ALGEBRAIC ASPECTS OF ROOTED TREE MAPS
HIDEKI MURAHARA AND TATSUSHI TANAKA

Abstract. Based on the Connes–Kreimer Hopf algebra of rooted trees, the rooted tree maps are defined as linear maps on noncommutative polynomial algebra in two indeterminates. It is known that they induce a large class of linear relations for multiple zeta values. In this paper, we investigate some basic algebraic properties of rooted tree maps by relating to the harmonic algebra. We also characterize the antipode maps as the conjugation by the special map $\tau$.

1. Introduction

Let $H$ be the Connes–Kreimer Hopf algebra of rooted trees introduced in [3]. By assigning to $f \in H$, the rooted tree map $\tilde{f}$ is introduced in [9] as an element in $\text{End}(A)$, where $A$ denotes the noncommutative polynomial algebra $\mathbb{Q}[x, y]$. It is known that the rooted tree maps induce a large class of linear relations for multiple zeta values. In [1, 2], we find some results in algebraic properties of rooted tree maps to make some applications to multiple zeta values clear. In this paper, we establish new algebraic formulas for rooted tree maps in the harmonic algebra.

Our first theorem gives an explicit formula for rooted tree maps by using the product $\diamond$ (defined in [4]), which is a variation of the so-called harmonic product on $A$. To state the formula, we need a polynomial $F_f \in A$ determined by $f \in H$, which we define in Section 3.

Theorem 1.1. For any $f \in H$ and $w \in A$, we have

$$\tilde{f}(wx) = (F_f \circ w)x.$$

Our second theorem shows that another polynomial $G_f \in A$ determined by $f \in H$ gives a similar formula for $\tilde{S}(f) \in \text{End}(A)$, where $S$ denotes the antipode of $f$ (see Section 4 for the precise definition of $G_f$).

Theorem 1.2. For any $f \in H$ and $w \in A$, we have

$$\tilde{S}(f)(wx) = (G_f \circ w)x.$$

By theorems 1.1 and 1.2 we have $(G_f \circ w)x = \tilde{S}(f)(wx) = (F_{S(f)} \circ w)x$ for $w \in A$. Thus we obtain

Corollary 1.3. For any $f \in H$, we have

$$G_f = F_{S(f)}.$$

Let $\tau$ be the anti-automorphism on $A$ with $\tau(x) = y$ and $\tau(y) = x$. This $\tau$ is an involution and known to give the dual index of multiple zeta values. Our third theorem asserts that $\tau$ plays another role to connect the rooted tree maps with their antipode maps.
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Theorem 1.4. For any \( f \in \mathcal{H} \), we have
\[
\widetilde{S}(f) = \tau \tilde{f} \tau.
\]

In Section 2, we discuss definitions and some basic properties of the Connes–Kreimer Hopf algebra of rooted trees, rooted tree maps, and harmonic products. Sections 3–5 are devoted to proofs of theorems 1.1, 1.2, and 1.4 in turn.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Connes–Kreimer Hopf algebra of rooted trees. We review briefly the Connes–Kreimer Hopf algebra of rooted trees introduced in \([3]\). A tree is a finite and connected graph without cycles and a rooted tree is a tree in which one vertex is designated as the root. We consider the rooted trees without plane structure, e.g., \( \begin{tikzpicture} \Tree [.\node{} [.\node{} [.\node{} [.\node{}{\node{}}] [.\node{}{\node{}}] \edge ] \edge ] \edge ] \end{tikzpicture} \) where the topmost vertex represents the root. A (rooted) forest is a finite collection of rooted trees \( (t_1, \ldots, t_n) \), which we denote the commutative product by \( t_1 \cdots t_n \). Then the Connes–Kreimer Hopf algebra of rooted trees \( \mathcal{H} \) is the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-vector space freely generated by rooted forests with the commutative ring structure. We denote by \( \mathbb{I} \) the empty forest, which is regarded as the neutral element in \( \mathcal{H} \).

We define the linear map \( B_+ \) on \( \mathcal{H} \) by grafting all roots of trees in a forest on a common new root and \( B_+ (\mathbb{I}) = \bullet \). We find that, for a rooted tree \( t (\not= \mathbb{I}) \), there is a unique forest \( f \) such that \( t = B_+ (f) \). The coproduct \( \Delta \) on \( \mathcal{H} \) is defined by the following two rules.

1. \( \Delta (t) = \mathbb{I} \otimes t + (B_+ \otimes \text{id}) \circ \Delta(f) \) if \( t = B_+ (f) \) is a tree,
2. \( \Delta (f) = \Delta (g) \Delta (h) \) if \( f = gh \) with \( g, h \in \mathcal{H} \).

Note that components of the tensor product are reversely defined compared to those in \([3]\). We denote by \( S \) the antipode of \( \mathcal{H} \). In the sequel, we often employ the Sweedler notation\( \Delta(f) = \sum_{(f)} f' \otimes f'' \).

A subtree \( t' \) of the rooted tree \( t \) (denoted by \( t' \subset t \)) is a subgraph of \( t \) that is connected and contains the root of \( t \) (hence the empty tree \( \mathbb{I} \) cannot be a subtree in our sense), and we denote by \( t \setminus t' \) their subtraction. For example, we have \( t \setminus t' = \bullet \mathbb{I} \) if \( t = \begin{tikzpicture} \Tree [.\node{}{\node{}} \edge \Tree [.\node{}{\node{}} \edge [.\node{}{\node{}} \edge ] \edge ] \edge ] \end{tikzpicture} \) and \( t' = \bullet \).

Proposition 2.1 \([3]\). For a rooted tree \( t \), we have

1. \( \Delta (t) = \mathbb{I} \otimes t + \sum_{t' \subset t} t' \otimes (t \setminus t') \),
2. \( S(t) + \sum_{t' \subset t} t' S(t \setminus t') = 0 \).

2.2. Rooted tree maps. We here define rooted tree maps introduced in \([9]\). For \( u \in \mathcal{A} \), let \( L_u \) and \( R_u \) be \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear maps on \( \mathcal{A} \) defined by \( L_u(w) = uw \) and \( R_u(w) = wu \) (\( w \in \mathcal{A} \)). For \( f \in \mathcal{H} \), we define the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear map \( \tilde{f} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \), which we call the rooted tree map (RTM for short), recursively by

1. \( \mathbb{I} = \text{id} \),
2. \( \tilde{f}(x) = yx \) and \( \tilde{f}(y) = -yx \) if \( f = \bullet \)\( , \)
3. \( \tilde{i}(u) = L_y L_x L_y^{-1} \tilde{f}(u) \) if \( t = B_+ (f) \) is a tree,
4. \( \tilde{f}(u) = h(h(u)) \) if \( f = gh \),
5. \( \tilde{f}(uw) = \sum_{(f)} \tilde{t}(u) \tilde{t}'(w) \) for \( \Delta(f) = \sum_{(f)} f' \otimes f'' \),

where \( w \in \mathcal{A} \) and \( u \in \{x, y\} \). It is known that \( \vdash : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \text{End}(\mathcal{A}) \) is an algebra homomorphism. We sometimes denote its image by \( \tilde{\mathcal{H}} \). (Note that in this definition the order of the concatenation product on \( \mathcal{A} \) is treated reversely compared to that in \([9]\). Since the coproduct \( \Delta \) on \( \mathcal{H} \) is also defined reversely as above, this definition makes sense.)
For structures of ordinary multiple zeta values (see [5]). There are many results on the harmonic product. It is known that this product is commutative and associative, and has one of the product two products in the following sense.

**Lemma 2.2** ([5]). For \( f \in \mathcal{H} \) and \( w \in A \), we have \( \tilde{f}(zw) = z\tilde{f}(w) \) and \( \tilde{f}(wz) = \tilde{f}(w)z \).

### 2.3. Harmonic products

Let \( A^1 = \mathbb{Q} + yA \) be the subalgebra of \( A \). We define the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-bilinear product * on \( A^1 \), which is called the harmonic product, by

\[
\begin{align*}
    w * 1 &= 1 * w = w, \\
    yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} * yx^{l_1-1} \ldots yx^{l_s-1} &= yx^{k_1-1}(yx^{k_2-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} * yx^{l_1-1} \ldots yx^{l_s-1}) \\
    &\quad + yx^{l_1-1}(yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} * yx^{l_2-1} \ldots yx^{l_s-1}) \\
    &\quad + yx^{k_1+l_1-1}(yx^{k_2-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} * yx^{l_2-1} \ldots yx^{l_s-1}).
\end{align*}
\]

It is known that this product is commutative and associative, and has one of the product structures of ordinary multiple zeta values (see [5]). There are many results on the harmonic products. We here recall the following identity (see [4, Proposition 6] or [7, Proposition 7.1]). For \( yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} \in A^1 \), we have

\[
(1) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{r} (-1)^i yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_i-1} yx^{k_{i+1}-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} z x^{k_{i+1}-1} \ldots z x^{k_i-1} = 0.
\]

Next, we define the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-bilinear product \( \bar{\ast} \) on \( A^1 \) by

\[
\begin{align*}
    w \bar{\ast} 1 &= 1 \bar{\ast} w = w, \\
    yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} \bar{\ast} yx^{l_1-1} \ldots yx^{l_s-1} &= yx^{k_1-1}(yx^{k_2-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} \bar{\ast} yx^{l_1-1} \ldots yx^{l_s-1}) \\
    &\quad + yx^{l_1-1}(yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} \bar{\ast} yx^{l_2-1} \ldots yx^{l_s-1}) \\
    &\quad - yx^{k_1+l_1-1}(yx^{k_2-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} \bar{\ast} yx^{l_2-1} \ldots yx^{l_s-1}).
\end{align*}
\]

Let \( d_1 \) be the automorphism on \( A \) given by \( d_1(x) = x \) and \( d_1(y) = z \). We define the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear map \( d: A^1 \to A^1 \) by \( d(1) = 1 \) and \( d(yw) = yd_1(w) \). The map \( d \) intermediates between the two products in the following sense.

**Lemma 2.3** ([5]). For \( w_1, w_2 \in A^1 \), we have \( d(w_1 \bar{\ast} w_2) = d(w_1) * d(w_2) \).

Lastly, following [4], we define the product \( \diamond \) on \( A \) by

\[
\begin{align*}
    w \diamond 1 &= 1 \diamond w = w, \\
    xw_1 \diamond xw_2 &= x(w_1 \diamond xw_2) - x(yw_1 \diamond w_2), \\
    xw_1 \diamond yw_2 &= x(w_1 \diamond yw_2) + y(xw_1 \diamond w_2), \\
    yw_1 \diamond xw_2 &= y(w_1 \diamond xw_2) + x(yw_1 \diamond w_2), \\
    yw_1 \diamond yw_2 &= y(w_1 \diamond yw_2) - y(xw_1 \diamond w_2)
\end{align*}
\]

for \( w, w_1, w_2 \in A \) together with \( \mathbb{Q} \)-bilinearity. We find that the product \( \diamond \) is associative and commutative. Let \( \phi \) be the automorphism on \( A \) given by \( \phi(x) = z \) and \( \phi(y) = -y \). We note that \( \phi \) is an involution. The product \( \diamond \) is thought of a kind of the harmonic product * by virtue of \( w_1 \diamond w_2 = \phi(\phi(w_1) * \phi(w_2)) \) for \( w_1, w_2 \in A \).

**Lemma 2.4** ([4, Proposition 2.3]). For \( w_1, w_2 \in A \), we have \( zw_1 \diamond w_2 = w_1 \diamond zw_2 = z(w_1 \diamond w_2) \).

**Lemma 2.5.** For \( w_1, w_2 \in A \), we have \( w_1 xw_2 \diamond y = (w_1 \diamond y)xw_2 + w_1 x(w_2 \diamond y) \).
**Proof.** It is enough to show when \( w_1 \) is a word. We prove the lemma by induction on \( \deg(w_1) \). When \( \deg(w_1) = 0 \), we easily see the lemma holds. Assume \( \deg(w_1) \geq 1 \). If \( w_1 = zw'_1 (w'_1 \in \mathcal{A}) \), by the induction hypothesis and Lemma 2.4, we have

\[
\text{LHS} = z(w'_1xw_2 \odot y) = z(w'_1 \odot y)xw_2 + zw'_1x(w_2 \odot y) = \text{RHS}.
\]

If \( w_1 = xw'_1 (w'_1 \in \mathcal{A}) \), by the induction hypothesis and (2), we have

\[
\text{LHS} = x(w'_1xw_2 \odot y) + yw_1xw_2 = x(w'_1 \odot y)xw_2 + w_1x(w_2 \odot y) + yw_1xw_2 = \text{RHS}.
\]

This finishes the proof. \( \square \)

**3. Proof of Theorem 1.1**

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. For a forest \( f \), we set a polynomial \( F_f \in \mathcal{A}^1 \) recursively by

1. \( F_\mathbb{I} = 1 \),
2. \( F_\mathbb{B} = y \),
3. \( F_t = LyL_{x+2y}L_{-1}^{-1}(F_f) \) if \( t = B_+(f) \) is a tree and \( f \neq \mathbb{I} \),
4. \( F_f = F_g \odot F_h \) if \( f = gh \).

The subscript of \( F \) is extended linearly. Put \( L = LyL_{x+2y}L_{-1}^{-1} \). To prove theorem 1.1, next proposition plays a key role.

**Proposition 3.1.** For \( w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{A} \) and \( f \in \mathcal{H} \), we have

\[
w_1xw_2 \odot F_f = \sum_{(f)} (F_{f'} \odot w_1)x(F_{f''} \odot w_2),
\]

where the sum on the right-hand side comes from the Sweedler notation of the coproduct \( \Delta(f) \).

**Proof.** It is enough to show when \( f \) is a forest. We prove the proposition by induction on \( \deg(f) \). When \( \deg(f) = 1 \), by Lemma 2.5, we find the proposition holds. Assume \( \deg(f) \geq 2 \). If \( f = gh \) \((g, h \neq \mathbb{I})\), by the induction hypothesis and the multiplicativity of the coproduct, we have

\[
w_1xw_2 \odot F_f = w_1xw_2 \odot (F_g \odot F_h)
= (w_1xw_2 \odot F_g) \odot F_h
= \sum_{(g)} \sum_{(h)} \left(F_{g'} \odot (F_{g'} \odot w_1) \right) \left(x(F_{f''} \odot (F_{f''} \odot w_2))
= \sum_{(g)} \sum_{(h)} \left((F_{h'} \odot F_{g'}) \odot w_1 \right) \left((F_{h''} \odot F_{g''}) \odot w_2\right)
= \sum_{(f)} (F_{f'} \odot w_1)x(F_{f''} \odot w_2).
\]
If $f$ is a tree (with $\deg(f) \geq 2$), we have $F_f = L(F_g)$, where $f = B_+(g)$. In this case, we prove the statement for a word $w_1$ by induction on $\deg(w_1)$. When $\deg(w_1) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{align*}
xw_2 \circ F_f &= xw_2 \circ L(F_g) \\
&= xw_2 \circ yxL_y^{-1}F_g + xw_2 \circ 2yF_g \\
&= x(w_2 \circ yxL_y^{-1}F_g) + y(xw_2 \circ xL_y^{-1}F_g) + x(w_2 \circ 2yF_g) + 2y(xw_2 \circ F_g) \\
&= y(xw_2 \circ xL_y^{-1}F_g) + x(w_2 \circ L(F_g)) + 2y(xw_2 \circ F_g).
\end{align*}$$

For the last term on the right-hand side, we have

$$\begin{align*}
2y(xw_2 \circ F_g) &= 2 \sum_{(g)} yF_gx(F_g' \circ w_2) \quad \text{(by induction)} \\
&= 2yx(F_g \circ w_2) + 2 \sum_{(g) \neq f} yF_g'x(F_g' \circ w_2) \\
&= 2yx(F_g \circ w_2) + \sum_{(g) \neq f} L(F_g')x(F_g' \circ w_2) - \sum_{(g) \neq f} yxL_y^{-1}F_g'x(F_g' \circ w_2).
\end{align*}$$

Then we find

$$\begin{align*}
xw_2 \circ F_f &= y(xw_2 \circ xL_y^{-1}F_g) + x(w_2 \circ L(F_g)) + 2yx(F_g \circ w_2) \\
&\quad + \sum_{(g) \neq f} L(F_g')x(F_g' \circ w_2) - \sum_{(g) \neq f} yxL_y^{-1}F_g'x(F_g' \circ w_2).
\end{align*}$$

Since

$$\begin{align*}
x(w_2 \circ L(F_g)) + yx(F_g \circ w_2) + \sum_{(g) \neq f} L(F_g')x(F_g' \circ w_2) &= \sum_{(f) \neq f} F_f'x(F_f' \circ w_2) \\
&= \quad \text{(by Proposition 2.1 (1) or the definition of $\Delta$)}
\end{align*}$$

and

$$\begin{align*}
y(xw_2 \circ xL_y^{-1}F_g) &= y(xL_y^{-1}F_g \circ xw_2) \\
&= yx(L_y^{-1}F_g \circ xw_2) - yx(F_g \circ w_2),
\end{align*}$$

we have

$$\begin{align*}
xw_2 \circ F_f &= \sum_{(f) \neq f} F_f'x(F_f' \circ w_2) + yx(L_y^{-1}F_g \circ xw_2) \\
&\quad - \sum_{(g) \neq f} yxL_y^{-1}F_g'x(F_g' \circ w_2).
\end{align*}$$

Here we see

$$L_y^{-1}F_g \circ xw_2 = \sum_{(g)} L_y^{-1}F_g'x(F_g' \circ w_2).$$
since
\[ y(L^{-1}_y F_g \circ x w_2) = y L^{-1}_y F_g \circ x w_2 - x(w_2 \circ F_g) \]
\[ = F_g \circ x w_2 - x(w_2 \circ F_g) \]
\[ = \sum_{(g)} F_{g'} x(F_{g'} \circ w_2) - x(w_2 \circ F_g) \]
\[ = \sum_{(g' \neq 1)} F_{g'} x(F_{g'} \circ w_2). \]
Hence we get
\[ xw_2 \circ F_f = \sum_{(f')} F_{f'} x(F_{f'} \circ w_2). \]

Now we proceed to the case when \( \deg(w_1) \geq 1 \). If \( w_1 = zw_1' (w_1' \in \mathcal{A}) \), we have
\[ zw_1' x w_2 \circ F_f = z(w_1' x w_2 \circ F_f) \]
\[ = z \sum_{(f')} (F_{f'} \circ w_1') x(F_{f''} \circ w_2) \]
\[ = \sum_{(f')} (F_{f'} \circ w_1) x(F_{f''} \circ w_2) \]
by the induction hypothesis. If \( w_1 = x w_1' (w_1' \in \mathcal{A}) \), since we have already proved the identity in the case of \( w_1 = 1 \), we have
\[ w_1 x w_2 \circ F_f = \sum_{(f')} F_{f'} x(F_{f''} \circ w_1' x w_2) \]
\[ = \sum_{(f')} F_{f'} x \sum_{(f'')} (F_{f''} \circ w_1') x(F_{f''} \circ w_2), \]
where we put \( \Delta(f'') = \sum_{(f'')} f''_a \otimes f''_b \). We also have
\[ \sum_{(f')} (F_{f'} \circ w_1) x(F_{f''} \circ w_2) = \sum_{(f')} (F_{f'} \circ x w_1') x(F_{f''} \circ w_2) \]
\[ = \sum_{(f')} \sum_{(f'')} F_{f''} x(F_{f''} \circ w_1') x(F_{f''} \circ w_2), \]
where we put \( \Delta(f') = \sum_{(f')} f'_a \otimes f'_b \). By the coassociativity of \( \Delta \), we find the result. \[ \square \]

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We prove the theorem only for forests \( f \) and words \( w \) by induction on \( \deg(f) \) and \( \deg(w) \). First, we prove the theorem when \( \deg(f) = 1 \). If \( \deg(w) = 0 \), we easily find the result. Suppose \( \deg(w) \geq 1 \). If \( w = zw' (w' \in \mathcal{A}) \), by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4, and the induction hypothesis, we have
\[ \text{LHS} = \tilde{f}(zw'x) = z \tilde{f}(w'x) = z(F_f \circ w')x = (F_f \circ zw')x = \text{RHS}. \]
On the other hand, if \( w = xw' (w' \in \mathcal{A}) \), we have
\[ \text{LHS} = \tilde{f}(xw'x) = yxw'x + x \tilde{f}(w'x) \]
and
\[ \text{RHS} = (y \circ xw')x = yxw'x + x(y \circ w')x. \]
By the induction hypothesis, we find the result.
Next, suppose \( \deg(f) \geq 2 \). If \( f = gh \ (g, h \neq \mathbb{I}) \), we have
\[
\hat{f}(wx) = \hat{g}(h(wx)) = (F_g \circ (F_h \circ w))x = (F_g \circ (F_h \circ w))x = (F_f \circ w)x
\]
Let \( f \) be a rooted tree and put \( f = B_+(g) \). When \( \deg(w) = 0 \), we have
\[
\hat{f}(x) = (yxL_{g}^{-1} + 2y)\hat{g}(x) = (yxL_{g}^{-1} + 2y)F_gx = F_fx
\]
Suppose \( \deg(w) \geq 1 \). If \( w = zw' \ (w' \in \mathcal{A}) \), we have
\[
\hat{f}(zwx) = z\hat{f}(w'x) = z(F_f \circ w')x = (F_f \circ zw')x
\]
by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.4. If \( w = uw \) (\( u \in B \)), we have
\[
\hat{f}(uw) = \sum_{j} \hat{f}(x)\hat{f}(w')x = \sum_{j} F_{f'}x(F_{f''} \circ w')x
\]
by the induction hypothesis. By Proposition 3.1, we have
\[
(F_f \circ uw)x = \sum_{j} F_{f'}x(F_{f''} \circ w')x.
\]
This completes the proof.

Remark 3.2. Although the commutativity of RTMs is guaranteed in general in [9], it is hard to see at a glance. The commutativity of RTMs on \( \mathcal{A}x \) also follows from this theorem and the commutativity of the product \( \circ \).

4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let \( \mathcal{A}^1 \) be the commutative \( \mathbb{Q} \)-algebra with the harmonic product \(*\). We define the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear map \( u: \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A} \ast \otimes \mathcal{A} \ast \) by \( u(1) = 1 \) and sending a word \( w = yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} \) to
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{r} (-1)^iyx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_i-1} \otimes yx^{k_i-1} zx^{k_i-1} \ldots zx^{k_i+1-1}.
\]
The notation \( u_w \) is sometimes used instead of \( u(w) \) for convenience. Let \( \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}^1 \otimes \mathcal{A}^1 \) be the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-subalgebra algebraically generated by \( u_w \)'s. The product of the tensor algebra is given componentwisely so that
\[
\begin{align*}
\mu(yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast \mu(yx^{l_1-1} \ldots yx^{l_s-1}) & = \sum_{i=0}^{r} \sum_{j=0}^{s} (-1)^{i+j}(yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_i-1} \ast yx^{l_1-1} \ldots yx^{l_j-1}) \\
& \quad \otimes (yx^{k_i-1} zx^{k_i-1} \ldots zx^{k_i+1-1} \ast yx^{l_j-1} zx^{l_j-1} \ldots zx^{l_j+1-1}).
\end{align*}
\]
Now we define the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear map \( \rho: \mathcal{yA} \to \mathcal{yA} \) by setting \( \rho(1) = 1 \) and \( \rho = L_\theta \epsilon L_\theta^{-1} \), where \( \epsilon \) is the anti-automorphism on \( \mathcal{A} \) such that \( \epsilon(x) = x \) and \( \epsilon(y) = y \). Note that \( \theta(yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1}) = yx^{k_r-1} \ldots yx^{k_1-1} \). Put \( L'_\theta(w_1 \otimes w_2) = yx^{a-1} w_1 \otimes w_2 \) for \( a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \).

Lemma 4.1. For \( w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{A}^1 \), we have
\[
u(w_1 \otimes w_2) = u(w_1) \ast u(w_2).
\]
Proof. It is enough to show the lemma for \( w_1 = yx^{k_1-1} \ldots yx^{k_r-1} \) and \( w_2 = yx^{l_1-1} \ldots yx^{l_s-1} \). The proof goes by induction on \( r + s \). The lemma holds when \( r + s \leq 1 \) since \( u(1) = 1 \otimes 1 \). Assume \( r + s \geq 2 \). Now note that
\[
\begin{align*}
u(w) & = 1 \otimes yx^{m_1-1} zx^{m_1-1} \ldots zx^{m_1-1} - L'_{m_1} u(yx^{m_2-1} \ldots yx^{m_1-1}) \\
& = 1 \otimes d\rho(w) - L'_{m_1} u(yx^{m_2-1} \ldots yx^{m_1-1})
\end{align*}
\]
holds for \( w = yx^{m_1-1} \cdots yx^{m_1-1} \). By definitions and the induction hypothesis, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
u(w_1 \boxtimes w_2) & = u(yx^{k_1-1}(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \boxtimes w_2) + yx^{l_1-1}(w_1 \boxtimes yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}) \\
& \quad - yx^{k_1+l_1-1}(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1} \boxtimes yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}) \\
& = 1 \otimes d\rho(w_1 \boxtimes w_2) - L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast u(w_2)) \\
& \quad + 1 \otimes d\rho(w_1 \boxtimes w_2) - L'_{l_1}(u(w_1) \ast u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1})) \\
& \quad - 1 \otimes d\rho(w_1 \boxtimes w_2) - L'_{k_1+l_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}) (\text{by } \text{Lemma } 2.3) \\
& = 1 \otimes d\rho(w_1 \boxtimes w_2) - L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast u(w_2)) - L'_{l_1}(u(w_1) \ast u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1})) \\
& \quad + L'_{k_1+l_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}))
\end{align*}
\]

and

\[
\begin{align*}
u(w_1) \ast \nu(w_2) & = (1 \otimes d\rho(w_1) - L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast u(w_2)) \ast (1 \otimes d\rho(w_2) - L'_{l_1}(u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}))) \\
& = 1 \ast (d\rho(w_1) \ast d\rho(w_2)) - L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast (1 \otimes d\rho(w_2))) \\
& \quad - (1 \otimes d\rho(w_1)) \ast L'_{l_1}(u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1})) + L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast L'_{l_1}(u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1})).
\end{align*}
\]

Let us show that these two coincide. Because of Lemma 2.3 and \( \rho(w_1 \boxtimes w_2) = \rho(w_1) \boxtimes \rho(w_2) \), we have

\[
d\rho(w_1 \boxtimes w_2) = d\rho(w_1) \ast d\rho(w_2).
\]

Also we find that

\[
- L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast u(w_2)) + L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast (1 \otimes d\rho(w_2)))
\]

\[
= - L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast u(w_2)) - u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast (1 \otimes d\rho(w_2)))
\]

\[
= - L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast L'_{l_1}(u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}))
\]

and

\[
- L'_{l_1}(u(w_1) \ast u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1})) + (1 \otimes d\rho(w_1)) \ast L'_{l_1}(u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}))
\]

\[
= - L'_{l_1}(u(w_1) \ast u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1})) - (1 \otimes d\rho(w_1)) \ast u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}))
\]

\[
= - L'_{l_1}(L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1})).
\]

Since

\[
L'_{k_1+l_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}))
\]

\[
- L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast L'_{l_1}(u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}))
\]

\[
= L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast L'_{l_1}(u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}))
\]

\[
+ L'_{l_1}(L'_{k_1}(u(yx^{k_2-1} \cdots yx^{k_r-1}) \ast u(yx^{l_2-1} \cdots yx^{l_s-1}))
\]

we have the result. \( \square \)
Write \( u_w = \sum_{i=0}^{r} u'_{w,i} \otimes u''_{w,i} = \sum_{w} u'_w \otimes u''_w \). We define the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear maps \( p, q : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{A}^* \otimes \mathcal{A}^* \) by
\[
p(u_{w_1} \cdots u_{w_r}) = \sum_{u_{w_1}, \ldots, u_{w_r} \in \mathbb{Q}} y x L_y^{-1} (u'_{w_1} \cdots u'_{w_r}) \otimes (u''_{w_1} \cdots u''_{w_r}) \]
\[
+ 1 \otimes (d \rho(w_1) \cdots d \rho(w_1)) x, \]
\[
q(u_{w_1} \cdots u_{w_r}) = \sum_{u_{w_1}, \ldots, u_{w_r}} y (u'_{w_1} \cdots u'_{w_r}) \otimes (u''_{w_1} \cdots u''_{w_r}) \]
\[
- 1 \otimes (d \rho(w_1) \cdots d \rho(w_1)) z. \]

Lemma 4.2. We have \( \text{Im} p, \text{Im} q \subset \mathcal{B} \).

Proof. From Lemma 4.1 we have
\[
u_{w_1} \cdots u_{w_r} = u(w_1 \cdots w_r). \]
Thus, we need only to prove the lemma for the case \( r = 1 \). Since
\[
p(u_w) = 1 \otimes d \rho(w) x + \sum_{w} y x L_y^{-1} u'_w \otimes u''_w = u(y x^{k_1} y x^{k_2-1} \cdots y x^{k_r-1}) \in \mathcal{B}, \]
\[
q(u_w) = L'_y u_w - 1 \otimes d \rho(w) z = u(y^2 x^{k_1-1} y x^{k_2-1} \cdots y x^{k_r-1}) \in \mathcal{B}, \]
we obtain the result. \( \square \)

For a forest \( f \), we set a polynomial \( G_f \in \mathcal{A}^1 \) recursively by
1. \( G_{\emptyset} = 1 \),
2. \( G_\bullet = -y \),
3. \( G_t = R_{2x+y}(G_f) \) if \( t = B_+(f) \) is a tree and \( f \neq \emptyset \),
4. \( G_f = G_g \circ G_h \) if \( f = gh \).

The subscript of \( G \) is extended linearly. The following lemma is immediate from Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 and definitions.

Lemma 4.3. Let \( f \) be any forest with \( f \neq \emptyset \). If \( \sum_{(f)} \phi(F_{f'}) \otimes \phi(G_{f''}) \in \mathcal{B} \), we have
\[
p \left( \sum_{(f)} \phi(F_{f'}) \otimes \phi(G_{f''}) \right) = \sum_{(f)} y x L_y^{-1} \phi(F_{f'}) \otimes \phi(G_{f''}) + \phi(F_\emptyset) \otimes \phi(G_f) x = \mathcal{B}, \]
\[
q \left( \sum_{(f)} \phi(F_{f'}) \otimes \phi(G_{f''}) \right) = \sum_{(f)} y \phi(F_{f'}) \otimes \phi(G_{f''}) + y \phi(F_\emptyset) \otimes \phi(G_f) - \phi(F_\emptyset) \otimes \phi(G_f) z = \mathcal{B}. \]

Proposition 4.4. For any forest \( f \neq \emptyset \), we have
\[
\sum_{(f)} \phi(F_{f'}) \otimes \phi(G_{f''}) \in \mathcal{B}. \]

Proof. We prove the proposition by induction on \( \text{deg}(f) \). When \( \text{deg}(f) = 1 \), we easily see the statement holds. Assume \( \text{deg}(f) \geq 2 \). If \( f = gh \) \( (g, h \neq \emptyset) \), since \( \phi(F_g \circ F_h) = \phi(F_g) \star \phi(F_h) \),
we have
\[
\sum_{(f)} \phi(F_{f'}) \otimes \phi(G_{f''}) = \sum_{(g)} \phi(F_{g'} \circ F_{h'}) \otimes \phi(F_{g''} \circ F_{h''})
\]
\[
= \sum_{(g)} \sum_{(h)} (\phi(F_{g'}) \otimes \phi(G_{g''})) \star (\phi(F_{h'}) \otimes \phi(G_{h''})) .
\]
By the induction hypothesis, we find the result.
If \( f \) is a tree, we put \( f = B_+(g) \). Since
\[
\Delta(f) = 1 \otimes f + (B_+ \otimes \text{id}) \Delta(g),
\]
we have
\[
\sum_{(f)} \phi(F_{f'}) \otimes \phi(G_{f''}) = \phi(F_{I} \circ \phi(G_{g})) + \sum_{(g)} \phi(F_{B_+(g')} \otimes \phi(G_{g''}))
\]
\[
= \sum_{(g)} \phi(F_{g'} \otimes \phi(G_{g''})) \star \psi(F_{g'} \otimes \phi(G_{g''})),
\]
Then we get
\[
\sum_{(f)} \phi(F_{f'}) \otimes \phi(G_{f''}) = 0.
\]
By the induction hypothesis, we have \( \sum_{(g)} \phi(F_{g'}) \otimes \phi(G_{g''}) \in B \). Then, by Lemma 4.3, we find the result.

Let \( \text{Aug} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{H}_n \) be the augmentation ideal, where \( \mathcal{H}_n \) is the degree \( n \) homogeneous part of \( \mathcal{H} \). We define the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear map \( M : \mathcal{A}_T^1 \otimes \mathcal{A}_T^1 \to \mathcal{A}_T^1 \) by \( M(w_1 \otimes w_2) = w_1 * w_2 \). Note that \( M(w) = 0 \) for \( w \in \mathcal{B} \) by (1) in Subsection 2.3.

**Proposition 4.5.** For any \( f \in \text{Aug} \), we have
\[
\sum_{(f)} F_{f'} \circ G_{f''} = 0.
\]

**Proof.** We note that \( \phi(w_1) * \phi(w_2) = \phi(w_1 \circ w_2) \) holds for \( w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{A} \). By Proposition 4.4, we have
\[
0 = \sum_{(f)} M(\phi(F_{f'}) \otimes \phi(G_{f''})) = \sum_{(f)} \phi(F_{f'} \circ G_{f''}).
\]
Then we find the result.
Proof of Theorem 1.2. We prove the theorem by induction on \( \deg(f) \). It is easy to see the theorem holds if \( \deg(f) = 1 \). Suppose \( \deg(f) \geq 2 \). If \( f = gh \ (g, h \neq I) \), we have
\[
\tilde{S}(f)(wx) = \tilde{S}(gh)(wx) = \tilde{S}(g)((G_h \circ w)x) = (G_g \circ (G_h \circ w))x = ((G_g \circ G_h) \circ w)x = (G_f \circ w)x.
\]
If \( f = t \) is a tree, by Proposition 4.5, Theorem 1.1, and the induction hypothesis, we have
\[
(G_t \circ w)x = \sum_{t' \subset t}(F_{t'} \circ (G_{t'} \setminus w))x = \sum_{t' \subset t}(F_{t'} \circ (G_{t'} \setminus w))x = \sum_{t' \subset t}(F_{t'} \circ (G_{t'} \setminus w))x.
\]
Since \( \tilde{S}(t) + \sum_{v \subset t} \tilde{S}(t \setminus v) = 0 \) by Proposition 2.1 (2), we have
\[
(G_t \circ w)x = \tilde{S}(t)(w)x.
\]
□

5. Proof of Theorem 1.4

Proof of Theorem 1.4. First, we prove the theorem when \( w \in yAx \). Put \( w = yw'x \). By Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3, we have
\[
\tilde{S}(f)(w) = (F_{S(f)} \circ yw')x.
\]
We also have
\[
\tau \tilde{f}\tau(w) = \tau(F_{f} \circ \tau(w')x) = \tau((F_{f} \circ y\tau(w'))x) \quad \text{(by Theorem 1.1)}
\]
\[
= -\tau((y\tau L_{y}^{-1}(F_{S(f)}) \circ y\tau(w'))x) \quad \text{(by Proposition 5.1)}
\]
\[
= -y\tau(y\tau L_{y}^{-1}(F_{S(f)}) \circ y\tau(w'))
\]
\[
= (F_{S(f)} \circ yw')x \quad \text{(by Lemma 5.2)}.
\]
Thus we have
\[
\tilde{S}(f)(w) = \tau \tilde{f}\tau(w)
\]
for \( w \in yAx \).

Next, we prove the theorem when \( w \in zAx \) by induction on \( \deg(w) \). Put \( w = zw'x \). Then, by Lemma 2.2 we have
\[
\tilde{S}(f)(w) = z\tilde{S}(f)(w'x),
\]
\[
\tau \tilde{f}\tau(w) = \tau \tilde{f}\tau(zw'x) = z\tau \tilde{f}\tau(w'x).
\]
By (4) and the induction hypothesis, we have
\[
\tilde{S}(f)(w'x) = \tau \tilde{f}\tau(w'x)
\]
for any \( w' \in A \), and hence the assertion.
Finally, we prove the theorem when \( w \in \mathcal{A} z \) by induction on \( \deg(w) \). Put \( w = w'z \). Then we have

\[
\tilde{S}(f)(w) = (\tilde{S}(f)(w'))z, \\
\tau \tilde{f} \tau(w) = \tau \tilde{f} \tau(w') = (\tau \tilde{f} \tau(w'))z.
\]

By the induction hypothesis and \(^5\), we have the assertion. Therefore we have \( \tilde{S}(f)(w) = \tau \tilde{f} \tau(w) \) for any \( w \in \mathcal{A} \). 

**Proposition 5.1.** For \( f \in \Aug \), we have

\[
F_f = -y \tau L^{-1}_y F_{S(f)}.
\]

**Proof.** It is sufficient to prove the proposition for forests \( f \) by induction on \( \deg(f) \). Since \( F_\bullet = y \) and \( F_{S(\bullet)} = -y \), the proposition holds for \( \deg(f) = 1 \). Suppose \( \deg(f) \geq 2 \). If \( f = gh \) (\( g, h \neq 1 \)), we have

\[
F_f = F_g \circ F_h
\]

\[
= y \tau L^{-1}_y (G_g) \circ y \tau L^{-1}_y (G_h) \quad \text{(by induction and Corollary 1.3)}
\]

\[
= -R^{-1}_x \tau((G_g \circ G_h)x) \quad \text{(by Lemma 5.2 below)}
\]

and

\[
y \tau L^{-1}_y G_f = y \tau L^{-1}_y (G_g \circ G_h) = R^{-1}_x \tau((G_g \circ G_h)x).
\]

Thus we have the result. If \( f \) is a tree, put \( f = B_+(g) \). Then we have

\[
F_f = L(F_g)
\]

\[
= -L(y \tau L^{-1}_y G_g) \quad \text{(by induction and Corollary 1.3)}
\]

\[
= -y(x + 2y) R^{-1}_x \tau(G_g)
\]

and

\[
y \tau L^{-1}_y G_f = -y \tau L^{-1}_y R_{2x+y}(G_g) = -y(x + 2y) R^{-1}_x \tau(G_g).
\]

This finishes the proof. 

Now we define \( \sigma \in \Aut(\mathcal{A}) \) such that \( \sigma(x) = x \) and \( \sigma(y) = -y \). By definitions, we have

\[
\phi R_x^{-1} \tau R_x \phi = d \rho \sigma.
\]

We find that \( d, \sigma, \) and \( \rho \) are homomorphisms with respect to the harmonic product \( * \), and \( \rho \) commutes with \( \sigma \). Hence the composition \( d \rho \sigma \) is also a homomorphism with respect to the harmonic product \( * \), and so is \( -\phi R_x^{-1} \tau R_x \phi \) because of \(^6\). This implies the composition \( -R_x^{-1} \tau R_x \) is a homomorphism with respect to the product \( \circ \) (defined in Section 2) and hence we conclude the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.2.** For \( w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{A} \), we have

\[
(yw_1 \circ yw_2)x + y \tau(y \tau(w_1) \circ y \tau(w_2)) = 0.
\]

**Proof.** We have

\[
yw_1 \circ yw_2 = R^{-1}_x L_y(w_1 x) \circ R^{-1}_x L_y(w_2 x)
\]

\[
= R^{-1}_x \tau R_x \tau(w_1 x) \circ R^{-1}_x \tau R_x \tau(w_2 x)
\]

\[
= -R^{-1}_x \tau R_x (w_1 x \circ w_2 x).
\]

This gives the lemma. 

\( \square \)
Remark 5.3. According to [2], for any \( w \in \mathcal{Y}_\mathcal{A}x \), there exists \( \tilde{f} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{H}} \) such that \( w = \tilde{f}(x) \).
Hence we have \( (1 - \tau)(w) = (1 - \tau)(\tilde{f}(x)) = (\tilde{f} + \tau \tilde{S} \tilde{f})(x) = (\tilde{f} + \tilde{S}(\tilde{f}))(x) \) due to Theorem 1.4, which means each of the duality formulas for multiple zeta values also appears in this form in the context of RTMs.
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