

# A presentation of relative unitary Steinberg groups

Egor Voronetsky\*  
 Chebyshev Laboratory,  
 St. Petersburg State University,  
 14th Line V.O., 29B,  
 Saint Petersburg 199178 Russia

June 24, 2022

## Abstract

We find an explicit presentation of relative odd unitary Steinberg groups constructed by odd form rings and of relative doubly laced Steinberg groups over commutative rings, i.e. the Steinberg groups associated with the Chevalley group schemes of the types  $B_\ell$ ,  $C_\ell$ ,  $F_4$  for  $\ell \geq 3$ .

## 1 Introduction

Relative Steinberg groups  $\text{St}(R, I)$  were defined in the stable linear case by F. Keune and J.-L. Loday in [4, 10]. Namely, this group is just

$$\frac{\text{Ker}(p_{2*}: \text{St}(I \rtimes R) \rightarrow \text{St}(R))}{[\text{Ker}(p_{1*}), \text{Ker}(p_{2*})]},$$

where  $R$  is a unital associative ring,  $I \trianglelefteq R$ ,  $p_1: I \rtimes R \rightarrow R, a \rtimes p \mapsto a + p$  and  $p_2: I \rtimes R \rightarrow R, a \rtimes p \mapsto p$  are ring homomorphisms. Such a group is a crossed module over  $\text{St}(R)$  generated by  $x_{ij}(a)$  for  $a \in I$  with the “obvious” relations that are satisfied by the generators  $t_{ij}(a)$  of the normal subgroup  $E(R, I) \trianglelefteq E(R)$ . It is classically known that  $\text{St}(R, I)$  is generated by  $z_{ij}(a, p) = x_{ji}^{(p)}x_{ij}(a)$  for  $a \in I$  and  $p \in R$  as an abstract group, the same holds for the relative elementary groups.

Such relative Steinberg groups and their generalizations for unstable linear groups and Chevalley groups are used in, e.g., proving centrality of  $K_2$  [7, 11], a suitable local-global principle for Steinberg groups [6, 7, 12], early stability of  $K_2$  [12], and  $\mathbb{A}^1$ -invariance of  $K_2$  [8, 9]. In [11, theorem 9] S. Sinchuk proved that all relations between the generators  $z_\alpha(a, p)$  of  $\text{St}(\Phi; R, I)$ , where  $\Phi$  is a root

---

\*Research is supported by the Russian Science Foundation grant 22-21-00257.

system of type ADE and  $R$  is commutative, come from various  $\text{St}(\Psi; R, I)$  for root subsystems  $\Psi \subseteq \Phi$  of type  $A_3$ , i.e.  $\text{St}(\Phi; R, I)$  is the amalgam of  $\text{St}(\Psi; R, I)$  with identifying generators  $z_\alpha(a, p)$ .

There exist explicit presentations (in the sense of abstract groups) of relative unstable linear and symplectic Steinberg groups in terms of van der Kallen's generators, i.e. analogues of arbitrary transvections in  $\text{GL}(n, R)$  or  $\text{Sp}(2n, R)$ , see [5, 12] and [11, proposition 8].

In [15] we determined the relations between the generators  $z_\alpha(a, p)$  in the following two cases:

- for relative unstable linear Steinberg groups  $\text{St}(n; R, I)$  with  $n \geq 4$ ,
- for relative simply laced Steinberg groups  $\text{St}(\Phi; R, I)$  with  $\Phi$  of rank  $\geq 3$ .

It turns out that all the relations between  $z_\alpha(a, p)$  come from  $\text{St}(\Psi; R, I)$  for  $\Psi$  of types  $A_2$  and  $A_1 \times A_1$ , thus Sinchuk's result may be strengthened a bit.

The relations for the simply laced Steinberg groups are easily obtained from the linear case and Sinchuk's result. In the linear case we actually considered Steinberg groups associated with a generalized matrix ring  $T$  instead of  $M(n, R)$ , i.e. if  $T$  is a ring with a complete family of  $n$  full idempotents. Such a generality is convenient to apply "root elimination", i.e. in order to replace the generators of a Steinberg group parametrized by a root system  $\Phi$  by some new generators parametrized by a system of relative roots  $\Phi/\alpha$ . Moreover, instead of an ideal  $I \trianglelefteq R$  we considered arbitrary crossed module  $\delta: A \rightarrow T$  in the sense of associative rings since this is necessary for, e.g., applying the method of Steinberg pro-groups [13, 14].

In this paper we find the relations between the generators  $z_\alpha(a, p)$  for

- relative odd unitary Steinberg groups  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta)$ , where  $\delta: (S, \Theta) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$  is a crossed module of odd form rings and  $(R, \Delta)$  has an orthogonal hyperbolic family of sufficiently large rank in the sense of [13] (this is a unitary analogue of generalized matrix rings and crossed modules of associative rings),
- relative doubly laced Steinberg groups  $\text{St}(\Phi; K, \mathfrak{a})$  with  $\Phi$  of rank  $\geq 3$ , where  $K$  is a unital commutative ring and  $\delta: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow K$  is a crossed module of commutative rings.

The odd unitary case already gives a presentation of relative Steinberg groups associated with classical sufficiently isotropic reductive groups by [16, theorem 4], so the second case is non-trivial only for the root system of type  $F_4$ .

Actually, relative elementary subgroups of  $\text{St}(\Phi; K)$  for doubly laced  $\Phi$  may be defined not only for ordinary ideals  $\mathfrak{a} \trianglelefteq K$ , but for E. Abe's [1] admissible pairs  $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ , where  $\mathfrak{a} \trianglelefteq K$  and  $\mathfrak{a}_2 \leq \mathfrak{b} \leq \mathfrak{a}$  is a subgroup such that  $\mathfrak{b}k^2 \leq \mathfrak{b}$  for all  $k \in K$  if  $\Phi$  is of type  $C_\ell$  and  $\mathfrak{b} \trianglelefteq K$  if  $\Phi$  is of type  $B_\ell$  or  $F_4$ . Such a pair naturally gives a subgroup  $E(\Phi; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \leq G^{\text{sc}}(\Phi, K)$  generated by  $x_\alpha(a)$  for short roots  $\alpha$  and  $a \in \mathfrak{a}$  and by  $x_\beta(b)$  for long roots  $\beta$  and  $b \in \mathfrak{b}$ .

In order to study relative Steinberg groups associated with admissible pairs, we consider new families of Steinberg groups  $\text{St}(\Phi; K, L)$ , where  $\Phi$  is a doubly laced root system and  $(K, L)$  is a *pair of type B, C, or F* respectively (the precise definition is given in section 8). Then admissible pairs are just crossed submodules of  $(K, K)$  for a commutative unital ring  $K$ . We also find the relations between the generators  $z_\alpha(a, p)$  of

- relative doubly laced Steinberg groups  $\text{St}(\Phi; K, L; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ , where  $\Phi$  is a doubly laced root system of rank  $\geq 3$  and  $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow (K, L)$  is a crossed modules of pairs of types B, C, or F respectively.

All relations between the generators  $z_\alpha(a, p)$  involve only the roots from root subsystems of rank 2, i.e.  $A_2, BC_2, A_1 \times A_1, A_1 \times BC_1$  in the odd unitary case and  $A_2, B_2, A_1 \times A_1$  in the doubly-laced case.

## 2 Relative unitary Steinberg groups

We use the group-theoretical notation  ${}^g h = ghg^{-1}$  and  $[g, h] = ghg^{-1}h^{-1}$ . If a group  $G$  acts on a set  $X$ , then we usually denote the action by  $(g, x) \mapsto {}^g x$ . If  $X$  is itself a group, then  $[g, x] = {}^g x x^{-1}$  and  $[x, g] = x({}^g x)^{-1}$  are the commutators in  $X \rtimes G$ . A *group-theoretical crossed module* is a homomorphism  $\delta: N \rightarrow G$  of groups such that there is a fixed action of  $G$  on  $N$ ,  $\delta$  is  $G$ -equivariant, and  ${}^n n' = \delta(n)n'$  for  $n, n' \in N$ .

The group operation in a 2-step nilpotent group  $G$  is usually denoted by  $\dot{+}$ . If  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  are subsets of  $G$  containing  $\dot{0}$  and  $\prod_i X_i \rightarrow G, (x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto x_1 \dot{+} \dots \dot{+} x_n$  is a bijection, then we write  $G = \bigoplus_i X_i$ .

Let  $A$  be an associative unital ring and  $\lambda \in A^*$ . A map  $\overline{(-)}: A \rightarrow A$  is called a  $\lambda$ -*involution* if it is an anti-automorphism,  $\overline{\overline{x}} = \lambda x \lambda^{-1}$ , and  $\overline{\lambda} = \lambda^{-1}$ . For a fixed  $\lambda$ -involution a map  $B: M \times M \rightarrow A$  for a module  $M_A$  is called a *hermitian form* if it is biadditive,  $B(m, m'a) = B(m, m')a$ , and  $B(m', m) = \overline{B(m, m')}\lambda$ .

Now let  $A$  be an associative unital ring with a  $\lambda$ -involution and  $M_A$  be a module with a hermitian form  $B$ . The *Heisenberg group* of  $B$  is the set  $\text{Heis}(B) = M \times A$  with the group operation  $(m, x) \dot{+} (m', x') = (m + m', x - B(m, m') + x')$ . The multiplicative monoid  $A^\bullet$  acts on  $\text{Heis}(B)$  from the right by  $(m, x) \cdot y = (my, \overline{y}xy)$ . An  $A^\bullet$ -invariant subgroup  $\mathcal{L} \leq \text{Heis}(B)$  is called an *odd form parameter* if

$$\{(0, x - \overline{x}\lambda) \mid x \in A\} \leq \mathcal{L} \leq \{(m, x) \mid x + B(m, m) + \overline{x}\lambda = 0\}.$$

The corresponding *quadratic form* is the map  $q: M \rightarrow \text{Heis}(B)/\mathcal{L}, m \mapsto (m, 0) \dot{+} \mathcal{L}$ . Finally, the unitary group is

$$U(M, B, \mathcal{L}) = \{g \in \text{Aut}(M_A) \mid B(gm, gm') = B(m, m'), q(gm) = q(m) \text{ for all } m, m' \in M\}.$$

Recall definitions from [13, 16]. An *odd form ring* is a pair  $(R, \Delta)$ , where  $R$  is an associative non-unital ring,  $\Delta$  is a group with the group operation  $\dot{+}$ , the multiplicative semigroup  $R^\bullet$  acts on  $\Delta$  from the right by  $(u, a) \mapsto u \cdot a$ , and there are maps  $\phi: R \rightarrow \Delta, \pi: \Delta \rightarrow R, \rho: \Delta \rightarrow R$  such that

- $\phi$  is a group homomorphism,  $\phi(\bar{a}ba) = \phi(b) \cdot a$ ;
- $\pi$  is a group homomorphism,  $\pi(u \cdot a) = \pi(u)a$ ;
- $[u, v] = \phi(-\overline{\pi(u)\pi(v)})$ ;
- $\rho(u \dot{+} v) = \rho(u) - \overline{\pi(u)\pi(v)} + \rho(v)$ ,  $\overline{\rho(u)} + \overline{\pi(u)\pi(u)} + \rho(u) = 0$ ,  $\rho(u \cdot a) = \bar{a}\rho(u)a$ ;
- $\pi(\phi(a)) = 0$ ,  $\rho(\phi(a)) = a - \bar{a}$ ;
- $\phi(a + \bar{a}) = \phi(\bar{a}a) = 0$  (in [13, 16] we used the stronger axiom  $\phi(a) = \dot{0}$  for all  $a = \bar{a}$ );
- $u \cdot (a + b) = u \cdot a \dot{+} \phi(\bar{b}\rho(u)a) \dot{+} u \cdot b$ .

Let  $(R, \Delta)$  be an odd form ring. Its *unitary group* is the set

$$U(R, \Delta) = \{g \in \Delta \mid \pi(g) = \overline{\rho(g)}, \pi(g)\overline{\pi(g)} = \overline{\pi(g)\pi(g)}\}$$

with the identity element  $1_U = \dot{0}$ , the group operation  $gh = g \cdot \pi(h) \dot{+} h \dot{+} g$ , and the inverse  $g^{-1} = \dot{-}g \cdot \overline{\pi(g)} \dot{-} g$ . The unitary groups of odd form rings in [13, 16] are precisely the graphs of  $\pi: U(R, \Delta) \rightarrow R$  as subsets of  $R \times \Delta$ .

An odd form ring  $(R, \Delta)$  is called *special* if the homomorphism  $(\pi, \rho): \Delta \rightarrow \text{Heis}(R)$  is injective, where  $\text{Heis}(R) = R \times R$  with the operation  $(x, y) \dot{+} (z, w) = (x + z, y - \bar{x}z + w)$ . It is called *unital* if  $R$  is unital and  $u \cdot 1 = u$  for  $u \in \Delta$ . In other words,  $(R, \Delta)$  is a special unital odd form ring if and only if  $R$  is a unital associative ring with 1-involution and  $\Delta$  is an odd form parameter with respect to the  $R$ -module  $R$  and the hermitian form  $R \times R \rightarrow R$ ,  $(x, y) \mapsto \bar{x}y$ , where we identify  $\Delta$  with its image in  $\text{Heis}(R)$ .

If  $M_A$  is a module over a unital ring with a  $\lambda$ -involution,  $B$  is a hermitian form on  $M$ , and  $\mathcal{L}$  is an odd form parameter, then there is a special unital odd form ring  $(R, \Delta)$  such that  $U(M, B, \mathcal{L}) \cong U(R, \Delta)$ , see [13, section 2] or [16, section 3] for details.

We say that an odd form ring  $(R, \Delta)$  *acts* on an odd form ring  $(S, \Theta)$  if there are multiplication operations  $R \times S \rightarrow S$ ,  $S \times R \rightarrow S$ ,  $\Theta \times R \rightarrow \Theta$ ,  $\Delta \times S \rightarrow \Delta$  such that  $(S \rtimes R, \Theta \rtimes \Delta)$  is a well-defined odd form ring. There is an equivalent definition in terms of explicit axioms on the operations, see [13, section 2]. For example, each odd form ring naturally acts on itself. Actions of  $(R, \Delta)$  on  $(S, \Theta)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with isomorphism classes of right split short exact sequences

$$(S, \Theta) \rightarrow (S \rtimes R, \Theta \rtimes \Delta) \rightleftarrows (R, \Delta),$$

since the category of odd form rings and their homomorphisms is algebraically coherent semi-abelian in the sense of [2].

Let us call  $\delta: (S, \Theta) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$  a *precrossed module* of odd form rings if  $(R, \Delta)$  acts on  $(S, \Theta)$  and  $\delta$  is a homomorphism preserving the action of  $(R, \Delta)$ . Such objects are in one-to-one correspondence with *reflexive graphs* in the category of odd form rings, i.e. tuples  $((R, \Delta), (T, \Xi), p_1, p_2, d)$ , where  $p_1, p_2: (T, \Xi) \rightarrow$

$(R, \Delta)$  are homomorphisms with a common section  $d$ . Namely,  $(S, \Theta)$  corresponds to the kernel of  $p_2$  and  $\delta$  is induced by  $p_1$ .

A precrossed module  $\delta: (S, \Theta) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$  is a *crossed module* of odd form rings if *Peiffer identities*

- $ab = \delta(a)b = a\delta(b)$  for  $a, b \in S$ ;
- $u \cdot a = \delta(u) \cdot a = u \cdot \delta(a)$  for  $u \in \Theta, a \in S$

hold. Equivalently, the corresponding reflexive graph is an *internal category* (and even an *internal groupoid*, necessarily in the unique way), i.e. there is a homomorphism

$$m: \lim((T, \Xi) \xrightarrow{p_2} (R, \Delta) \xleftarrow{p_1} (T, \Xi)) \rightarrow (T, \Xi)$$

such that the homomorphisms from any  $(I, \Gamma)$  to  $(R, \Delta)$  and  $(T, \Xi)$  form a set-theoretic category. See [3] for details.

The unitary group  $U(R, \Delta)$  acts on  $(R, \Delta)$  by automorphisms via

$${}^g a = \alpha(g) a \overline{\alpha(g)} \text{ for } a \in R, \quad {}^g u = (g \cdot \pi(u) \dot{+} u) \cdot \overline{\alpha(g)} \text{ for } u \in \Delta.$$

where  $\alpha(g) = \pi(g) + 1 \in R \rtimes \mathbb{Z}$ . The second formula also gives the conjugacy action of  $U(R, \Delta)$  on itself.

If  $(R, \Delta)$  acts on  $(S, \Theta)$ , then  $U(R, \Delta)$  acts on  $U(S, \Theta)$  in the sense of groups and  $U(S \rtimes R, \Theta \rtimes \Delta) = U(S, \Theta) \rtimes U(R, \Delta)$ . For any crossed module  $\delta: (S, \Theta) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$  the induced homomorphism  $\delta: U(S, \Theta) \rightarrow U(R, \Delta)$  is a crossed module of groups.

Recall from [13] that a *hyperbolic pair* in an odd form ring  $(R, \Delta)$  is a tuple  $\eta = (e_-, e_+, q_-, q_+)$ , where  $e_-$  and  $e_+$  are orthogonal idempotents in  $R$ ,  $e_- = e_+$ ,  $q_\pm$  are elements of  $\Delta$ ,  $\pi(q_\pm) = e_\pm$ ,  $\rho(q_\pm) = 0$ , and  $q_\pm = q_\pm \cdot e_\pm$ . A sequence  $H = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell)$  is called an *orthogonal hyperbolic family* of rank  $\ell$ , if  $\eta_i = (e_{-i}, e_i, q_{-i}, q_i)$  are hyperbolic pairs, the idempotents  $e_{|i|} = e_i + e_{-i}$  are orthogonal, and  $e_{|i|} \in R e_{|j|} R$  for all  $1 \leq i, j \leq \ell$ . We also say that the orthogonal hyperbolic family  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell$  is *strong* if  $e_i \in R e_j R$  for all  $1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell$ .

From now on and until the end of section 7, we fix a crossed module  $\delta: (S, \Theta) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$  of odd form rings and an orthogonal hyperbolic family  $H = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell)$  in  $(R, \Delta)$ . We also use the notation

$$S_{ij} = e_i S e_j, \quad \Theta_j^0 = \{u \in \Theta \cdot e_j \mid e_k \pi(u) = 0 \text{ for all } 1 \leq |k| \leq \ell\}$$

for  $1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell$ , and similarly for the corresponding subgroups of  $R$  and  $\Delta$ . Clearly,

$$S_{ij} R_{jk} + S_{i,-j} R_{-j,k} = S_{ik}, \quad \Theta_i^0 \cdot R_{ij} \dot{+} \Theta_{-i}^0 \cdot R_{-i,j} \dot{+} \phi(S_{-j,j}) = \Theta_j^0$$

for all  $i, j, k \neq 0$ . If  $H$  is strong, then actually

$$S_{ij} R_{jk} = S_{ik}, \quad \Theta_i^0 \cdot R_{ij} \dot{+} \phi(S_{-j,j}) = \Theta_j^0.$$

An *unrelativized Steinberg group*  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta)$  is the abstract group with the generators  $X_{ij}(a), X_j(u)$  for  $1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell, i \neq \pm j, a \in S_{ij}, u \in \Theta_j^0$ , and the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
X_{ij}(a) &= X_{-j, -i}(-\bar{a}); \\
X_{ij}(a) X_{ij}(b) &= X_{ij}(a + b); \\
X_j(u) X_j(v) &= X_j(u + v); \\
[X_{ij}(a), X_{kl}(b)] &= 1 \text{ for } j \neq k \neq -i \neq -l \neq j; \\
[X_{ij}(a), X_l(u)] &= 1 \text{ for } i \neq l \neq -j; \\
[X_{-i, j}(a), X_{ji}(b)] &= X_i(\phi(ab)); \\
[X_i(u), X_i(v)] &= X_i(\phi(-\overline{\pi(u)}\pi(v))); \\
[X_i(u), X_j(v)] &= X_{-i, j}(-\overline{\pi(u)}\pi(v)) \text{ for } i \neq \pm j; \\
[X_{ij}(a), X_{jk}(b)] &= X_{ik}(ab) \text{ for } i \neq \pm k; \\
[X_i(u), X_{ij}(a)] &= X_{-i, j}(\rho(u)a) X_j(\dot{-}u \cdot (-a)).
\end{aligned}$$

Of course, the group  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta)$  is functorial on  $(S, \Theta)$ . In particular, the homomorphism

$$\delta: \text{StU}(S, \Theta) \rightarrow \text{StU}(R, \Delta), X_{ij}(a) \mapsto X_{ij}(\delta(a)), X_j(u) \mapsto X_j(\delta(u))$$

is well-defined. There is also a canonical homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{st}: \text{StU}(S, \Theta) &\rightarrow \text{U}(S, \Theta), \\
X_{ij}(a) &\mapsto T_{ij}(a) = q_i \cdot a \dot{-} q_{-j} \cdot \bar{a} \dot{-} \phi(a), \\
X_j(u) &\mapsto T_j(u) = u \dot{-} \phi(\rho(u) + \pi(u)) \dot{-} q_{-j} \cdot (\rho(u) - \overline{\pi(u)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Let  $p_{i*}: \text{StU}(S \times R, \Theta \times \Delta) \rightarrow \text{StU}(R, \Delta)$  be the induced homomorphisms. The *relative Steinberg group* is

$$\text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta) = \text{Ker}(p_{2*}) / [\text{Ker}(p_{1*}), \text{Ker}(p_{2*})].$$

It is easy to see that it is a crossed module over  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta)$ . The *diagonal group* is

$$D(R, \Delta) = \{g \in \text{U}(R, \Delta) \mid g \cdot e_i \overline{\pi(g)} \dot{-} q_i \cdot \overline{\pi(g)} \dot{-} g \cdot e_i = \dot{0} \text{ for } 1 \leq |i| \leq \ell\},$$

it acts on  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta)$  by

$${}^g T_{ij}(a) = T_{ij}({}^g a), \quad {}^g T_j(u) = T_j({}^g u).$$

Hence it also acts on the commutative diagram of groups

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{StU}(S, \Theta) & \longrightarrow & \text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta) & \xrightarrow{\text{st}} & \text{U}(S, \Theta) & \longrightarrow & \text{Aut}(S, \Theta) \\
& \searrow \delta & \delta \downarrow & & \delta \downarrow & \nearrow & \\
& & \text{StU}(R, \Delta) & \xrightarrow{\text{st}} & \text{U}(R, \Delta) & \longrightarrow & \text{Aut}(R, \Delta)
\end{array}$$

### 3 Root systems of type BC

Let

$$\Phi = \{\pm e_i \pm e_j \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq \ell\} \cup \{\pm e_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq \ell\} \cup \{\pm 2e_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq \ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\ell$$

be a *root system* of type  $\text{BC}_\ell$ . For simplicity let also  $e_{-i} = -e_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ . The *roots* of  $\Phi$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the *root subgroups* of  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_{e_j - e_i}(a) &= X_{ij}(a) \text{ for } a \in S_{ij}, i + j > 0, \\ X_{e_i}(u) &= X_i(u) \text{ for } u \in \Theta_i^0, \\ X_{2e_i}(u) &= X_i(u) \text{ for } u \in \phi(S_{-i,i}). \end{aligned}$$

The image of  $X_\alpha$  is denoted by  $X_\alpha(S, \Theta)$ . The *Chevalley commutator formulas* from the definition of  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta)$  may be written as

$$[X_\alpha(\mu), X_\beta(\nu)] = \prod_{\substack{i\alpha + j\beta \in \Phi \\ i, j > 0}} X_{i\alpha + j\beta}(f_{\alpha\beta ij}(\mu, \nu))$$

for all non-antiparallel  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$  and some universal expressions  $f_{\alpha\beta ij}$ . It is also useful to set  $f_{\alpha\beta 01}(\mu, \nu) = \nu$  and  $f_{\alpha\beta 02}(\mu, \nu) = \dot{0}$  if  $\beta$  is *ultrashort* (i.e. of length 1), the root  $\beta$  is considered as the largest with respect to a linear order in the product.

It is easy to see that  $\text{Ker}(p_{2*}) \leq \text{StU}(S \rtimes R, \Theta \rtimes \Delta)$  is the group with the action of  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta)$  generated by  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta)$  with the additional relations

$$X_\alpha(\mu)X_\beta(\nu) = \prod_{\substack{i\alpha + j\beta \in \Phi \\ i \geq 0, j > 0}} X_{i\alpha + j\beta}(f_{\alpha\beta ij}(\mu, \nu))$$

for non-antiparallel  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$ ,  $\mu \in R \cup \Delta$ ,  $\nu \in S \cup \Theta$ . Hence the relative Steinberg group  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta)$  is the crossed module over  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta)$  generated by  $\delta: \text{StU}(S, \Theta) \rightarrow \text{StU}(R, \Delta)$  with the same additional relations.

The *Weyl group*  $W(\text{BC}_\ell) = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^\ell \rtimes S_\ell$  acts on the orthogonal hyperbolic family  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell$  by permutations and sign changes (i.e.  $(e_{-i}, e_i, q_{-i}, q_i) \mapsto (e_i, e_{-i}, q_i, q_{-i})$ ), so the correspondence between roots and root subgroups is  $W(\text{BC}_\ell)$ -equivariant. Also, the hyperbolic pairs from the orthogonal hyperbolic family and the opposite ones are in one-to-one correspondence with the set of ultrashort roots,  $\eta_i$  corresponds to  $e_i$ , and  $\eta_{-i} = (e_i, e_{-i}, q_i, q_{-i})$  corresponds to  $e_{-i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ .

Recall that a subset  $\Sigma \subseteq \Phi$  is called *closed* if  $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma$  and  $\alpha + \beta \in \Phi$  imply  $\alpha + \beta \in \Sigma$ . We say that a closed subset  $\Sigma \subseteq \Phi$  is *saturated*, if  $\alpha \in \Sigma$  together with  $\frac{1}{2}\alpha \in \Phi$  imply  $\frac{1}{2}\alpha \in \Sigma$ . If  $X \subseteq \Phi$ , then  $\langle X \rangle$  is the smallest saturated closed subset of  $\Phi$  containing  $X$ ,  $\mathbb{R}X$  is the linear span of  $X$ , and  $\mathbb{R}_+X$  is the smallest convex cone containing  $X$ . A saturated root subsystem  $\Psi \subseteq \Phi$  is a saturated closed subset such that  $\Psi = -\Psi$ .

A closed subset  $\Sigma \subseteq \Phi$  is called *special* if  $\Sigma \cap -\Sigma = \emptyset$ . It is well-known that a closed subset of  $\Phi$  is special if and only if it is a subset of some system of positive roots. Hence the smallest saturated closed subset containing a special closed subset it also special. A root  $\alpha$  in a saturated special closed set  $\Sigma$  is called *extreme* if it is indecomposable into a sum of two roots of  $\Sigma$  and in the case  $\alpha \in \Phi_{\text{us}}$  the root  $2\alpha$  is not a sum of two distinct roots of  $\Sigma$ . Every non-empty saturated special closed set contains an extreme root and if  $\alpha \in \Sigma$  is extreme, then  $\Sigma \setminus \langle \alpha \rangle$  is also a saturated special closed set. Notice that if  $\Sigma$  is a saturated special closed subset and  $u$  is an extreme ray of  $\mathbb{R}_+\Sigma$ , then  $u$  contains an extreme root of  $\Sigma$ .

If  $\Sigma \subseteq \Phi$  is a special closed subset, then the map  $\prod_{\alpha \in \Sigma \setminus 2\Sigma} X_\alpha(S, \Theta) \rightarrow \text{StU}(S, \Theta)$  is injective for any linear order on  $\Sigma \setminus 2\Sigma$  and its image  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Sigma)$  is a subgroup of  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta)$  independent on the order. Moreover, the homomorphism  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Sigma) \rightarrow \text{U}(S, \Theta)$  is injective. This follows from results of [13][section 4].

Let  $\Psi \subseteq \Phi$  be a saturated root subsystem. Consider the following binary relation on  $\Phi_{\text{us}}$ :  $e_i \sim_\Psi e_j$  if  $e_i - e_j \in \Psi \cup \{0\}$  and  $e_j \notin \Psi$ . Actually, this is a partial equivalence relation (i.e. symmetric and transitive),  $e_i \sim_\Psi e_j$  if and only if  $e_{-i} \sim_\Psi e_{-j}$ ,  $e_i \not\sim_\Psi e_{-i}$ . Conversely, each partial equivalence relation on  $\Phi_{\text{us}}$  with these properties arise from unique saturated root subsystem.

The image of  $\Phi \setminus \Psi$  in  $\mathbb{R}^\ell / \mathbb{R}\Psi$  is denoted by  $\Phi/\Psi$ , in the case  $\Psi = \langle \alpha \rangle$  we write just  $\Phi/\alpha$ . We associate with  $\Psi$  a new orthogonal hyperbolic family  $H/\Psi$  as follows. If  $E \subseteq \Phi_{\text{us}}$  is an equivalence class with respect to  $\sim_\Psi$ , then  $\eta_E$  is the sum of all hyperbolic pairs corresponding to the elements of  $E$ , where a sum of two hyperbolic pairs is given by

$$(e_-, e_+, q_-, q_+) \oplus (e'_-, e'_+, q'_-, q'_+) = (e_- + e'_-, e_+ + e'_+, q_- + q'_-, q_+ + q'_+)$$

if  $(e_- + e_+)(e'_- + e'_+) = 0$ . The family  $H/\Psi$  consists of all  $\eta_E$ , if we take only one equivalence class  $E$  from each pair of opposite equivalence classes (so  $H/\Psi$  does not contain opposite hyperbolic pairs). The Steinberg groups constructed by  $H/\Psi$  are denoted by  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Phi/\Psi)$ ,  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi)$ , and  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi)$ . In the case  $\Psi = \emptyset$  we obtain the original Steinberg groups with omitted  $\Phi/\emptyset = \Phi$  in the notation. Now it is easy to see that  $\Phi/\Psi$  is a root system of type  $\text{BC}_{\ell - \dim(\mathbb{R}\Psi)}$ , it parametrizes the root subgroups of the corresponding Steinberg groups. Note that  $H/\Psi$  is well-defined only up to the action of  $\text{W}(\Phi/\Psi)$ .

Let us denote the map  $\Phi \setminus \Psi \rightarrow \Phi/\Psi$  by  $\pi_\Psi$ . The preimage of a special closed subset of  $\Phi/\Psi$  is a special closed subset of  $\Phi$ . There is a canonical group homomorphism  $F_\Psi: \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi) \rightarrow \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi)$ , it maps every root subgroup  $X_\alpha(S, \Theta) \leq \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi)$  to  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta; \pi_\Psi^{-1}(\{\alpha, 2\alpha\} \cap \Phi/\Psi)) \leq \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi)$  in such a way that

$$\text{st} \circ F_\Psi = \text{st}: \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi) \rightarrow \text{U}(S, \Theta).$$

Of course,  $\{\alpha, 2\alpha\} \cap \Phi/\Psi = \{\alpha, 2\alpha\}$  if  $\alpha$  is ultashort and it equals  $\{\alpha\}$  otherwise.

There are similarly defined natural homomorphisms  $F_\Psi: \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Phi/\Psi) \rightarrow \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Phi)$  and  $F_\Psi: \text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi) \rightarrow \text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$ . By [13,



propositions 1 and 2],  $F_\Psi: \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Phi/\alpha) \rightarrow \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Phi)$  is an isomorphism for every root  $\alpha$  if  $\ell \geq 4$  or  $\ell \geq 3$  and the orthogonal hyperbolic family is strong. The diagonal group  $D(R, \Delta; \Phi/\Psi)$  constructed by  $H_\Psi$  contains the root elements  $T_\alpha(\mu)$  for all  $\alpha \in \Psi$  and

$$F_\Psi(T_\alpha(\mu)g) = X_\alpha(\mu)F_\Psi(g) \in \text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$$

for  $g \in \text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi)$ ,  $\alpha \in \Psi$ .

Note that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the saturated root subsystems of  $\Phi$  containing a saturated root subsystem  $\Psi$  and the saturated root subsystems of  $\Phi/\Psi$ . If  $\Psi \subseteq \Psi' \subseteq \Phi$  are two saturated root subsystems, then

$$\pi_\Psi \circ \pi_{\Psi'/\Psi} = \pi_{\Psi'}: \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi') \rightarrow \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi).$$

Let  $e_{i \oplus j} = e_i + e_j$ ,  $q_{i \oplus j} = q_i \dot{+} q_j$ ,  $e_{\ominus i} = e_{-i} + e_0 + e_i$ . There are new root homomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} X_{i, \pm(l \oplus m)}: S_{i, \pm(l \oplus m)} &= S_{i, \pm l} \oplus S_{i, \pm m} \rightarrow \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/(e_m - e_l)) \text{ for } i \notin \{0, \pm l, \pm m\}; \\ X_{\pm(l \oplus m), j}: S_{\pm(l \oplus m), j} &= S_{\pm l, j} \oplus S_{\pm m, j} \rightarrow \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/(e_m - e_l)) \text{ for } j \notin \{0, \pm l, \pm m\}; \\ X_{\pm(l \oplus m)} = X_{\pm(l \oplus m)}^0: \Delta_{\pm(l \oplus m)}^0 &= \Theta_{\pm l}^0 \dot{+} \phi(S_{\mp l, \pm m}) \dot{+} \Theta_{\pm m}^0 \rightarrow \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/(e_m - e_l)); \\ X_j^{\ominus m}: \Theta_j^{\ominus m} &= q_{-m} \cdot S_{-m, j} \dot{+} \Theta_j^0 \dot{+} q_m \cdot S_{m, j} \rightarrow \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/e_m) \text{ for } j \notin \{0, \pm m\}. \end{aligned}$$

The remaining root morphisms of  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/e_m)$  and  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/(e_m - e_l))$  are denoted by the usual  $X_{ij}$  and  $X_j = X_j^0$ .

## 4 Conjugacy calculus

Let us say that a group  $G$  has a *conjugacy calculus* with respect to the orthogonal hyperbolic family  $H$  if there is a family of maps

$$\text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Sigma) \times \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi) \rightarrow G, (g, h) \mapsto {}^g\{h\}_\Sigma$$

parametrized by a saturated special closed subset  $\Sigma \subseteq \Phi$  such that

- (Hom)  ${}^g\{h_1 h_2\}_\Sigma = {}^g\{h_1\}_\Sigma {}^g\{h_2\}_\Sigma$ ;
- (Sub)  ${}^g\{h\}_{\Sigma'} = {}^g\{h\}_\Sigma$  if  $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$ ;
- (Chev)  ${}^{gX_\alpha(\mu)}\{X_\beta(\nu)\}_\Sigma = {}^g\left\{\prod_{\substack{i \geq 0, j > 0 \\ i \alpha + j \beta \in \Phi}} X_{i \alpha + j \beta}(f_{\alpha \beta i j}(\mu, \nu))\right\}_\Sigma$  if  $\alpha, \beta$  are non-antiparallel and  $\alpha \in \Sigma$ ;
- (XMod)  ${}^{X_\alpha(\delta(\mu))}g\{h\}_\Sigma = {}^1\{X_\alpha(\mu)\}_\Sigma {}^g\{h\}_\Sigma {}^1\{X_\alpha(\mu)\}_\Sigma^{-1}$  if  $\alpha \in \Sigma$ ;
- (Conj)  ${}^{g_1}\{h_1\}_{\Sigma'} F_\Psi(g_2)\{F_\Psi(h_2)\}_{\pi_\Psi^{-1}(\Sigma)} {}^{g_1}\{h_1\}_{\Sigma'}^{-1} = F_\Psi(fg_2)\{F_\Psi(fh_2)\}_{\pi_\Psi^{-1}(\Sigma)}$  if  $\Psi \subseteq \Phi$  is a saturated root subsystem,  $\Sigma \subseteq \Phi/\Psi$  is a saturated special closed subset,  $\alpha \in \Psi$ ,  $\Sigma' \subseteq \Psi$ ,  $f = {}^{\text{st}(g_1)}\text{st}(h_1) \in \text{U}(S, \Theta)$ .

The axiom (Sub) implies that we may omit the subscript  $\Sigma$  in the maps  $(g, h) \mapsto {}^g\{h\}_\Sigma$ .

If  $G$  has a conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H$ , then we define the elements

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{ij}(a, p) &= X^{ji(p)}\{X_{ij}(a)\}; & X_{ij}(a) &= Z_{ij}(a, 0); \\ Z_j(u, s) &= X^{-j(s)}\{X_j(u)\}; & X_j(u) &= Z_j(u, \dot{0}); \\ Z_{i,j\oplus k}(a, p) &= F_{e_k - e_j}(X^{j\oplus k, i(p)})\{F_{e_k - e_j}(X_{i,j\oplus k}(a))\}; & X_{i,j\oplus k}(a) &= Z_{i,j\oplus k}(a, 0); \\ Z_{i\oplus j, k}(a, p) &= F_{e_j - e_i}(X^{k, i\oplus j(p)})\{F_{e_j - e_i}(X_{i\oplus j, k}(a))\}; & X_{i\oplus j, k}(a) &= Z_{i\oplus j, k}(a, 0); \\ Z_{i\oplus j}(u, s) &= F_{e_j - e_i}(X^{-(i\oplus j)(s)})\{F_{e_j - e_i}(X_{i\oplus j}(u))\}; & X_{i\oplus j}(u) &= Z_{i\oplus j}(u, \dot{0}); \\ Z_j^{\ominus i}(u, s) &= F_{e_i}(X^{-j(s)})\{F_{e_i}(X_j^{\ominus i}(u))\} \text{ for } \alpha = e_i; & X_j^{\ominus i}(u) &= Z_j^{\ominus i}(u, \dot{0}) \end{aligned}$$

of  $G$ . Since  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta)$  and  $\text{U}(S, \Theta)$  have natural conjugacy calculi with respect to  $H$ , we use the notation  $Z_{ij}(a, p)$  and  $Z_j(u, s)$  for the corresponding elements in these groups.

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose that  $\delta: (S, \Theta) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$  is a crossed module of form rings,  $H$  is an orthogonal hyperbolic family in  $(R, \Delta)$ , and a group  $G$  has a conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H$ . Then the following identities hold:*

(Sym)  $Z_{ij}(a, p) = Z_{-j, -i}(-\bar{a}, -\bar{p})$  and  $Z_{i\oplus j, k}(a, p) = Z_{-k, (-i)\oplus(-j)}(-\bar{a}, -\bar{p})$ ;

(Add) *The maps  $Z_{ij}$ ,  $Z_j$ ,  $Z_{i\oplus j, k}$ ,  $Z_{i, j\oplus k}$ ,  $Z_{i\oplus j}$ ,  $Z_j^{\ominus i}$  are homomorphisms on the first variables.*

- (Comm) 1.  $[Z_{ij}(a, p), Z_{kl}(b, q)] = 1$  if  $\pm i, \pm j, \pm k, \pm l$  are distinct,  
 2.  $[Z_{ij}(a, p), Z_l(b, q)] = 1$  if  $\pm i, \pm j, \pm l$  are distinct,  
 3.  $Z_{ij}^{(a, p)} Z_{i\oplus j, k}(b, q) = Z_{i\oplus j, k}(Z_{ij}^{(a, p)} b, Z_{ij}^{(a, p)} q)$ ,  
 4.  $Z_{ij}^{(a, p)} Z_{i\oplus j}(u, s) = Z_{i\oplus j}(Z_{ij}^{(a, p)} u, Z_{ij}^{(a, p)} s)$ ,  
 5.  $Z_i^{(u, s)} Z_{\ominus i, j}(v, t) = Z_{\ominus i, j}(Z_i^{(u, s)} v, Z_i^{(u, s)} t)$ ;

- (Simp) 1.  $Z_{ik}(a, p) = Z_{i\oplus j, k}(a, p)$ ;  
 2.  $Z_{ij}(a, p) = Z_{(-i)\oplus j}(\phi(a), \phi(p))$ ;  
 3.  $Z_j(u, s) = Z_j^{\ominus i}(u, s)$ ;

- (HW) 1.  $Z_{j\oplus k, i}(T_{jk}(r)a, p + q) = Z_{k, i\oplus j}(T_{ij}(p)a, T_{ij}(p)(q + r))$  for  $a \in S_{ki}$ ,  $p \in R_{ij}$ ,  $q \in R_{ik}$ ,  $r \in R_{jk}$ ,  
 2.  $Z_{-j\oplus -i}(T_{ij}(q)(u \dot{+} \phi(a)), s \dot{+} \phi(p) \dot{+} t) = Z_{\ominus i, -j}(T_i(s)(u \dot{+} q_i \cdot a), T_i(s)(q_{-i} \cdot p \dot{+} t \dot{+} q_i \cdot q))$  for  $u \in \Theta_{-j}^0$ ,  $a \in S_{i, -j}$ ,  $s \in \Delta_i^0$ ,  $p \in R_{-i, j}$ ,  $t \in \Delta_j^0$ ,  $q \in R_{ij}$ ;

- (Delta) 1.  $Z_{ij}(a, \delta(b) + p) = Z_{ji}(b, 0) Z_{ij}(a, p) Z_{ji}(-b, 0)$ ,  
 2.  $Z_j(u, \delta(v) \dot{+} s) = Z_{-j}(v, \dot{0}) Z_j(u, s) Z_{-j}(\dot{-}v, \dot{0})$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $G$  is a group with the elements  $Z_{ij}(a, p)$ ,  $Z_j(u, s)$ ,  $Z_{i \oplus j, k}(a, p)$ ,  $Z_{i, j \oplus k}(a, p)$ ,  $Z_{i \oplus j}(u, s)$ ,  $Z_{\ominus i, j}(u, s)$  satisfying the identities above. Then  $G$  has a unique conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H$  such that the distinguished elements coincide with the corresponding expressions from the conjugacy calculus.

*Proof.* If  $G$  has a conjugacy calculus, then all the identities may be proved by direct calculations. In particular, (Comm) follows from (Conj), (Delta) follows from (XMod), and the remaining ones follow from (Hom), (Sub), (Chev).

To prove the converse, notice that (Add) and (Sym) imply

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{ij}(0, p) &= 1, & Z_{i \oplus j, k}(0, p) &= 1, & Z_{i, j \oplus k}(0, p) &= 1, \\ Z_j(\dot{0}, s) &= 1, & Z_{i \oplus j}(\dot{0}, s) &= 1, & Z_{\ominus i, j}(\dot{0}, s) &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

Together with (Sym), (Add), (Simp), and (HW) it follows that  $X_{i \oplus j, k}(a)$ ,  $X_{i, j \oplus k}(a)$ ,  $X_{i \oplus j}(u)$ , and  $X_{\ominus i, j}(u)$  may be expressed in terms of the root elements  $X_{ij}(a)$  and  $X_j(u)$  in the natural way (these elements are defined as various  $Z_{(-)}(=, \dot{0})$ ). In particular, (Comm) implies that the root elements satisfy the Chevalley commutator formulas. It is also easy to see that (Sym), (Add), (Simp), and (HW) give some canonical expressions of all the distinguished elements in terms of  $Z_{ij}(a, p)$  and  $Z_j(u, s)$ .

We explicitly construct the maps  $(g, h) \mapsto {}^g\{h\}_\Sigma$  by induction on  $|\Sigma|$ , the case  $\Sigma = \emptyset$  is trivial. Simultaneously we show that  ${}^g\{h\}_\Sigma$  evaluates to a distinguished element if  $\Sigma$  is strictly contained in a system of positive roots of a rank 2 saturated root subsystem and  $h \in U(S, \Theta; -\Sigma)$ . Hence from now on we assume that  $\Sigma \subseteq \Phi$  is a saturated special closed subset and there are unique maps  ${}^g\{h\}_{\Sigma'}$  for all saturated  $\Sigma'$  with  $|\Sigma'| < |\Sigma|$  satisfying the axioms (Hom), (Sub), and (Chev).

Firstly, we construct  ${}^g\{X_\alpha(\mu)\}_\Sigma$ , where  $\alpha \in \Phi \setminus 2\Phi$  if a fixed root. If there is an extreme root  $\beta \in \Sigma \setminus 2\Sigma$  such that  $\beta \neq -\alpha$ , then we define

$${}^g X_\beta(\nu) \{X_\alpha(\mu)\}_\Sigma = {}^g \{X_\beta(\nu) X_\alpha(\mu)\}_{\Sigma \setminus \langle \beta \rangle}$$

for any  $g \in \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Sigma \setminus \langle \beta \rangle)$ , where  $X_\beta(\nu) X_\alpha(\mu) = \prod_{\substack{i\alpha + j\beta \in \Phi \\ i \geq 0, j > 0}} X_{i\alpha + j\beta}(f_{\alpha\beta ij}(\mu, \nu)) \in \text{StU}(S, \Theta)$ . By (HW), this definition gives the distinguished element for appropriate  $\Sigma$ .

Let us check that the definition is correct, i.e. if  $\beta, \gamma \in \Sigma \setminus 2\Sigma$  are two extreme roots,  $\beta, \gamma, -\alpha$  are distinct, and  $g \in \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Sigma \setminus (\langle \beta \rangle \cup \langle \gamma \rangle))$ , then

$${}^g X_\beta(\nu) \{X_\gamma(\lambda) X_\alpha(\mu)\}_{\Sigma \setminus \langle \gamma \rangle} = g^{[X_\beta(\nu), X_\gamma(\lambda)]} X_\gamma(\lambda) \{X_\beta(\nu) X_\alpha(\mu)\}_{\Sigma \setminus \langle \beta \rangle}.$$

If  $\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle$  is special, then this claim easily follows. Else these roots lie in a common saturated root subsystem  $\Phi_0$  of type  $A_2$  or  $BC_2$ . We may assume that  $\Sigma = \langle \beta, \gamma \rangle$ , otherwise there is an extreme root in  $\Sigma$  but not in  $\Phi_0$ . If  $\Phi_0$  is of type  $BC_2$  and  $\langle \beta, \gamma \rangle$  is not its subsystem of positive roots, then the required identity follows from (Sym). Otherwise this is a simple corollary of (HW).

The above definition cannot be used if  $\Sigma = \langle -\alpha \rangle$ . In this case we just define

$$X_{j_i}^{(p)}\{X_{ij}(a)\}_{\langle e_j - e_i \rangle} = Z_{ij}(a, p), \quad X_{-i}^{(s)}\{X_i(u)\}_{\langle e_i \rangle} = Z_i(u, s).$$

Now let us check that the map  $(g, h) \rightarrow {}^g\{h\}_\Sigma$  is well-defined, i.e. factors through the Steinberg relations on  $h$ . By construction, it factors through the homomorphism property of the root elements. Let us check that the Chevalley commutator formula for  $[X_\alpha(*), X_\beta(*)]$  is also preserved, where  $\alpha, \beta$  are linearly independent roots. If there is an extreme root  $\gamma \in \Sigma$  such that  $\langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \rangle$  is special, then we may apply the construction of  ${}^g\{h\}_\Sigma$  via  $\gamma$ . Otherwise let  $\Phi_0 \subseteq \Phi$  be the rank 2 saturated root subsystem containing  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ . If  $\Phi_0$  is of type  $A_1 \times A_1$  or  $A_1 \times BC_1$ , then  $\Sigma = \langle -\alpha, -\beta \rangle$  and we may apply the corresponding case of (Comm). If  $\Phi_0$  is of type  $A_2$  or  $BC_2$  and  $\Sigma$  is not its subsystem of positive roots, then we just apply (Add).

Consider the case where  $\Phi_0$  is of type  $A_2$ ,  $\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta \in \Phi_0$ , and  $\Sigma = \langle -\alpha, -\beta \rangle$ . Without loss of generality,  $\alpha = e_j - e_i$  and  $\beta = e_k - e_j$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} X_{j_i}^{(p)} X_{k_i}^{(q)} X_{k_j}^{(r)}\{X_{ij}(a) X_{jk}(b)\}_\Sigma &= X_{k, i \oplus j}^{(T_{j_i}^{(p)}(qa))} Z_{ij}(a, p) Z_{i \oplus j, k}(b, T_{j_i}^{(p)}(q+r)) \\ &= Z_{i \oplus j, k}^{(T_{j_i}^{(p)} T_{ij}^{(a)} b, T_{j_i}^{(p)}(q+r))} X_{k, i \oplus j}^{(T_{j_i}^{(p)}(qa))} Z_{ij}(a, p) \\ &= X_{j_i}^{(p)} X_{k_i}^{(q)} X_{k_j}^{(r)}\{X_{jk}(b) X_{ik}(ab) X_{ij}(a)\}_\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

The remaining case is where  $\Phi_0$  is of type  $BC_2$ ,  $\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta, 2\alpha + \beta \in \Phi_0$ , and  $\Sigma = \langle -\alpha, -\beta \rangle$ . Without loss of generality,  $\alpha = e_i$  and  $\beta = e_j - e_i$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} X_{-i}^{(s)} X_{i, -j}^{(p)} X_{-j}^{(t)} X_{j_i}^{(q)}\{X_i(u) X_{ij}(a)\}_\Sigma &= Z_{i \oplus j}(u, s \dot{+} \phi(p) \dot{+} t) Z_{\ominus i, j}^{(T_{-i}^{(s)}(q_i \cdot a), T_{-i}^{(s)}(q_i \cdot p \dot{+} t \dot{-} q_{-i} \cdot \bar{q}))} \\ &= X_{\ominus i, -j}^{(T_{-i}^{(s)}[t \dot{+} q_i \cdot p, T_i(u)])} Z_i(u, s) \\ &\cdot Z_{\ominus i, j}^{(T_{-i}^{(s)}(q_i \cdot a), T_{-i}^{(s)}(q_i \cdot p \dot{+} t \dot{-} q_{-i} \cdot \bar{q}))} \\ &= Z_{\ominus i, j}^{(T_{-i}^{(s)}(q_i \cdot a \dot{+} u \cdot a \dot{+} q_{-i} \cdot \rho(u)a), T_{-i}^{(s)}(q_i \cdot p \dot{+} t \dot{-} q_{-i} \cdot \bar{q}))} \\ &\cdot Z_{i \oplus j}(u, s \dot{+} \phi(p) \dot{+} t) \\ &= X_{-i}^{(s)} X_{i, -j}^{(p)} X_{-j}^{(t)} X_{j_i}^{(q)}\{X_{ij}(a) X_j(u \cdot a) X_{-i, j}(\rho(u)a) X_i(u)\}_\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, our map  $(g, h) \mapsto {}^g\{h\}_\Sigma$  satisfy the required properties and it is unique. The axiom (XMod) follows from the Steinberg relations on the root elements, (Comm), and (Delta) if  $\Sigma$  is one-dimensional, the general case follows from the construction of  ${}^g\{h\}_\Sigma$ .

To prove the axiom (Conj), without loss of generality  $\Sigma'$  is one-dimensional and  $\Psi = \mathbb{R}\Sigma' \cap \Phi$ . Applying (Chev) multiple times to the term  ${}^{F_\Psi(g_2)}\{F_\Psi(h_2)\}_{\pi_\Psi^{-1}(\Sigma)}$ , we reduce to the case where  $\Sigma$  is also one-dimensional. This is precisely (Comm).  $\square$

From now on let  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$  be the universal group with a conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H$ . It is the abstract group with the presentation given by proposition 1. Clearly, for a saturated root subsystem  $\Psi \subseteq \Phi$  there is a homomorphism  $F_\Psi: \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi) \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$ , i.e. every

group with a conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H$  also has a canonical conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H_{\Psi}$ . We have a sequence of groups

$$\mathrm{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi) \rightarrow \overline{\mathrm{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi) \rightarrow \mathrm{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$$

with the action of  $\mathrm{D}(R, \Delta; \Phi)$ . Our goal for the next several sections is to prove that the right arrow is an isomorphism.

## 5 Lemmas about odd form rings

The difficult part in the proof that  $\overline{\mathrm{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi) \rightarrow \mathrm{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$  is an isomorphism is to construct an action of  $\mathrm{StU}(R, \Delta; \Phi)$  on the left hand side. In order to do this, we prove that  $F_{\alpha} : \overline{\mathrm{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha) \rightarrow \overline{\mathrm{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$  is an isomorphism for all roots  $\alpha$ , then the automorphisms of the left hand side induced by  $T_{\alpha}(\mu)$  give certain automorphisms of the right hand side. In this section we prove surjectivity of  $F_{\alpha}$  and several preparatory results.

**Lemma 1.** *If  $\pm i, \pm j, \pm k$  are distinct non-zero indices, then the multiplication map*

$$(S_{ik} \oplus S_{i,-k}) \otimes_{e_{|k|} R e_{|k|}} (R_{kj} \oplus R_{-k,j}) \rightarrow S_{ij}$$

*is an isomorphism. If, in addition,  $H$  is strong, then*

$$S_{ik} \otimes_{R_{kk}} R_{kj} \rightarrow S_{ij}$$

*is also an isomorphism.*

*Proof.* This is an easy result from Morita theory. Let  $e_j = \sum_{l=\pm k} \sum_m x_{lm} y_{lm}$  for some  $x_{lm} \in R_{jl}$  and  $y_{ml} \in R_{lj}$ , they exists since  $e_j \in R e_{|k|} R$ . Then a direct calculation show that

$$S_{ij} \rightarrow (S_{ik} \oplus S_{i,-k}) \otimes_{e_{|k|} R e_{|k|}} (R_{kj} \oplus R_{-k,j}), a \mapsto \sum_{l=\pm k} \sum_m a x_{lm} \otimes y_{lm}$$

is the inverse to the map from the statement. The second claim follows by the same argument if we take  $l = k$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *For any  $\pm j, \pm k$  distinct non-zero indices consider the group  $F$  with generators  $u \boxtimes p$  for  $u \in \Theta_{\pm k}^0$ ,  $p \in R_{\pm k,j}$  and  $\phi(a)$  for  $a \in S_{-j,j}$ . The relations are*

- $\phi(a + b) = \phi(a) \dot{+} \phi(b)$ ,  $\phi(a) = \phi(-\bar{a})$ ;
- $u \boxtimes a \dot{+} \phi(b) = \phi(b) \dot{+} u \boxtimes a$ ,  $[u \boxtimes a, v \boxtimes b] = \phi(-\bar{a}\pi(u)\pi(v)b)$ ;
- $(u \dot{+} v) \boxtimes a = u \boxtimes a \dot{+} v \boxtimes a$ ,  $u \boxtimes (a + b) = u \boxtimes a \dot{+} \phi(\bar{b}\rho(u)a) \dot{+} u \boxtimes b$ ;
- $u \boxtimes ab = (u \cdot a) \boxtimes b$  for  $u \in \Theta_l^0$ ,  $a \in R_{lm}$ ,  $b \in R_{mj}$ ,  $l, m \in \{-k, k\}$ ;
- $\phi(a) \boxtimes b = \phi(\bar{b}ab)$ .

Then the homomorphism

$$f: F \rightarrow \Theta_j^0, u \boxtimes p \mapsto u \cdot p, \phi(a) \mapsto \phi(a)$$

is an isomorphism. If the orthogonal hyperbolic family is strong, then it suffices to take only the generators  $u \boxtimes p$  for  $u \in \Theta_k^0$ ,  $p \in R_{kj}$  and  $\phi(a)$  for  $a \in S_{-j,j}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $e_j = \sum_{l=\pm k} \sum_m x_{lm} y_{lm}$  for some  $x_{lm} \in R_{jl}$  and  $y_{ml} \in R_{lj}$ . Consider the map

$$g: \Theta_j^0 \rightarrow F, u \mapsto \sum_{l=\pm k} \sum_m (u \cdot x_{lm}) \boxtimes y_{lm} \dot{+} \phi \left( \sum_{(l,m) < (l',m')} \overline{y_{l'm'}} \overline{x_{l'm'}} \rho(u) x_{lm} y_{lm} \right),$$

it is a section of  $f$ . The relations of  $F$  easily imply that  $g$  is a homomorphism. Finally,

$$g(f(\phi(a))) = \sum_{l=\pm k} \sum_m (\phi(a) \cdot x_{lm}) \boxtimes y_{lm} \dot{+} \phi \left( \sum_{(l,m) < (l',m')} \overline{y_{l'm'}} \overline{x_{l'm'}} (a - \bar{a}) x_{lm} y_{lm} \right) = \phi(a)$$

and

$$g(f(u \boxtimes a)) = \sum_{l=\pm k} \sum_m (u \cdot a x_{lm}) \boxtimes y_{lm} \dot{+} \phi \left( \sum_{(l,m) < (l',m')} \overline{y_{l'm'}} \overline{x_{l'm'}} \bar{a} \rho(u) a x_{lm} y_{lm} \right) = u \boxtimes a.$$

The second claim may be proved in the same way.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.** *The homomorphism*

$$F_\alpha: \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha) \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$$

is surjective if  $\alpha$  is a short root and  $\ell \geq 3$  or if  $\alpha$  is an ultrashort root and  $\ell \geq 2$ . The homomorphism

$$F_{\Psi/\alpha}: \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi) \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$$

is also surjective if  $\alpha \in \Psi \subseteq \Phi$  is a root subsystem of type  $A_2$ ,  $\ell \geq 3$ , and  $H$  is strong.

*Proof.* By proposition 1,  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$  is generated by  $Z_{ij}(a, p)$  and  $Z_j(u, s)$ . It suffices to show that they lie in the images of the homomorphisms. This is clear for the generators with the roots not in  $\{\alpha, -\alpha\}$  or  $\Psi$  respectively. For the remaining roots  $\beta$  it suffices to show that  $X_\beta(S, \Theta)$  lie in the images. This easily follows from the Chevalley commutator formula and lemmas 1, 2.  $\square$

Of course, the proposition also implies that

$$F_\alpha: \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi) \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$$

is surjective if  $\ell \geq 3$  and  $\Psi$  is of type  $BC_2$  or  $\ell \geq 4$  and  $\Psi$  is of type  $A_2$ .

The final technical lemma is needed in the next section.

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose that  $\ell = 3$  and  $H$  is strong. Let  $A$  be an abelian group and*

$$\{-\}_{ij}: R_{1i} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} R_{ij} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} S_{j3} \rightarrow A$$

*be homomorphisms for  $i, j \in \{-2, 2\}$ . Suppose also that*

$$(A1) \{p \otimes qr \otimes a\}_{ik} = \{pq \otimes r \otimes a\}_{jk} + \{p \otimes q \otimes ra\}_{ij};$$

$$(A2) \{p \otimes q \otimes \bar{p}a\}_{-i,i} = 0;$$

$$(A3) \{p \otimes qr \otimes a\}_{ij} = \{\bar{q} \otimes \bar{p}r \otimes a\}_{-i,j};$$

$$(A4) \{p \otimes q \otimes ra\}_{ij} = -\{\bar{r} \otimes \bar{q} \otimes \bar{p}a\}_{-j,-i}.$$

*Then  $\{x\}_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i, j, x$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $R_{|2|,|2|} = \begin{pmatrix} R_{-2,-2} & R_{-2,2} \\ R_{2,-2} & R_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  and  $S_{|2|,3} = \begin{pmatrix} S_{-2,3} \\ S_{23} \end{pmatrix}$ . For convenience we prove the claim for arbitrary left  $R_{|2|,|2|}$ -module  $S_{|2|,3}$  instead of a part of a crossed module, where  $S_{\pm 1,3} = R_{\pm 1,2} \otimes_{R_{22}} S_{23}$  in (A2) and (A4). From the last two identities we get

$$\{px \otimes \bar{y}q \otimes a\}_{ij} = \{py \otimes \bar{x}q \otimes a\}_{-i,j}; \quad (A5)$$

$$\{p \otimes qx \otimes \bar{y}a\}_{ji} = \{p \otimes qy \otimes \bar{x}a\}_{j,-i} \quad (A6)$$

for  $x \in R_{1i}$  and  $y \in R_{1,-i}$ . This implies that

$$\{pxyq \otimes r \otimes a\}_{ij} = \{pyxq \otimes r \otimes a\}_{ij} \quad (A7)$$

for  $x, y \in R_{\pm 1, \pm 1}$ . Let  $(I, \Gamma) \trianglelefteq (R, \Delta)$  be the odd form ideal generated by  $xy - yx$  for  $x, y \in R_{11}$ . From (A5)–(A7) we obtain that  $\{-\}_{ij}$  factor through  $R/I$  and  $S_{|2|,3}/(I \cap R_{|2|,|2|})S_{|2|,3}$ , so we may assume that  $R_{11}$  is commutative. It is easy to see that

$$\{rx \otimes ye_1z \otimes we_1a\}_{ij} = \{x \otimes yrz \otimes we_1a\}_{ij} = \{x \otimes ye_1z \otimes wra\}_{ij} \quad (A8)$$

for  $r \in R_{11}$ . By (A5) and (A6), it suffices to prove that  $\{x\}_{22} = 0$ .

From (A2), (A4), (A5), and (A6) we get

$$\{px \otimes qx \otimes a\}_{22} = 0; \quad (A9)$$

$$\{p \otimes yq \otimes ya\}_{22} = 0 \quad (A10)$$

for  $x \in R_{12}$  and  $y \in R_{21}$ . Using (A1), (A8), (A9), (A10), and the linearizations of (A9) and (A10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \{x \otimes y(pq)^3z \otimes wa\}_{22} &= \{xyp \otimes q(pq)^2z \otimes wa\}_{22} + \{(pq)^2x \otimes yp \otimes qzwa\}_{22} \\ &= \{xyp \otimes qz' \otimes wpqa\}_{22} + \{x' \otimes yppq \otimes qzwa\}_{22} \\ &= -\{xyz' \otimes qp \otimes w't\}_{22} - \{x' \otimes qp \otimes y'zwt\}_{22} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for  $x, p, z \in R_{12}$ ,  $y, q, w \in R_{21}$ ,  $a \in S_{13}$ , where  $x' = pqx - xqp$ ,  $y' = ypq - qpy$ ,  $z' = pqz - zqp$ ,  $w' = wpq - qpw$ . The last equality follows from  $x'q = py' = z'q = pw' = 0$ . It remains to notice that the elements  $(pq)^3$  generate the unit ideal in  $R_{11}$ .  $\square$

## 6 Construction of root subgroups

In this and the next sections  $\alpha = e_m$  or  $\alpha = e_m - e_l$  for  $m \neq \pm l$  is a fixed root. We also assume that  $\ell \geq 4$  or  $\ell = 3$  and  $H$  is strong. We are going to prove that

$$F_\alpha: \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha) \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$$

is an isomorphism, i.e. that  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$  has a natural conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H$ .

In this section we construct root elements  $\tilde{X}_\beta(\mu) \in \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$  for  $\beta \in \Phi$  and prove the Steinberg relations for them. Let  $I = \{m, -m\}$  if  $\alpha = e_m$  and  $I = \{m, -m, l, -l\}$  if  $\alpha = e_m - e_l$  be the set of non-trivial indices. If  $\beta \notin \mathbb{R}\alpha$ , then there is a canonical choice for such elements, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{ij}(a) &= X_{ij/\alpha}(a) \text{ for } i, j \notin I; \\ \tilde{X}_{ij}(a) &= \tilde{X}_{-j, -i}(-\bar{a}) = X_{i, \pm\infty/\alpha}(a) \text{ for } \alpha = e_m - e_l, i \notin I, j \in \{\pm l, \pm m\}; \\ \tilde{X}_{ij}(a) &= X_{\pm\infty/\alpha}(\phi(a)) \text{ for } \alpha = e_m - e_l, i = \mp l, j = \pm m \text{ or } i = \mp m, j = \pm l; \\ \tilde{X}_{ij}(a) &= \tilde{X}_{-j, -i}(-\bar{a}) = X_{j/\alpha}(q_i \cdot a) \text{ for } \alpha = e_m, i = \pm m; \\ \tilde{X}_j(u) &= X_{j/\alpha}(u) \text{ for } j \notin I; \\ \tilde{X}_j(u) &= X_{\pm\infty/\alpha}(u) \text{ for } \alpha = e_m - e_l, j = \pm m \text{ or } j = \pm l. \end{aligned}$$

These elements satisfy all the Steinberg relations involving only roots from saturated special closed subsets  $\Sigma \subseteq \Phi$  disjoint with  $\mathbb{R}\alpha$ . Similar elements also may be defined in  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Phi/\alpha)$  and  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$ . The conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H_\alpha$  gives a way to evaluate the elements  $\tilde{X}_\beta(\mu)\{\tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu)\}$  in terms of  $\tilde{X}_{i\beta+j\gamma}(\lambda)$  if  $\pm\alpha \notin \langle \beta, \gamma \rangle$  and  $\langle \beta, \gamma \rangle$  is special. Up to symmetry, it remains to construct  $\tilde{X}_{lm}(a) \in \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$  for  $\alpha = e_m - e_l$  and  $\tilde{X}_m(u) \in \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$  for  $\alpha = e_m$ , as well as to prove the Steinberg relations involving  $\alpha$  and  $2\alpha$ .

Consider the expressions  $\tilde{X}_\beta(\mu)\{\tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu)\}$ , where  $\alpha \in \langle \beta, \gamma \rangle$  but  $\alpha$  is linearly independent with  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  separately. We expand them in terms of  $\tilde{X}_{i\beta+j\gamma}(\lambda)$



adding the new terms as follows. If  $\alpha = e_m - e_l$  let

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{X}_{li}^{(p)}\{\tilde{X}_{im}(a)\} &= \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, a) \tilde{X}_{im}(a); \\
\tilde{X}_{im}^{(p)}\{\tilde{X}_{li}(a)\} &= {}^i\tilde{X}_{lm}(-a, p) \tilde{X}_{li}(a); \\
\tilde{X}_{-l}^{(s)}\{\tilde{X}_m(u)\} &= \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s, \dot{-}u) \tilde{X}_m(u); \\
\tilde{X}_m^{(s)}\{\tilde{X}_{-l}(u)\} &= {}^\pi\tilde{X}_{lm}(u, s) \tilde{X}_{-l}(u); \\
\tilde{X}_{-l}^{(s)}\{\tilde{X}_{-l,m}(a)\} &= \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-l}(s, a) \tilde{X}_m(\dot{-}s \cdot (-a)) \tilde{X}_{-l,m}(a); \\
\tilde{X}_m^{(s)}\{\tilde{X}_{l,-m}(a)\} &= {}^{-m}\tilde{X}_{lm}(a, \dot{-}s) \tilde{X}_{-l}(\dot{-}s \cdot \bar{a}) \tilde{X}_{l,-m}(a); \\
\tilde{X}_{l,-m}^{(p)}\{\tilde{X}_m(u)\} &= \tilde{X}_{-l}(u \cdot \bar{p}) \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-m}(-p, \dot{-}u) \tilde{X}_m(u); \\
\tilde{X}_{-l,m}^{(p)}\{\tilde{X}_{-l}(u)\} &= \tilde{X}_m(u \cdot (-p))^{-l}\tilde{X}_{lm}(u, -p) \tilde{X}_{-l}(u); \\
\tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta) &= \langle \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, a), {}^i\tilde{X}_{lm}(a, p), \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s, u), {}^\pi\tilde{X}_{lm}(u, s), \\
&\quad \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-l}(s, a), {}^{-m}\tilde{X}_{lm}(a, s), \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-m}(p, u), {}^{-l}\tilde{X}_{lm}(u, p) \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

In the case  $\alpha = e_m$  let

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{X}_{-m,i}^{(p)}\{\tilde{X}_{im}(a)\} &= \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(p, a) \tilde{X}_{im}(a); \\
\tilde{X}_i^{(s)}\{\tilde{X}_{im}(a)\} &= \tilde{X}_{-i,m}(\rho(s)a) \tilde{X}_m^i(\dot{-}s, -a) \tilde{X}_{im}(a); \\
\tilde{X}_{im}^{(p)}\{\tilde{X}_i(u)\} &= {}^i\tilde{X}_m(u, -p) \tilde{X}_{-i,m}(-\rho(u)p) \tilde{X}_i(u); \\
\tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta) &= \langle \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(p, a), \tilde{X}_m^i(s, a), {}^i\tilde{X}_m(u, p) \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 4.** *If  $g \in \tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$  and  $\beta \in \Phi/\alpha$ , then*

$${}^gZ_\beta(\mu, \nu) = Z_\beta({}^{\delta(\text{st}(g))}\mu, {}^{\delta(\text{st}(g))}\nu).$$

*Proof.* Without loss of generality,  $g$  is a generator of  $\tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$ . Let  $\Psi \subseteq \Phi$  be the saturated irreducible root subsystem of rank 2 involved in the definition of  $g$  (of type  $A_2$  or  $BC_2$ ). If  $\beta \notin \Psi/\alpha$ , then the claim follows from (Conj). Otherwise we apply proposition 2 to

$$F_\beta: \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\Psi) \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$$

in order to decompose  $Z_\beta(\mu, \nu)$  into the generators with roots not in  $\Psi/\alpha$ .  $\square$

Let  $\text{eval}: \tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta) \rightarrow S_{lm}$  or  $\text{eval}: \tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta) \rightarrow \Theta_m^0$  be such that  $\text{st}(g) = T_{lm}(\text{eval}(g))$  or  $\text{st}(g) = T_m(\text{eval}(g))$  depending on the choice of  $\alpha$ . Lemma 4 implies that

$$[\tilde{X}_\beta(\mu), g] = \prod_{\substack{i\beta+j\alpha \in \Phi \\ i,j > 0}} X_{i\beta+j\alpha}(f_{\beta\alpha ij}(\mu, \text{eval}(g)))$$

for all  $g \in \tilde{X}_\alpha(*)$  if  $\beta$  and  $\alpha$  are linearly independent.

We still have to prove the relations between the generators of  $\tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$ . In order to do so, we consider expressions

$$\prod_{\beta \in \Sigma} \tilde{X}_\beta(\mu_\beta) \{ \tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu) \}_\Sigma,$$

where  $\Sigma \subseteq \Phi$  is at most two-dimensional saturated special closed subset,  $\alpha$  is linearly independent with  $\Sigma$ ,  $\alpha \notin \langle \gamma \rangle$ , and  $\langle \Sigma, \gamma, \alpha \rangle$  is special. Such an expression may be decomposed into a product of root elements  $\tilde{X}_\beta(\nu)$  and the generators of  $\tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$  in two ways if at the first step we take one of the extreme roots of  $\Sigma$  applying (Chev). We say that the expression *gives* an identity  $h_1 = h_2$  between products of such root elements. Similarly, expressions  $\tilde{X}_\beta(\mu) \{ \tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu_1 + \nu_2) \}_{\langle \beta \rangle}$  *give* an identity  $h_1 = h_2$  if  $\alpha \in \langle \beta, \gamma \rangle$  and at the first step we either apply (Hom) and (Chev), or replace  $\tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu_1 + \nu_2)$  by  $\tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu_1) \tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu_2)$  and apply (Chev) to the result.

Note also that any generator of  $\tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$  is trivial if either of its arguments vanishes.

**Lemma 5.** *Suppose that  $\alpha = e_m$ . Then there is unique homomorphism  $\tilde{X}_m : \Theta_m^0 \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$  such that*

$$g = \tilde{X}_m(\text{eval}(g))$$

for all  $g \in \tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$ .

*Proof.* Lemma 4 implies that the elements  $\tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(p, a)$  lie in the center of  $\tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$ . It is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{-m,i}^i(p) \{ \tilde{X}_{im}(a+b) \} &\text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(p, a+b) = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(p, a) \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(p, b); \\ \tilde{X}_{-m,j}^i(p) \tilde{X}_{-m,i}^i(q) \tilde{X}_{ji}^i(r) \{ \tilde{X}_{im}(a) \} &\text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(q+pr, a) = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(q, a) \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^j(p, ra) \text{ for } i \neq \pm j; \\ \tilde{X}_{-m,i}^i(p) \tilde{X}_{jm}^{-i}(q) \{ \tilde{X}_{ij}(a) \} &\text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(p, aq) = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^{-j}(\bar{q}, -\bar{a}\bar{p}) \text{ for } i \neq \pm j. \end{aligned}$$

From the second identity we easily get  $\tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(p+q, a) = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(p, a) \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(q, a)$  and  $\tilde{X}_{-m,m}^i(pq, a) = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}^j(p, qa)$  for all  $i, j \neq \pm m$ . Hence by lemma 1 there is a unique homomorphism

$$\tilde{X}_{-m,m} : S_{-m,m} \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$$

such that  $\tilde{X}_{-m,m}^k(p, a) = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}(pa)$  and  $\tilde{X}_{-m,m}(a) = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}(-\bar{a})$ .

It turns out that for  $i \neq \pm j$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{im}^{-i}(p) \{ \tilde{X}_i(u+v) \} &\text{ gives } {}^i\tilde{X}_m(u+v, p) = {}^i\tilde{X}_m(u, p) {}^i\tilde{X}_m(v, p); \\ \tilde{X}_{jm}^{-i}(r) \tilde{X}_{-j,i}^i(p) \{ \tilde{X}_{ij}(a) \} &\text{ gives } {}^j\tilde{X}_m(\phi(pa), r) = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}(\bar{r}par); \\ \tilde{X}_{im}^{-i}(p) \tilde{X}_{jm}^{-i}(q) \tilde{X}_{ji}^{-i}(r) \{ \tilde{X}_j(u) \} &\text{ gives } {}^j\tilde{X}_m(u, rp+q) = {}^i\tilde{X}_m(u \cdot r, p) \tilde{X}_{-m,m}(\bar{q}\rho(u)rp) {}^j\tilde{X}_m(u, q). \end{aligned}$$

The second identity may be generalized to  ${}^i\tilde{X}_m(\phi(a), p) = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}(\bar{p}ap)$ . The last identity is equivalent to  ${}^j\tilde{X}_m(u, rp) = {}^i\tilde{X}_m(u \cdot r, p)$  and  ${}^j\tilde{X}_m(u, rp + q) = {}^j\tilde{X}_m(u, rp)\tilde{X}_{-m,m}(\bar{q}\rho(u)rp){}^j\tilde{X}_m(u, q)$  for  $i \neq \pm j$ . Hence  ${}^i\tilde{X}_m(u, p + q) = {}^i\tilde{X}_m(u, p)\tilde{X}_{-m,m}(\bar{q}\rho(u)p){}^i\tilde{X}_m(u, q)$  and  ${}^j\tilde{X}_m(u, pq) = {}^i\tilde{X}_m(u \cdot p, q)$  for all  $i, j \neq \pm m$ . Moreover, lemma 4 implies that  $[g, {}^i\tilde{X}_m(u, p)] = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}(\overline{p\pi(u)\pi(\text{eval}(g))})$  for all  $g \in \tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$ . Now lemma 2 gives the unique homomorphism

$$\tilde{X}_m : \Theta_m^0 \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$$

such that  $\tilde{X}_m(\phi(a)) = \tilde{X}_{-m,m}(a)$  and  ${}^i\tilde{X}_m(u, p) = \tilde{X}_m(u \cdot p)$ .

It remains to prove that  $\tilde{X}_m^i(s, a) = \tilde{X}_m(s \cdot a)$ . This easily follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_i(\dot{-}s)\{\tilde{X}_{im}(-a - b)\} &\text{ gives } \tilde{X}_m^i(s, a + b) = \tilde{X}_m^i(s, a)\tilde{X}_{-m,m}(\bar{b}\rho(s)a)\tilde{X}_m^i(s, b); \\ \tilde{X}_j(\dot{-}s)\tilde{X}_{im}(-p)\{\tilde{X}_{ji}(-a)\} &\text{ gives } \tilde{X}_m^j(s, ap) = \tilde{X}_m(s \cdot ap) \text{ for } i \neq \pm j. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 6.** *Suppose that  $\alpha = e_m - e_l$ . Then there is unique homomorphism  $\tilde{X}_{lm} : S_{lm} \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$  such that*

$$g = \tilde{X}_{lm}(\text{eval}(g))$$

for all  $g \in \tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$ .

*Proof.* First of all, there is a nontrivial element from the Weyl group  $W(\Phi)$  stabilizing  $\alpha$  and  $\Phi/\alpha$ , it exchanges  $\pm e_l$  with  $\mp e_m$ . It gives a duality between the generators of  $\tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, a) &\leftrightarrow {}^{-i}\tilde{X}_{lm}(\bar{a}, -\bar{p}), & \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-l}(s, a) &\leftrightarrow {}^{-m}\tilde{X}_{lm}(-\bar{a}, \dot{-}s), \\ \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s, u) &\leftrightarrow {}^\pi\tilde{X}_{lm}(\dot{-}u, s), & \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-m}(p, u) &\leftrightarrow {}^{-l}\tilde{X}_{lm}(\dot{-}u, -\bar{p}). \end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to prove only one half of the identities between the generators. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{i,-l}(q)\tilde{X}_{-l}(s)\tilde{X}_{li}(-p)\{\tilde{X}_m(\dot{-}u)\} &\text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s \dot{+} \phi(pq), u) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s, u); \\ \tilde{X}_{-m,i}(-p)\tilde{X}_{-l}(s)\{\tilde{X}_{im}(a)\} &\text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s, \phi(pa)) = 1; \end{aligned}$$

in particular,  $\tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s, \phi(a)) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(\phi(p), u) = 1$ . From this and lemma 4 we easily obtain that  $\tilde{X}_\alpha(S, \Theta)$  is abelian. Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{li}(p)\tilde{X}_{lj}(r)\tilde{X}_{ij}(q)\{\tilde{X}_{jm}(a)\} &\text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, qa)\tilde{X}_{lm}^j(r, a) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^j(pq + r, a) \text{ for } i \neq \pm j; \\ \tilde{X}_{li}(p)\{\tilde{X}_{im}(a + b)\} &\text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, a + b) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, a)\tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, b); \\ \tilde{X}_{-m,i}(-q)\tilde{X}_{li}(r)\tilde{X}_{l,-m}(p)\{\tilde{X}_{im}(a)\} &\text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-m}(-p, \phi(qa))\tilde{X}_{lm}^i(pq + r, a) = {}^{-i}\tilde{X}_{lm}(p\bar{a}, \bar{q})\tilde{X}_{lm}^i(r, a). \end{aligned}$$

The first identity is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, qa) &= \tilde{X}_{lm}^j(pq, a); & (B1) \\ \tilde{X}_{lm}^j(pq + r, a) &= \tilde{X}_{lm}^j(pq, a)\tilde{X}_{lm}^j(r, a) \end{aligned}$$

for  $i \neq \pm j$  and the third one is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{X}_{lm}^{-m}(-p, \phi(qa)) \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(pq, a) &= {}^{-i}\tilde{X}_{lm}(p\bar{a}, \bar{q}); \\ \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(pq + r, a) &= \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(pq, a) \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(r, a).\end{aligned}\tag{B2}$$

It follows that the maps  $\tilde{X}_{lm}^i(-, =)$  are biadditive.

Now we have

$$\tilde{X}_{-l, i}(p) \tilde{X}_{-l}(s) \{\tilde{X}_{im}(a)\} \text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-l}(s, pa) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(\rho(s)p, a); \tag{B3}$$

$$\tilde{X}_{li}(p) \tilde{X}_{-i}(s) \{\tilde{X}_{-i, m}(a)\} \text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, \rho(s)a) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-i}(p\rho(s), a); \tag{B4}$$

$$\tilde{X}_{i, -l}(q) \tilde{X}_{li}(-p) \{\tilde{X}_{-l, m}(a)\} \text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-l}(\phi(pq), a) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, qa) \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-i}(-\bar{q}, \bar{p}a); \tag{B5}$$

$$\tilde{X}_{-l}(s) \tilde{X}_i(t) \{\tilde{X}_{im}(-a)\} \text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s, t \cdot a) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(\overline{\pi(s)}\pi(t), a). \tag{B6}$$

Using (B6), we easily obtain

$$\tilde{X}_{i, -l}(-p) \tilde{X}_i(t) \{\tilde{X}_{-l, m}(a)\} \text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-l}(t \cdot p, a) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(\bar{p}\rho(t), pa). \tag{B7}$$

We are ready to construct a homomorphism  $\tilde{X}_{lm}$  such that  $\tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, a) = \tilde{X}_{lm}(pa)$  using lemma 1. If  $\ell \geq 4$ , then it exists by (B1). Otherwise  $H$  is firm and we may apply lemma 3 to

$$\{p \otimes q \otimes a\}_{ij} = \tilde{X}_{lm}^j(pq, a) \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, qa)^{-1}.$$

Namely, (B5) and (B7) imply (A2); (B3) and (B5) imply (A3); and (B5) implies (A4).

It remains to express the remaining generators via  $\tilde{X}_{lm}$ . For  $\tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi$ ,  $\tilde{X}_{lm}^{-l}$ , and  $\tilde{X}_{lm}^{-m}$  this follows from (B3), (B6),

$$\tilde{X}_{-l}(s) \{\tilde{X}_m(\dot{-}u \dot{-} v)\} \text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s, v \dot{+} u) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s, u) \tilde{X}_{lm}^\pi(s, v);$$

$$\tilde{X}_{-l}(s) \{\tilde{X}_{-l, m}(a + b)\} \text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-l}(s, a + b) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-l}(s, a) \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-l}(s, b);$$

$$\tilde{X}_{li}(p) \tilde{X}_{i, -m}(-r) \tilde{X}_{i, -m}(-q) \{\tilde{X}_m(\dot{-}u)\} \text{ gives } \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-m}(pq + r, u) = \tilde{X}_{lm}^i(p, q\rho(u)) \tilde{X}_{lm}^{-m}(r, u).$$

The dual generators may be expressed via  $\tilde{X}_{lm}$  using (B2).  $\square$

The elements  $\tilde{X}_\alpha(\mu)$  constructed by lemmas 5 and 6 satisfy all the missing Steinberg relations in  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$ . Also,

$$\tilde{X}_\alpha(\mu) g \tilde{X}_\alpha(\mu)^{-1} = T_\alpha(\mu)g \tag{*}$$

for any  $g$ , this is easy to check for  $g = Z_\beta(\lambda, \nu)$  expressing  $\tilde{X}_\alpha(\mu)$  via  $Z_\gamma(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ , where  $\gamma$  and  $\beta$  are linearly independent.

## 7 Presentation of relative odd unitary Steinberg groups

We are ready to construct a conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H$  on  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$ . For a special closed subset  $\Sigma \subseteq \Phi/\alpha$  and  $g \in \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Sigma)$  let

$$\begin{aligned} {}^g\{\tilde{X}_\beta(\mu)\}_{\pi_\alpha^{-1}(\Sigma)} &= {}^g\{\tilde{X}_{\pi_\alpha(\beta)}(\mu)\} \text{ for } \beta \notin \mathbb{R}\alpha; \\ {}^g\{\tilde{X}_\beta(\mu)\}_{\pi_\alpha^{-1}(\Sigma)} &= [g, T_\beta(\mu)] \tilde{X}_\beta(\mu) \text{ for } \beta \in \mathbb{R}\alpha \end{aligned}$$

be the elements of  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$ , where  $T_\beta(\mu)$  naturally acts on  $\text{StU}(S \rtimes R, \Theta \rtimes \Delta; \Sigma)$ .

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  be linearly independent roots of  $\Phi$  such that  $\alpha$  lies in the relative interior of the angle spanned by  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ . Then*

$${}^{gX_\beta(\mu)}\{X_\gamma(\nu)\}_{\pi_\alpha(\beta)} = \prod_{\substack{i\beta+j\gamma \in \Phi; \\ i \geq 0, j > 0}} {}^g\{X_{i\alpha+j\beta}(f_{\alpha\beta ij}(\mu, \nu))\}_{\pi_\alpha(\beta)}$$

for all  $g \in \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \pi_\alpha(\beta))$  and some order of the factors in the right hand side.

*Proof.* We evaluate the expressions

$$\begin{aligned} &X_{lj(p)} X_{li(q)} X_{mi(q')} X_{ji(r)} \{\tilde{X}_{im}(a)\} \text{ for } \alpha = e_m - e_i; \\ &X_{i,-l(p)} X_{-m(s)} X_{-l,m(q)} X_{-l(s')} X_{mi(r)} X_{li(r')} X_i(t) \{\tilde{X}_m(u)\} \text{ for } \alpha = e_m - e_i; \\ &X_{-m,j(p)} X_j(s) X_{-i,j(q)} X_{-m,i(r)} X_i(t) X_{mi(r')} X_{ji()} \{\tilde{X}_{im}(u)\} \text{ for } \alpha = e_m; \\ &X_{li(p)} X_{-m(s)} X_{-l,m(q)} X_{-l(s')} X_{i,-l(r)} \{\tilde{X}_{-l,m}(a)\} \text{ for } \alpha = e_m - e_i; \end{aligned}$$

in two ways as products of the elements  $\tilde{X}_\beta$  and the terms from the statement assuming that the indices and their opposites are distinct and non-zero. During the calculations we put the factors  $\tilde{X}_{im}(a)$ ,  $\tilde{X}_m(u)$ ,  $\tilde{X}_{-l,m}(a)$  inside the curly brackets in the rightmost position. In this way we obtain the cases of the required identity modulo an element from  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Sigma')$  for a special closed subset  $\Sigma'$ , but such an element must be trivial by considering the images in  $\text{U}(S, \Theta)$ .

The remaining two cases follow from

$$\begin{aligned} X_l(u) X_{-m,t(q)} X_m(v) \{\tilde{X}_{l,-m}(a)\} &\equiv X_{im(p)} X_l(u) X_{-m,t(q)} X_m(v) X_l(w) \{\tilde{X}_{l,-m}(a)\} \\ &= X_l(u) X_{-m,t(q)} X_m(v \dot{+} w \cdot (-p)) X_{-i,m(-\rho(w)p)} X_i(w) \{\tilde{X}_{l,-i}(a\bar{p}) \tilde{X}_{l,-m}(a)\} \\ &= X_{-i,m(-\rho(w)p)} X_l(u) X_{-m,t(q)} X_m(v \dot{+} w \cdot (-p)) \{\tilde{X}_{l,-i}(a\bar{p}) \tilde{X}_{-l}(w \cdot (-p\bar{a})) \tilde{X}_{li}(-a\bar{p}\overline{\rho(w)})\} \\ &\cdot X_l(u) X_{-m,t(q)} X_m(v \dot{+} w \cdot (-p)) \{\tilde{X}_{li}(-a\bar{p}\overline{\rho(w)}) \tilde{X}_{l,-m}(a)\} \\ &\equiv X_l(u) X_{-m,t(q)} X_m(v \dot{+} w \cdot (-p)) \{\tilde{X}_{-l}(w \cdot (-p\bar{a})) \tilde{X}_{l,-m}(a)\} \end{aligned}$$

in  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta; \langle e_l - e_i, -e_i - e_l, e_m - e_l, e_m + e_l \rangle) \backslash \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$  for  $\alpha = e_m - e_l$  and

$$\begin{aligned} X_{mi(p)} X_i(u) X_{-m,i(q)} \{ \tilde{X}_{-i}(v) \} &\equiv X_{mi(p)} X_i(u) X_{-m,i(q)} X_{ji(s)} X_{-m,j(r)} \{ \tilde{X}_{-i}(v) \} \\ &= X_{mi(p)} X_i(u) X_{-m,i(q-rs)} X_{-m,j(r)} \{ \tilde{X}_{-i}(v) \tilde{X}_{i,-j}(-\rho(v)\bar{s}) \tilde{X}_{-j}(v \cdot \bar{s}) \} \\ &\equiv X_{mi(p)} X_i(u) X_{-m,i(q-rs)} \{ \tilde{X}_{-i}(v) \tilde{X}_{im}(-\rho(v)\bar{s}\bar{r}) \} \end{aligned}$$

in  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha) / \text{StU}(S, \Theta; \langle -e_j - e_i, -e_m - e_j, e_i, e_m \rangle)$  for  $\alpha = e_m$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $\delta: (S, \Theta) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$  be a crossed module of odd form rings, where  $(R, \Delta)$  has an orthogonal hyperbolic family of rank  $\ell$ . Suppose that*

- either  $\ell \geq 4$ ,
- or  $\ell = 3$  and the orthogonal hyperbolic family is strong.

Then  $F_\alpha: \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha) \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi)$  is an isomorphism for any  $\alpha \in \Phi$ .

*Proof.* We construct the inverse homomorphism  $G_\alpha$  by providing a conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H$  on  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$ . Let us construct the maps  $(g, h) \mapsto {}^g\{h\}_\Sigma$  by induction on  $\Sigma$  ordered by inclusion. If  $\Sigma = \emptyset$ , then the required homomorphism  $\text{StU}(S, \Theta; \Phi) \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$  exists by lemmas 5 and 6. Below we use the conjugacy calculus on  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$  and the already known properties of  $\tilde{X}_\alpha(\mu)$  without explicit references.

If  $\Sigma$  does not intersect  $\mathbb{R}\alpha$ , then we already have the map if  $h$  is a root element. In the subcase of the two-dimensional  $\langle \alpha, \Sigma \rangle$  the maps  ${}^g\{-\}_\Sigma$  are homomorphisms by lemma 7 and the easy observation

$$\begin{aligned} {}^g\{\tilde{X}_\alpha(\mu)\}_{\pi_\alpha^{-1}(\langle -\beta \rangle)} {}^g\{F_\alpha(\tilde{X}_\beta(\nu))\}_{\pi_\alpha^{-1}(\langle -\beta \rangle)} {}^g\{\tilde{X}_\alpha(\mu)\}_{\pi_\alpha^{-1}(\langle -\beta \rangle)}^{-1} &= [g, X_\alpha(\delta(\mu))]^{T_\alpha(\mu)} {}^g\{F_\alpha(\tilde{X}_\beta(T_\alpha(\mu)\nu))\}_{\pi_\alpha^{-1}(\langle -\beta \rangle)} \\ &= {}^g\{F_\alpha(\tilde{X}_\beta(T_\alpha(\mu)\nu))\}_{\pi_\alpha^{-1}(\langle -\beta \rangle)} \end{aligned}$$

for  $\beta \in \Phi/\alpha$ . They also satisfy (Chev) by lemma 7. In general we prove (Hom) and (Chev) by an easy induction, since we always may apply (Chev) to some extreme root of  $\Sigma$ .

Now suppose that  $\alpha$  is an extreme root of  $\Sigma$ . We define the map  $(-)\{=\}_\Sigma$  by

$$X_\alpha(\mu)g\{h\}_\Sigma = T_\alpha(\mu)({}^g\{h\}_{\Sigma \setminus \langle \alpha \rangle})$$

for  $g \in \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Sigma \setminus \langle \alpha \rangle)$ . It clearly satisfies (Hom) and (Chev).

Finally, we show that there is unique  $(-)\{=\}_\Sigma$  by induction on the smallest face  $\Gamma$  of  $\mathbb{R}_+\Sigma$  containing  $\alpha$ . The cases where such a face has the dimension 0 or 1 are already known. In order to construct  $(-)\{\tilde{X}_\beta(\lambda)\}_\Sigma$  we take an extreme root  $\gamma \in \Gamma \cap \Sigma$  not antiparallel to  $\beta$  and let

$${}^g X_\gamma(\mu) \{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\lambda) \}_\Sigma = {}^g \left\{ \prod_{\substack{i\gamma + j\beta \in \Phi \\ i > 0, j \geq 0}} \tilde{X}_{i\gamma + j\beta}(f_{\gamma\beta ij}(\mu, \lambda)) \right\}_{\Sigma \setminus \langle \gamma \rangle}$$

for  $g \in \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Sigma \setminus \langle \gamma \rangle)$ . It is clearly independent on  $\gamma$  unless  $\Gamma$  is two-dimensional and both  $\alpha$  and  $-\beta$  lie in its relative interior. In this case let  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  be the extreme roots of  $\Sigma$  and  $\tilde{X}_\beta(\lambda) = \prod_t^{X_\delta(\kappa_t)} \{\tilde{X}_{\varepsilon_t}(\lambda_t)\}$  be a decomposition for some root  $\delta$  not in  $\mathbb{R}\Sigma$ . We may choose such a decomposition with the additional property that  $\langle \Sigma, \delta \rangle$  is special with the face  $\Gamma$ . Abusing the notation, for any  $g \in \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Sigma \setminus (\langle \gamma_1 \rangle \cup \langle \gamma_2 \rangle))$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} g^{X_{\gamma_1}(\mu)} \{ \tilde{X}_{\gamma_2}(\nu) \tilde{X}_\beta(\lambda) \}_{\Sigma \setminus \langle \gamma_2 \rangle} &= \prod_t g^{X_{\gamma_1}(\mu) X_{\gamma_2}(\nu) X_\delta(\kappa_t)} \{ \tilde{X}_{\gamma_2}(\nu) \tilde{X}_{\varepsilon_t}(\lambda_t) \}_{\langle \Sigma, \delta \rangle \setminus \langle \gamma_2 \rangle} \\ &= \prod_t g^{X_{\gamma_1}(\mu) X_{\gamma_2}(\nu) X_\delta(\kappa_t)} \{ \tilde{X}_{\gamma_1}(\mu) \tilde{X}_{\gamma_2}(\nu) \tilde{X}_{\varepsilon_t}(\lambda_t) \}_{\langle \Sigma, \delta \rangle \setminus \langle \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \rangle} \\ &= \prod_t g^{[X_{\gamma_1}(\mu), X_{\gamma_2}(\nu)] X_{\gamma_2}(\nu) X_{\gamma_1}(\mu) X_\delta(\kappa_t)} \{ \tilde{X}_{\gamma_1}(\mu) \tilde{X}_{\varepsilon_t}(\lambda_t) \}_{\langle \Sigma, \delta \rangle \setminus \langle \gamma_1 \rangle} \\ &= g^{[X_{\gamma_1}(\mu), X_{\gamma_2}(\nu)] X_{\gamma_2}(\nu)} \{ \tilde{X}_{\gamma_1}(\mu) \tilde{X}_\beta(\lambda) \}_{\Sigma \setminus \langle \gamma_1 \rangle}, \end{aligned}$$

so the maps  $(-)\{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\lambda) \}_\Sigma$  are well-defined.

If the dimension of  $\Gamma$  is at least 3, then it is easy to see that  $(-)\{ = \}_\Sigma$  satisfy (Hom) and (Chev). Now suppose that  $\Gamma$  is two-dimensional. Clearly,  $g\{-\}_\Sigma$  preserve the Steinberg relations for  $[\tilde{X}_\beta(\mu), \tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu)]$  if at least one of  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$  does not lie in  $\mathbb{R}\Gamma$ . It follows that (Chev) holds in the form

$$g^{X_\beta(\mu)} \{ X_\gamma(\nu) \}_\Sigma = \prod_{\substack{i\beta+j\gamma \in \Phi \\ i>0, j \geq 0}} g \{ X_{i\beta+j\gamma}(f_{\beta\gamma ij}(\mu, \nu)) \}_\Sigma$$

for  $\beta \in \Sigma \setminus \mathbb{R}\Gamma$ . We prove that  $g\{-\}_\Sigma$  preserves the remaining Steinberg relations for  $[\tilde{X}_\beta(\mu), \tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu)]$  with  $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}\Gamma$  by induction on the angle between  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ , the case of parallel roots is trivial. Let again  $\tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu) = \prod_t^{X_\delta(\kappa_t)} \{\tilde{X}_{\varepsilon_t}(\lambda_t)\}$  be a decomposition for a root  $\delta$  not in  $\mathbb{R}\Sigma$ . Applying (Chev), we may also assume that  $\Sigma \subseteq \Gamma$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} g\{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\mu) \}_\Sigma \{ g\{ \tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu) \}_\Sigma \} &= \prod_t g\{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\mu) \}_\Sigma \{ g^{X_\delta(\kappa_t)} \{ \tilde{X}_{\varepsilon_t}(\lambda_t) \}_{\langle \Sigma, \delta \rangle} \} \\ &= \prod_t g^{X_\delta(\kappa_t)} \{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\mu) \tilde{X}_\delta(\kappa_t)^{-1} \tilde{X}_\beta(\mu) \tilde{X}_\delta(\kappa_t) \tilde{X}_{\varepsilon_t}(\lambda_t) \}_{\langle \Sigma, \delta \rangle} \\ &= \prod_t g\{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\mu) \tilde{X}_\delta(\kappa_t) \tilde{X}_{\varepsilon_t}(\lambda_t) \}_{\langle \Sigma, \delta \rangle} = g\{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\mu) \tilde{X}_\gamma(\nu) \}_\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Now it is easy to see that  $(-)\{ = \}_\Sigma$  satisfy all the cases of (Hom), (Sub), and (Chev). Let us show that they satisfy (XMod) in the form

$$\tilde{X}_\gamma(\mu) g\{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\nu) \}_\Sigma \tilde{X}_\gamma(\mu)^{-1} = X_\gamma(\delta(\mu)) g\{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\nu) \}_\Sigma$$

by induction on  $\Sigma$ . If there is an extreme root  $\gamma \neq \delta \in \Sigma$  non-antiparallel to  $\beta$ , then we use (Chev) and the induction hypothesis. If  $\Sigma = \langle \gamma \rangle$ , then the

identity follows from the definitions. Finally, suppose that  $\Sigma = \langle \gamma, -\beta \rangle$  is two-dimensional. Then

$$\tilde{X}_\gamma(\mu) {}^g\{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\nu) \}_\Sigma \tilde{X}_\gamma(\mu)^{-1} = \tilde{X}_\gamma(\mu) {}^g\{ \tilde{X}_\gamma(\mu) \}_\Sigma^{-1} ({}^g\{ \tilde{X}_\gamma(\mu) \tilde{X}_\beta(\nu) \}_\Sigma) = X_\gamma(\delta(\mu)) {}^g\{ \tilde{X}_\beta(\nu) \}_\Sigma$$

for any  $g \in \text{StU}(R, \Delta; \Sigma \setminus \langle \gamma \rangle)$  by (Chev) and the induction hypothesis.

It remains to check (Conj) in the form

$$\tilde{Z}_\beta(\mu, \nu) {}^{F_\beta(g)}\{ F_\beta(h) \}_{\pi_\beta^{-1}(\Sigma)} \tilde{Z}_\beta(\mu, \nu)^{-1} = {}^{F_\beta(fg)}\{ F_\beta(fh) \}_{\pi_\beta^{-1}(\Sigma)}$$

for  $f = Z_\beta(\mu, \nu) \in \text{U}(S, \Theta)$ . This is easy for  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}\alpha$ , so we may assume that  $\beta$  and  $\alpha$  are linearly independent. Then

$$\tilde{Z}_\beta(\mu, \nu) {}^{F_{\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle}(g')}\{ F_{\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle}(h') \} \tilde{Z}_\beta(\mu, \nu)^{-1} = {}^{F_{\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle}(fg')}\{ F_{\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle}(fh') \}$$

by (Conj) applied to the conjugacy calculus with respect to  $H/\alpha$  and any  ${}^{F_\beta(g)}\{ F_\beta(h) \}$  may be expressed in terms of  ${}^{F_{\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle}(g')}\{ F_{\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle}(h') \}$ .

Now we have group homomorphisms  $F_\alpha$  and  $G_\alpha$ . By proposition 2 the map  $F_\alpha$  is surjective and by construction  $G_\alpha \circ F_\alpha$  is the identity, so they are mutually inverse.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\delta: (S, \Theta) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$  be a crossed modules of odd form rings, where  $(R, \Delta)$  has an orthogonal hyperbolic family of rank  $\ell$ . Suppose that*

- either  $\ell \geq 4$ ,
- or  $\ell = 3$  and the orthogonal hyperbolic family is strong.

*Then  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta) \rightarrow \text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta)$  is an isomorphism. In particular, the relative Steinberg group has the explicit presentation from proposition 1. Moreover, under the assumption  $\ell \geq 3$  this homomorphism is surjective.*

*Proof.* First of all we prove the surjectivity of

$$u: \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta) \rightarrow \text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta)$$

for  $\ell \geq 3$  and of

$$\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha) \rightarrow \text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$$

for any root  $\alpha$  and  $\ell \geq 3$  under the additional assumption that the orthogonal hyperbolic family is strong or  $\alpha$  is ultrashort. It suffices to check that the image is invariant under the action of the corresponding absolute Steinberg group. But it is invariant under the action of any fixed generator by proposition 2.

Now we assume that  $\ell \geq 4$  or  $\ell = 3$  and the orthogonal hyperbolic family is strong. Let us construct an action of  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta)$  on  $G = \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta)$ . For any  $\alpha \in \Phi$  an element  $X_\alpha(\mu)$  gives the canonical automorphism of  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\alpha)$ , so by theorem 1 it gives an automorphism of  $G$ . We have to check that these automorphisms satisfy the Steinberg relations. Clearly,  $X_\alpha(\mu \dot{+} \nu)$  gives the



composition of the automorphisms associated with  $X_\alpha(\mu)$  and  $X_\alpha(\nu)$ . If  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are linearly independent roots, then the automorphisms induced by the formal products  $[X_\alpha(\mu), X_\beta(\nu)]$  and  $\prod_{\substack{i\alpha+j\beta \in \Phi \\ i,j > 0}} X_{i\alpha+j\beta}(f_{\alpha\beta ij}(\mu, \nu))$  coincide on the image of  $\overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta; \Phi/\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle)$ , so it remains to apply proposition 2.

Now it is easy to construct an  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta)$ -equivariant homomorphism

$$v: \text{StU}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta) \rightarrow \overline{\text{StU}}(R, \Delta; S, \Theta), X_\alpha(\mu) \mapsto X_\alpha(\mu).$$

We already know that  $u$  is surjective and clearly  $v \circ u$  is the identity, so  $u$  is an isomorphism.  $\square$

## 8 Doubly laced Steinberg groups

In this and the next section  $\Phi$  is one of the root systems  $\mathbb{B}_\ell, \mathbb{C}_\ell, \mathbb{F}_4$ . In order to define relative Steinberg groups of type  $\Phi$  over commutative rings with respect to Abe's admissible pairs, it is useful to consider Steinberg groups of type  $\Phi$  over pairs  $(K, L)$ , where  $K$  parametrizes the short root elements and  $L$  parametrizes the long root ones.

Let us say that  $(K, L)$  is a *pair of type B* if

- $L$  is a unital commutative ring,  $K$  is an  $L$ -module;
- there is a classical quadratic form  $s: K \rightarrow L$ , i.e.  $s(kl) = s(k)l^2$  and the expression  $s(k | k') = s(k + k') - s(k) - s(k')$  is  $L$ -bilinear.

Next,  $(K, L)$  is a *pair of type C* if

- $K$  is a unital commutative ring;
- $L$  is an abelian group;
- there are additive maps  $d: K \rightarrow L$  and  $u: L \rightarrow K$ ;
- there is a map  $L \times K \rightarrow L$ ,  $(l, k) \mapsto l \cdot k$ ;
- $(l + l') \cdot k = l \cdot k + l' \cdot k$ ,  $l \cdot (k + k') = l \cdot k + d(kk'u(l)) + l \cdot k'$ ;
- $u(d(k)) = 2k$ ,  $u(l \cdot k) = u(l)k^2$ ,  $d(u(l)) = 2l$ ,  $d(k) \cdot k' = d(kk'^2)$ ;
- $l \cdot 1 = l$ ,  $(l \cdot k) \cdot k' = l \cdot kk'$ .

Finally,  $(K, L)$  is a *pair of type F* if

- $K$  and  $L$  are unital commutative rings;
- there is a unital ring homomorphism  $u: L \rightarrow K$ ;
- there are maps  $d: K \rightarrow L$  and  $s: K \rightarrow L$ ;
- $d(k + k') = d(k) + d(k')$ ,  $d(u(l)) = 2l$ ,  $u(d(k)) = 2k$ ,  $d(ku(l)) = d(k)l$ ;

- $s(k+k') = s(k) + d(kk') + s(k')$ ,  $s(kk') = s(k)s(k')$ ,  $s(u(l)) = l^2$ ,  $u(s(k)) = k^2$ .

If  $(K, L)$  is a pair of type C or F, we have a map  $K \times L \rightarrow K$ ,  $(k, l) \mapsto kl = ku(l)$ . If  $(K, L)$  is a pair of type B or F, then there is a map  $(L, K) \rightarrow L$ ,  $(l, k) \mapsto l \cdot k = ls(k)$ . Using these additional operations, any pair  $(K, L)$  of type F is also a pair of both types B and C. For any unital commutative ring  $K$  the pair  $(K, K)$  with  $u(k) = k$ ,  $d(k) = 2k$ ,  $s(k) = k^2$  is of type F.

The *Steinberg group* of type  $\Phi$  over a pair  $(K, L)$  of the corresponding type is the abstract group  $\text{St}(\Phi; K, L)$  with the generators  $x_\alpha(k)$  for short  $\alpha \in \Phi$ ,  $k \in K$ ;  $x_\beta(l)$  for long  $\beta \in \Phi$ ,  $l \in L$ ; and the relations

$$\begin{aligned} x_\alpha(p) x_\alpha(q) &= x_\alpha(p+q); \\ [x_\alpha(p), x_\beta(q)] &= 1 \text{ if } \alpha + \beta \notin \Phi \cup \{0\}; \\ [x_\alpha(p), x_\beta(q)] &= x_{\alpha+\beta}(N_{\alpha\beta}pq) \text{ if } \alpha + \beta \in \Phi \text{ and } |\alpha| = |\beta| = |\alpha + \beta|; \\ [x_\alpha(p), x_\beta(q)] &= x_{\alpha+\beta}\left(\frac{N_{\alpha\beta}}{2}s(p|q)\right) \text{ if } \alpha + \beta \in \Phi \text{ and } |\alpha| = |\beta| < |\alpha + \beta|; \\ [x_\alpha(p), x_\beta(q)] &= x_{\alpha+\beta}(N_{\alpha\beta}pq) x_{2\alpha+\beta}(N_{\alpha\beta}^{21}q \cdot p) \text{ if } \alpha + \beta, 2\alpha + \beta \in \Phi; \\ [x_\alpha(p), x_\beta(q)] &= x_{\alpha+\beta}(N_{\alpha\beta}qp) x_{\alpha+2\beta}(N_{\alpha\beta}^{12}p \cdot q) \text{ if } \alpha + \beta, \alpha + 2\beta \in \Phi. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $N_{\alpha\beta}$ ,  $N_{\alpha\beta}^{21}$ ,  $N_{\alpha\beta}^{12}$  are the structure constants. In the case of the pair  $(K, K)$  there is a canonical homomorphism  $\text{st}: \text{St}(\Phi, K) = \text{St}(\Phi; K, K) \rightarrow \text{G}^{\text{sc}}(\Phi, K)$  to the simply connected Chevalley group over  $K$  of type  $\Phi$ .

In order to apply the results on odd unitary groups, we need a construction of odd form rings by pairs of types B and C. If  $(K, L)$  is a pair of type B and  $\ell \geq 0$ , then we consider the special odd form ring  $(R, \Delta) = \text{AO}(2\ell + 1; K, L)$

- $R = (K \otimes_L K)e_{00} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i| \leq \ell} (Ke_{i0} \oplus Ke_{0i}) \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell} Le_{ij}$ ;
- $\overline{xe_{ij}} = xe_{-j, -i}$  for  $i \neq 0$  or  $j \neq 0$ ,  $\overline{(x \otimes y)e_{00}} = (y \otimes x)e_{00}$ ;
- $(xe_{ij})(ye_{kl}) = 0$  for  $j \neq k$ ;
- $(xe_{ij})(ye_{jk}) = xye_{ik}$  for  $j \neq 0$  if at least one of  $i$  and  $k$  is non-zero;
- $(xe_{0j})(ye_{j0}) = (x \otimes y)e_{00}$  for  $j \neq 0$ ;
- $(xe_{i0})(ye_{0j}) = s(x|y)e_{ij}$  for  $i, j \neq 0$ ;
- $(xe_{i0})((y \otimes z)e_{00}) = s(x|y)ze_{i0}$  for  $i \neq 0$ ;
- $((x \otimes y)e_{00})((z \otimes w)e_{00}) = (x \otimes s(y|z)w)e_{00}$ ;
- $\Delta$  is the subgroup of  $\text{Heis}(R)$  generated by  $\phi(S)$ ,  $((x \otimes y)e_{00}, -(s(x)y \otimes y)e_{00})$ ,  $(xe_{0i}, -s(x)e_{-i,i})$ ,  $(xe_{i0}, 0)$ , and  $(xe_{ij}, 0)$ .

Clearly,  $(R, \Delta)$  had a strong orthogonal hyperbolic family of rank  $\ell$  and the corresponding odd unitary Steinberg group is naturally isomorphic to  $\text{St}(\mathbf{B}_\ell; K, L)$ . The Steinberg relations in  $\text{St}(\mathbf{B}_\ell; K, L)$  and  $\text{StU}(R, \Delta)$  are the same since  $\text{AO}(2\ell +$

$1, K, K$ ) has the unitary group  $\mathrm{SO}(2\ell+1, K) \times (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})(K)$  by [16] for every unital commutative ring  $K$ . Of course,  $\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{B}_\ell; K, L)$  may also be constructed by the module  $L^\ell \oplus K \oplus L^\ell$  with the quadratic form  $q(x_{-\ell}, \dots, x_{-1}, k, x_1, \dots, x_\ell) = \sum_{i=1}^\ell x_{-i}x_i + s(k)$ , but the corresponding odd form ring and the orthogonal group are not functorial on  $(K, L)$ .

If  $(K, L)$  is a pair of the type C, then let  $(R, \Delta) = \mathrm{ASp}(2\ell; K, L)$ , where

- $R = \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell} Ke_{ij}$ ;
- $\overline{xe_{ij}} = \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j x e_{-j, -i}$ ,  $(xe_{ij})(ye_{kl}) = 0$  for  $j \neq k$ ,  $(xe_{ij})(ye_{jl}) = xye_{il}$ ;
- $\Delta = \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell; i+j > 0} \phi(Ke_{ij}) \dot{\oplus} \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i| \leq \ell} Lv_i \dot{\oplus} \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell} q_i \cdot Ke_{ij}$ ;
- $xv_i \dot{+} yv_i = (x+y)v_i$ ,  $q_i \cdot xe_{ij} \dot{+} q_i \cdot ye_{ij} = q_i \cdot (x+y)e_{ij}$ ;
- $\phi(xe_{-i, i}) = d(x)v_i$ ,  $\pi(xv_i) = 0$ ,  $\rho(xv_i) = u(x)e_{-i, i}$ ;
- $(xv_i) \cdot (ye_{jk}) = \dot{0}$  for  $i \neq j$ ,  $(xv_i) \cdot (ye_{ik}) = \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_k (x \cdot y)v_k$ ;
- $\pi(q_i \cdot xe_{ij}) = xe_{ij}$ ,  $\rho(q_i \cdot xe_{ij}) = 0$ ;
- $(q_i \cdot xe_{ij}) \cdot (ye_{kl}) = \dot{0}$  for  $j \neq k$ ,  $(q_i \cdot xe_{ij}) \cdot (ye_{jk}) = q_i \cdot xye_{ik}$ ;

Again,  $(R, \Delta)$  had a strong orthogonal hyperbolic family of rank  $\ell$  and its odd unitary Steinberg group is naturally isomorphic to  $\mathrm{St}(\mathcal{C}_\ell; K, L)$ . The Steinberg relations in these two Steinberg groups coincide since  $\mathrm{ASp}(2\ell; K, K)$  is the odd form ring constructed by the split symplectic module over  $K$  for any unital commutative ring  $K$ , so its unitary group is  $\mathrm{Sp}(2\ell, K)$ .

We do not construct an analogue of  $\mathrm{G}(\mathrm{F}_4, K)$  for pairs of type F and do not prove that the product map

$$\prod_{\text{short } \alpha \in \Pi} K \times \prod_{\text{long } \beta \in \Pi} L \rightarrow \mathrm{St}(\mathrm{F}_4; K, L), (x_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Pi} \mapsto \prod_{\alpha \in \Pi} X_\alpha(p_\alpha)$$

is injective for a system of positive roots  $\Pi \subseteq \Phi$ . Such claims are not required in the proof of our main result.

## 9 Relative doubly laced Steinberg groups

In the simply-laced case [15] relative Steinberg groups are parametrized by the root system and a *crossed module of commutative rings*  $\delta: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow K$ , where  $K$  is a unital commutative ring,  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a  $K$ -module,  $\delta$  is a homomorphism of  $K$ -modules, and  $a\delta(a') = \delta(a)a'$  for all  $a, a' \in K$ . In the doubly-laced case we may construct semi-abelian categories of pairs of all three types by omitting the unitality conditions in the definitions, but in this approach we have to add the condition that the action in the definition of a crossed module is unital.

Instead we say that  $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$  is a *precrossed module* over a pair  $(K, L)$  of a given type if there is a reflexive graph  $((K, L), (K', L'), p_1, p_2, d)$  in the category

of pairs of the given type, where  $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = \text{Ker}(p_2)$ . This may be written as explicit family of operations between the sets  $\mathfrak{a}$ ,  $\mathfrak{b}$ ,  $K$ ,  $L$  satisfying certain axioms, in particular,  $\delta: (\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow (K, L)$  is a pair of homomorphisms of abelian groups induced by  $p_1$ . A precrossed module  $\delta: (\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow (K, L)$  is called a *crossed module* if the corresponding reflexive graph has a structure of internal category (necessarily unique), this may be described as additional axioms on the operations (an analogue of Peiffer identities). It is easy to see that crossed submodules of  $\text{id}: (K, L) \rightarrow (K, L)$  are precisely Abe's admissible pairs.

For crossed module  $\delta: (\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow (K, L)$  of pairs of a given type the *relative Steinberg group* is

$$\text{St}(\Phi; K, L; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = \text{Ker}(p_{2*}) / [\text{Ker}(p_{1*}), \text{Ker}(p_{2*})],$$

where  $p_{i*}: \text{St}(\Phi; \mathfrak{a} \times K, \mathfrak{b} \times L) \rightarrow \text{St}(\Phi; K, L)$  are the induced homomorphisms. As in the odd unitary case and the simply laced case, this is the crossed module over  $\text{St}(\Phi; K, L)$  with the generators  $x_\alpha(a)$  for short  $\alpha \in \Phi$ ,  $a \in \mathfrak{a}$  and  $x_\beta(b)$  for long  $\beta \in \Phi$ ,  $b \in \mathfrak{b}$  satisfying the Steinberg relations,  $\delta(x_\alpha(a)) = x_\alpha(\delta(a))$  for any root  $\alpha$  and  $a \in \mathfrak{a} \cup \mathfrak{b}$ , and

$$x_\alpha(p)x_\beta(a) = \prod_{\substack{i\alpha+j\beta \in \Phi \\ i,j > 0}} x_{i\alpha+j\beta}(f_{\alpha\beta ij}(p, a))$$

for  $\alpha \neq -\beta$ ,  $p \in K \cup L$ ,  $a \in \mathfrak{a} \cup \mathfrak{b}$ .

If  $\delta: (\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow (K, L)$  is a crossed modules of pairs of type C and  $\ell \geq 0$ , then  $\delta: \text{ASp}(\ell; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow \text{ASp}(\ell; K, L)$  is a crossed module of odd form rings, where

$$\text{ASp}(\ell; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = \text{Ker}(p_2: \text{ASp}(\ell; \mathfrak{a} \times K, \mathfrak{b} \times L) \rightarrow \text{ASp}(\ell; K, L)).$$

Clearly,

$$\text{ASp}(\ell; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = \left( \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell} \mathfrak{a}e_{ij}, \bigoplus_{\substack{1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell \\ i+j > 0}} \phi(\mathfrak{a}e_{ij}) \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i| \leq \ell} \mathfrak{b}v_i \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell} q_i \cdot \mathfrak{a}e_{ij} \right),$$

so we may apply theorem 2 for Chevalley groups of type  $C_\ell$ .

For pairs of type B the construction  $\text{AO}(2\ell+1; -, =)$  does not preserve fiber products, so we have to modify it a bit. Take a crossed module  $\delta: (\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow (K, L)$  of pairs of type B and consider the odd form rings  $(T, \Xi) = \text{AO}(2\ell+1; \mathfrak{a} \times K, \mathfrak{b} \times L)$ ,  $(R, \Delta) = \text{AO}(2\ell+1; K, L)$  forming a reflexive graph. Let  $(\tilde{T}, \tilde{\Xi})$  be the special odd form factor ring of  $(T, \Xi)$  by the odd form ideal  $(I, \Gamma)$ , where  $I \leq T$  is the subgroup generated by  $(a \otimes a' - a \otimes \delta(a'))e_{00}$  and  $(a \otimes a' - \delta(a) \otimes a')e_{00}$  for  $a, a' \in \mathfrak{a}$ . It is easy to check that  $I$  is an involution invariant ideal of  $T$ , so  $(\tilde{T}, \tilde{\Xi})$  is well-defined, and the homomorphisms  $p_i: (T, \Xi) \rightarrow (R, \Delta)$  factor through  $(\tilde{T}, \tilde{\Xi})$ . Moreover, the precrossed module  $(S, \Theta) = \text{Ker}(p_2: (\tilde{T}, \tilde{\Xi}) \rightarrow (R, \Delta))$  over  $(R, \Delta)$  satisfies the Peiffer relations and

$$S = Xe_{00} \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i| \leq \ell} (\mathfrak{a}e_{i0} \oplus \mathfrak{a}e_{0i}) \oplus \bigoplus_{1 \leq |i|, |j| \leq \ell} \mathfrak{b}e_{ij}$$

for some group  $X$ , so we may also apply theorem 2 for Chevalley groups of type  $B_\ell$ .

If  $\alpha, \beta, \alpha - \beta$  are short roots, then  $V_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$  denotes the abelian group  $\mathfrak{a}e_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{a}e_\beta$ . The groups  $X_{\alpha-\beta}(K)$  and  $X_{\beta-\alpha}(K)$  naturally act on  $V_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$  in such a way that the homomorphism

$$V_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow \text{St}(\Phi; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}), xe_\alpha \oplus ye_\beta \mapsto X_\alpha(x) X_\beta(y)$$

is equivariant (in the case of  $F_4$  we consider  $X_{\pm(\alpha-\beta)}(K)$  as abstract groups, not as their images in the Steinberg group). Similarly, if  $\alpha, \beta, \alpha - \beta$  are long roots, then  $V_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = \mathfrak{b}e_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{b}e_\beta$  is a representation of  $X_{\alpha-\beta}(L)$  and  $X_{\beta-\alpha}(L)$ . If  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are long and  $(\alpha + \beta)/2$  is short, then  $V_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = \mathfrak{b}e_\alpha \oplus \mathfrak{a}e_{(\alpha+\beta)/2} \oplus \mathfrak{b}e_\beta$  is a representation of  $X_{(\alpha-\beta)/2}(K)$  and  $X_{(\beta-\alpha)/2}(K)$ . Finally, if  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are short and  $\alpha + \beta$  is long, then  $V_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = \mathfrak{a}e_\alpha \dot{+} \mathfrak{b}e_{\alpha+\beta} \dot{+} \mathfrak{a}e_\alpha$  is a 2-step nilpotent group with the group operation

$$(xe_\alpha \dot{+} ye_{\alpha+\beta} \dot{+} ze_\beta) \dot{+} (x'e_\alpha \dot{+} y'e_{\alpha+\beta} \dot{+} z'e_\beta) = (x+x')e_\alpha \dot{+} (y - \frac{N_{\alpha\beta}}{2} s(z | x') + z')e_{\alpha+\beta} \dot{+} (z+z')e_\beta$$

and the action of  $X_{\alpha-\beta}(L)$  and  $X_{\beta-\alpha}(L)$  such that the homomorphism

$$V_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow \text{St}(\Phi; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}), xe_\alpha \dot{+} ye_{\alpha+\beta} \dot{+} ze_\beta \mapsto X_\alpha(x) X_{\alpha+\beta}(y) X_\beta(z)$$

is equivariant.

We are ready to construct a presentation of  $G = \text{St}(\Phi; K, L; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ . Let  $Z_\alpha(x, p) = X_{-\alpha}(p)X_\alpha(x) \in G$  for  $x \in \mathfrak{a}, p \in K$  if  $\alpha$  is short and  $x \in \mathfrak{b}, p \in L$  if  $\alpha$  is long. If  $V_{\alpha\beta}(K, L)$  is defined, then there are also natural elements  $Z_{\alpha\beta}(u, s) \in G$  for  $u \in V_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$  and  $s \in V_{-\alpha, -\beta}(K, L)$

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\Phi$  be one of the root systems  $B_\ell, C_\ell$ , or  $F_4$  for  $\ell \geq 3$ ;  $(K, L)$  be a pair of the corresponding type;  $(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$  be a crossed module over  $(K, L)$ . Then  $\text{St}(\Phi; K, L; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$  as an abstract group is generated by  $Z_\alpha(x, p)$  and  $Z_{\alpha\beta}(u, s)$  with the relations*

(Sym)  $Z_{\alpha\beta}(u, s) = Z_{\beta\alpha}(u, s)$  if we identify  $V_{\alpha\beta}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$  with  $V_{\beta\alpha}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ ;

(Add) 1.  $Z_\alpha(x, p) Z_\alpha(y, p) = Z_\alpha(x + y, p)$ ,  
2.  $Z_{\alpha\beta}(u, s) Z_{\alpha\beta}(v, s) = Z_{\alpha\beta}(u \dot{+} v, s)$ ;

(Comm) 1.  $[Z_\alpha(x, p), Z_\beta(y, q)] = 1$  for  $\alpha \perp \beta$  and  $\alpha + \beta \notin \Phi$ ,  
2.  $Z_\gamma(x, p) Z_{\alpha\beta}(u, s) = Z_{\alpha\beta}(Z_\gamma(\delta(x), p) u, Z_\gamma(\delta(x), p) s)$  for  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}(\alpha - \beta)$ ;

(Simp)  $Z_\alpha(x, p) = Z_{\alpha\beta}(xe_\alpha, pe_{-\alpha})$ ;

(HW) 1.  $Z_{\alpha, \alpha+\beta}(X_{-\beta}(r) xe_{\alpha+\beta}, pe_{-\alpha} \oplus qe_{-\alpha-\beta}) = Z_{\alpha+\beta, \beta}(X_{-\alpha}(p) xe_{\alpha+\beta}, X_{-\alpha}(p) (qe_{-\alpha-\beta} \oplus re_{-\beta}))$ , where  $\alpha, \beta$  is a basis of root subsystem of type  $A_2$ ,  
2.  $Z_{\alpha, \alpha+\beta}(X_{-\beta}(s) (xe_{2\alpha+\beta} \dot{+} ye_{\alpha+\beta}), pe_{-\alpha} \dot{+} qe_{-2\alpha-\beta} \dot{+} re_{-\alpha-\beta}) = Z_{2\alpha+\beta, \beta}(X_{-\alpha}(p) (xe_{2\alpha+\beta} \dot{+} ye_{\alpha+\beta}), X_{-\alpha}(p) (qe_{-2\alpha-\beta} \oplus re_{-\alpha-\beta} \oplus se_{-\beta}))$ , where  $\alpha, \beta$  is a basis of a root subsystem of type  $B_2$  and  $\alpha$  is short;

$$(Delta) \quad Z_\alpha(x, \delta(y) + p) = Z_{-\alpha}(y, 0) Z_\alpha(x, p) Z_{-\alpha}(-y, 0).$$

*Proof.* If  $\Phi$  is of type  $B_\ell$  or  $C_\ell$ , then the claim directly follows from theorem 2, so we may assume that  $\Phi$  is of type  $F_4$ . Let  $G$  be the group with the presentation from the statement, it is generated by the elements  $Z_\alpha(a, p)$  satisfying only the relations involving roots from root subsystems of rank 2. First of all, we construct a natural action of  $\text{St}(\Phi; K, L)$  on  $G$ . Notice that any three-dimensional root subsystem  $\Psi \subseteq \Phi$  such that  $\Psi = \mathbb{R}\Psi \cap \Phi$  is of type  $B_3$ ,  $C_3$ , or  $A_1 \times A_2$ .

Let  $g = X_\alpha(a)$  be a root element in  $\text{St}(\Phi; K, L)$  and  $h = Z_\beta(b, p)$  be a generator of  $G$ . If  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are linearly independent, then  ${}^g h$  may be defined directly as  $h$  itself or an appropriate  $Z_{\gamma_1 \gamma_2}(u, s)$ . Otherwise we take a root subsystem  $\alpha \in \Psi \subseteq \Phi$  of rank 2 of type  $A_2$  or  $B_2$ , express  $h$  in terms of  $Z_\gamma(c, q)$  for  $\gamma \in \Psi \setminus \mathbb{R}\alpha$ , and apply the above construction for  ${}^g Z_\gamma(c, q)$ . The resulting element of  $G$  is independent of the choices of  $\Psi$  and the decomposition of  $h$  since we already know the theorem in the cases  $B_3$  and  $C_3$ .

We have to check that  ${}^g(-)$  preserves the relations between the generators. Let  $\Psi$  be the intersection of  $\Phi$  with the span of the roots in a relation,  $\Psi' = (\mathbb{R}\Psi + \mathbb{R}\alpha) \cap \Phi$ . Consider the possible cases:

- If  $\Psi'$  is of rank  $< 3$  or has one of the types  $B_3$ ,  $C_3$ , then the result follows from the cases  $B_3$  and  $C_3$  of the theorem.
- If  $\Psi'$  is of type  $A_1 \times A_2$  and  $\alpha$  lies in the first factor (so  $\Psi$  is the second factor), then  $g$  acts trivially on the generators with the roots from  $\Psi$  and there is nothing to prove.
- If  $\Psi'$  is of type  $A_1 \times A_2$ ,  $\alpha$  lies in the second factor, and  $\Psi$  is of type  $A_1 \times A_1$ , then we have to check that  $[{}^g Z_\beta(b, p), {}^g Z_\gamma(c, q)] = 1$ , where  $\beta$  lies in the first factor and  $\gamma$  lies in the second factor. But  ${}^g Z_\beta(b, p) = Z_\beta(b, p)$  commutes with  ${}^g Z_\gamma(c, q)$ , the latter one is a product of various  $Z_{\gamma'}(c', q')$  with  $\gamma'$  from the second factor of  $\Psi'$ .

Now let us check that the resulting automorphisms of  $G$  corresponding to root elements satisfy the Steinberg relations when applied to a fixed  $Z_\beta(b, p)$ . Let  $\Psi$  be the intersection of  $\Phi$  with the span of the root from such a relation and  $\Psi' = (\mathbb{R}\Psi + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap \Phi$ . There are the following cases:

- If  $\Psi'$  is of rank  $< 3$  or has one of the types  $B_3$ ,  $C_3$ , then the result follows from the cases  $B_3$  and  $C_3$  of the theorem.
- If  $\Psi'$  is of type  $A_1 \times A_2$  and  $\beta$  lies in the first factor (so  $\Psi$  is the second factor), then both sides of the relation trivially act on  $Z_\beta(b, p)$  and there is nothing to prove.
- If  $\Psi'$  is of type  $A_1 \times A_2$ ,  $\beta$  lies in the second factor, and  $\Psi$  is of type  $A_1 \times A_1$ , then we have to check that  $X_\alpha(a) X_\gamma(c) Z_\beta(b, p) = X_\gamma(c) X_\alpha(a) Z_\beta(b, p)$ , where  $\alpha$  lies in the first factor and  $\gamma$  lies in the second factor. But both sides coincide with  $X_\gamma(c) Z_\beta(b, p)$ , it is a product of various  $Z_{\beta'}(b', p')$  with  $\beta'$  from the second factor of  $\Psi'$ .

Now consider the homomorphism

$$u: G \rightarrow \text{St}(\Phi; K, L; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}), Z_\alpha(a, p) \mapsto X_{-\alpha}^{(p)}X_\alpha(a).$$

By construction, it is  $\text{St}(\Phi; K, L)$ -equivariant, so it is surjective. The  $\text{St}(\Phi; K, L)$ -equivariant homomorphism

$$v: \text{St}(\Phi; K, L; \mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \rightarrow G, X_\alpha(a) \mapsto X_\alpha(a)$$

is clearly well-defined and surjective. It remains to notice that  $v \circ u$  is the identity.  $\square$

## References

- [1] E. Abe. Normal subgroups of Chevalley groups over commutative rings. *Cont. Math.*, 83:1–17, 1989.
- [2] A. S. Cigoli, J. R. A. Gray, and T. Van der Linden. Algebraically coherent categories. *Theory and applications of categories*, 30(54):1864–1905, 2015.
- [3] A. S. Cigoli, S. Mantovani, and G. Metere. Peiffer product and Peiffer commutator for internal pre-crossed modules. Preprint, arXiv:1503.05008, 2015.
- [4] F. Keune. The relativization of  $K_2$ . *J. Algebra*, 54:159–177, 1978.
- [5] A. Lavrenov. Relative symplectic Steinberg group. Preprint, arXiv:1412.2421, 2014.
- [6] A. Lavrenov. A local-global principle for symplectic  $K_2$ . *Doc. Math.*, 23:653–675, 2018.
- [7] A. Lavrenov and S. Sinchuk. On centrality of even orthogonal  $K_2$ . *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 221(5):1134–1145, 2017.
- [8] A. Lavrenov and S. Sinchuk. A Horrocks-type theorem for even orthogonal  $K_2$ . *Doc. Math.*, 25:767–809, 2020.
- [9] A. Lavrenov, S. Sinchuk, and E. Voronetsky. On the  $\mathbb{A}_1$ -invariance of  $K_2$  modeled on linear and even orthogonal groups. Preprint, arXiv:2110.11087, 2021.
- [10] J.-L. Loday. Cohomologie et groupe de Steinberg relatifs. *J. Algebra*, 54:178–202, 1978.
- [11] S. Sinchuk. On centrality of  $K_2$  for Chevalley groups of type  $E_\ell$ . *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 220(2):857–875, 2016.
- [12] M. S. Tulenbaev. The Steinberg group of a polynomial ring. *Math. USSR Sbornik*, 45(1):131–144, 1983.

- [13] E. Voronetsky. Centrality of odd unitary  $K_2$ -functor. Preprint, arXiv:2005.02926, 2020.
- [14] E. Voronetsky. Centrality of  $K_2$ -functor revisited. *J. Pure Appl. Alg.*, 225(4), 2021.
- [15] E. Voronetsky. An explicit presentation of relative Steinberg groups. *J. Algebra*, 602:278–299, 2022.
- [16] E. Voronetsky. Twisted forms of classical groups. *Algebra i Analiz*, 34(2):56–94, 2022.