

## ON THE RELATIVE $K$ -GROUP IN THE ETNC, PART II

OLIVER BRAUNLING

ABSTRACT. In a previous paper we showed, under some assumptions, that the relative  $K$ -group in the Burns-Flach formulation of the equivariant Tamagawa number conjecture (ETNC) is canonically isomorphic to a  $K$ -group of locally compact equivariant modules. This viewpoint, as well as the usual one, come with generator-relator presentations (due to Bass-Swan and Nenashev) and in this paper we provide an explicit map.

Let  $A$  be a finite-dimensional semisimple  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra and  $\mathfrak{A} \subset A$  an order. We write  $A_{\mathbb{R}} := A \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$ . There is the long exact sequence

$$(0.1) \quad \cdots \longrightarrow K_n(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow K_n(A_{\mathbb{R}}) \longrightarrow K_{n-1}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow K_{n-1}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \cdots$$

In the previous paper [Bra18b] we have shown, assuming  $\mathfrak{A}$  to be regular, that there is a canonical isomorphism

$$(0.2) \quad K_n(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R}) \cong K_{n+1}(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}),$$

where  $\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is the exact category of locally compact topological right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -modules. We are mostly interested in the case  $n = 0$ . In the formulation of the equivariant Tamagawa number conjecture (ETNC) of Burns and Flach [BF01], the equivariant Tamagawa numbers live in the relative  $K$ -group  $K_0(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R})$ . This group has an explicit presentation due to Bass-Swan, based on generators

$$[P, \varphi, Q] \quad \text{with} \quad \varphi : P_{\mathbb{R}} \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_{\mathbb{R}},$$

where  $P, Q$  are finitely generated projective right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -modules; modulo some relations. On the other hand, the group  $K_1(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}})$  has an explicit presentation due to Nenashev, based on double exact sequences

$$A \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{p} \\ \xrightarrow{q} \end{array} B \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{r} \\ \xrightarrow{s} \end{array} C,$$

where  $A, B, C$  are locally compact right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -modules; modulo some other relations. Unfortunately, the isomorphism between these groups, and between these two concrete presentations, produced by [Bra18b] had remained inexplicit. We fix this issue now.

Given  $[P, \varphi, Q]$ , we send it to a double exact sequence called “ $\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle$ ”, having the shape

$$\left[ \prod T_P \oplus P \oplus Q \oplus \prod T_Q \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{c} \\ \xrightarrow{d} \end{array} \prod T_P \oplus P \oplus P_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus Q \oplus \prod T_Q \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{e} \\ \xrightarrow{f} \end{array} T_P \oplus \bigoplus P \oplus \bigoplus Q \oplus T_Q \right],$$

where  $P$  carries the discrete topology,  $P_{\mathbb{R}} := P \otimes \mathbb{R}$  is topologically a real vector space, and  $T_P := P_{\mathbb{R}}/P$  carries the torus quotient topology (correspondingly for  $Q$ ). The products and direct sums are indexed over  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . The four morphisms are complicated to define: They arise as the sum

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 11R23 11G40; Secondary 11R65 28C10.

*Key words and phrases*. Equivariant Tamagawa number conjecture, ETNC, locally compact modules.

The author was supported by DFG GK1821 “Cohomological Methods in Geometry” and a Junior Fellowship at the Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies (FRIAS).

of various maps, which can be depicted as

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod T_P & \cdots & T_P \\
 & & & & \nearrow \\
 P & \cdots & \oplus P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus P \\
 & \searrow & & & \\
 & & P_{\mathbb{R}} & & \\
 & \nearrow & \searrow & & \\
 Q & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus Q & \cdots & \oplus Q \\
 & & & & \searrow \\
 \prod T_Q & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod T_Q & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T_Q
 \end{array}$$

$\varphi^{-1} \circ i_Q$  (dotted arrow from  $Q$  to  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ )  
 $i_Q$  (dotted arrow from  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  to  $\oplus Q$ )

where we read the objects in the left (resp. middle, right) column as the direct summands appearing in the left (resp. middle, right) term of the double exact sequence. The solid versus dotted lines indicate which side of the double exact sequence they belong to. Each of the arrows without a label only depends on  $P$  and  $Q$ , but not on  $\varphi$ . A detailed construction of this double exact sequence is too long for the introduction, and we refer to §2 for details. We only gave these brief indications to give an impression what kind of object we are dealing with. It is complicated.

But it is exactly what we need for an explicit formula:

**Theorem.** *Let  $A$  be a finite-dimensional semisimple  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra and  $\mathfrak{A} \subset A$  an order. Then the map*

$$(0.3) \quad K_0(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow K_1(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}})$$

*sending  $[P, \varphi, Q]$  to the double exact sequence  $\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle$  is a well-defined morphism from the Bass–Swan to the Nenashev presentation. If  $\mathfrak{A}$  is regular, then this map is an isomorphism.*

The mere existence of the map (not needing  $\mathfrak{A}$  regular) will be Theorem 2.2 and is independent of the previous paper [Bra18b]. The proof of isomorphy will be Theorem 3.2. The latter is a lot harder and will require us to work with some explicit simplicial model of  $K$ -theory, based on the work of Gillet and Grayson.

Why is this comparison map so complicated?

Indeed, the apparent complexity of  $\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle$  is very misleading. It feels appropriate to compare this situation to Leibniz’s formula for the determinant

$$\det M = \sum_{\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n} \mathrm{sgn}(\pi) M_{1, \pi(1)} \cdot M_{2, \pi(2)} \cdots M_{n, \pi(n)}.$$

Hardly anyone would use this formula for working with determinants in a concrete computation, or for any practical purpose, but it is a closed-form formula which is valid for *all* matrices  $M$ . The same is true for  $\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle$ . In general, it is an overcomplicated representative for the underlying  $K_1$ -class, but it is a *uniform* closed-form expression valid for all Bass–Swan representatives  $[P, \varphi, Q]$ .

Since the ETNC is a conjecture in arithmetic geometry, readers might not be particularly enthusiastic about simplicial sets. We have gone to some lengths in order to write down the proof of the above theorem as a direct verification using only the Bass–Swan and Nenashev presentations alone, mostly. Yet, one step of the proof inevitably needs us to touch algebraic  $K$ -theory as a space, or more concretely as a simplicial set. We will explain everything we need for this in a self-contained fashion.

As for [Bra18b], the entire theory should exist without having to assume that  $\mathfrak{A}$  is regular. This will require a slightly different definition of  $\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Roughly speaking,  $\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  corresponds to  $G$ -theory, so just as one has to restrict to projective modules for  $K(\mathfrak{A})$ , a similar variation of the

definition of  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  will work for general  $\mathfrak{A}$ . See the introduction of [Bra18b] for a few more details on the rôle of  $G$ -theory here.

**Acknowledgement.** *This work is heavily inspired by Dustin Clausen’s paper [Cla17]. Bernhard Köck had concretely asked me whether the elements I discussed in my earlier papers on locally compact modules could be made explicit in the Nenashev presentation. This article provides a concrete answer. Moreover, I thank B. Chow, M. Flach, D. Grayson, A. Huber, B. Morin, A. Nickel, M. Wendt, C. Winges for discussions and/or correspondence. I thank the FRIAS, where the universal definition of  $\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle$  was found, for its excellent working conditions and rich opportunities for academic exchange.*

## 1. THE EXPLICIT PRESENTATIONS

*Convention.* For us, a ring is always unital and associative. They are not assumed to be commutative. We freely use the category  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ , see [Bra18b] for its definition and further background.

We recall the basic design of the two explicit presentations in the format we shall use.

**1.1. Bass–Swan’s presentation.** Let  $\varphi : R \rightarrow R'$  be a morphism of rings. We will drop the map  $\varphi$  from the notation and simply write  $M_{R'} := M \otimes_R R'$  for the base change along  $\varphi$ , where  $M$  is an arbitrary right  $R$ -module.

Let  $\text{Sw}(R, R')$  be the following category: Its objects are triples  $(P, \alpha, Q)$ , where  $P, Q$  are finitely generated projective right  $R$ -modules and  $\alpha : P_{R'} \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_{R'}$  is an isomorphism of right  $R'$ -modules. A morphism  $f : (P_1, \alpha_1, Q_1) \rightarrow (P_2, \alpha_2, Q_2)$  is a pair of right  $R$ -module homomorphisms  $p : P_1 \rightarrow P_2$ ,  $q : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_2$  such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_{1,R'} & \xrightarrow{p} & P_{2,R'} \\ \alpha_1 \downarrow \sim & & \sim \downarrow \alpha_2 \\ Q_{1,R'} & \xrightarrow{q} & Q_{2,R'} \end{array}$$

commutes.

Define Bass–Swan’s relative  $K_0$ -group, which we denote by “ $K_0(R, R')$ ”, as follows:

- (1) It is generated by all objects of  $\text{Sw}(R, R')$ . We write this as  $[P, \alpha, Q]$ .
- (2) (*Relation A*) For morphisms  $a, b$  in the category  $\text{Sw}(R, R')$ , composable as

$$(1.1) \quad (P', \alpha', Q') \xrightarrow{a} (P, \alpha, Q) \xrightarrow{b} (P'', \alpha'', Q'')$$

such that the induced composable arrows  $P' \hookrightarrow P \twoheadrightarrow P''$  and  $Q' \hookrightarrow Q \twoheadrightarrow Q''$  are exact sequences of right  $R'$ -modules, impose the relation:

$$(1.2) \quad [P, \alpha, Q] = [P', \alpha', Q'] + [P'', \alpha'', Q''].$$

- (3) (*Relation B*) For objects  $(P, \alpha, Q)$  and  $(Q, \beta, S)$  impose the relation:

$$(1.3) \quad [P, \alpha, Q] + [Q, \beta, S] = [P, \beta \circ \alpha, S].$$

**1.2. Nenashev’s presentation.** Suppose  $\mathcal{C}$  is an exact category. Sherman had the idea that every element in  $K_1(\mathcal{C})$  should be expressible in a certain normalized form. To this end, he used the Gillet–Grayson model for the  $K$ -theory space  $K(\mathcal{C})$  and then showed that every element  $\alpha \in K_1(\mathcal{C})$ , i.e. every closed loop in  $\pi_1 K(\mathcal{C})$ , is homotopic to a loop of a special shape, [She98]. This was extended by Nenashev to give a complete generator-relator presentation of the group in a series of papers [Nen96, Nen98a, Nen98b].

A *double (short) exact sequence* in  $\mathcal{C}$  is the datum of two short exact sequences

$$\text{Yin} : A \xrightarrow{p} B \xrightarrow{r} C \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Yang} : A \xrightarrow{q} B \xrightarrow{s} C,$$

where only the maps may differ, but the objects agree for both the Yin and Yang exact sequence. We write

$$(1.4) \quad A \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{p} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{q} \end{array} B \begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{r} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{s} \end{array} C$$

as a shorthand.

We recall Nenashev's presentation in the concrete form for  $\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ .

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{A}$  be a regular order in a finite-dimensional semisimple  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra. Then the abelian group  $K_1(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}})$  has the following presentation:*

- (1) *We attach a generator to each double exact sequence*

$$A \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{p} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{q} \end{array} B \begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{r} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{s} \end{array} C,$$

where  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $C$  are locally compact right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -modules.

- (2) *Whenever the Yin and Yang exact sequences agree, i.e.,*

$$(1.5) \quad A \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{p} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{p} \end{array} B \begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{r} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{r} \end{array} C,$$

we declare the class to vanish.

- (3) *Suppose there is a (not necessarily commutative)  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & B & \begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & C \\ \downarrow \dashrightarrow & & \downarrow \dashrightarrow & & \downarrow \dashrightarrow \\ D & \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & E & \begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & F \\ \downarrow \dashrightarrow & & \downarrow \dashrightarrow & & \downarrow \dashrightarrow \\ G & \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & H & \begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & I \end{array}$$

whose rows  $\mathrm{Row}_i$  and columns  $\mathrm{Col}_j$  are double exact sequences. Suppose after deleting all Yin (resp. all Yang) exact sequences, the remaining diagram commutes. Then we impose the relation

$$(1.6) \quad \mathrm{Row}_1 - \mathrm{Row}_2 + \mathrm{Row}_3 = \mathrm{Col}_1 - \mathrm{Col}_2 + \mathrm{Col}_3.$$

We shall write " $K_1(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}})_{\mathrm{Nenashev}}$ " if we wish to stress that we mean the above presentation.

*Remark 1.2 (Compatibility with literature).* Our notational convention is opposite to the one used in Nenashev's papers [Nen96, Nen98a, Nen98b], and closer instead to the one used in Weibel's  $K$ -theory book. In particular, if  $\varphi : X \rightarrow X$  is an automorphism of an object in an exact category  $\mathcal{C}$ , the canonical map  $\mathrm{Aut}(X) \rightarrow K_1(\mathcal{C})$  maps it to

$$0 \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{1} \end{array} X \begin{array}{c} \dashrightarrow \\ \xrightarrow{\varphi} \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} X.$$

See [Nen98b, Equation 2.2] for a discussion of this. Further, the vertex  $(P, P')$  in the Gillet–Grayson model lies in the connected component of  $[P'] - [P] \in \pi_0 K(\mathcal{C})$ , i.e. also precisely opposite to Nenashev's conventions, cf. [She96, §1, middle of p. 176]. In order to be particularly sure about which arrows belong to the Yin or Yang side, we do not only distinguish by top/bottom or left/right arrows, but also use solid versus dotted arrows.

The following is a rather easy exercise in the handling of the Nenashev presentation, but since it illustrates some basic principles in a simple fashion, we provide all details.

**Lemma 1.3.** *Suppose we are given a double exact sequence*

$$A' \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} A \begin{array}{c} \twoheadrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} A''$$

and a second one (with  $B$ s instead of  $A$ s). Suppose we have a diagram

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} A' & \hookrightarrow & A & \twoheadrightarrow & A'' \\ \downarrow x' & & \downarrow x & & \downarrow x'' \\ B' & \hookrightarrow & B & \twoheadrightarrow & B'' \end{array}$$

where  $x', x, x''$  are isomorphisms, and which commutes irrespective of whether we use the Yin or Yang exact sequences. Then both double exact sequences agree in  $K_1(\mathbb{C})_{\text{Nenashev}}$ .

*Proof.* We have the  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram of double short exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A' & \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & A & \begin{array}{c} \twoheadrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & A'' \\ \Downarrow & & \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\ B' & \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & B & \begin{array}{c} \twoheadrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & B'' \\ \Downarrow & & \Downarrow & & \Downarrow \\ 0 & \begin{array}{c} \hookrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & 0 & \begin{array}{c} \twoheadrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} & 0 \end{array}$$

where the double downward arrows “ $\Downarrow$ ” in the first row are (both for Yin and Yang) the maps  $x', x, x''$ . Thus, the commutativity of Diagram 1.7 settles that the top half of the diagram commutes. The downward arrows “ $\Downarrow$ ” in the bottom half all are zero maps. We obtain the relation

$$\text{Row}_1 - \text{Row}_2 + \text{Row}_3 = \text{Col}_1 - \text{Col}_2 + \text{Col}_3$$

by Equation 1.6. We have  $[\text{Row}_3] = 0$  since for the bottom row both Yin and Yang sequence agree, and for the same reason  $[\text{Col}_i] = 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Thus, it remains  $[\text{Row}_1] = [\text{Row}_2]$ , which is precisely our claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.4.** *We have* 
$$\left[ X \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{1} \\ \dashrightarrow_{\varphi} \end{array} X \begin{array}{c} \twoheadrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} 0 \right] = \left[ 0 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\varphi} \\ \dashrightarrow_1 \end{array} X \begin{array}{c} \twoheadrightarrow \\ \dashrightarrow \end{array} X \right].$$

*Proof.* By Remark 1.2 the left term agrees with  $\tilde{l}(\varphi)$  in [Nen98b, Equation 2.2], and thus with  $l(\varphi)$  by Lemma 3.1, *loc. cit.* Translating back with Remark 1.2 yields our claim.  $\square$

**1.3. Graphical schematics for double exact sequences.** The notation of Equation 1.4 is not very helpful when the involved objects and morphisms are complicated.

In addition to the standard notation, we shall introduce a slightly different notation in the present text: Suppose we write the graphical schematic

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} A'_1 & \xrightarrow{a'_1} & A_1 & \xrightarrow{a_1} & A''_1 \\ A'_2 & \xrightarrow{a'_2} & A_2 & \xrightarrow{a_2} & A''_2 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \hline B'_1 & \xrightarrow{b'_1} & B_1 & \xrightarrow{b_1} & B''_1 \\ B'_2 & \xrightarrow{b'_2} & B_2 & \xrightarrow{b_2} & B''_2 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \end{array}$$

and suppose further

- (1) each  $A'_i \hookrightarrow A_i \twoheadrightarrow A''_i$  is an exact sequence,
- (2) each  $B'_i \hookrightarrow B_i \twoheadrightarrow B''_i$  is an exact sequence,
- (3) in each column (left, middle, right) the objects above and below the horizontal delimiter are isomorphic by a concrete isomorphism, i.e.

$$(1.9) \quad \begin{aligned} I' &: \bigoplus_i A'_i \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_i B'_i \\ I &: \bigoplus_i A_i \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_i B_i \\ I'' &: \bigoplus_i A''_i \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_i B''_i, \end{aligned}$$

then we attach the following double short exact sequence to this datum:

$$\kappa = \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus_i A'_i & \xrightarrow{p} & \bigoplus_i A_i & \xrightarrow{r} & \bigoplus_i A''_i \\ \bigoplus_i A'_i & \xrightarrow{q} & \bigoplus_i A_i & \xrightarrow{s} & \bigoplus_i A''_i \end{array} \right],$$

where

- (1)  $p := \bigoplus a'_i$ ,  $r := \bigoplus a_i$ ,
- (2)  $q := I^{-1} \circ (\bigoplus b'_i) \circ I'$ ,  $s := I''^{-1} \circ (\bigoplus b_i) \circ I$ .

(*Wiring*) We tacitly assume here that  $i$  runs through finitely many values only, i.e. our input graphic schematic will always only have finitely many rows. We call the datum of  $I', I, I''$  the *wiring* of the schematic.

We note that since each  $A'_i \hookrightarrow A_i \twoheadrightarrow A''_i$  is an exact sequence, so is their direct sum, and analogously for  $B$ . Thus,  $\kappa$  is indeed a double short exact sequence.

## 2. THE COMPARISON MAP

Suppose  $\mathfrak{A}$  is an arbitrary order in a finite-dimensional semisimple  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra  $A$ . In this section we shall set up a concrete map from the Bass–Swan to the Nenashev presentation.

We recall: If  $P$  denotes a finitely generated right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -module, we write  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  to denote the base change  $P \otimes_{\mathfrak{A}} \mathbb{R}$  (or equivalently  $P \otimes_{\mathfrak{A}} A_{\mathbb{R}}$ ). For every  $P$ , we have a canonical short exact sequence

$$P \xrightarrow{\iota_P} P_{\mathbb{R}} \xrightarrow{q_P} T_P \quad \text{in} \quad \text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}},$$

where  $P$  refers to itself, equipped with the discrete topology,  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  is equipped with the real vector space topology, and  $T_P$  denotes the quotient taken in  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ . This means that the underlying topological space of  $T_P$  is a real torus  $\mathbb{T}^n$  with  $n := \dim_{\mathbb{R}}(P_{\mathbb{R}})$ . The key point is that, topologically,  $P$  is a discrete full rank lattice in  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ .

Now consider the generator  $[P, \varphi, Q]$  in Bass–Swan’s presentation. Then  $\varphi : P_{\mathbb{R}} \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_{\mathbb{R}}$  is an isomorphism. Note that alongside

$$(2.1) \quad Q \xrightarrow{\iota_Q} Q_{\mathbb{R}} \xrightarrow{q_Q} T_Q$$

we also get the short exact sequence

$$(2.2) \quad Q \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-1} \circ \iota_Q} P_{\mathbb{R}} \xrightarrow{q_Q \circ \varphi} T_Q.$$

It is basically the same, except for that we have replaced the middle object via the isomorphism  $\varphi$ . This sequence will henceforth play an important rôle.

We now make the following crucial definition (and explain some potentially unclear notation below the definition):

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $(P, \alpha, Q)$  be an object in the category  $\text{Sw}(\mathfrak{A}, A_{\mathbb{R}})$ . We write  $\langle\langle P, \alpha, Q \rangle\rangle$  for the following schematic:*

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus P & \xrightarrow{1} & \bigoplus P & & \\ P & \longrightarrow & P_{\mathbb{R}} & \longrightarrow & T_P & & \\ \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{1} & \prod T_P & \longrightarrow & 0 & & \\ Q & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus Q & \xrightarrow{s} & \bigoplus Q & & \\ \prod T_Q & \xrightarrow{s} & \prod T_Q & \longrightarrow & T_Q & & \\ \hline P & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus P & \xrightarrow{s} & \bigoplus P & & \\ \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{s} & \prod T_P & \longrightarrow & T_P & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus Q & \xrightarrow{1} & \bigoplus Q & & \\ Q & \xrightarrow{\varphi^{-1} \circ \iota_Q} & P_{\mathbb{R}} & \xrightarrow{q_Q \circ \varphi} & T_Q & & \\ \prod T_Q & \xrightarrow{1} & \prod T_Q & \longrightarrow & 0 & & \end{array}$$

Whenever convenient, we also use the notation  $\langle\langle P, \alpha, Q \rangle\rangle$  for the associated double short exact sequence (following the recipe of §1.3).

We have used some shorthands here, which we explain now:

- (1) The symbol  $\bigoplus P$  refers to the coproduct indexed over  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . By the map “ $s$ ” (as in ‘shift’) in  $P \hookrightarrow \bigoplus P \xrightarrow{s} \bigoplus P$  we mean the map

$$(2.4) \quad (p_0, p_1, p_2, \dots) \mapsto (p_1, p_2, \dots).$$

Analogously, for  $Q$ .

- (2) The symbol  $\prod T_P$  refers to the product indexed over  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . By the map “ $s$ ” (again as in ‘shift’) in  $\prod T_P \xrightarrow{s} \prod T_P \rightarrow T_P$  we mean the map

$$(t_0, t_1, t_2, \dots) \mapsto (0, t_0, t_1, \dots).$$

- (3) We observe that in the left column the objects above the delimiter line are the same ones as below the line, just with the zero object placed in a different location. Thus, for the map  $I'$  in Equation 1.9 we take the obvious map. The same is true for the right column, so for  $I''$  we also take the obvious map. The middle column is a little more involved since there is also a permutation of the summands involved; but again it is clear what map we take for  $I$ .

We note that  $\bigoplus P$  carries the discrete topology, and  $\prod T_P$  is compact by Tychonoff’s theorem. We call both shift maps  $s$ , although they are a little different, because the underlying idea of both maps is so similar.

We now have fully defined  $\langle\langle P, \alpha, Q \rangle\rangle$ . Still, let us describe it a little more. The very same object can also be drawn as follows:

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod T_P & \cdots \dashrightarrow & T_P \\ P & \cdots \dashrightarrow & \bigoplus P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bigoplus P \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & P_{\mathbb{R}} & & \\ Q & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \bigoplus Q & \cdots \dashrightarrow & \bigoplus Q \\ & \nearrow & & \searrow & \\ \prod T_Q & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod T_Q & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T_Q \end{array}$$

*(Note: In the original image, the arrow from  $P$  to  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  is labeled  $\varphi^{-1} \circ \iota_Q$ , and the arrow from  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  to  $T_P$  is labeled  $\alpha_Q$ .)*

Here again the three columns correspond to the left, middle and right object in the double exact sequence. The corresponding left (resp. middle, resp. right) object in the double exact sequence arises by taking the direct sum of the left (resp. middle, resp. right) column. The solid arrows correspond to the Yin arrows, the dotted ones to Yang. This depiction is probably the best to see the structure of the wiring.

To make it more readable, we have dropped the zero objects in the above picture and neglected labeling the arrows in the cases where it is clear: among the  $\bigoplus P$  and  $\prod T_P$ , resp. for  $Q$ , the horizontal exact sequences stem from the shift maps  $s$ , while the single arrows correspond to the identity map. Thus, all in all,  $\langle\langle P, \alpha, Q \rangle\rangle$  defines a double exact sequence of the shape

$$\left[ \prod T_P \oplus P \oplus Q \oplus \prod T_Q \xrightarrow{\quad} \prod T_P \oplus P \oplus P_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus Q \oplus \prod T_Q \xrightarrow{\quad} T_P \oplus \bigoplus P \oplus \bigoplus Q \oplus T_Q \right],$$

where the morphisms are slightly involved to spell out, and surely easier to understand from Figure 2.3 or Figure 2.5 than by trying to squeeze them into the double exact sequence notation. It would lead to very heavy arrow labels.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Suppose  $\mathfrak{A}$  is an arbitrary order in a finite-dimensional semisimple  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra  $A$ . The map*

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta : K_0(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R}) &\longrightarrow K_1(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}})_{\mathrm{Nenashev}} \\ [P, \varphi, Q] &\longmapsto \text{double exact sequence of } \langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle \end{aligned}$$

*is well-defined.*

We shall split the slightly involved proof into several little lemmata.

**Lemma 2.3.** *The map  $\vartheta$  respects Relation A (Equation 1.2), i.e. for morphisms  $a, b$  composable as*

$$(P', \alpha', Q') \xrightarrow{a} (P, \alpha, Q) \xrightarrow{b} (P'', \alpha'', Q'')$$

*such that the induced composable arrows  $P' \hookrightarrow P \twoheadrightarrow P''$  and  $Q' \hookrightarrow Q \twoheadrightarrow Q''$  are exact sequences of right  $R'$ -modules, we have*

$$(2.6) \quad [\langle\langle P, \alpha, Q \rangle\rangle] = [\langle\langle P', \alpha', Q' \rangle\rangle] + [\langle\langle P'', \alpha'', Q'' \rangle\rangle].$$

*Proof.* First of all, we note that the input datum gives rise to a commutative diagram of the shape

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} P'_{\mathbb{R}} & \hookrightarrow & P_{\mathbb{R}} & \twoheadrightarrow & P''_{\mathbb{R}} \\ \downarrow \alpha' & & \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \alpha'' \\ Q'_{\mathbb{R}} & \hookrightarrow & Q_{\mathbb{R}} & \twoheadrightarrow & Q''_{\mathbb{R}} \end{array}$$



We note that the exactness of  $P' \hookrightarrow P \twoheadrightarrow P''$  also gives natural exact sequences

$$(2.8) \quad \bigoplus P' \hookrightarrow \bigoplus P \twoheadrightarrow \bigoplus P'', \quad \text{and} \quad \prod T_{P'} \hookrightarrow \prod T_P \twoheadrightarrow \prod T_{P''}.$$

The same is true for  $Q, Q_{\mathbb{R}}, \bigoplus Q, \prod T_Q$ . This means that we get short exact sequences for all the entries in  $\langle\langle P, \alpha, Q \rangle\rangle$ , having their counterparts in  $\langle\langle P', \alpha', Q' \rangle\rangle$  and  $\langle\langle P'', \alpha'', Q'' \rangle\rangle$  on the left resp. right side. We thus can set up a  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram

$$\begin{array}{c} \langle\langle P', \alpha', Q' \rangle\rangle \\ \Downarrow \\ \langle\langle P, \alpha, Q \rangle\rangle \\ \Downarrow \\ \langle\langle P'', \alpha'', Q'' \rangle\rangle \end{array}$$

as follows: The columns are induced for both Yin and Yang arrows from the sequences above, e.g., in Equation 2.8, and correspondingly for all other entries in the schematic. On most terms in the schematic it is obvious that the resulting squares commute. The only potentially delicate piece is the middle cross for all three terms of the exact sequences (by middle cross we mean the four diagonal arrows in Figure 2.5). We just discuss the monic piece around the ‘ $\hookrightarrow$ ’ in detail; the epic piece can be treated analogously. We depict the situation below. On the left we see the middle cross of  $\langle\langle P', \alpha', Q' \rangle\rangle$ , and on the right the middle cross of  $\langle\langle P, \alpha, Q \rangle\rangle$ . Let us describe the compatible maps from left to right which then form the top downward arrows “ $\Downarrow$ ” in the above  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram.

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & T_{P'} & & T_P \\ & & \nearrow & & \nearrow \\ P' & & & & P \\ & \searrow & & & \searrow \\ & & P'_{\mathbb{R}} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & P_{\mathbb{R}} \\ & \nearrow & \dashrightarrow & \dashrightarrow & \nearrow \\ Q' & & & & Q \\ & \searrow & & & \searrow \\ & & T_{Q'} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T_Q \end{array}$$

On the Yin side (the solid arrows), we just use the natural maps coming from Equation 2.1, e.g.,

$$P' \hookrightarrow P'_{\mathbb{R}} \twoheadrightarrow T_{P'}$$

on the left. On the Yang side, we could do the same if we had  $Q_{\mathbb{R}}$  sitting in the middle, since we have a corresponding natural sequence

$$Q' \hookrightarrow Q'_{\mathbb{R}} \twoheadrightarrow T_{Q'}.$$

Thus, we play the trick of Equation 2.2, that is: We pre- and post-compose  $Q'_{\mathbb{R}}$  with the isomorphisms  $\alpha', \alpha'^{-1}$ ; and correspondingly for  $Q_{\mathbb{R}}$  with  $\alpha, \alpha^{-1}$ . The necessary diagram of commutativities to check that this compatibly fills the squares in Figure 2.9 is *precisely* the diagram in Equation 2.7. In the figure above, the front dashed contour parallelogram (the one more to the right) corresponds precisely to the left commuting square in Equation 2.7, composed with the natural maps  $q_{Q'}$  resp.  $q_Q$ . The back dashed contour parallelogram (the one more to the left) corresponds to the same square, but for the inverse morphisms  $\alpha'^{-1}$  and  $\alpha^{-1}$  instead, this time pre-composed with the natural maps  $\iota_{Q'}$  resp.  $\iota_Q$ . Since in the columns we use the same maps for the Yin and Yang side, in Nenashev’s relation of the  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram we have no column contributions, and the remaining relation among the rows in precisely Equation 2.6, proving our claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $X \in \text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  be arbitrary. In  $K_1(\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}})_{\text{Nenashev}}$  the class of*

$$(2.10) \quad s_X := \left[ X \oplus X \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{1} \\ \xrightarrow{q} \end{array} X \oplus X \xrightarrow{\gg} 0 \right],$$

where  $q$  swaps both summands, i.e.  $(x, y) \mapsto (y, x)$ , is zero. The same is true if we additionally impose a sign switch, i.e. use  $(x, y) \mapsto (y, -x)$  instead.

*Proof.* We deal with the case without the sign: (Step 1) Suppose  $X$  is a vector  $\mathfrak{A}$ -module. Then it can be written as  $X = \mathfrak{X} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ , where  $\mathfrak{X}$  is a discrete right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -module and full  $\mathbb{Z}$ -rank lattice in  $X$ . We can also consider the swap for  $\mathfrak{X} \oplus \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X} \oplus \mathfrak{X}$  in  $\text{PMod}(\mathfrak{A})$ . Note that we can send this swapping automorphism along the exact functors

$$\text{PMod}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \text{PMod}(A_{\mathbb{R}}) \longrightarrow \text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}},$$

which are  $(-) \mapsto (-) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ , and then interpreting the vector space as its underlying locally compact right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -module with the real topology. The resulting automorphism in  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  is precisely the one of our claim. However, the composition  $K_1(\mathfrak{A}) \rightarrow K_1(A_{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow K_1(\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}})$  is zero, which is seen in terms of the Nenashev presentation in [Bra18b, Example 2.7]. At least if  $\mathfrak{A}$  is regular, it alternatively follows from [Bra18b, Theorem 11.2], which avoids working in the Nenashev presentation. The proof given loc. cit. would also extend to arbitrary orders  $\mathfrak{A}$ . (Step 2) Now let  $X \in \text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  be arbitrary. By [Bra18b, Lemma 6.5] we can find an exact sequence

$$(2.11) \quad C \hookrightarrow X \twoheadrightarrow V \oplus D$$

in  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  with  $C$  compact,  $D$  discrete and  $V$  a vector  $\mathfrak{A}$ -module. Consider the double exact sequence

$$S = \left[ C \oplus C \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\hookrightarrow} \\ \xrightarrow{\twoheadrightarrow} \end{array} X \oplus X \xrightarrow{\twoheadrightarrow} (V \oplus D) \oplus (V \oplus D) \right]$$

which arises as the direct sum of two copies of Equation 2.11. Consider the  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram

$$\begin{array}{c} S \\ \Downarrow \\ S \\ \Downarrow \\ 0, \end{array}$$

where the top downward arrows “ $\Downarrow$ ” are the identity on the Yin side, and are swapping the respective two summands on the Yang side. The resulting relation

$$\text{Row}_1 - \text{Row}_2 + \text{Row}_3 = \text{Col}_1 - \text{Col}_2 + \text{Col}_3$$

simplifies to  $[S] - [S] + [0] = [s_C] - [s_X] + [s_{V \oplus D}]$ , where  $s_{(-)}$  denotes the class of Equation 2.10 for  $C$ ,  $X$  and  $V \oplus D$  (instead of  $X$ ) respectively. Similarly we obtain  $[s_{V \oplus D}] = [s_V] + [s_D]$ . We have  $[s_V] = 0$  by Step 1. The classes of  $[s_C]$  and  $[s_D]$  can be seen to be zero by an Eilenberg swindle, see again the method of [Bra18b, Example 2.7]. Alternatively: For the compact object  $C$ , we may regard  $C$  in  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}, C}$  and consider the class of  $s_C$  there. Thus, our  $[s_C]$  is the image in  $K_1(\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}})$  under the exact functor  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}, C} \rightarrow \text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ . Since  $K_1(\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}, C}) = 0$  by the Eilenberg swindle ([Bra18a, Lemma 4.2]; the category  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}, C}$  is closed under infinite products by Tychonoff’s Theorem), it follows that  $[s_C] = 0$ . Analogously, we obtain  $[s_D] = 0$  by using the corresponding functor from discrete  $\mathfrak{A}$ -modules, an exact category which is closed under infinite coproducts. Combining these equations,  $[s_X] = 0$ , which is what we wanted to show. For the signed swap, the same argument works; however, the signed swap is in fact trivial in  $K$ -theory generally, see [Nen98b, Lemma 3.2, (i)] (this is valid, recall how to translate notation, Remark 1.2).  $\square$

*Remark 2.5.* The above lemma might sound counter-intuitive, especially if  $X$  is a vector  $\mathfrak{A}$ -module. Its statement would be false in  $K_1(\mathbb{R})$ . What it really says is that  $K$ -theory does not see orientation-reversal in  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ . To see this, note that in the above proof, the swapping class, once viewed in  $K_1(\mathfrak{A})$ , agrees via

$$\begin{pmatrix} & 1 \\ 1 & \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \\ & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with the class of multiplication by  $-1$ . Note that the first three matrices are elementary and thus zero in  $K_1$ . This observation extends the invisibility of orientations to the Haar measure as discussed in [Bra18b, §2], and when  $\mathfrak{A} = \mathbb{Z}$ , it is literally that.

Relation B (Equation 1.3) is a little more complicated to handle. It is already not completely obvious that  $[P, \text{id}, P]$  is being sent to zero. Hence, as a warm-up and illustration of the general method, let us prove this first.

**Lemma 2.6.** *The map  $\vartheta$  sends  $[P, \text{id}, P]$  to zero.*

*Proof.* Unravelling definitions, we find that  $\langle\langle P, \text{id}, P \rangle\rangle$  corresponds to the double exact sequence depicted below on the left:

$$(2.12) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T_P \\ P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus P \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & P_{\mathbb{R}} & & \\ & \nearrow & & \searrow & \\ P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus P \\ \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T_P \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T_P \\ P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus P \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & P_{\mathbb{R}} & & \\ & \nearrow & & \searrow & \\ P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus P \\ \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & T_P \end{array}$$

Next, we produce a morphism of double exact sequences from the left schematic to the right. Objectwise, the maps are: (a) the identity on the Yin side everywhere, (b) and on the Yang side, we use the swap map

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{array}{c} \prod T_P \oplus \prod T_P \longrightarrow \prod T_P \oplus \prod T_P \\ (x, y) \longmapsto (y, x) \end{array}$$

and analogously we swap the summands of  $P \oplus P$ , as well as of  $\oplus P \oplus \oplus P$ . We use the identity map on  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ . Let us explain this along Figure 2.12: One can think about the map which we have just described in two ways: Firstly, as exchanging all objects  $\prod T_P$ ,  $P$ ,  $\oplus P$  on the upper half of the figure with their counterparts on the lower half; the object  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  remains where it is. When we speak of the top and lower half here, we do not mean the Yin and Yang side (which often in double exact sequences are depicted as the top and bottom arrow), but we rather just mean the obvious symmetry of Figure 2.12 when mirroring it along the horizontal middle axis. Our swapping operation only refers to this symmetry and only to the Yang side, i.e. the dotted arrows. However, in the above figure on the right, we use a different graphical presentation: Instead of swapping the objects, we leave all the objects at precisely the same position as before. Instead, we swap all the dotted (i.e. Yang) arrows between them. So, one way to think about going from left to right is that all the dotted arrows  $(A) \dashrightarrow (B)$  on the upper half get exchanged with their corresponding arrow  $(A) \dashrightarrow (B)$  on the lower half. In total, this morphism of double exact sequences gives a

$(3 \times 3)$ -diagram

$$\begin{array}{c} \langle\langle P, \text{id}, P \rangle\rangle \\ \Downarrow \\ S \\ \Downarrow \\ 0, \end{array}$$

where  $S$  denotes the double exact sequence on the right in Figure 2.12, the downward arrows “ $\Downarrow$ ” are those induced from  $\text{id} : P_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow P_{\mathbb{R}}$  (for both Yin and Yang), the identity on all objects on the Yin side, and the swapping maps of Equation 2.13 for all other objects on the Yang side. Since these maps are all isomorphisms, we get the zero double exact sequence as the quotient. The resulting Nenashev relation

$$\text{Row}_1 - \text{Row}_2 + \text{Row}_3 = \text{Col}_1 - \text{Col}_2 + \text{Col}_3$$

of Equation 1.6 simplifies to  $[\langle\langle P, \text{id}, P \rangle\rangle] - [S] + [0] = 0$ , because  $[\text{Col}_i] = 0$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . The latter is seen as follows: The column classes spelled out (and written horizontally to save space) are direct sums of double exact sequences

$$\left[ \begin{array}{ccc} (-) & \xrightarrow{\quad 1 \quad} & (-) \xrightarrow{\quad} 0 \\ (-) & \xrightarrow[\quad q \quad]{\quad} & (-) \xrightarrow{\quad} 0 \end{array} \right],$$

where  $q$  is either the identity or a swapping map. Thus, its class is always zero, either by the relation of Equation 1.5 or by Lemma 2.4.  $\square$

With this preparation, we are ready for a generalization of the previous lemma.


**Lemma 2.7.** *The map  $\vartheta$  respects Relation B (Equation 1.3), i.e. we have*

$$[\langle\langle P, \psi\varphi, R \rangle\rangle] = [\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle] + [\langle\langle Q, \psi, R \rangle\rangle].$$

*Proof.* We consider the graphical schematics of  $\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle$  and  $\langle\langle Q, \psi, R \rangle\rangle$ , as they were given in Equation 2.3. Using this data as input, we form a new schematic: Write the top half lines of both  $\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle$  and  $\langle\langle Q, \psi, R \rangle\rangle$  under each other, and analogously for the bottom lines of each, giving the new schematic which we call  $J$ . Along with its wiring, it can be depicted as follows below on

the left:

(2.14)



and we ignore the shaded areas for the moment. This schematic defines a double exact sequence. We find a natural  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle \\
 \Downarrow \\
 J \\
 \Downarrow \\
 \langle\langle Q, \psi, R \rangle\rangle,
 \end{array}$$

where the top downward arrows “ $\Downarrow$ ” are (both for Yin and Yang) just the inclusion of the  $\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle$ -sub-schematic, and correspondingly the bottom arrows “ $\Downarrow$ ” the corresponding quotient maps, and the quotient is exactly the remaining  $\langle\langle Q, \psi, R \rangle\rangle$ -sub-schematic. The downward double exact sequences are split exact. The resulting Nenashev relation is just

$$(2.15) \quad [\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle] - [J] + [\langle\langle Q, \psi, R \rangle\rangle] = [0] - [0] + [0],$$

because the columns represent zero since Yin and Yang agree, Equation 1.5. We now set up maps from  $J$  to a new schematic: The idea is that we map the schematic to itself, just that on the objects  $T_Q, \prod T_Q, Q, \oplus Q$ , which each appear twice in the shaded areas, we use the identity map on the Yin side, but swap both objects on the Yang side. On  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  and  $Q_{\mathbb{R}}$  we use the identity both for Yin and Yang. This changes the wiring, so actually this is not a map to the same schematic, but to  $J'$ , as depicted in Figure 2.14 above on the right. As before in the proof of Lemma 2.6, in this figure we have left all objects where they were and just adjusted the arrows. The solid arrows, i.e. the Yin side, of  $J$  and  $J'$  agree, but we see that on the Yang side all arrows have moved to their

respective mirror partner. The maps which we have just described, set up a  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram


$$(2.16) \quad \begin{array}{c} J \\ \Downarrow \\ J' \\ \Downarrow \\ 0, \end{array}$$

and the quotient is zero since both the identity maps on the Yin side, as well as the swapping maps on the Yang side are isomorphisms. The resulting Nenashev relation is  $[J] - [J'] + [0] = [0] - [0] + [0]$ , since again the columns are either the identity or swapping maps, so they are zero by Lemma 2.4. Next, within the shaded area of Figure 2.14 on the right, we find the doubled versions of the the exact sequences

$$\prod T_Q \xrightarrow{s} \prod T_Q \twoheadrightarrow T_Q \quad \text{and} \quad \prod T_Q \xrightarrow{1} \prod T_Q \twoheadrightarrow 0,$$


$$Q \hookrightarrow \bigoplus Q \xrightarrow{s} \bigoplus Q \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \hookrightarrow \bigoplus Q \xrightarrow{1} \bigoplus Q,$$

and note that both Yin and Yang morphisms agree. We can map them as a sub-double exact sequence to  $J'$ , giving a  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram, but since Yin and Yang agree, they all contribute the zero class. Thus, the class of  $[J']$  agrees with its quotient by these sequences, which yields the schematic depicted below on the left:



We now map the schematic on the left to the one depicted above on the right. To this end, we use identity maps on all objects except for  $Q_{\mathbb{R}}$ , where we instead use  $\varphi^{-1}$  both for Yin and Yang (as alluded to by the dashed arrow in the figure). As the reader can see, we have adjusted the wiring on the right hand side to ensure that this defines a commuting diagram (obviously it suffices to change the four in- resp. outgoing maps around  $Q_{\mathbb{R}}$  resp.  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  to accommodate for these changes). Write  $J''$  for the schematic on the right. The morphism just described gives rise to another  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram as in Equation 2.16, this time showing  $[J'] = [J'']$ . There is no contribution from the columns since we only used the identity map, or  $(\varphi^{-1}, \varphi^{-1})$  for both Yin and Yang, which is zero by Equation

1.5. Finally, we set up a map from  $J''$  (above on the right) to  $J'''$ , defined as



This map is the identity on all objects on the Yin side. On the Yang side, it is the identity on all objects, except on the pair  $P_{\mathbb{R}} \oplus P_{\mathbb{R}}$ , on which it is the swapping map once more. The morphism again gives rise to another  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram as in Equation 2.16, showing  $[J''] = [J''']$  since there is no column contribution (the columns are just the identity for both Yin and Yang, or the swapping map, which is zero by Lemma 2.4 again). Just as we had killed the pieces in the shaded areas in Figure 2.14, we can now get rid off the double exact sequence  $Q \hookrightarrow P_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow T_R$  in the middle, where the Yin and Yang side agree. The resulting schematic is exactly  $\langle\langle P, \psi\varphi, R \rangle\rangle$ . Thus, using that we had shown that  $[J] = [J'] = [J''] = [J''']$ , Equation 2.15 now shows


$$[\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle] - [\langle\langle P, \psi\varphi, R \rangle\rangle] + [\langle\langle Q, \psi, R \rangle\rangle] = 0,$$

which proves that Relation B is respected under our map  $\vartheta$ . □

The combination of the previous lemmata settles the proof of Theorem 2.2.

### 3. PROOF OF ISOMORPHY

**3.1. Recollections on the Gillet–Grayson model.** Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a pointed exact category, i.e. an exact category with a fixed choice of a zero object which we shall henceforth denote by “0”. We briefly summarize the Gillet–Grayson model. It originates from the articles [GG87, GG03]. Define a simplicial set  $G_{\bullet}\mathcal{C}$  whose  $n$ -simplices are given by a pair of commutative diagrams



such that (1) the diagrams agree strictly above the bottom row, (2) all sequences  $P_i \hookrightarrow P_j \twoheadrightarrow P_{j/i}$  are exact, (2') all sequences  $P'_i \hookrightarrow P'_j \twoheadrightarrow P'_{j/i}$  are exact, (3) all sequences  $P_{i/j} \hookrightarrow P_{m/j} \twoheadrightarrow P_{m/i}$  are exact.

The face and degeneracy maps come from deleting the  $i$ -th row and column, or by duplicating them. For details we refer to the references. Thus, the 0-simplices are pairs  $(P, P')$  of objects. The 1-simplices are pairs of exact sequences

$$(3.1) \quad P_0 \hookrightarrow P_1 \twoheadrightarrow P_{1/0} \qquad P'_0 \hookrightarrow P'_1 \twoheadrightarrow P_{1/0}$$

with the same cokernel. The main result of Gillet and Grayson is the equivalence

$$K(\mathbb{C}) \cong |G_\bullet \mathbb{C}|,$$

or more specifically: The space  $|G_\bullet \mathbb{C}|$  is an infinite loop space and as such equivalent to a connective spectrum. This spectrum is canonically equivalent to the  $K$ -theory spectrum of  $\mathbb{C}$ . As explained in Remark 1.2 the 0-simplex  $(P, P')$  lies in the connected component  $[P'] - [P] \in \pi_0 K(\mathbb{C})$ .

**Definition 3.1** (Nenashev). *To any double exact sequence  $\kappa$ , Nenashev attaches a loop  $e(\kappa) \in \pi_1 K(\mathbb{C})$ . Concretely,*

$$\kappa = \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} A \hookrightarrow^p B \twoheadrightarrow^r C \\ \downarrow^q \quad \quad \downarrow^s \\ A \hookrightarrow B \twoheadrightarrow C \end{array} \right]$$

is mapped to a path made from three 1-simplices in the Gillet–Grayson model, namely

(1) we go from  $(0, 0)$  to  $(A, A)$  by the edge

$$0 \hookrightarrow A \twoheadrightarrow^1 A \qquad 0 \hookrightarrow A \twoheadrightarrow^1 A,$$

(2) then we go from  $(A, A)$  to  $(B, B)$  by the edge

$$A \hookrightarrow^q B \twoheadrightarrow^s C \qquad A \hookrightarrow^p B \twoheadrightarrow^r C$$

(3) and then we return from  $(B, B)$  to  $(0, 0)$  by running backwards along

$$0 \hookrightarrow B \twoheadrightarrow^1 B \qquad 0 \hookrightarrow B \twoheadrightarrow^1 B.$$

If  $A \in \mathbb{C}$  is an object,  $e(A)$  denotes the edge

$$0 \hookrightarrow A \twoheadrightarrow^1 A \qquad 0 \hookrightarrow A \twoheadrightarrow^1 A$$

from  $(0, 0)$  to  $(A, A)$ .

The path  $e(\kappa)$  is visibly a closed loop. All vertices lie in the connected component of zero in  $|G_\bullet \mathbb{C}|$ . This construction agrees with the  $e(\kappa)$  in [Nen98b, Equation 2.2  $\frac{1}{2}$ ], except for the swapped roles of left and right, in line with Remark 1.2. In summary: Whenever we use a double exact sequence in the Nenashev presentation, it corresponds homotopically to the closed loop just described.

### 3.2. Proof.

**Theorem 3.2.** *Suppose  $\mathfrak{A}$  is a regular order in a semisimple finite-dimensional  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra  $A$ . Then there is a commutative diagram*

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & K_1(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R}) & \longrightarrow & K_1(\mathfrak{A}) & \longrightarrow & K_1(A_{\mathbb{R}}) \xrightarrow{\delta} K_0(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow K_0(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \cdots \\ & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \parallel \quad X \quad \downarrow \vartheta \quad Y \quad \parallel \\ \cdots & \longrightarrow & K_2(\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}) & \longrightarrow & K_1(\mathfrak{A}) & \longrightarrow & K_1(A_{\mathbb{R}}) \longrightarrow K_1(\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}) \xrightarrow{\partial} K_0(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \cdots \end{array}$$

and the map  $\vartheta$  of Theorem 2.2 is an isomorphism.

We split the proof into several lemmata.



**Lemma 3.3.** *The square denoted by  $X$  in Equation 3.2 commutes.*

*Proof.* Let an element in  $K_1(A_{\mathbb{R}})$  be given, say represented by some isomorphism  $\varphi \in \mathrm{GL}_n(A_{\mathbb{R}})$  for  $n$  sufficiently large. We follow the downward and then right arrow first: The downward arrow is the identity. The bottom map is induced from the exact functor  $\mathrm{PMod}(A_{\mathbb{R}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  which sends a finitely generated projective right  $A_{\mathbb{R}}$ -module to itself, regarded as a locally compact module with the real topology (since  $A_{\mathbb{R}}$  is semisimple, finitely generated projective just means free of finite rank here). This class corresponds to an automorphism and by Remark 1.2 it has the Nenashev representative

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} 0 & \xrightarrow{\quad 0 \quad} & A_{\mathbb{R}}^n \xrightarrow{\quad \varphi \quad} A_{\mathbb{R}}^n \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \xrightarrow{\quad 0 \quad} & A_{\mathbb{R}}^n \xrightarrow{\quad 1 \quad} A_{\mathbb{R}}^n \end{array}$$

Next, follow the square the other way: Following the top right arrow, we get

$$\delta(\varphi) = [\mathfrak{A}^n, \varphi, \mathfrak{A}^n] \in K_0(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R}),$$

using the explicit presentation, see [Swa68, p. 215]. The map  $\vartheta$  sends this to the class of  $\langle\langle \mathfrak{A}^n, \varphi, \mathfrak{A}^n \rangle\rangle$ , which in turn unravels as the double exact sequence underlying the schematic depicted below on the left:

We now show that its class agrees with the class of the schematic depicted above on the right. The proof for this follows exactly the same pattern as the proof of Lemma 2.6 and we leave the details to the reader. However, unlike in the cited proof, this time the middle double exact sequence (the one which is bent in the figure above on the right) can be non-trivial. We use it as the first row in the following  $(3 \times 3)$ -diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathfrak{A}^n & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\mathfrak{A}^n}} & A_{\mathbb{R}}^n & \xrightarrow{q_{\mathfrak{A}^n}} & T_{\mathfrak{A}}^n \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \mathfrak{A}^n & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\mathfrak{A}^n}} & A_{\mathbb{R}}^n & \xrightarrow{q_{\mathfrak{A}^n}} & T_{\mathfrak{A}}^n \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \xrightarrow{\quad 0 \quad} & 0 & \xrightarrow{\quad 0 \quad} & 0 \end{array}$$

Using that the top row of this diagram represents the class of  $\langle\langle \mathfrak{A}^n, \varphi, \mathfrak{A}^n \rangle\rangle$  as we had just shown, the resulting Nenashev relation, i.e. the relation of Equation 1.6, of this diagram reads

$$[\langle\langle \mathfrak{A}^n, \varphi, \mathfrak{A}^n \rangle\rangle] - [0] + [0] = [0] - \left[ A_{\mathbb{R}}^n \xrightarrow[\varphi]{1} A_{\mathbb{R}}^n \xrightarrow[1]{1} 0 \right] + [0],$$

but this agrees with Equation 3.3 by Lemma 1.4.  $\square$

We recall the following definition since it plays a fairly important rôle in the next proof.

**Definition 3.4.** *Suppose  $G \in \text{LCA}$  is an LCA group. A subset  $U \subseteq G$  is called symmetric if  $g \in U$  implies  $-g \in U$ . The group  $G$  is called compactly generated if there exists a symmetric compact subset  $C \subseteq G$  such that  $G = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} C^n$ . We write  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg}$  for the fully exact subcategory of topological right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -modules whose underlying LCA group is compactly generated.*

**Lemma 3.5.** *The square denoted by  $Y$  in Equation 3.2 commutes.*

*Proof.* Let  $[P, \varphi, Q] \in K_0(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R})$  be an arbitrary element. Then under the top right arrow it is sent to

$$(3.4) \quad [P] - [Q] \in K_0(\mathfrak{A}),$$

see [Swa68, p. 215] or [Wei13, Chapter II, Definition 2.10] for this map. Thus, it remains to see that we also get this if we follow the square the other way: Firstly, the map  $\vartheta$  sends  $[P, \varphi, Q]$  to the class of the double exact sequence underlying  $\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle$ , i.e. the schematic

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \prod T_P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod T_P & \cdots & \longrightarrow & T_P \\ & & & & & \nearrow \\ P & \cdots & \oplus P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus P & \\ & \searrow & & & & \\ & & P_{\mathbb{R}} & & & \\ & \nearrow & & & & \searrow \\ Q & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \oplus Q & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \oplus Q \\ & & & & & \searrow \\ \prod T_Q & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \prod T_Q & \longrightarrow & & T_Q \end{array}$$

*(Note: In the original image, there are additional arrows: a solid arrow from  $P$  to  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$ , a solid arrow from  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  to  $\oplus P$ , a dotted arrow from  $Q$  to  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  labeled  $\varphi^{-1} \circ \iota_Q$ , and a dotted arrow from  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  to  $\oplus Q$  labeled  $\iota_Q$ .)*

Thus, we need to compute what the map  $\partial$  in Diagram 3.2 does with this element. We begin by describing how the boundary map

$$\partial : K_1(\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}) \longrightarrow K_0(\mathfrak{A})$$

arises in [Bra18b]. For this, we have to trace through our constructions and go back to how this map was defined. This leads us to the proof of [Bra18b, Proposition 11.1]. In this proof, we first set up the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg} & \longrightarrow & \text{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}} & \longrightarrow & \text{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\text{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg} \\ g \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \Phi \\ \text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg} & \longrightarrow & \text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}} & \longrightarrow & \text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg}, \end{array}$$

where  $\text{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg}$  denotes the category of finitely generated right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -modules,  $\text{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  the category of all right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -modules,  $\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg} = \text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}} \cap \text{LCA}_{cg}$  the category of topological right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -modules whose underlying LCA group is compactly generated. Both rows are exact sequences of exact categories. The map  $\Phi$  stems from the exact functor

$$\text{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\text{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg} \longrightarrow \text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\text{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg},$$

which is induced from sending a right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -module to itself, equipped with the discrete topology. It is shown loc. cit. that  $\Phi$  is in fact an exact equivalence of the given quotient exact categories. In particular, it induces an equivalence of the level of  $K$ -theory. Applying non-connective  $K$ -theory, we get two fiber sequences and then the argument *ibid.* shows that the left square is bi-Cartesian in spectra. The long exact sequences in Diagram 3.2 now arise as the long exact sequences of (stable)

homotopy groups, using that the bi-Cartesian diagram has a contractible node. From this, one unravels by diagram chase that the differential

$$\partial : \pi_1 K(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}) \longrightarrow \pi_0 K(\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg})$$

agrees with the composition  $\partial^* \circ \Phi^{-1} \circ q$  in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & \pi_1 K(\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}) & \longrightarrow & \pi_1 K(\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg}) & \xrightarrow{\partial^*} & \pi_0 K(\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg}) \\ & & \downarrow & & \parallel_{\Phi} & & \downarrow \\ \pi_1 K(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg}) & \longrightarrow & \pi_1 K(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}) & \xrightarrow{q} & \pi_1 K(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg}) & \longrightarrow & \pi_0 K(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg}), \end{array}$$

where  $\partial^*$  is the boundary map of the long exact sequence of homotopy groups coming from the localization sequence in the top row, i.e.

$$\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg}.$$

This localization sequence *ibid.* was produced from Schlichting's localization theorem, see [Bra18a, Theorem 4.1] for the formulation we use, or [Sch04] for the proof. Several further remarks: The proof of [Bra18b, Theorem 11.3] shows that the non-connective  $K$ -theory of all the involved categories agrees with their connective  $K$ -theory, i.e. their usual Quillen algebraic  $K$ -theory. Thus, from now on view  $K(-)$  as a connective spectrum. We now unravel the maps in  $\partial^* \circ \Phi^{-1} \circ q$ :

(Step 1) The map  $q$  is induced from the exact quotient functor

$$\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}} \longrightarrow \mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg}.$$

Thus,  $q$  sends the schematic in Figure 3.5 to itself, but regarded in  $\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg}$ . We observe that  $P$  is finitely generated projective and thus has underlying LCA group isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Since  $T_P$  is a torus, it is compact, and by Tychonoff's Theorem,  $\coprod T_P$  is also compact. Both arguments also work verbatim for  $Q$  and  $\coprod T_Q$ . Further, the underlying LCA group of  $P_{\mathbb{R}}$  is a finite-dimensional real vector space. Thus, by the classification of compactly generated LCA groups, all these objects are compactly generated, see [Mos67, Theorem 2.5]. As a result, for each such object we obtain an isomorphism to the zero object in the category  $\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg}$ . Thus, the class of  $q(\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle)$  is the double exact sequence  $l$ , defined as

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus P & \xrightarrow{1} & \bigoplus P & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus Q & \xrightarrow{s} & \bigoplus Q & & \\ \hline 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus P & \xrightarrow{s} & \bigoplus P & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus Q & \xrightarrow{1} & \bigoplus Q & & \end{array}$$

in the notation of Equation 1.8 (and the wiring is the obvious one, that is: each object above the line is wired to its copy below the line; this is the wiring which remains from Figure 3.5). We recall that  $s$  is the shift map of Equation 2.4. Since the wiring is so simple here, we stick to this graphical presentation from now on. It may appear like a mistake that the shift maps  $s$  are both depicted with kernel "0", but this is accurate since while in the category  $\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}$  the quotient would be  $P$  resp.  $Q$ , in the quotient category  $\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A},cg}$  these objects are isomorphic to zero. Next, we need to apply the map  $\Phi^{-1}$ . Being the inverse map to a functor, this is usually a tough operation, but it is easy in our situation: Note that all objects in Figure 3.6 are discrete right  $\mathfrak{A}$ -modules, so we can right away read this as the schematic for a double exact sequence in  $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg}$ , which  $\Phi$  obviously sends to itself. Finally, we need to apply  $\partial^*$ . This is more delicate: Recall that

$$K(\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg}) \longrightarrow K(\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}) \longrightarrow K(\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg})$$

is a fiber sequence in spectra by Schlichting's localization theorem. As all spectra here are connective, we may read this as a fiber sequence of infinite loop spaces as well. We take simplicial

sets  $\mathbf{sSet}$  as our  $\infty$ -category of ‘spaces’. Next, use Gillet–Grayson’s model to have a simplicial set describing  $K$ -theory; we had reviewed what we need in §3.1. Now, the boundary map

$$(3.7) \quad \partial^* : \pi_1 K(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg}) \longrightarrow \pi_0 K(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg})$$

has the following topological meaning: We take a loop  $\ell$  in the space  $K(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg})$  and lift it along the fibration of spaces

$$K(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}) \longrightarrow K(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg}).$$

This is possible, but only as a path which need not be closed, so we obtain a path from the distinguished pointing of  $K(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ , which is the point defined by  $(0,0)$  for the zero object in the Gillet–Grayson model, to some other point, which in concrete terms is a pair  $(A, B)$ . The boundary map  $\partial^*$  then sends  $\ell$  to the connected component in which this endpoint  $(A, B)$  lies. Since we use the Gillet–Grayson model, we need to perform all these steps simplicially. In the case at hand, the double exact sequence  $\Phi^{-1}q(\langle\langle P, \varphi, Q \rangle\rangle)$  is our input loop, and we had seen that the description of Figure 3.6 is valid. In the Gillet–Grayson model, a double exact sequence corresponds to the path

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & e(l) & \\ (0,0) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & (\oplus P \oplus \oplus Q, \oplus P \oplus \oplus Q) \\ & \searrow & \uparrow \\ & & e(\oplus P \oplus \oplus Q) \\ & (0,0) & \end{array}$$

See Definition 3.1. Recall that  $l$  was the double exact sequence of Figure 3.6. As explained above, we now need to lift this loop to a path in the Gillet–Grayson space of  $\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ . We recall that an edge from the point  $(P_0, P'_0)$  to a point  $(P_1, P'_1)$  in the Gillet–Grayson model corresponds to a pair of exact sequences with equal cokernels. Concretely, we shall take

$$(3.9) \quad Q^C \dashrightarrow \oplus P \oplus \oplus Q \xrightarrow{1 \oplus s} \oplus P \oplus \oplus Q \quad P^C \longrightarrow \oplus P \oplus \oplus Q \xrightarrow{s \oplus 1} \oplus P \oplus \oplus Q$$

which visibly have equal cokernels. This defines an edge (we stress that this datum is different from a double exact sequence). We now replace the edge  $e(l)$  in Figure 3.8 by this new edge. We get a non-closed path

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (Q, P) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & (\oplus P \oplus \oplus Q, \oplus P \oplus \oplus Q) \\ (0,0) & & \uparrow \\ & & e(\oplus P \oplus \oplus Q) \\ & (0,0) & \end{array}$$

The key point is that this path also defines a path in  $\pi_1 K(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}})$ , much unlike Figure 3.8 which would not since the shift map  $s$  is *not* an isomorphism in the category  $\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}$ . We claim that it is a lift along the fibration: Indeed, under the map

$$\pi_1 K(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}) \longrightarrow \pi_1 K(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A}}/\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg})$$

the kernels  $P$  and  $Q$  which appear on the left in Equation 3.9 again become isomorphic to zero since they are finitely generated, and thus the upper edge transforms to  $e(l)$  again. As we had discussed above, the boundary map  $\partial^*$  of Equation 3.7 now maps the lifted path to the connected component of its endpoint. This endpoint is  $(Q, P)$ . However, the identification

$$\pi_0 K(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg}) \xrightarrow{\sim} K_0(\mathbf{Mod}_{\mathfrak{A},fg})$$

in terms of the Gillet–Grayson model is given by the map  $(Q, P) \mapsto [P] - [Q]$ , see Remark 1.2. Hence, we have obtained the same as in Equation 3.4, which is exactly what we had to show.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.2.* Using Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.5, we find that the two squares to the left as well as to the right of the downward arrow  $\vartheta$  in Equation 3.2 commute. Since all other downward arrows in these squares are isomorphisms, it follows that  $\vartheta$  is an isomorphism as well by the Five Lemma.  $\square$

*Conjecture 1.* There should be an elementary proof that  $\vartheta$  is an isomorphism, solely based on the generators and relations, and without truly touching algebraic  $K$ -theory.

More might be possible:

*Conjecture 2.* There should be a recipe to map a double exact sequence to a Bass–Swan generator. It should be possible to check in an elementary (but probably complicated) fashion that composing both maps either way yields the identity map.

*Remark 3.6.* Using the work of Grayson [Gra12], the higher  $K$ -groups  $K_n(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}})$  all have explicit presentations generalizing Nenashev’s presentation for  $K_1$ . The compatibility between the Nenashev and Grayson presentations is settled first in [KW17], and even better in [KKW18]. Furthermore, the long exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow K_n(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow K_n(A_{\mathbb{R}}) \longrightarrow K_{n-1}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow K_{n-1}(\mathfrak{A}) \longrightarrow \cdots$$

involving relative  $K$ -groups can also be generalized to higher  $n > 0$ , and the higher relative  $K$ -groups  $K_{n-1}(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R})$  admit a similar concrete model in the style of Grayson, see [Gra16, Corollary 2.3]. Perhaps one could extend the above proof and isolate a concrete formula for the isomorphism

$$K_n(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\sim} K_{n+1}(\mathrm{LCA}_{\mathfrak{A}}),$$

of Theorem 3.2 for all  $n \geq 0$ . It would be based on the corresponding relative versus absolute Grayson presentation using binary multi-complexes.

## REFERENCES

- [BF01] D. Burns and M. Flach, *Tamagawa numbers for motives with (non-commutative) coefficients*, Doc. Math. **6** (2001), 501–570. MR 1884523
- [Bra18a] O. Brauning, *K-theory of locally compact modules over rings of integers*, International Mathematics Research Notices (2018), rny083.
- [Bra18b] ———, *On the relative K-group in the ETNC*, arXiv:1806.10856 (2018).
- [Cla17] D. Clausen, *A K-theoretic approach to Artin maps*, arXiv:1703.07842 [math.KT] (2017).
- [GG87] H. Gillet and D. Grayson, *The loop space of the Q-construction*, Illinois J. Math. **31** (1987), no. 4, 574–597. MR 909784
- [GG03] ———, *Erratum to: “The loop space of the Q-construction”*, Illinois J. Math. **47** (2003), no. 3, 745–748. MR 2007234
- [Gra12] D. Grayson, *Algebraic K-theory via binary complexes*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **25** (2012), no. 4, 1149–1167. MR 2947948
- [Gra16] ———, *Relative algebraic K-theory by elementary means*, 2016.
- [KKW18] D. Kasprowski, B. Koeck, and C. Winges,  *$K_1$ -groups via binary complexes of fixed length*, arXiv:1811.10954 [math.KT] (2018).
- [KW17] D. Kasprowski and C. Winges, *Shortening binary complexes and commutativity of K-theory with infinite products*, arXiv:1705.09116 [math.KT] (2017).
- [Mos67] M. Moskowitz, *Homological algebra in locally compact abelian groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **127** (1967), 361–404. MR 0215016
- [Nen96] A. Nenashev, *Double short exact sequences produce all elements of Quillen’s  $K_1$* , Algebraic K-theory (Poznań, 1995), Contemp. Math., vol. 199, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996, pp. 151–160. MR 1409623
- [Nen98a] ———, *Double short exact sequences and  $K_1$  of an exact category*, K-Theory **14** (1998), no. 1, 23–41. MR 1621690
- [Nen98b] ———,  *$K_1$  by generators and relations*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **131** (1998), no. 2, 195–212. MR 1637539

- [Sch04] M. Schlichting, *Delooping the K-theory of exact categories*, *Topology* **43** (2004), no. 5, 1089–1103. MR 2079996 (2005k:18023)
- [She96] C. Sherman, *Connecting homomorphisms in localization sequences*, *Algebraic K-theory* (Poznań, 1995), *Contemp. Math.*, vol. 199, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996, pp. 175–183. MR 1409625
- [She98] ———, *On  $K_1$  of an exact category*, *K-Theory* **14** (1998), no. 1, 1–22. MR 1621689
- [Swa68] R. G. Swan, *Algebraic K-theory*, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, No. 76, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1968. MR 0245634
- [Wei13] C. Weibel, *The K-book*, *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*, vol. 145, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2013, An introduction to algebraic K-theory. MR 3076731

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF BONN, ENDENICHER ALLEE 60, 53115 BONN, GERMANY  
*E-mail address:* oliver.braeunling@math.uni-freiburg.de, obraeunl@uni-bonn.de