sum_{0 \leq i < j \leq m} \text{sgn}(f) \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_m \in S} \left(\prod_{s=1}^m \text{ord}_{z-c_s} (\iota(p_s) - \iota(p'_s)) \right) \\ \times I^{\mathfrak{l}}(c_i; c_{i+1}, \dots, c_j; c_{j+1}) \otimes I^{\mathfrak{m}}(x; c_1, \dots, c_i, c_{j+1}, \dots, c_m; y)$$

where we put $c_0 := x$ and $c_{m+1} := y$. We denote by $T_{x,y}^{\mathfrak{l}}(f)$ the image of $T_{x,y}(f)$ in \mathfrak{L} . For (6.8), we introduce the following notation.

Definition 6.15. For three histories

$$f_1 = \left(V \xrightarrow{p_1 p'_1} \dots \xrightarrow{p_i p'_i} W_1 \right) \in \mathcal{F}(V, W_1), \quad f_2 \in \mathcal{F}(W_1, W_2), \quad f_3 = \left(W_2 \xrightarrow{p_{i+1} p'_{i+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{p_m p'_m} U \right) \in \mathcal{F}(W_2, U),$$

we define $T_{x,y}(f_1, f_2, f_3) \in \mathfrak{L} \otimes \mathcal{H}$ by

$$T_{x,y}(f_1, f_2, f_3) := \text{sgn}(f_1) \text{sgn}(f_3) \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_m \in S} \left(\prod_{s=1}^m \text{ord}_{z-c_s} (\iota(p_s) - \iota(p'_s)) \right) T_{c_i, c_{i+1}}^{\mathfrak{l}}(f_2) \otimes I^{\mathfrak{m}}(x; c_1, \dots, c_m; y)$$

where we again put $c_0 := x$ and $c_{m+1} := y$.

Then, by definition, we have

$$(6.9) \quad D\left(\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,U)} T_{x,y}(f) \right) = \sum_{V \prec W_1 \not\prec W_2 \prec U} \sum_{\substack{f_1 \in \mathcal{F}(V, W_1) \\ f_2 \in \mathcal{F}(W_1, W_2) \\ f_3 \in \mathcal{F}(W_2, U)}} T_{x,y}(f_1, f_2, f_3) \\ = \sum_{V \prec W_1 \not\prec W_2 \prec U} \sum_{\substack{f_1 \in \mathcal{F}(V, W_1) \\ f_3 \in \mathcal{F}(W_2, U)}} T_{x,y}(f_1, f_3)$$

where we put

$$T_{x,y}(f_1, f_3) := \sum_{f_2 \in \mathcal{F}(W_1, W_2)} T_{x,y}(f_1, f_2, f_3).$$

By (6.7) and (6.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D(\psi_{x,y}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U))) &= -D(\mathrm{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U))) + \sum_{V \prec U} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,U)} (1 \otimes \mathrm{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot D(T_{x,y}(f)) \\
&\quad + \sum_{V \prec U} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,U)} (1 \otimes T_{x,y}(f)) \cdot D(\mathrm{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \\
&= -D(\mathrm{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U))) + \sum_{V \prec W_1 \not\prec W_2 \prec U} \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,W_1) \\ g \in \mathcal{F}(W_2,U)}} (1 \otimes \mathrm{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot T_{x,y}(f, g) \\
(6.10) \quad &\quad + \sum_{V \prec U} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,U)} (1 \otimes T_{x,y}(f)) \cdot D(\mathrm{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V)))
\end{aligned}$$

Now we calculate $T_{x,y}(f, g)$.

Definition 6.16. Assume that $V \not\prec W$. We write $V \triangleleft W$ if V and W can be written as

$$V = \{a_0 < \cdots < a_i < a_{i+1} < \cdots < a_{k+1}\}$$

and

$$W = \{a_0 < \cdots < a_i < b_1 < \cdots < b_j < a_{i+1} < \cdots < a_{k+1}\}$$

for some $0 \leq i \leq k$ and $j > 0$ and $a_0, \dots, a_{k+1}, b_1, \dots, b_j \in P$. Furthermore, we define $\omega(V, W)$ to be the substring

$$\omega(V, W) := \{a_i < b_1 < \cdots < b_j < a_{i+1}\}$$

of W in this case.

Lemma 6.17. *Let*

$$V = \{a_1 < \cdots < a_{n+1}\},$$

$$U = \{a_1 < b_{1,1} < \cdots < b_{1,r_1} < a_2 < b_{2,1} < \cdots < b_{2,r_2} < \cdots < a_n < b_{n,1} < \cdots < b_{n,r_n} < a_{n+1}\}$$

and

$$U_i = \{a_i < b_{i,1} < \cdots < b_{i,r_i} < a_{i+1}\} \quad (1 \leq i \leq n)$$

where $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}, b_{1,1}, \dots, b_{1,r_1}, b_{2,1}, \dots, b_{2,r_2}, \dots, b_{n,1}, \dots, b_{n,r_n} \in P$. Then, for $x, y \in \tilde{S}$,

$$\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,U)} T_{x,y}(f) = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{g \in \mathcal{F}(U_i)} T_{x,y}(g) \right).$$

Proof. It follows from the shuffle product formula and the definition of history. \square

Lemma 6.18. *Suppose that $\mathrm{Hyp}(k-1)$ holds. Then for any $V \not\prec U$ such that $\#U - \#V \leq k-1$, we have*

$$\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,U)} T_{x,y}^{\mathfrak{l}}(f) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(V, U))) - \mathrm{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(V, U))) & V \triangleleft U \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.17, $\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,U)} T_{x,y}(f)$ vanishes if there exists $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ such that $r_i, r_j > 0$. Thus, we have

$$\sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,U)} T_{x,y}^{\mathfrak{l}}(f) = \begin{cases} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\omega(V,U))} T_{x,y}^{\mathfrak{l}}(g) & V \triangleleft U \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\#U - \#V \leq k-1$,

$$\psi_{x,y}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(\omega(V, U))) = 0$$

by $\text{Hyp}(k-1)$, and thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= -\text{ev}_y^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(V, U))) + \sum_{W \prec \omega(V, U)} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(W)} \text{ev}_x^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}(W)) T_{x,y}^{\mathbb{I}}(f) \\ &= -\text{ev}_y^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(V, U))) + \sum_{\substack{W \prec \omega(V, U) \\ \#W \text{ is 2 or } \# \omega(V, U)}} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(W)} \text{ev}_x^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}(W)) T_{x,y}^{\mathbb{I}}(f) \\ &= -\text{ev}_y^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(V, U))) + \text{ev}_x^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(V, U))) + \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(\omega(V, U))} T_{x,y}^{\mathbb{I}}(f). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{F}(\omega(V, U))} T_{x,y}^{\mathbb{I}}(g) = \text{ev}_y^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(V, U))) - \text{ev}_y^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(V, U)))$$

as desired. \square

Definition 6.19. Let $V \prec U$. We call a pair of histories a *divided-history* from V to U if it is of the form (f, g) where $f \in \mathcal{F}(V, W_1)$, $g \in \mathcal{F}(W_2, U)$ with some $V \prec W_1 \triangleleft W_2 \prec U$.

We express a divided-history (f, g) as

$$V \xrightarrow{p_1 p'_1} \dots \xrightarrow{p_r p'_r} W_1 \Rightarrow W_2 \xrightarrow{q_1 q'_1} \dots \xrightarrow{q_s q'_s} U$$

where

$$f = \left(V \xrightarrow{p_1 p'_1} \dots \xrightarrow{p_r p'_r} W_1 \right), \quad g = \left(W_2 \xrightarrow{q_1 q'_1} \dots \xrightarrow{q_s q'_s} U \right).$$

We denote by $\mathcal{G}(V, U)$ the set of divided-histories from V to U .

Definition 6.20. For a divided-history

$$(f, g) := \left(V \xrightarrow{p_1 p'_1} \dots \xrightarrow{p_i p'_i} W_1 \Rightarrow W_2 \xrightarrow{p_{i+1} p'_{i+1}} \dots \xrightarrow{p_m p'_m} U \right),$$

define $T_{x,y}^R(f, g)$ and $T_{x,y}^L(f, g)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} T_{x,y}^R(f, g) &= \text{sgn}(f) \text{sgn}(g) \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_m \in S} \left(\prod_{s=1}^m \text{ord}_{z-c_s}(\iota(p_s) - \iota(p'_s)) \right) \text{ev}_{c_{i+1}}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(W_1, W_2))) \otimes I^{\mathbb{m}}(x; c_1, \dots, c_m; y) \\ T_{x,y}^L(f, g) &= \text{sgn}(f) \text{sgn}(g) \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_m \in S} \left(\prod_{s=1}^m \text{ord}_{z-c_s}(\iota(p_s) - \iota(p'_s)) \right) \text{ev}_{c_i}^{\mathbb{I}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(W_1, W_2))) \otimes I^{\mathbb{m}}(x; c_1, \dots, c_m; y) \end{aligned}$$

where we put $c_0 := x$ and $c_{m+1} := y$.

Now suppose that $\text{Hyp}(k-1)$ holds and that $U \in \mathcal{B}_k$. Then by Lemma 6.18, for $V \prec W_1 \not\prec W_2 \prec U \in \mathcal{B}_k$, $f \in \mathcal{F}(V, W_1)$ and $g \in \mathcal{F}(W_2, U)$, we have

$$T_{x,y}(f, g) \equiv \begin{cases} T_{x,y}^R(f, g) - T_{x,y}^L(f, g) & W_1 \triangleleft W_2 \\ 0 & W_1 \not\triangleleft W_2 \end{cases}$$

except for the case where $\#W_1 = 2$ and $W_2 = U$. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (6.11) \quad & \sum_{V \prec W_1 \not\prec W_2 \prec U} \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{F}(V, W_1) \\ g \in \mathcal{F}(W_2, U)}} (1 \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathbb{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot T_{x,y}(f, g) \\ & \equiv \sum_{V \not\prec U} (1 \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathbb{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot \sum_{(f, g) \in \mathcal{G}(V, U)} (T_{x,y}^R(f, g) - T_{x,y}^L(f, g)) \pmod{\mathfrak{L}_k \otimes \mathbb{Q}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we decompose $\mathcal{G}(V, U)$ in two ways:

$$\mathcal{G}(V, U) = \mathcal{G}_R^{(1)}(V, U) \sqcup \mathcal{G}_R^{(2)}(V, U) \sqcup \mathcal{G}_R^{(3)}(V, U) = \mathcal{G}_L^{(1)}(V, U) \sqcup \mathcal{G}_L^{(2)}(V, U) \sqcup \mathcal{G}_L^{(3)}(V, U)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_R^{(1)}(V, U)$ the subset of $\mathcal{G}(V, U)$ consisting of the elements of the forms

$$V \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow W \Rightarrow U,$$

$\mathcal{G}_R^{(2)}(V, U)$ the subset of $\mathcal{G}(V, U)$ consisting of the elements of the forms

$$\cdots \rightarrow (Aa_0a_{k+1}B) \Rightarrow (Aa_0a_1 \dots a_{i-1}a_{i+1} \dots a_k a_{k+1}B) \rightarrow (Aa_0a_1 \dots a_k a_{k+1}B) \rightarrow \cdots \quad (1 \leq i \leq k),$$

$\mathcal{G}_R^{(3)}(V, U)$ the subset of $\mathcal{G}(V, U)$ consisting of the elements of the forms

$$\cdots \rightarrow (A_1A_2abB) \Rightarrow (A_1A_2aWbB) \rightarrow (A_1xA_2aWbB) \rightarrow \cdots$$

or

$$\cdots \rightarrow (AabB_1B_2) \Rightarrow (AaWbB_1B_2) \rightarrow (AaWbB_1xB_2) \rightarrow \cdots,$$

$\mathcal{G}_L^{(1)}(V, U)$ the subset of $\mathcal{G}(V, U)$ consisting of the elements of the form

$$V \Rightarrow W \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow U,$$

$\mathcal{G}_L^{(2)}(V, U)$ the subset of $\mathcal{G}(V, U)$ consisting of the elements of the form

$$\cdots \rightarrow (Aa_0a_{k+1}B) \rightarrow (Aa_0a_i a_{k+1}B) \Rightarrow (Aa_0a_1 \dots a_k a_{k+1}B) \rightarrow \cdots \quad (k \geq 1, i \in \{1, k\}),$$

$\mathcal{G}_L^{(3)}(V, U)$ the subset of $\mathcal{G}(V, U)$ consisting of the elements of the form

$$\cdots \rightarrow (A_1A_2abB) \rightarrow (A_1xA_2abB) \Rightarrow (A_1xA_2aWbB) \rightarrow \cdots$$

or

$$\cdots \rightarrow (AabB_1B_2) \rightarrow (AabB_1xB_2) \Rightarrow (AaWbB_1xB_2) \rightarrow \cdots.$$

By Lemma 6.5 and Hyp($k-1$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{V \not\leq U} (1 \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot \sum_{(f,g) \in \mathcal{G}_R^{(1)}(V,U)} T_{x,y}^R(f,g) \\ &= \sum_{V \not\leq U} (1 \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot \left(\sum_{V \triangleleft W \triangleleft U} \text{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(W,U))) \otimes \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,W)} T_{x,y}(f) \right) \\ &= \sum_{W \triangleleft U} \text{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(W,U))) \otimes \left(\sum_{V \triangleleft W} \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V)) \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(V,W)} T_{x,y}(f) \right) \\ &= \sum_{W \triangleleft U} \text{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(W,U))) \otimes (\psi_{x,y}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(W)) + \text{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(W))) \\ &= \sum_{W \triangleleft U} \text{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(W,U))) \otimes \text{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(W)) \\ (6.12) \quad &= D(\text{ev}_y^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U))) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{V \not\leq U} (1 \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot \sum_{(f,g) \in \mathcal{G}_L^{(1)}(V,U)} T_{x,y}^L(f,g) \\ &= \sum_{V \not\leq U} (1 \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot \left(\sum_{V \triangleleft W \triangleleft U} \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(V,W))) \otimes \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(W,U)} T_{x,y}(f) \right) \\ &= \sum_{W \triangleleft U} \left(1 \otimes \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(W,U)} T_{x,y}(f) \right) \cdot \left(\sum_{V \triangleleft W} \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{l}}(\mathbb{I}(\omega(V,W))) \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V)) \right) \\ (6.13) \quad &= \sum_{W \triangleleft U} \left(1 \otimes \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}(W,U)} T_{x,y}(f) \right) \cdot D(\text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(W))). \end{aligned}$$

Next by Lemma 6.6, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^k T_{x,y}^R(\cdots \rightarrow (Aa_0a_{k+1}B) \Rightarrow (Aa_0a_1 \dots a_{i-1}a_{i+1} \dots a_ka_{k+1}B) \xrightarrow{a_ia_{i+1}} (Aa_0a_1 \dots a_ka_{k+1}B) \rightarrow \cdots) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^k T_{x,y}^R(\cdots \rightarrow (Aa_0a_{k+1}B) \Rightarrow (Aa_0a_1 \dots a_{i-1}a_{i+1} \dots a_ka_{k+1}B) \xrightarrow{a_{i-1}a_i} (Aa_0a_1 \dots a_ka_{k+1}B) \rightarrow \cdots) \\
& = \sum_{i \in \{1,k\}} T_{x,y}^L(\cdots \rightarrow (Aa_0a_{k+1}B) \xrightarrow{a_ia_{k+1}} (Aa_0a_ia_{k+1}B) \Rightarrow (Aa_0a_1 \dots a_ka_{k+1}B) \rightarrow \cdots) \\
& + \sum_{i \in \{1,k\}} T_{x,y}^L(\cdots \rightarrow (Aa_0a_{k+1}B) \xrightarrow{a_0a_i} (Aa_0a_ia_{k+1}B) \Rightarrow (Aa_0a_1 \dots a_ka_{k+1}B) \rightarrow \cdots)
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$(6.14) \quad \sum_{V \not\supseteq U} (1 \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot \sum_{(f,g) \in \mathcal{G}_R^{(2)}(V,U)} T_{x,y}^R(f,g) = \sum_{V \not\supseteq U} (1 \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot \sum_{(f,g) \in \mathcal{G}_L^{(2)}(V,U)} T_{x,y}^L(f,g).$$

Furthermore, since

$$\begin{aligned}
& T_{x,y}^R(\cdots \rightarrow (A_1A_2abB) \Rightarrow (A_1A_2aWbB) \rightarrow (A_1xA_2aWbB) \rightarrow \cdots) \\
& = T_{x,y}^L(\cdots \rightarrow (A_1A_2abB) \rightarrow (A_1xA_2abB) \Rightarrow (A_1xA_2aWbB) \rightarrow \cdots)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& T_{x,y}^R(\cdots \rightarrow (AabB_1B_2) \Rightarrow (AaWbB_1B_2) \rightarrow (AaWbB_1xB_2) \rightarrow \cdots) \\
& = T_{x,y}^L(\cdots \rightarrow (AabB_1B_2) \rightarrow (AabB_1xB_2) \Rightarrow (AaWbB_1xB_2) \rightarrow \cdots),
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$(6.15) \quad \sum_{V \not\supseteq U} (1 \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot \sum_{(f,g) \in \mathcal{G}_R^{(3)}(V,U)} T_{x,y}^R(f,g) = \sum_{V \not\supseteq U} (1 \otimes \text{ev}_x^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(V))) \cdot \sum_{(f,g) \in \mathcal{G}_L^{(3)}(V,U)} T_{x,y}^L(f,g).$$

By (6.10), (6.11), (6.12), (6.13), (6.15) and (6.14), we have

$$(6.16) \quad D(\psi_{x,y}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U))) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathcal{L}_k \otimes \mathbb{Q}}$$

for $U \in B_k$ under the hypothesis $H(k-1)$. Now we are ready to prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 6.21 (Confluence relation for motivic iterated integrals). *For $x, y \in \tilde{S}$ and $u \in \mathcal{B}$, we have*

$$\psi_{x,y}(u) = 0.$$

Proof. Assume that $U \in B_k$. We prove $\psi_{x,y}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U)) = 0$ by induction on k . By definition, we have

$$\text{per}(\psi_{x,y}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U))) = 0.$$

By (6.16) and the induction hypothesis, we have

$$D(\psi_{x,y}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U))) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathcal{L}_k \otimes \mathbb{Q}}.$$

Thus by Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\psi_{x,y}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(U)) = 0.$$

which completes the proof. \square

Remark 6.22. Theorem 6.21 can be viewed as an ultimate generalization of the confluence relation defined in the authors' previous article [11]. In fact, the confluence relation in [11] is obtained from Theorem 6.21 under the setting $\mathcal{P} := \{0, 1, z\}$ and $S := \{0, 1\}$ together with the tangential vectors $v(0) = 1$, $v(1) = -1$.

7. PROOFS OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

In this section, we first prove the motivicity of the confluence relations for Euler sums discussed in Part 1 i.e. $\mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} \subset \ker(L^{\mathfrak{m}})$ by using the general result in the previous section. We then derive the main theorems by combining this motivicity result and the results in Part 1.

For the proof of $\mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} \subset \ker(L^{\mathfrak{m}})$, we apply Theorem 6.21 under the setting $\mathcal{P} := \{0, -1, z, -z^2\}$ and $S := \{0, 1, -1\}$ where we set the tangential vectors as $v(0) = 1$, $v(1) = -1$ and $v(-1) \in \mathbb{Q}^\times$ arbitrary. Define a linear map $\mathfrak{i} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ by $\mathfrak{i}(e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k}) := \mathbb{I}_\gamma(0; p_1, \dots, p_k; z)$ where γ is the straight path from 0 to z .

Lemma 7.1. *For $w \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(w)) = \text{ev}_0^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathfrak{i}(w))$.*

Proof. By definition of $\text{ev}_0^{\mathfrak{m}}$ (Definition 6.4), for $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \{0, -1, z, -z^2\}$ with $p_1 \neq 0$ and $p_k \neq z$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ev}_0^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathfrak{i}(e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k})) &= \text{ev}_0^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{I}_\gamma(0; p_1, \dots, p_k; z)) \\ &= J_\gamma(0; p_1, \dots, p_k; z)|_{T=0}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $J_\gamma(;;)$ (see Section 5.7), the last quantity is equal to

$$J_{\text{up}}(0; p_1, \dots, p_k; z).$$

Thus the lemma is reduced to the equality

$$L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k})) = J_{\text{up}}(0; p_1, \dots, p_k; z)|_{T=0}.$$

If $-1 \in \{p_1, \dots, p_k\}$, then the left hand side is zero since $\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k}) = 0$, while the right hand side is also zero by Lemma 5.18. Thus we assume that $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \{0, z, -z^2\}$. Furthermore, since the both $L^{\mathfrak{m}} \circ \text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}$ and $\text{ev}_0^{\mathfrak{m}} \circ \mathfrak{i}$ satisfy the shuffle relation, it is enough to only consider the cases

$$e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k} \in \mathcal{B}'', \text{ i.e. } p_1 = z$$

and

$$e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k} \in \mathcal{B}''', \text{ i.e. } p_1, \dots, p_k \in \{0, -z^2\}.$$

For the first case, since the sequence $(0, \frac{p_1}{z}, \dots, \frac{p_k}{z}, 1)$ is very regular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\text{up}}(0; p_1, \dots, p_k; z) &= I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(0; (\frac{p_1}{z})[0], \dots, (\frac{p_k}{z})[0]; 1) \\ &= L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\overline{\text{reg}}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k})) \\ &= L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\text{dist}_{z \rightarrow 0}(\overline{\text{reg}}(e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k}))) \\ &= L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k})), \end{aligned}$$

and thus we are done. For the second case, since the sequence $(0, \frac{p_1}{z^2}, \dots, \frac{p_k}{z^2}; 1/z)$ is very regular, we have

$$J_{\text{up}}(0; p_1, \dots, p_k; z) = I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(0; (\frac{p_1}{z^2})[0], \dots, (\frac{p_k}{z^2})[0]; (\frac{1}{z})[0]),$$

where $(\frac{1}{z})[0]$ is the extended tangential base point at ∞ with the tangential vector $e^T \in \mathbb{Q}[[T]]$. Thus, if we put $b_j = -\frac{p_j}{z^2} \in \{0, 1\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\text{up}}(0; p_1, \dots, p_k; z)|_{T=0} &= I_{\text{up}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(0; b_1, \dots, b_k; \overrightarrow{1}_\infty) \\ &= L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\text{reg}_{\sqcup}(\varrho(e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_k}))) \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Möbius transformation $t \mapsto t/(t-1)$ for the last equality. Now that $L^{\mathfrak{m}}$ satisfies the regularized double shuffle relation, the duality relation, and the distribution relation, we can show

$$L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\text{reg}_{\sqcup}(\varrho(e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_k}))) = L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\wp(e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_k})),$$

since the proof of Lemma 2.17 only uses those relations. Since

$$L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\wp(e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_k})) = L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k}))$$

by definition, this completes the proof. \square

As a special case of Theorem 6.21, we obtain the following theorem.

Proposition 7.2. *We have*

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} \subset \ker(L^{\mathfrak{m}}).$$

Proof. We apply Theorem 6.21 under the setting $\mathcal{P} := \{0, -1, z, -z^2\}$ and $S := \{0, 1, -1\}$ where we set the tangential vectors as $v(0) = 1$, $v(1) = -1$ and $v(-1) \in \mathbb{Q}^\times$ arbitrary. Let $u = e_{p_1} \cdots e_{p_k} \in \mathcal{B}$ with $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $p_1 \neq 0$ and $p_k \neq 0$. It is enough to show that

$$L^{\mathfrak{m}}(u|_{z \rightarrow 1} - \varphi(u)) = 0.$$

Then

$$L^{\mathfrak{m}}(u|_{z \rightarrow 1}) = \text{ev}_1^{\mathfrak{m}}(u)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\varphi(u)) &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in S} L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\text{reg}_{z \rightarrow 0}(\partial_{c_1} \cdots \partial_{c_l} u)) \cdot L^{\mathfrak{m}}(e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_l}) \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in S} \text{ev}_0^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbf{i}(\partial_{c_1} \cdots \partial_{c_l} u)) \cdot L^{\mathfrak{m}}(e_{c_1} \cdots e_{c_l}) \\ &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in S} \text{ev}_0^{\mathfrak{m}}(\partial_{c_1} \cdots \partial_{c_l} \mathbf{i}(u)) \cdot I^{\mathfrak{m}}(0; c_1, \dots, c_l; 1) \\ &= \psi_{0,1}(\mathbf{i}(u)) + \text{ev}_1^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbf{i}(u)). \end{aligned}$$

Here, ∂_c on the first and second lines are the one defined in Definition 6.7 while that on the third line is the one defined in Definition 2.21. The second equality is by Lemma 7.1, and the other equalities are by definition. Hence, by Theorem 6.21,

$$L^{\mathfrak{m}}(u|_{z \rightarrow 1} - \varphi(u)) = -\psi_{0,1}(\mathbf{i}(u)) = 0$$

as desired. \square

Theorem 7.3. Let $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}}$ be the ideal of $\mathfrak{H}^{(2)} := (\mathbb{Q} \langle e_0, e_1, e_{-1} \rangle, \sqcup)$ generated by e_0, e_1 and \mathcal{I}_{CF} . Then, we have

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}} = \ker(L^{\mathfrak{m}}).$$

Proof. Let k be a non-negative integer and $\mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)}$ the degree k part of $\mathfrak{H}^{(2)}$. Let F_k be the Fibonacci number defined by $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} F_k t^k = 1/(1 - t - t^2)$. Then by a result of Deligne [5],

$$(7.1) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(\mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)} / (\mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)} \cap \ker(L^{\mathfrak{m}})) \right) = F_k,$$

whereas by Theorem 3.1,

$$(7.2) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(\mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)} / (\mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)} \cap \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}}) \right) = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(\mathcal{A}_{k,\infty}^0(\{0, 1, -1\}) / \mathcal{I}_{\text{CF}} \right) \leq \#\mathcal{I}^{\text{D}}(k, \infty) = F_k.$$

Combining (7.1) and (7.2), we have

$$(7.3) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(\mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)} \cap \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}} \right) \geq \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \left(\mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)} \cap \ker(L^{\mathfrak{m}}) \right).$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 7.2,

$$(7.4) \quad \mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)} \cap \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}} \subset \mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)} \cap \ker(L^{\mathfrak{m}}).$$

By comparing (7.3) and (7.4), we find

$$\mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)} \cap \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}} = \mathfrak{H}_k^{(2)} \cap \ker(L^{\mathfrak{m}}).$$

Thus, we can conclude that $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_{\text{CF}} = \ker(L^{\mathfrak{m}})$. \square

Put $\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}) = (-1)^d L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbf{w}(\mathbb{k}))$, $\tilde{\zeta}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}) = L^{\mathfrak{m}}(\tilde{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbb{k}))$ where $\mathbf{w}(\mathbb{k}), \tilde{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbb{k})$ are as defined in Definition 2.11. Then, by Proposition 7.2, we obtain the following refinement of Theorem Theorem 3.10.

Theorem 7.4. Let $k, d \geq 0$. For $\mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{I}(k, d)$, $\tilde{\zeta}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k})$ is a $\mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ -linear combination of $\left\{ \tilde{\zeta}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}') \mid \mathbb{k}' \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{D}}(k, d) \right\}$. More explicitly, for $\mathbb{k} \in \mathcal{I}(k, d) \setminus \mathcal{I}^{\text{D}}(k, d)$, we have

$$\tilde{\zeta}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}) = \sum_{\mathbb{k}' \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{D}}(k, d)} \alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'} \tilde{\zeta}^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}')$$

where $\alpha_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'}$'s are as defined in Theorem 3.10.

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP18J00982, JP18K13392, JP19J00835, and JP20K14293.

REFERENCES

- [1] G.V. Belyĭ, ‘On Galois extensions of a maximal cyclotomic field,’ *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 1979, 43(2): 267–276.
- [2] F. Brown, ‘Mixed Tate motives over \mathbb{Z} ,’ *Ann. Math.*, 175 (2012), 949–976.
- [3] F. Brown, ‘On the decomposition of motivic multiple zeta values,’ in *Galois-Teichmüller Theory and Arithmetic Geometry*, H. Nakamura et. al. (eds.), *Adv. Studies in Pure Math.* 68, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2012, pp. 31–58.
- [4] P. Deligne, ‘Le groupe fondamental de la droite projective moins trois points,’ in *Galois groups over \mathbb{Q}* (Berkeley, CA, 1987), *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, 16 (1989), 79–297.
- [5] P. Deligne, ‘Le groupe fondamental unipotent motivique de $\mathbb{G}_m - \mu_N$, pour $N = 2, 3, 4, 6$ ou 8 ,’ *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci.* (2010), 101–141.
- [6] V. G. Drinfeld, ‘On quasitriangular quasi-Hopf algebras and a group closely connected with $\text{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q})$,’ *Leningrad Math. J.* 2 (1991), no. 4, 829–860.
- [7] H. Furusho, ‘The pentagon equation and the confluence relations,’ arXiv:1809.00789 [math.QA].
- [8] C. Glanois ‘Motivic unipotent fundamental groupoid of $\mathbb{G}_m \setminus \mu_N$ for $N = 2, 3, 4, 6, 8$ and Galois descents,’ *J. Number Theory*, 160 (2016), 334–384.
- [9] A. B. Goncharov, ‘Galois symmetries of fundamental groupoids and noncommutative geometry,’ *Duke Math. J.* 128 (2005), no. 2, 209–284.
- [10] A. Grothendieck, ‘Esquisse d’un programme,’ in “Geometric Galois actions, 1”, *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, 242, (1997) 5–48.
- [11] M. Hirose and N. Sato, ‘Iterated integrals on $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty, z\}$ and a class of relations among multiple zeta values,’ *Adv. Math.* 348 (2019), 163–182.
- [12] M. Hoffman, ‘The Algebra of Multiple Harmonic Series,’ *J. Algebra*, 194-2 (1997), 477 - 495.
- [13] K. Ihara, M. Kaneko, and D. Zagier, ‘Derivation and double shuffle relations for multiple zeta values,’ *Compos. Math.* 142 (2006), 307–338
- [14] M. Kaneko and S. Yamamoto, ‘A new integral-series identity of multiple zeta values and regularizations,’ *Selecta Math. (N. S.)* 24 (2018), 2499–2521.
- [15] M. Kontsevich and D. Zagier, ‘Periods,’ in *Mathematics unlimited—2001 and beyond*, Springer, Berlin (2001) 771–808.
- [16] Z-h. Li and C. Qin, ‘Some relations deduced from regularized double shuffle relations of multiple zeta values,’ *Int. J. Number Theory* 17 (2021), 91–146
- [17] E. Panzer, ‘Feynman integrals and hyperlogarithms,’ PhD thesis, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 2014; arXiv:1506.07243 [math-ph].

(Minoru Hirose) INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH, NAGOYA UNIVERSITY, FURO-CHO, CHIKUSA-KU, NAGOYA, 464-8602, JAPAN

Email address: minoru.hirose@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp

(Nobuo Sato) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY, NO. 1, SEC. 4, ROOSEVELT RD., TAIPEI 10617, TAIWAN (R.O.C.)

Email address: nbsato@ntu.edu.tw