

BLOCK SHUFFLE IDENTITIES FOR MULTIPLE ZETA VALUES

MINORU HIROSE AND NOBUO SATO

ABSTRACT. In 1998, Borwein, Bradley, Broadhurst and Lisoněk posed two families of conjectural identities among multiple zeta values, later generalized by Charlton using his alternating block notation. In this paper, we prove a new class of identities among multiple zeta values that simultaneously resolve and generalize these conjectures.

1. INTRODUCTION

The multiple zeta values are real numbers defined by the multiple Dirichlet series

$$\zeta(\mathbf{k}) := \sum_{0 < m_1 < \dots < m_d} \frac{1}{m_1^{k_1} \dots m_d^{k_d}}$$

for a multi-index $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d)$. Here we assume $k_1, \dots, k_{d-1} \geq 1$ and $k_d > 1$ for the convergence. The sum of the entries $k_1 + \dots + k_d$ is called the weight while d is called the depth of the multiple zeta values. In the case of depth $d = 1$, a multiple zeta value is a Riemann zeta value, and a famous evaluation formula of Euler says that

$$\zeta(2) = \frac{\pi^2}{6}$$

which gave a surprising answer to Barseł's problem. Furthermore, Euler showed

$$\zeta(4) = \frac{\pi^4}{90}, \zeta(6) = \frac{\pi^6}{945}, \zeta(8) = \frac{\pi^8}{9450}, \zeta(10) = \frac{\pi^{10}}{93555}, \zeta(12) = \frac{691\pi^{12}}{638512875}$$

and in general

$$\zeta(2m) \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot \pi^{2m}$$

for a positive integer m . On the other hand, it is widely believed that none of the 'odd' Riemann zeta values $\zeta(2m+1)$ are rational multiples of powers of π , and it is even conjectured that all of 'odd' Riemann zeta values and π are algebraically independent. Let us refer to a multiple zeta value which is a rational multiple of some power of π as an 'Eulerian' multiple zeta value. In weight two, there is only one multiple zeta value $\zeta(2)$ which is Eulerian by the aforementioned Euler's formula. Then, in weight three, we have two multiple zeta values $\zeta(3), \zeta(1, 2)$ which turn out to be equal:

$$\zeta(1, 2) = \zeta(3)$$

as shown also by Euler. Thus, at least conjecturally, neither of them are Eulerian. In weight four, we have four multiple zeta values $\zeta(4), \zeta(1, 3), \zeta(2, 2), \zeta(1, 1, 2)$, and it is known that

$$\zeta(4) = \zeta(1, 1, 2) = \frac{\pi^4}{90}, \zeta(1, 3) = \frac{\pi^4}{360}, \zeta(2, 2) = \frac{\pi^4}{120},$$

which shows that they are all Eulerian. In higher weights, we have a infinite series of Eulerian multiple zeta values

$$\zeta(\overbrace{2, 2, \dots, 2}^n) = \frac{\pi^{2n}}{(2n+1)!}$$

which is an easy consequence of the infinite product expression of sine function. Moreover, it is not hard to show that

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11M32, Secondary 33E20.

Key words and phrases. cyclic insertion conjecture, block notation, block shuffle product, mixed Tate motives, motivic multiple zeta values, level filtration, multiple zeta values, iterated integrals, multiple polylogarithms, hyperlogarithms.

$$\zeta(\overbrace{2m+2, 2m+2, \dots, 2m+2}^{n \text{ times}}) \quad (1.1)$$

is an Eulerian multiple zeta value for m, n non-negative integers, and by the general ‘duality’ relation of the multiple zeta values, this also implies that

$$\zeta(\overbrace{\{1\}^{2m}, 2, \{1\}^{2m}, 2, \dots, \{1\}^{2m}, 2}^{n \text{ times}}) \quad (1.2)$$

is also an Eulerian multiple zeta value for m, n non-negative integers. These two series of Eulerian multiple zeta values cover $\zeta(2, 2)$ and $\zeta(1, 1, 2)$, but does not cover $\zeta(1, 3)$. As a generalization of $\zeta(1, 3) = \frac{\pi^4}{360}$, Zagier conjectured a simple evaluation formula

$$\zeta(\{1, 3\}^n) = \frac{2\pi^{4n}}{(4n+2)!}$$

which was later proved in [2]. A natural question is then “what are *all* Eulerian multiple zeta values?”. Borwein-Bradley-Broadhurst performed a numerical investigation on multiple zeta values and discovered the following remarkable series of conjecturally Eulerian multiple zeta values:

Conjecture 1 ([2, equation (18)]). For $m, n \geq 0$,

$$\zeta(\{\{2\}^m, 1, \{2\}^m, 3\}^n, \{2\}^m) \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{1}{2n+1} \frac{\pi^{\text{wt}}}{(\text{wt}+1)!} \quad \left(= \frac{1}{2n+1} \zeta(\{2\}^{\text{wt}/2}) \right) \quad (1.3)$$

where $\text{wt} = 4(m+1)n + 2m$ is the weight of the multiple zeta values.

Extensive numerical evidence¹ shows that it is very likely that (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3) exhaust all the Eulerian multiple zeta values. Furthermore, Borwein-Bradley-Broadhurst-Lisoněk [3] introduced the Z -notation

$$Z(m_0, \dots, m_{2n}) := \zeta(\{2\}^{m_0}, 1, \{2\}^{m_1}, 3, \{2\}^{m_2}, \dots, 1, \{2\}^{m_{2n-1}}, 3, \{2\}^{m_{2n}})$$

and generalized Conjecture 1 as follows:

Conjecture 2 (Cyclic insertion conjecture, [3, Conjecture 1]). For $n \geq 0$ and $m_0, \dots, m_{2n} \geq 0$, we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{2n} Z(m_{2n-j+1}, \dots, m_{2n}, m_0, \dots, m_{2n-j}) = \zeta(\{2\}^{2n+\sum_{j=0}^{2n} m_j}).$$

Using the Z -notation, they also gave the following conjecture.

Conjecture 3 ([3, Conjecture 2]). For $a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2 \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & Z(a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, a_3) + Z(a_2, b_1, a_3, b_2, a_1) + Z(a_3, b_1, a_1, b_2, a_2) \\ & = Z(a_1, b_2, a_2, b_1, a_3) + Z(a_2, b_2, a_3, b_1, a_1) + Z(a_3, b_2, a_1, b_1, a_2). \end{aligned}$$

Conjectures 1, 2 and 3 were later generalized by Charlton by his invention of the (alternating) block notation for the motivic multiple zeta values ([9, 8]). To state his conjectures, let us define some notations. For a_1, \dots, a_k with $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \{0, 1\}$, we denote by

$$I^{\mathbf{m}}(0, a_1, \dots, a_k, 1)$$

the motivic iterated integral of $\frac{dt}{t-a_1}, \dots, \frac{dt}{t-a_k}$ along the straight path from 0 (with the tangential vector $\frac{d}{dt}$) to 1 (with the tangential vector $-\frac{d}{dt}$). We call a (possibly empty) sequence (l_1, \dots, l_d) of positive integers an index, and say that (l_1, \dots, l_d) is admissible if it is empty or $l_1 > 1$ and $l_d > 1$. Also, we define the parity (even/odd) of (l_1, \dots, l_d) to be the parity of $\sum_{i=1}^d (l_i - 1)$.

¹The authors have verified this fact up to weight 22 based on the data of The Multiple Zeta Values data mine [1].

Definition 4 ((Alternating) block notation, [9, Definition 2.2.8], [8, Notation 3.6]). For an odd index (l_1, \dots, l_d) , we define

$$I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(l_1, \dots, l_d) := I^{\text{m}}(a_0, \dots, a_{n+1})$$

where $n+2 = l_1 + \dots + l_d$ and a_i 's are defined by $a_0 = 0$ and

$$a_{i+1} = \begin{cases} a_i & i \in \{l_1, l_1 + l_2, \dots, l_1 + \dots + l_{d-1}\} \\ 1 - a_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Notice that $a_{n+1} = 1$ by the oddness of (l_1, \dots, l_d) .

Example 5. For example,

$$I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(3, 4, 5) = I^{\text{m}}(\overbrace{0, 1, 0}^3, \overbrace{0, 1, 0, 1}^4, \overbrace{1, 0, 1, 0, 1}^5).$$

The block notation can be viewed as a generalization of Z -notation since

$$Z^{\text{m}}(m_0, \dots, m_{2n}) = (-1)^{m_0 + \dots + m_{2n}} I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(2m_0 + 2, \dots, 2m_{2n} + 2)$$

with the motivic version Z^{m} of Z . With this setup, Charlton's conjectures are stated as follows.

Conjecture 6 (Generalized cyclic insertion conjecture, [9, Conjecture 2.5.1][8, Conjecture 6.1]). For $d \geq 1$ and $l_1, \dots, l_d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^d (l_i - 1)$ is odd, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(l_{i+1}, \dots, l_d, l_1, \dots, l_i) = \begin{cases} I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(l_1 + \dots + l_d) & d : \text{odd} \\ 0 & d : \text{even.} \end{cases}$$

Conjecture 7 (Generalization of Conjecture 3, [9, Conjecture 2.8.2][8, Conjecture 8.3]). For $n \geq 1$ and $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}, b_1, \dots, b_n \geq 2$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} a_i + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i$ is even, we have

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a_{\sigma(1)}, b_1, a_{\sigma(2)}, b_2, \dots, a_{\sigma(n)}, b_n, a_{\sigma(n+1)}) = 0.$$

The purpose of this paper is to prove a new extensive class of identities among multiple zeta values simultaneously generalizing Conjectures 6 and 7, which we call *block shuffle identities*. To state the block shuffle identities, we start with preparing some algebraic settings. Let $\mathfrak{X} := \mathbb{Q}\langle x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots \rangle$ be the free non-commutative algebra generated by the formal variables x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots over \mathbb{Q} . For an index $\mathbb{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d)$, we put $x_{\mathbb{k}} := x_{k_1} \cdots x_{k_d}$. We denote by \mathfrak{X}^+ (resp. $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}, \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}$) the subspace of \mathfrak{X} spanned by $x_{\mathbb{k}}$'s for all non-empty (resp. even, odd) indices \mathbb{k} , and put $\mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}^+ = \mathfrak{X}^+ \cap \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}$. For $k \geq 0$, we define a \mathbb{Q} -linear map $s_k : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} s_k(x_i w) &= x_{i+k} w \quad (w \in \mathfrak{X}), \\ s_k(1) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We define a \mathbb{Q} -bilinear map $\diamond : \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} u \diamond 1 &= 1 \diamond u = u \quad (u \in \mathfrak{X}), \\ x_a u \diamond x_b v &= x_a(u \diamond x_b v) + x_b(x_a u \diamond v) - s_{a+b}(u \diamond v) \quad (u, v \in \mathfrak{X}) \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently

$$x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_l} \diamond x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} = \sum_{n=0}^{l+m} (-1)^{(l+m-n)/2} \sum_{(f,g) \in \mathcal{D}_n} x_{c_1(f,g)} \cdots x_{c_n(f,g)}$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_n := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} f: \{1, \dots, l\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\} \\ g: \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\} \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{l} f, g: \text{weakly increasing,} \\ \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \#f^{-1}(i) - \#g^{-1}(i) = \pm 1 \end{array} \right\}$$

and $c_i(f, g) := \sum_{j \in f^{-1}(i)} a_j + \sum_{j \in g^{-1}(i)} b_j$. For example, $x_a x_b \diamond x_c = x_c x_a x_b + x_a x_c x_b + x_a x_b x_c - x_{a+b+c}$. Let \mathcal{H} be the ring of motivic periods of mixed Tate motives over \mathbb{Q} . We define a \mathbb{Q} -linear map $L_B^{\text{m}} : \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by

$$L_B^{\text{m}}(x_{l_1} \cdots x_{l_d}) := I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(l_1, \dots, l_d).$$

Also, we put

$$\mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}} := \bigoplus_{d=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus_{\substack{(l_1, \dots, l_d): \text{even} \\ (l_1, \dots, l_d) \neq (1, \dots, 1)}} \mathbb{Q}x_{l_1} \cdots x_{l_d}.$$

Definition 8 (Block regularization). Define a \mathbb{Q} -linear map $L_B : \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by the generating series

$$\sum_{\mathbb{k}: \text{odd}} L_B(x_{\mathbb{k}})X_{\mathbb{k}} := \Gamma_1(X_1)^{-2} \left(\sum_{\mathbb{k}: \text{odd}} L_B^{\sqcup}(x_{\mathbb{k}})X_{\mathbb{k}} \right) \Gamma_1(-X_1)^{-2} \quad \left(\in \mathcal{H} \langle \langle X_1, X_2, \dots \rangle \rangle \right)$$

where $X_{(k_1, \dots, k_d)} = X_{k_1} \cdots X_{k_d}$ and $\Gamma_1(t) = \exp(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \zeta^{\text{m}}(n)(-t)^n/n) \in \mathcal{H}[[t]]$.

Note that $L_B(x_{\mathbb{k}}) = L_B^{\sqcup}(x_{\mathbb{k}})$ for any odd admissible index \mathbb{k} by definition. The following are the main results of this paper.

Theorem 9 (Block shuffle identity, the first form). *For $u \in \mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}}$ and $v \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}$, we have*

$$L_B^{\sqcup}(u \diamond v) = 0.$$

Theorem 10 (Block shuffle identity, the second form). *For $u \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}^+$ and $v \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}$, we have*

$$L_B(u \diamond v) = 0.$$

Using some algebraic identities (Propositions 16 and 17), our main theorem yields all the aforementioned conjectures:

Theorem 11. *Conjectures 6 and 7 (and thus Conjectures 1, 2, 3) are true.*

Remark 12. Charlton formulated a generalization of Conjecture 6 to the non-admissible case, which is also a consequence of Theorem 10 (see Proposition 53).

Remark 13. Let us make a few historical remarks. The case $m_0 + \cdots + m_{2n} = 1$ of Conjecture 2 is proved in [3, Theorem 2] (“dressed with 2” identity). Later on, Bowman and Bradley showed a more general result

$$\sum_{m_0 + \cdots + m_{2n} = m} Z(m_0, \dots, m_{2n}) = \frac{1}{2n+1} \binom{m+2n}{m} \cdot \frac{\pi^{\text{wt}}}{(\text{wt}+1)!}$$

which is also a consequence (obtained by summing all the cases with $m_0 + \cdots + m_{2n} = m$) of Conjecture 2. By a method using motivic multiple zeta values, Charlton [7] showed that $\zeta(\{\{2\}^m, 1, \{2\}^m, 3\}^n, \{2\}^m)$ are Eulerian, i.e., $\zeta(\{\{2\}^m, 1, \{2\}^m, 3\}^n, \{2\}^m) \in \mathbb{Q} \cdot \pi^{\text{wt}}$ for all $m, n \geq 0$. It should be stressed that Charlton’s result only gives the existence of the rational numbers $q_{n,m} \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$\zeta(\{\{2\}^m, 1, \{2\}^m, 3\}^n, \{2\}^m) = q_{n,m} \cdot \pi^{\text{wt}},$$

but does not provide a way to determine $q_{n,m}$ itself. Also, Keilthy showed in [16, Corollary 2.4.4], [17, Corollary 6.4] that

$$L_B^{\sqcup}(u \sqcup v) \equiv 0$$

holds modulo lower block degree and products. To compare his result with our results, notice that the top degree ($n = l + m$) terms in the definition of $x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_l} \diamond x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m}$ agrees with

$$x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_l} \sqcup x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m}.$$

Thus, Keilthy’s result says that the block shuffle identity (Theorems 9, 10) holds modulo lower block degree and products. As a final remark, Hoffman’s conjectural identities

$$\zeta(3, \{2\}^n, 1, 2) = \zeta(\{2\}^{n+3}) + 2\zeta(3, 3, \{2\}^n)$$

are another consequence of Conjecture 6, which has been proved by the authors in their previous paper [12].

Another interesting consequence of our main theorem is:

Proposition 14. *Let $W_{2,3}$ denote the finite sequences of 2 and 3, and $\mathbb{W}_{2,3}$ the set of formal \mathbb{Q} -linear sums of elements of $W_{2,3}$. We define a binary operation $\star : W_{2,3} \times W_{2,3} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}_{2,3}$ recursively by*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{k} \star \emptyset &= \emptyset \star \mathbb{k} = \mathbb{k} \\ (\mathbb{k}, 2) \star \mathbb{k}' &= \mathbb{k} \star (\mathbb{k}', 2) = (\mathbb{k} \star \mathbb{k}', 2) \\ (\mathbb{k}, 3) \star (\mathbb{k}', 3) &= (\mathbb{k} \star (\mathbb{k}', 3), 3) + ((\mathbb{k}, 3) \star \mathbb{k}', 3) + (\mathbb{k} \star \mathbb{k}', 2, 2, 2). \end{aligned}$$

Then for $\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}' \in W_{2,3}$, we have

$$\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}', \mathbb{k}^\dagger) = \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k} \star \mathbb{k}')$$

where \mathbb{k}^\dagger is the dual index of \mathbb{k} .

Remark 15. Notice that, the left-hand side $\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}', \mathbb{k}^\dagger)$ of this proposition is of the form

$$\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\{2\}^{a_1}, 3, \dots, \{2\}^{a_r}, 3, \{2\}^c, 1, \{2\}^{b_s+1}, \dots, 1, \{2\}^{b_1+1}) \quad (a_1, \dots, a_r, b_1, \dots, b_s, c \geq 0)$$

which is equal to

$$\pm I_{\text{bl}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(2a_1 + 3, \dots, 2a_r + 3, 2c + 2, 2b_s + 3, \dots, 2b_1 + 3)$$

under the block notation. Given an index (l_1, \dots, l_d) with $l_1, \dots, l_d \geq 2$ and $\#\{l_i : \text{even}\} = 1$, this proposition gives a way to express $I_{\text{bl}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(l_1, \dots, l_d)$ as a sum of $\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k})$ with $\mathbb{k} \in W_{2,3}$. As we know that $\{\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k})\}_{\mathbb{k} \in W_{2,3}}$ (namely, the Hoffman basis) are linearly independent by Brown's theorem, our theorem gives all \mathbb{Q} -linear relations among such $I_{\text{bl}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(l_1, \dots, l_d)$'s. This proposition also says that $\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}', \mathbb{k}^\dagger)$ is a \mathbb{Z} -linear sum of $\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k})$ with $\mathbb{k} \in W_{2,3}$ (in light of its significance, we restate this fact as Theorem 56 in the final section and discuss related experimental observations). At least numerically, it seems that these are the only multiple zeta values having such a property, and no other multiple zeta values are \mathbb{Z} -linear sum of the Hoffman basis. Nevertheless, we also conjecture general 2-integrality of the coefficients in the expansion by the Hoffman basis, that is, all the motivic multiple zeta values are $\mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ -linear sums of $\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k})$ for $\mathbb{k} \in W_{2,3}$.

The outline of the proof of Theorems 9 and 10 is as follows. In a nutshell, the basic strategy is to construct a lift of the block shuffle identity to hyperlogarithms and make use of their differential equations. To be a bit more precise, we will use a refined algebraic version of the differential equations in order to work at the level of motivic iterated integrals. The proof is roughly divided into three parts; the construction of the multivariable block shuffle product, the proof of the algebraic differential formula of the multivariable block shuffle product, and the derivation of the block shuffle identity from the algebraic differential formula. Here, for the final step of the proof, we use the motivicity result of the confluence relation proved in another article [14] of the authors and additional arguments concerning the non-admissible generalization.

This paper is organized as follows. To begin with, in Section 2, we discuss various consequences of the block shuffle identities described above. We will show that all the aforementioned conjectures (Conjectures 6, 7) together with Proposition 14 are corollaries of the block shuffle identity (Theorem 10) via certain algebraic identities/congruences. The subsequent sections (Sections 3, 4 and 5) are mainly devoted to the proof of the block shuffle identity. Firstly, in Section 3, we will construct a multivariable lift of the block shuffle product; we give a definition of the multivariable block shuffle product and prove its compatibility with the original block shuffle product. Compared to the original block shuffle product, the definition of the multivariable block shuffle product has a much more complex form. For this reason, we will describe its combinatorial nature in a more intuitive way and also give several recurrence formulas satisfied by the multivariable block shuffle product (Propositions 26 and 27). Then, in Section 4, we will prove a key differential formula of the multivariable block shuffle product. Finally, in Section 5, we will prove the full versions of the block shuffle identity (Theorems 9, 10). The derivation of the full version (non-admissible extension) of Charlton's generalized cyclic insertion conjecture and analog of the block shuffle identity for refined symmetric multiple zeta values (Conjecture 54, Theorem 55) are also discussed at the end of Section 5. Finally, in Section 6, we will discuss a certain maximality of the block shuffle relation and their significance from the perspective of the size of the coefficients.

2. CONSEQUENCES OF THE BLOCK SHUFFLE IDENTITY

2.1. Derivation of Charlton's conjectures from the block shuffle identity. Let $\mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+$ be the \mathbb{Q} -vector subspace of \mathfrak{X} spanned by $\{u \diamond v \mid u, v \in \mathfrak{X}^+\}$. The purpose of this section is prove some algebraic identities and derive Conjectures 6 and 7 from Theorem 10. For convenience, we extend the definition of L_B to \mathfrak{X} by setting $L_B(\mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}) = \{0\}$. Since Theorem 10 says that

$$\mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+ \subset \ker L_B,$$

it is enough to prove the following propositions.

Proposition 16. *For $d \geq 1$ and $l_1, \dots, l_d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we have*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} x_{l_{i+1}} \cdots x_{l_d} x_{l_1} \cdots x_{l_i} \equiv \begin{cases} x_{l_1+\dots+l_d} & d : \text{odd} \\ 0 & d : \text{even} \end{cases} \pmod{\mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+}.$$

Proposition 17. *For $n \geq 1$ and $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}, b_1, \dots, b_n \geq 1$, we have*

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) x_{a_{\sigma(1)}} x_{b_1} x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{a_{\sigma(n)}} x_{b_n} x_{a_{\sigma(n+1)}} \in \mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+.$$

To prove these propositions, we need some lemmas. For $c \geq 1$, we define \mathbb{Q} -bilinear maps $f_c : \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^+$ by

$$f_c(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_l}, x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m}) = \sum_{n=1}^{l+m+1} (-1)^{(l+m+1-n)/2} \sum_{(f,g) \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_n} x_{\alpha_1(f,g)} \cdots x_{\alpha_n(f,g)}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_n := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} f: \{1, \dots, l\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\} \\ g: \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\} \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{l} f, g: \text{ weakly increasing,} \\ \#f^{-1}(i) - \#g^{-1}(i) = \begin{cases} 0 & i=1 \\ \pm 1 & i \in \{2, \dots, n\} \end{cases} \end{array} \right\}$$

and

$$\alpha_i(f, g) = c\delta_{1,i} + \sum_{j \in f^{-1}(i)} a_j + \sum_{j \in g^{-1}(i)} b_j.$$

By definition, f_c satisfies

$$f_c(u, 1) = f_c(1, u) = x_c u \quad (u \in \mathfrak{X}) \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$f_c(x_a u, x_b v) = x_c f_a(u, x_b v) + x_c f_b(x_a u, v) - f_{c+a+b}(u, v) \quad (u, v \in \mathfrak{X}), \quad (2.2)$$

which also gives an inductive definition of f_c . Note also that

$$x_a u \diamond x_b v = f_a(u, x_b v) + f_b(x_a u, v) \quad (u, v \in \mathfrak{X}) \quad (2.3)$$

by definition.

Lemma 18. *For $n \geq 1$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $v \in \mathfrak{X}$, we have*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} S(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_i}) \diamond x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_n} v = f_{a_n}(S(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_{n-1}}), v)$$

where S is the anti-automorphism of \mathfrak{X} defined by $S(x_k) = -x_k$. In particular,

$$x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_n} v \equiv f_{a_n}(S(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_{n-1}}), v) \pmod{\mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+}.$$

Proof. Put

$$g_i = f_{a_i}(S(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_{i-1}}), x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_n} v)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $g_0 = 0$. Then, by (2.3), we have

$$S(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_i}) \diamond x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_n} v = g_{i+1} - g_i$$

for $i = 0, \dots, n-1$. Thus, by telescoping the sum, we get

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} S(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_i}) \diamond x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_n} v = g_n - g_0 = f_{a_n}(S(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_{n-1}}), v)$$

which proves the claim. \square

Lemma 19. For $n \geq 0$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \geq 1$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^n f_c(S(x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_n}), x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_i}) = \begin{cases} x_{c+a_1+\cdots+a_n} & n : \text{even} \\ 0 & n : \text{odd}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We prove the lemma by the induction on n . The cases $n = 0, 1$ are trivial by definition. Suppose that $n \geq 2$. Then, the left-hand side can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0}^n f_c(S(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_i}), x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_n}) \\ \stackrel{(2.1)}{=} & \underbrace{x_c x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_n}}_{(i=0 \text{ term})} + \underbrace{x_c S(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_n})}_{(i=n \text{ term})} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} f_c(S(x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_n}), x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_i}) \\ \stackrel{(2.2)}{=} & x_c x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_n} + x_c S(x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_n}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} f_{c+a_1+a_n}(S(x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_{n-1}}), x_{a_2} \cdots x_{a_i}) \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_c f_{a_n}(S(x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_{n-1}}), x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_i}) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_c f_{a_1}(S(x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_n}), x_{a_2} \cdots x_{a_i}) \\ \stackrel{(2.1)}{=} & \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} f_{c+a_1+a_n}(S(x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_{n-1}}), x_{a_2} \cdots x_{a_i}) \\ & - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} x_c f_{a_n}(S(x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_{n-1}}), x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_i}) + \sum_{i=1}^n x_c f_{a_1}(S(x_{a_{i+1}} \cdots x_{a_n}), x_{a_2} \cdots x_{a_i}) \\ \text{ind. hyp.} \stackrel{=}{=} & \begin{cases} x_{c+a_1+a_n+(a_2+\cdots+a_{n-1})} & n : \text{even} \\ 0 & n : \text{odd}, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

by which we complete the proof. \square

Lemma 20. For $n \geq 1$ and $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}, b_1, \dots, b_n \geq 1$, we have

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) f_{b_1}(x_{a_{\sigma(1)}}, x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{a_{\sigma(n)}} x_{b_n} x_{a_{\sigma(n+1)}}) = 0.$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on n . The case $n = 1$ is trivial by definition, so let $n \geq 2$. For $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}$, put

$$u_\sigma = x_{a_{\sigma(3)}} x_{b_3} \cdots x_{a_{\sigma(n)}} x_{b_n} x_{a_{\sigma(n+1)}}.$$

Then the left hand side of lemma can be written as

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) f_{b_1}(x_{a_{\sigma(1)}}, x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{b_2} u_\sigma).$$

By applying (2.2) twice together with (2.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} f_{b_1}(x_{a_{\sigma(1)}}, x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{b_2} u_\sigma) &= -x_{b_1+a_{\sigma(1)}+a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{b_2} u_\sigma - x_{b_1} x_{a_{\sigma(1)}+a_{\sigma(2)}+b_2} u_\sigma \\ &\quad + x_{b_1} x_{a_{\sigma(1)}} x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{b_2} u_\sigma + x_{b_1} x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{a_{\sigma(1)}} x_{b_2} u_\sigma \\ &\quad + x_{b_1} x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} f_{b_2}(x_{a_{\sigma(1)}}, u_\sigma). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Noting the trivial identities

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) x_{b_1+a_{\sigma(1)}+a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{b_2} u_\sigma &= 0, \\ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) x_{b_1} x_{a_{\sigma(1)}+a_{\sigma(2)}+b_2} u_\sigma &= 0, \\ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) x_{b_1} (x_{a_{\sigma(1)}} x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} + x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{a_{\sigma(1)}}) x_{b_2} u_\sigma &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

the alternating sum of (2.4) is computed as

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) f_{b_1}(x_{a_{\sigma(1)}}, x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{b_2} u_\sigma) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) x_{b_1} x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} f_{b_2}(x_{a_{\sigma(1)}}, u_\sigma) = 0,$$

where for the last equality we used the induction hypothesis. This proves the lemma. \square

Now, let us prove Propositions 16 and 17.

Proof of Proposition 16. Let $d \geq 1$ and $l_1, \dots, l_d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. By Lemma 18, we have

$$x_{l_{i+1}} \cdots x_{l_d} x_{l_1} \cdots x_{l_i} \equiv f_{l_d}(S(x_{l_{i+1}} \cdots x_{l_{d-1}}), x_{l_1} \cdots x_{l_i})$$

modulo $\mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+$ for $i = 0, \dots, d-1$. Summing this for $0 \leq i \leq d-1$, and using Lemma 19, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} x_{l_{i+1}} \cdots x_{l_d} x_{l_1} \cdots x_{l_i} \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} f_{l_d}(S(x_{l_{i+1}} \cdots x_{l_{d-1}}), x_{l_1} \cdots x_{l_i}) = \begin{cases} x_{l_1+\dots+l_d} & d : \text{odd} \\ 0 & d : \text{even}, \end{cases}$$

which proves the claim. \square

Proof of Proposition 17. Let $n \geq 1$ and $a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}, b_1, \dots, b_n \geq 1$. Again, by Lemma 18, we have

$$x_{a_1} x_{b_1} x_{a_2} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{a_n} x_{b_n} x_{a_{n+1}} \equiv -f_{b_1}(x_{a_1}, x_{a_2} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{a_n} x_{b_n} x_{a_{n+1}}).$$

modulo $\mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+$. Taking the alternating sum over all permutations of a_i 's, and using Lemma 20,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) x_{a_{\sigma(1)}} x_{b_1} x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{a_{\sigma(n)}} x_{b_n} x_{a_{\sigma(n+1)}} &\equiv - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) f_{b_1}(x_{a_{\sigma(1)}}, x_{a_{\sigma(2)}} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{a_{\sigma(n)}} x_{b_n} x_{a_{\sigma(n+1)}}) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim. \square

2.2. Derivation of Proposition 14 from the block shuffle identity. In this section, we derive Proposition 14 from Theorem 10. For this purpose, we first reformulate Proposition 14 in terms of L_B . Let $W'_{2,3}$ be a subset of $W_{2,3}$ consisting of indices which do not end with 2. Define

$$\iota : W'_{2,3} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}, \quad \theta : W_{2,3} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(\{2\}^{k_d}, 3, \dots, \{2\}^{k_1}, 3) &= (-1)^{k_1+\dots+k_d} x_{2k_1+3} \cdots x_{2k_d+3}, \\ \theta(\{2\}^{k_d}, 3, \dots, \{2\}^{k_1}, 3, \{2\}^{k_0}) &= (-1)^{k_0+\dots+k_d} x_{2k_0+2} x_{2k_1+3} \cdots x_{2k_d+3}. \end{aligned}$$

By definition, they satisfy the recursion

$$\begin{aligned} \iota(\mathbb{k}, \{2\}^c, 3) &= (-1)^c x_{2c+3} \cdot \iota(\mathbb{k}) \quad (\mathbb{k} \in W'_{2,3}), \\ \theta(\mathbb{k}, 3, \{2\}^c) &= (-1)^c x_{2c+2} \cdot s_1(\theta(\mathbb{k})) \quad (\mathbb{k} \in W_{2,3}). \end{aligned}$$

By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} & \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\{2\}^{k_d}, 3, \dots, \{2\}^{k_1}, 3, \{2\}^{k_0}) \\ &= (-1)^{k_0 + \dots + k_d + d} I^{\mathfrak{m}}(\overbrace{0, 1, \dots, 0, 1, 0}^{2k_d+3}, \overbrace{0, 1, \dots, 0, 1, 0}^{2k_{d-1}+3}, \dots, \overbrace{0, 1, \dots, 0, 1, 0}^{2k_1+3}, \overbrace{0, 1, \dots, 0, 1}^{2k_0+2}) \\ &= (-1)^{k_0 + \dots + k_d} L_B(x_{2k_0+2} x_{2k_1+3} \cdots x_{2k_d+3}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}) = L_B(\theta(\mathbb{k})) \quad (\mathbb{k} \in W_{2,3}).$$

Now write $\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}' \in W_{2,3}$ in the forms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{k} &= (\mathbf{k}, \{2\}^a) \quad (\mathbf{k} \in W'_{2,3}), \\ \mathbb{k}' &= (\mathbf{l}, \{2\}^b) \quad (\mathbf{l} \in W'_{2,3}). \end{aligned}$$

Then $\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k} \star \mathbb{k}')$ (the right-hand side of Proposition 14) is equal to

$$L_B(\theta(\mathbf{k} \star \mathbf{l}, \{2\}^{a+b}))$$

as checked above, and by a similar calculation $\zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbb{k}', \mathbb{k}^\dagger)$ (the left-hand side of Proposition 14) is equal to

$$(-1)^{a+b} L_B(S(\iota(\mathbf{l})) x_{2+2a+2b} \iota(\mathbf{k})).$$

Hence, Proposition 14 is equivalent to

$$S(\iota(\mathbf{l})) x_{2+2c} \iota(\mathbf{k}) - (-1)^c \theta(\mathbf{k} \star \mathbf{l}, \{2\}^c) \in \ker L_B$$

with $c = a + b$.

Now let us derive Proposition 14 from Theorem 10. For this purpose, it is sufficient to show

$$S(\iota(\mathbf{l})) x_{2+2c} \iota(\mathbf{k}) - (-1)^c \theta(\mathbf{k} \star \mathbf{l}, \{2\}^c) \in \mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+.$$

Noting that the first term is congruent to

$$f_{2+2c}(\iota(\mathbf{l}), \iota(\mathbf{k})),$$

modulo $\mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+$ by Lemma 18, it is also enough to prove

$$f_{2+2c}(\iota(\mathbf{l}), \iota(\mathbf{k})) \equiv (-1)^c \theta(\mathbf{k} \star \mathbf{l}, \{2\}^c) \pmod{\mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+}.$$

In fact, the following stronger equality holds:

Lemma 21. *For $c \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} \in W'_{2,3}$, we have*

$$f_{2+2c}(\iota(\mathbf{l}), \iota(\mathbf{k})) = (-1)^c \theta(\mathbf{k} \star \mathbf{l}, \{2\}^c).$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on \mathbf{k} and \mathbf{l} . If $\mathbf{k} = \emptyset$ (or $\mathbf{l} = \emptyset$), then the equality holds since

$$\begin{aligned} f_{2+2c}(\iota(\mathbf{l}), \iota(\emptyset)) &= x_{2+2c} \iota(\mathbf{l}) \\ &= (-1)^c \theta(\mathbf{l}, \{2\}^c). \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $\mathbf{k} = (\mathbf{k}', \{2\}^s, 3)$ and $\mathbf{l} = (\mathbf{l}', \{2\}^t, 3)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{2+2c}(\iota(\mathbf{l}), \iota(\mathbf{k})) &= (-1)^{s+t} f_{2+2c}(x_{2t+3} \iota(\mathbf{l}'), x_{2s+3} \iota(\mathbf{k}')) \\ &= (-1)^s x_{2+2c} f_{2s+3}(\iota(\mathbf{l}), \iota(\mathbf{k}')) + (-1)^t x_{2+2c} f_{2t+3}(\iota(\mathbf{l}'), \iota(\mathbf{k})) \\ &\quad - (-1)^{s+t} f_{2+2c+2s+2t+6}(\iota(\mathbf{l}'), \iota(\mathbf{k}')) \\ &= (-1)^s x_{2+2c} s_1(f_{2s+2}(\iota(\mathbf{l}), \iota(\mathbf{k}'))) + (-1)^t x_{2+2c} s_1(f_{2t+2}(\iota(\mathbf{l}'), \iota(\mathbf{k}))) \\ &\quad + (-1)^{s+t+3} f_{2+2c+2s+2t+6}(\iota(\mathbf{l}'), \iota(\mathbf{k}')). \end{aligned}$$

Using induction hypothesis, the last expression is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & x_{2+2c} s_1(\theta(\mathbf{k}' \star \mathbf{l}, \{2\}^s)) + x_{2+2c} s_1(\theta(\mathbf{k} \star \mathbf{l}', \{2\}^t)) + (-1)^c \theta(\mathbf{k}' \star \mathbf{l}', \{2\}^{c+s+t+3}) \\ &= (-1)^c (\theta(\mathbf{k}' \star \mathbf{l}, \{2\}^s, 3, \{2\}^c) + \theta(\mathbf{k} \star \mathbf{l}', \{2\}^t, 3, \{2\}^c) + \theta(\mathbf{k}' \star \mathbf{l}', \{2\}^{s+t+3+c})) \\ &= (-1)^c \theta(\mathbf{k} \star \mathbf{l}, \{2\}^c), \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 56. It suffices to show

$$\ker L_B \cap \mathfrak{X}' \subset \mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+.$$

Then, by Brown's theorem [6], $\ker L_B \cap \theta(W_{2,3}) = 0$. Notice that $\{S(\iota(\mathbf{l}))_{x_{2c+2}\iota(\mathbf{k})} | \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{k} \in W'_{2,3}, c \geq 0\}$ forms a basis of \mathfrak{X}' and

$$\xi_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}, c} := S(\iota(\mathbf{l}))_{x_{2c+2}\iota(\mathbf{k})} - (-1)^c \theta(\mathbf{k} \star \mathbf{l}, \{2\}^c) \in \ker L_B$$

for $\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{k} \in W'_{2,3}$ and $c \geq 0$ by the proof above. Thus $\{\xi_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}, c} | \mathbf{l}, \mathbf{k} \in W'_{2,3}, c \geq 0\}$ spans $\ker L_B \cap \mathfrak{X}'$. Since $\xi_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}, c} \in \mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+$, this proves the desired claim. \square

3. MULTIVARIABLE GENERALIZATION OF THE BLOCK SHUFFLE PRODUCT

Recall that the block shuffle product is a product defined on \mathfrak{X} . Charlton's alternating block notation (see Definition 28 for the precise definition) gives a natural way to identify the non-constant part of \mathfrak{X} as a subspace of $\mathbb{Q}\langle e_0, e_1 \rangle$. The goal of this section is to extend the block shuffle product to a multi-variable setting. To give a little more detail, we let $\mathcal{A} := \mathbb{Q}\langle e_x | x \in \mathbb{C} \rangle$ and $\mathcal{A}^+ := \bigoplus_{\substack{n>0 \\ x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{C}}} \mathbb{Q}e_{x_1} \cdots e_{x_n}$ be its subspace without the constant term. We shall construct a \mathbb{Q} -bilinear map

$$\diamond : \mathfrak{X} \times \mathcal{A}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^+$$

that extends the block shuffle product

$$\diamond : \mathfrak{X} \times \mathfrak{X}^+ \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}^+.$$

This extension will play a crucial role of our proof of the block shuffle identity in later section, and the construction of this multivariable lift is indeed the most non-trivial part throughout the entire proof of the block shuffle identity.

3.1. Definition of the multivariable block shuffle product. In this section, we define a multivariable extension of the block shuffle product. To begin with, let ι be an involution on \mathbb{C} defined by $\iota(z) = 1 - z$ and ι its induced involution on \mathcal{A} i.e., $\iota(e_z) = e_{1-z}$. We write ι^k (resp. ι^k) for the k -times composition of ι (resp. ι^k). For $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we put

$$U(b) := \overbrace{e_0 e_1 e_0 e_1 \cdots e_{\iota^b(1)}}^b + \overbrace{e_1 e_0 e_1 e_0 \cdots e_{\iota^b(0)}}^b \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Definition 22 (Multi-variable block shuffle product). We define a \mathbb{Q} -bilinear map $\diamond : \mathfrak{X} \times \mathcal{A}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^+$ by

$$x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} = \sum_{d=n}^{n+m} (-1)^{n+m-d} \sum_{(i_1, \dots, i_d, f) \in \mathcal{B}_d} e_{a_{i_1}} V_1 \iota^{s_1}(e_{a_{i_2}}) \cdots V_{d-1} \iota^{s_{d-1}}(e_{a_{i_d}})$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_d := \left\{ f: \{1, \dots, m\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, d-1\} \mid \begin{array}{l} 1=i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_d=n \\ \delta_{0, f^{-1}(\{k\})} \leq i_{k+1} - i_k \leq 1. \end{array} \right\},$$

$s_1, \dots, s_{d-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $V_1, \dots, V_{d-1} \in \mathcal{A}$ (both of which depend on $(i_1, \dots, i_d, f) \in \mathcal{B}_d$) are given by

$$s_k = \sum_{f(j) \leq k} (b_j - 1)$$

and

$$V_k = \begin{cases} 1 & f^{-1}(\{k\}) = \emptyset \\ U(i_{k+1} - i_k - 1 + \sum_{f(j)=k} b_j) & f^{-1}(\{k\}) \neq \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

Example 23. For example, $x_k x_l \diamond e_a e_b$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& + e_a U(k+l) e_b & (d=2, (i_1, i_2) = (1, 2), f(1) = 1, f(2) = 1) \\
& - e_a U(k-1) e_a U(l) e_b & (d=3, (i_1, i_2, i_3) = (1, 1, 2), f(1) = 1, f(2) = 2) \\
& - e_a U(k+l-1) e_a e_b & (d=3, (i_1, i_2, i_3) = (1, 1, 2), f(1) = 1, f(2) = 1) \\
& - e_a U(k) e_b U(l-1) e_b & (d=3, (i_1, i_2, i_3) = (1, 2, 2), f(1) = 1, f(2) = 2) \\
& - e_a e_b U(k+l-1) e_b & (d=3, (i_1, i_2, i_3) = (1, 2, 2), f(1) = 2, f(2) = 2) \\
& + e_a U(k-1) e_a U(l-1) e_a e_b & (d=4, (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) = (1, 1, 1, 2), f(1) = 1, f(2) = 2) \\
& + e_a U(k-1) e_a e_b U(l-1) e_b & (d=4, (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) = (1, 1, 2, 2), f(1) = 1, f(2) = 3) \\
& + e_a e_b U(k-1) e_b U(l-1) e_b & (d=4, (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) = (1, 2, 2, 2), f(1) = 2, f(2) = 3).
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 24. We conjecture that \diamond is associative i.e., $u \diamond (v \diamond w) = (u \diamond v) \diamond w$ for $u, v \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $w \in \mathcal{A}^+$.

Remark 25. To have a better idea of what terms appear in the multivariable block shuffle product, we give another more intuitive description of $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}$ here. Let $S_{n,m}$ be the set of words in letters A_1, \dots, A_n and B_1, \dots, B_m satisfying the following conditions.

- A_1, \dots, A_n appear in this order and each A_i appear at least once.
- B_1, \dots, B_m appear in this order and each B_i appear exactly once.
- For each i , A_i does not appear consecutively.
- The first letter isomorphism A_1 while the last letter is A_n .

For example,

$$S_{2,2} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A_1 B_1 B_2 A_2, A_1 B_1 A_1 B_2 A_2, A_1 B_1 B_2 A_1 A_2, A_1 B_1 A_2 B_2 A_2, A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 A_2, \\ A_1 B_1 A_1 B_2 A_1 A_2, A_1 B_1 A_1 A_2 B_2 A_2, A_1 A_2 B_1 A_2 B_2 A_2 \end{array} \right\}.$$

(In general, the cardinality of $S_{n,m}$ is $2^{m-1} \left\{ \binom{n+m-1}{m} + \binom{n+m-2}{m} \right\}$). Then the previous definition is equivalent to

$$x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} := \sum_{W \in S_{n,m}} h(W)$$

where h is a map defined recursively by

$$\begin{aligned}
h(A_p B_i \cdots B_j A_p W) &= (-1)^{j-i} e_{a_p} U\left(\sum_{k=i}^j b_k - 1\right) \cdot \iota^{\sum_{k=i}^j (b_k - 1)} (h(A_p W)), \\
h(A_p B_i \cdots B_j A_{p+1} W) &= (-1)^{j-i+1} e_{a_p} U\left(\sum_{k=i}^j b_k\right) \cdot \iota^{\sum_{k=i}^j (b_k - 1)} (h(A_{p+1} W)), \\
h(A_p A_{p+1} W) &= e_{a_p} (h(A_{p+1} W))
\end{aligned}$$

and $h(A_n) = e_{a_n}$.

By definition of the multivariable block shuffle product, it satisfies the following recurrence relation.

Proposition 26. For $m \geq 0, n \geq 1$ with $(m, n) \neq (0, 1)$, the above-defined \diamond satisfies the recursion formulas

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} &= \sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^{k-1} e_{a_1} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - 1) \cdot \iota^{b_1 + \cdots + b_k - k} (x_{b_{k+1}} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) \\
&+ \sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^k e_{a_1} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k) \cdot \iota^{b_1 + \cdots + b_k - k} (x_{b_{k+1}} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_2} \cdots e_{a_n}) \\
&+ e_{a_1} (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_2} \cdots e_{a_n})
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} &= \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} (-1)^{m-1-l} (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_l} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) U(b_{l+1} + \cdots + b_m - 1) \mathbf{t}^{b_1 + \cdots + b_m - m} (e_{a_n}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} (-1)^{m-l} (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_l} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{n-1}}) U(b_{l+1} + \cdots + b_m) \mathbf{t}^{b_1 + \cdots + b_m - m} (e_{a_n}) \\ &\quad + (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{n-1}}) \mathbf{t}^{b_1 + \cdots + b_m - m} (e_{a_n}), \end{aligned}$$

where we understand that the terms of the form $u \diamond 1$ with $u \in \mathfrak{X}$ on the right-hand side are zero.

The following identity is also useful.

Proposition 27. *Let $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq 2$. For $1 \leq s \leq n-1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} &= \sum_{k=0}^m (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_k} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_s}) \cdot \mathbf{t}^{b_1 + \cdots + b_k - k} (x_{b_{k+1}} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_{s+1}} \cdots e_{a_n}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{0 \leq k < l \leq m} (-1)^{l-k} (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_k} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_s}) \cdot U(b_{k+1} + \cdots + b_l) \\ &\quad \cdot \mathbf{t}^{b_1 + \cdots + b_l - l} (x_{b_{l+1}} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_{s+1}} \cdots e_{a_n}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We can verify the claim by separating each term of $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}$ at the right of the last (= the rightmost) e_{a_s} (or $e_{\iota(a_s)}$) and at the left of the first (= the leftmost) $e_{a_{s+1}}$ (or $e_{\iota(a_{s+1})}$). \square

3.2. Compatibility with the usual block shuffle product.

Definition 28. We define a map $B: \mathfrak{X}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}\langle e_0, e_1 \rangle$ by

$$B(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m}) = e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{b_1 + \cdots + b_m}}$$

where a_i 's are defined by $a_1 = 0$ and

$$a_{i+1} = \begin{cases} a_i & i \in \{b_1, b_1 + b_2, \dots, b_1 + \cdots + b_{m-1}\} \\ 1 - a_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 29. *For $u, v \in \mathfrak{X}$, we have*

$$u \diamond B(v) = B(u \diamond v).$$

Proof. By linearity, it is enough to consider the case when u and v are monomials. Let

$$u = x_{a_1} \cdots x_{a_m}, \quad v = x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_n}.$$

We shall prove the claim by induction on $n+m$. Put $d_k = a_1 + \cdots + a_k$ and $u_k = x_{a_{k+1}} x_{a_{k+2}} \cdots x_{a_m}$ for $k = 0, \dots, m$. We write $B(v)$ as

$$e_0 \mathbf{t}^t (B(v'))$$

with $t \in \{0, 1\}$ and $v' \in \mathfrak{X}$. More explicitly,

$$(t, v') = \begin{cases} (1, x_{b_1-1} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_n}) & b_1 > 1 \\ (0, x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_n}) & b_1 = 1. \end{cases}$$

By the first formula of Proposition 26, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u \diamond B(v) &= \sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^{k-1} e_0 U(d_k - 1) \mathbf{t}^{d_k - k} (u_k \diamond B(v)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^k e_0 U(d_k) \mathbf{t}^{d_k - k + t} (u_k \diamond B(v')) \\ &\quad + e_0 \mathbf{t}^t (u \diamond B(v')). \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis, the first term $\sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^{k-1} e_0 U(d_k - 1) \iota^{d_k - k} (u_k \diamond B(v))$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^{k-1} e_0 U(d_k - 1) \iota^{d_k - k} (B(u_k \diamond v)) \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k: \text{even}}}^m B(s_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v) + x_1 x_{d_k - 1}(u_k \diamond v)) + \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k: \text{odd}}}^m B(x_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v) + x_1 s_{d_k - 1}(u_k \diamond v)), \end{aligned}$$

by noting $e_0 U(d_k - 1) = \prod_{j=0}^{d_k - 1} e_{\iota^j(0)} + e_0 \prod_{j=0}^{d_k - 2} e_{\iota^j(0)}$, $B(u_k \diamond v) = e_0 \cdots$ and $\iota^{d_k - k}(e_0 \cdots) = e_{\iota^{d_k - k}(0)} \cdots$. Similarly, the second term $\sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^k e_0 U(d_k) \iota^{d_k - k + t} (u_k \diamond B(v'))$ is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^k e_0 U(d_k) \iota^{d_k - k + t} (B(u_k \diamond v')) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k+t: \text{odd}}}^m (-1)^k B(s_{d_{k+1}}(u_k \diamond v') + x_1 x_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v')) + \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k+t: \text{even}}}^m (-1)^k B(x_{d_{k+1}}(u_k \diamond v') + x_1 s_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v')) \\ &= (-1)^t \left(- \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k+t: \text{odd}}}^m B(s_{d_{k+1}}(u_k \diamond v') + x_1 x_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v')) + \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k+t: \text{even}}}^m B(x_{d_{k+1}}(u_k \diamond v') + x_1 s_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v')) \right), \end{aligned}$$

and the last term $e_0 \iota^t (u \diamond B(v'))$ is equal to

$$e_0 \iota^t (B(u \diamond v')) = \begin{cases} B(x_1(u \diamond v')) & t = 0 \\ B(s_1(u \diamond v')) & t = 1. \end{cases}$$

Thus if $t = 1$ then $u \diamond B(v)$ is equal to the image of

$$\begin{aligned} & - \left[\sum_{\substack{k=0 \\ k: \text{even}}}^m s_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v - s_1(u_k \diamond v')) - \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k: \text{odd}}}^m (x_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v) - x_{d_{k+1}}(u_k \diamond v')) \right] \\ & + \left[\sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k: \text{odd}}}^m x_1 s_{d_k - 1}(u_k \diamond v - s_1(u_k \diamond v')) - \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k: \text{even}}}^m (x_1 x_{d_k - 1}(u_k \diamond v) - x_1 x_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v')) \right] \\ & + u \diamond v \\ & = 0 + 0 + u \diamond v = u \diamond v \end{aligned}$$

under B . Here, we used

$$u_k \diamond v - s_1(u_k \diamond v') = \begin{cases} x_{a_{k+1}}(u_{k+1} \diamond v) - x_{a_{k+1}+1}(u_{k+1} \diamond v') & k < m \\ 0 & k = m, \end{cases}$$

which follows from $v = s_1(v')$. Similarly, if $t = 0$ then $u \diamond B(v)$ is equal to the image of

$$\begin{aligned} & - \left[\sum_{\substack{k=0 \\ k: \text{even}}}^m s_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v - x_1(u_k \diamond v')) - \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k: \text{odd}}}^m (x_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v) - s_{d_{k+1}}(u_k \diamond v')) \right] \\ & + \left[\sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k: \text{odd}}}^m x_1 s_{d_k - 1}(u_k \diamond v - x_1(u_k \diamond v')) - \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ k: \text{even}}}^m (x_1 x_{d_k - 1}(u_k \diamond v) - x_1 s_{d_k}(u_k \diamond v')) \right] \\ & + u \diamond v. \\ & = 0 + 0 + u \diamond v = u \diamond v \end{aligned}$$

under B . Here, we use

$$u_k \diamond v - x_1(u_k \diamond v') = \begin{cases} x_{a_{k+1}}(u_{k+1} \diamond v) - s_{a_{k+1}+1}(u_{k+1} \diamond v') & k < m \\ 0 & k = m \end{cases}$$

which follows from $v = x_1 v'$. Thus in either case, we have $u \diamond B(v) = B(u \diamond v)$ as desired. \square

4. ALGEBRAIC DIFFERENTIAL FORMULA FOR THE MULTIVARIABLE BLOCK SHUFFLE PRODUCT

In this section, we prove the block shuffle identity by constructing its multivariable version. We prove a certain compatibility with an algebraic differential operator. Then, using the compatibility, we shall prove the block shuffle identities as well as its multi-variable generalization.

For a subset S of \mathbb{C} , we denote by $\mathcal{W}(S)$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}(S)$) the free monoid (resp. the free algebra over \mathbb{Q}) generated by the formal symbols $\{e_z \mid z \in S\}$. By definition, $\mathcal{A}(S)$ can be regard as the free \mathbb{Q} -vector space generated by $\mathcal{W}(S)$. For $s, t \in \mathbb{C}$, define the subspace $\mathcal{A}_{s,t}^0(S) \subset \mathcal{A}(S)$ by

$$\mathcal{A}_{s,t}^0(S) = \mathbb{Q} \oplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus_{\substack{a_1, \dots, a_k \in S \\ a_1 \neq s, a_k \neq t}} \mathbb{Q} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}.$$

For $X \subset \mathbb{C}$ and tangential basepoints $\hat{s} = \vec{u}_s, \hat{t} = \vec{v}_t$ at $s, t \in \mathbb{C}$ with tangential vectors u, v , we denote by $\pi_1(X, \hat{s}, \hat{t})$ the set of homotopy classes of piece-wisely smooth paths γ on X from \hat{s} to \hat{t} (i.e., $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with $\gamma((0, 1)) \subset X, \gamma(0) = s, \gamma(1) = t, \gamma'(0) = u$ and $\gamma'(1) = -v$). Moreover, we define $\Pi(X; s, t)$ to be the union of $\pi_1(X, \hat{s}, \hat{t})$ over all tangential basepoints \hat{s} and \hat{t} based at $s, t \in \mathbb{C}$.

Definition 30. Let S be a subset of \mathbb{C} , and \hat{s}, \hat{t} tangential basepoints at $s, t \in \mathbb{C}$. For $\gamma \in \pi_1(\mathbb{C} \setminus S; \hat{s}, \hat{t})$, we define a \mathbb{Q} -linear map $L_\gamma : e_s \mathcal{A}_{s,t}^0(S) e_t \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$L_\gamma(e_s e_{z_1} \cdots e_{z_n} e_t) := I_\gamma(\hat{s}; z_1, \dots, z_n; \hat{t})$$

where $I_\gamma(\hat{s}; z_1, \dots, z_n; \hat{t})$ is the iterated integral symbol introduced by Goncharov (see, for example, [10]²). In particular, when $s \neq z_1$ and $t \neq z_n$, $I_\gamma(\hat{s}; z_1, \dots, z_n; \hat{t})$ is expressed as

$$\int_{0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n < 1} \prod_{j=1}^n \frac{d\gamma(t_j)}{\gamma(t_j) - z_j}.$$

4.1. Algebraic differential formula for the multivariable block shuffle product. We fix complex numbers a_1, \dots, a_n such that $a_1, \dots, a_n, 1 - a_1, \dots, 1 - a_n, 0, 1$ are distinct. Put

$$S = \{a_1, \dots, a_n, 1 - a_1, \dots, 1 - a_n, 0, 1\}.$$

Let us fix positive integers b_1, \dots, b_m . Note that $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} \in \mathcal{A}(S)$ by definition. For $\alpha, \beta \in S$, we define a \mathbb{Q} -linear map $\partial_{\alpha, \beta} : \mathcal{A}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(S)$ by $\partial_{\alpha, \beta}(1) = \partial_{\alpha, \beta}(e_z) = 0$ and

$$\partial_{\alpha, \beta}(e_{z_0} \cdots e_{z_{k+1}}) = \sum_{i=1}^k \left(\Delta_{z_i, z_{i+1}}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{z_i, z_{i-1}}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) e_{z_0} \cdots \widehat{e_{z_i}} \cdots e_{z_{k+1}}$$

for $k \geq 0$, where $\Delta_{x,y}^{\alpha, \beta} \in \{0, 1\}$ is defined by

$$\Delta_{x,y}^{\alpha, \beta} = \begin{cases} 1 & \{\alpha, \beta\} \in \{\{x, y\}, \{1-x, 1-y\}\} \\ 0 & \{\alpha, \beta\} \notin \{\{x, y\}, \{1-x, 1-y\}\}. \end{cases}$$

Note that for $u \in \mathcal{A}(S)$, $L_\gamma(u)$ can be considered as a complex function of a_1, \dots, a_n , and its total differential is given by

$$dL_\gamma(u) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} L_\gamma(\partial_{a_i, a_j} u) \cdot d \log(a_i - a_j) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} L_\gamma(\partial_{1-a_i, a_j} u) \cdot d \log(1 - a_i - a_j) \quad (4.1)$$

²The definition differs by scaling factor of $(2\pi i)^n$.

using Goncharov's differential formula

$$dI(z_0; z_1, \dots, z_n; z_{n+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^n d \log \left(\frac{z_{i+1} - z_i}{z_i - z_{i-1}} \right) I(z_0; z_1, \dots, \widehat{z_i}, \dots, z_n; z_{n+1}).$$

This is the central motivation to calculate $\partial_{\alpha, \beta}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} \in \mathcal{A}(S))$. The purpose of this section is to obtain the following formula for $\partial_{\alpha, \beta}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n})$ (Theorem 38):

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\alpha, \beta}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) &= x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond (\partial_{\alpha, \beta}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n})) \\ &\quad + \delta_{b_1, 1} (\Delta_{a_1, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a_1, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{a_1, a_1}^{\alpha, \beta}) x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} \\ &\quad - \delta_{b_m, 1} (\Delta_{a_n, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a_n, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{a_n, a_n}^{\alpha, \beta}) x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 31. Define

$$D_{\alpha, \beta}(w_1, a, w_2) = \sum_{s \in S} \Delta_{a, s}^{\alpha, \beta} (w_1 e_s w_{2, s} - w_{1, s} e_s w_2)$$

where $w_{1, s}, w_{2, s} \in \mathcal{A}$ are defined by

$$w_1 = q_1 + \sum_{s \in S} w_{1, s} e_s, \quad w_2 = q_2 + \sum_{s \in S} e_s w_{2, s} \quad (q_1, q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}).$$

We put $\mathcal{A}(S)^+ := \mathcal{A}(S) \cap \mathcal{A}^+$.

Lemma 32. For $w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{A}(S)^+$ and $\alpha, \beta, a \in S$, we have

$$\partial_{\alpha, \beta}(w_1 e_a w_2) = \partial_{\alpha, \beta}(w_1 e_a) w_2 + w_1 \partial_{\alpha, \beta}(e_a w_2) + D_{\alpha, \beta}(w_1, a, w_2).$$

This lemma is an immediate consequence of the definition of $\partial_{\alpha, \beta}$ and $D_{\alpha, \beta}$. For $t \in \{0, 1\}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Z}$, we put

$$W(t; b) = \begin{cases} e_{\iota^0(t)} e_{\iota^1(t)} \cdots e_{\iota^{b-1}(t)} & b \geq 0 \\ 0 & b < 0. \end{cases}$$

For convenience, hereafter we regard $U(b) = 0$ for $b < 0$. Notice that $W(0; b) + W(1; b) = U(b)$ definition.

Lemma 33. Fix $\alpha, \beta \in S$. For $a \in S \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $k \geq 2$ and $b_1, \dots, b_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $s, s' \in \{0, 1\}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} D_{\alpha, \beta} (U(b_1 + \cdots + b_j - s), \iota^{b_1 + \cdots + b_j - j}(a), U(b_{j+1} + \cdots + b_k - s')) \\ &= -(-1)^s \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a, t}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{a, \iota^{k+1}(t)}^{\alpha, \beta}) W(t; b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') \\ &\quad + (\Delta_{a, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a, 1}^{\alpha, \beta}) \delta_{b_1, 1} \delta_{s, 1} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') \\ &\quad - (\Delta_{a, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a, 1}^{\alpha, \beta}) \delta_{b_k, 1} \delta_{s', 1} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s'). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that for $b, b' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $c \in \{a, 1-a\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\alpha, \beta}(U(b), c, U(b')) &= \sum_{t=0}^1 (1 - \delta_{b', 0}) \Delta_{c, t}^{\alpha, \beta} U(b) W(t; b') - \sum_{t=0}^1 (1 - \delta_{b, 0}) \Delta_{c, t}^{\alpha, \beta} W(\iota^{b+1}(t); b) U(b') \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^1 \Delta_{c, t}^{\alpha, \beta} (U(b) W(t; b') - W(\iota^{b+1}(t); b) U(b')) - \sum_{t=0}^1 \delta_{b', 0} \Delta_{c, t}^{\alpha, \beta} U(b) + \sum_{t=0}^1 \delta_{b, 0} \Delta_{c, t}^{\alpha, \beta} U(b') \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^1 \Delta_{c, t}^{\alpha, \beta} ((W(\iota^{b+1}(t); b) + W(\iota^b(t); b)) W(t; b') - W(\iota^{b+1}(t); b) (W(t; b') + W(\iota(t); b'))) \\
&\quad + (\delta_{b, 0} U(b') - \delta_{b', 0} U(b)) \sum_{t=0}^1 \Delta_{c, t}^{\alpha, \beta} \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^1 \Delta_{c, t}^{\alpha, \beta} (W(\iota^b(t); b + b') - W(\iota^{b+1}(t); b + b')) + (\delta_{b, 0} - \delta_{b', 0}) (\Delta_{c, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{c, 1}^{\alpha, \beta}) \cdot U(b + b') \\
&= (-1)^b (\Delta_{c, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{c, 1}^{\alpha, \beta}) \cdot U^-(b + b') + (\delta_{b, 0} - \delta_{b', 0}) (\Delta_{c, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{c, 1}^{\alpha, \beta}) \cdot U(b + b')
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$U^-(b) := W(0; b) - W(1; b).$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} D_{\alpha, \beta}(U(b_1 + \cdots + b_j - s), \iota^{b_1 + \cdots + b_j - j}(a), U(b_{j+1} + \cdots + b_k - s')) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{b_1 + \cdots + b_j - s} \left(\Delta_{\iota^{b_1 + \cdots + b_j - j}(a), 0}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{\iota^{b_1 + \cdots + b_j - j}(a), 1}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) U^-(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (\delta_{b_1 + \cdots + b_j - s, 0} - \delta_{b_{j+1} + \cdots + b_k - s', 0}) \left(\Delta_{\iota^{b_1 + \cdots + b_j - j}(a), 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{\iota^{b_1 + \cdots + b_j - j}(a), 1}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{j-s} \left(\Delta_{a, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{a, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) U^-(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (\delta_{j, 1} \delta_{b_1, 1} \delta_{s, 1} - \delta_{j, k-1} \delta_{b_k, 1} \delta_{s', 1}) \left(\Delta_{a, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') \\
&= \left(\Delta_{a, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{a, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) U^-(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (-1)^{j-s} \\
&\quad + (\delta_{b_1, 1} \delta_{s, 1} - \delta_{b_k, 1} \delta_{s', 1}) \left(\Delta_{a, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') \\
&= \begin{cases} (-1)^{s+1} \left(\Delta_{a, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{a, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) U^-(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') & k : \text{even} \\ 0 & k : \text{odd} \end{cases} \\
&\quad + (\delta_{b_1, 1} \delta_{s, 1} - \delta_{b_k, 1} \delta_{s', 1}) \left(\Delta_{a, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') \\
&= (-1)^{s+1} \left(\Delta_{a, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{a, \iota^k(1)}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) U^-(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s') \\
&\quad + (\delta_{b_1, 1} \delta_{s, 1} - \delta_{b_k, 1} \delta_{s', 1}) \left(\Delta_{a, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - s - s').
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 34. For $\alpha \in S \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $\beta \in \{0, 1\}$, $m > 0$ and $b_1, \dots, b_m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\alpha, \beta}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) &= (\Delta_{a_1, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a_1, 1}^{\alpha, \beta}) \delta_{b_1, 1} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} \\ &\quad - (\Delta_{a_n, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a_n, 1}^{\alpha, \beta}) \delta_{b_m, 1} x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on $n + m$. The case $m = n = 1$ is easily checked from the definition. Suppose that $(m, n) \neq (1, 1)$. Decomposing $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}$ as

$$x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} = \sum_l w_l e_{p_l} w'_l \quad (w_l \in e_{a_1} \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\}), w'_l \in \mathcal{A}, p_l \in \{a_1, a_2\}),$$

and applying Lemma 32, we obtain

$$\partial_{\alpha, \beta}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) = F_1 + F_2 + F_3$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \sum_l \partial_{\alpha, \beta}(w_l e_{p_l}) w'_l \\ F_2 &= \sum_l w_l \partial_{\alpha, \beta}(e_{p_l} w'_l) \\ F_3 &= \sum_l D_{\alpha, \beta}(w_l, p_l, w'_l). \end{aligned}$$

To compute these F_i 's further, let us recall the recurrence relation of \blacklozenge -product (the first formula of Proposition 26). We put $c_k = \sum_{j=1}^k (b_j - 1)$, $c'_k = \sum_{j=m-k+1}^m (b_j - 1)$,

$$g_{k, i} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{k+i} \iota^{c_k}(x_{b_{k+1}} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_n}) & 0 \leq i < n \\ 0 & i \geq n \end{cases},$$

$$G_{k, i} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{k+i} \iota^{c'_k}(x_{b_{k+1}} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \blacklozenge e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_n}) & 0 \leq i < n \\ 0 & i \geq n \end{cases},$$

and

$$Y_{k, t}(s) = e_{a_1} W(t; c_k + k + s - 2) g_{k, s}.$$

Then the recurrence relation is expressed as

$$x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} = - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m e_{a_1} U(c_k + k + s - 1) g_{k, s} - e_{a_1} g_{0, 1}. \quad (4.2)$$

We put $a_j = a_1$ for $j \notin \{1, \dots, n\}$ to avoid undefined notations. For the calculation of F_1 , notice that $g_{k, s} \in e_{\iota^{c_k}(a_{s+1})} \mathcal{A}(S)$ and

$$\partial_{\alpha, \beta}(e_{a_1} U(c_k + k + s - 1) e_{\iota^{c_k}(a_{s+1})}) = \sum_{t=0}^1 \left(\Delta_{\iota^{c_k}(a_{s+1}), \iota^{c_k+k+s-2}(t)}^{\alpha, \beta} - \sum_{t=0}^1 \Delta_{a_1, \iota(t)}^{\alpha, \beta} \right) e_{a_1} W(t; c_k + k + s - 2) e_{\iota^{c_k}(a_{s+1})}$$

since if $c_k + k + s - 1 \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{\alpha,\beta}(e_{a_1}U(c_k + k + s - 1)e_{l^{c_k}(a_{s+1})}) &= \partial_{\alpha,\beta}\left(\sum_{t=0}^1 e_{a_1} \overbrace{e_{l(t)}e_{l^2(t)}\cdots e_{l^{c_k+k+s-1}(t)}}^{c_k+k+s-1} e_{l^{c_k}(a_{s+1})}\right) \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^1 \Delta_{l^{c_k}(a_{s+1}),l^{c_k+k+s-1}(t)}^{\alpha,\beta} e_{a_1} \overbrace{e_{l(t)}e_{l^2(t)}\cdots e_{l^{c_k+k+s-2}(t)}}^{c_k+k+s-2} e_{l^{c_k}(a_{s+1})} \\
&\quad - \sum_{t=0}^1 \Delta_{a_1,l(t)}^{\alpha,\beta} e_{a_1} \overbrace{e_{l^2(t)}\cdots e_{l^{c_k+k+s-1}(t)}}^{c_k+k+s-2} e_{l^{c_k}(a_{s+1})} \\
&= \sum_{t=0}^1 \left(\Delta_{l^{c_k}(a_{s+1}),l^{c_k+k+s}(t)}^{\alpha,\beta} - \sum_{t=0}^1 \Delta_{a_1,l(t)}^{\alpha,\beta} \right) e_{a_1} W(t; c_k + k + s - 2) e_{l^{c_k}(a_{s+1})}
\end{aligned}$$

and the case $c_k + k + s - 1 = 0$ is trivial. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
F_1 &= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 \left(\Delta_{a_1,l(t)}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{l^{c_k}(a_{s+1}),l^{c_k+k+s}(t)}^{\alpha,\beta} \right) e_{a_1} W(t; c_k + k + s - 2) g_{k,s} \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 \left(\Delta_{a_1,l(t)}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_{s+1},l^{k+s}(t)}^{\alpha,\beta} \right) Y_{k,t}(s).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we have $F_2 = F_2^{(1)} + F_2^{(2)}$ where

$$\begin{aligned}
F_2^{(1)} &= - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m e_{a_1} U(c_k + k + s - 1) \partial_{\alpha,\beta}(g_{k,s}), \\
F_2^{(2)} &= -e_{a_1} \partial_{\alpha,\beta}(g_{0,1}).
\end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis and the fact $\partial_{\alpha,\beta}(g_{m,s}) = 0$, $F_2^{(1)}$ is further decomposed as $F_2^{(1)} = F_2^{(1,1)} + F_2^{(1,2)}$ where

$$\begin{aligned}
F_2^{(1,1)} &= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_{k+1},1} \cdot e_{a_1} U(c_{k+1} + k + s - 1) g_{k+1,s} \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} \cdot e_{a_1} U(c_k + k + s - 2) g_{k,s} \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} \cdot e_{a_1} U(c_k + k + s - 2) g_{k,s} - \sum_{s=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} \cdot e_{a_1} U(c_1 + s - 1) g_{1,s} \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} \cdot Y_{k,t}(s) - 2(\Delta_{a_2,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_2,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} e_{a_1} g_{1,1}.
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
F_2^{(1,2)} &= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} (\Delta_{a_n,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_n,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_m,1} \cdot e_{a_1} U(c_k + k + s - 1) G_{k,s} \\
&= -(\Delta_{a_n,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_n,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_m,1} \cdot (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} + e_{a_1} G_{0,1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we have used the recurrence relation for $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}$. By the induction hypothesis, for $n \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F_2^{(2)} &= e_{a_1} \partial_{\alpha,\beta}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_2} \cdots e_{a_n}) \\
&= (\Delta_{a_2,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_2,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} \cdot e_{a_1} g_{1,1} + (\Delta_{a_n,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_n,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_m,1} \cdot e_{a_1} G_{0,1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, let us compute F_3 . Since

$$x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} = - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{j=1}^m e_{a_1} U(c_j + j + s - 1) g_{j,s} - e_{a_1} g_{0,1}$$

and

$$g_{j,s} = - \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{j < k \leq m} \iota^{c_j}(e_{a_{s+1}}) U(b_{j+1} + \cdots + b_k + s' - 1) g_{k,s+s'} - \iota^{c_j}(e_{a_{s+1}}) g_{j,s+1},$$

$$g_{0,1} = - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m e_{a_2} U(c_k + k + s - 1) g_{k,s+1} - e_{a_2} g_{0,2},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} &= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq m} e_{a_1} U(c_j + j + s - 1) \iota^{c_j}(e_{a_{s+1}}) U(b_{j+1} + \cdots + b_k + s' - 1) g_{k,s+s'} \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m e_{a_1} U(c_k + k + s - 1) \iota^{c_k}(e_{a_{s+1}}) g_{k,s+1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m e_{a_1} e_{a_2} U(c_k + k + s - 1) g_{k,s+1} \\ &\quad + e_{a_1} e_{a_2} g_{0,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_3 &= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq m} e_{a_1} D_{\alpha,\beta}(U(b_1 + \cdots + b_j + s - 1), \iota^{c_j}(a_{s+1}), U(b_{j+1} + \cdots + b_k + s' - 1)) g_{k,s+s'} \\ &\quad - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (1 - \delta_{b_1,1} \delta_{k,1} \delta_{s,0}) (\Delta_{a_{s+1}, \iota^{k+s}(t)}^{\alpha,\beta}) e_{a_1} W(t, c_k + k + s - 1) g_{k,s+1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (1 - \delta_{b_1,1} \delta_{k,1} \delta_{s,0}) (\Delta_{a_2, t}^{\alpha,\beta}) e_{a_1} W(t, c_k + k + s - 1) g_{k,s+1} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq m} e_{a_1} D_{\alpha,\beta}(U(b_1 + \cdots + b_j + s - 1), \iota^{c_j}(a_{s+1}), U(b_{j+1} + \cdots + b_k + s' - 1)) g_{k,s+s'} \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (1 - \delta_{b_1,1} \delta_{k,1} \delta_{s,0}) (\Delta_{a_2, t}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_{s+1}, \iota^{k-s}(t)}^{\alpha,\beta}) Y_{k,t}(s+1) \\ &= F_3^{(1)} + F_3^{(2)} + F_3^{(3)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$F_3^{(1)} = \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{1 \leq j < k \leq m} e_{a_1} D_{\alpha,\beta}(U(b_1 + \cdots + b_j + s - 1), \iota^{c_j}(a_{s+1}), U(b_{j+1} + \cdots + b_k + s' - 1)) g_{k,s+s'},$$

$$F_3^{(2)} = \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_2, t}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_{s+1}, \iota^{k-s}(t)}^{\alpha,\beta}) Y_{k,t}(s+1),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
F_3^{(3)} &= - \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_2,t}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_1,1-t}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} Y_{1,t}(1) \\
&= - \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_2,t}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_1,1-t}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} e_{a_1} W(t; b_1 - 1) g_{1,1} \\
&= - \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_2,t}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_1,1-t}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} e_{a_1} g_{1,1} \\
&= (\Delta_{a_1,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_1,1}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_2,0}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_2,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} e_{a_1} g_{1,1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The term $F_3^{(1)}$ can be computed using Lemma 33. In fact, by setting $a \mapsto a_{s+1}$, $s \mapsto 1 - s$, $s' \mapsto 1 - s'$ in Lemma 33, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{1 \leq j < k} D_{\alpha,\beta}(U(b_1 + \cdots + b_j + s - 1), \iota^{c_j}(a_{s+1}), U(b_{j+1} + \cdots + b_k + s' - 1)) \\
&= (-1)^s \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},t}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_{s+1},\iota^k(1-t)}^{\alpha,\beta}) W(t; b_1 + \cdots + b_k + s + s' - 2) \\
&\quad - (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} \delta_{s',0} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k + s + s' - 2) \\
&\quad + (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} \delta_{s,0} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k + s + s' - 2)
\end{aligned}$$

for $k \geq 2$, and thus we have

$$F_3^{(1)} = F_3^{(1,1)} + F_3^{(1,2)} + F_3^{(1,3)}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
F_3^{(1,1)} &= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m e_{a_1} \left((-1)^s \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},t}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_{s+1},\iota^{k+1}(t)}^{\alpha,\beta}) W(t; b_1 + \cdots + b_k + s + s' - 2) \right) g_{k,s+s'} \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (-1)^s (\Delta_{a_{s+1},t}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_{s+1},\iota^{k+1}(t)}^{\alpha,\beta}) Y_{k,t}(s + s') \\
&= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (-1)^s (\Delta_{a_{s+1},t}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_{s+1},\iota^{k+1}(t)}^{\alpha,\beta}) Y_{k,t}(s + s'),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
F_3^{(1,2)} &= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m e_{a_1} \left((\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} \delta_{s,0} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k + s + s' - 2) \right) g_{k,s+s'} \\
&= \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m e_{a_1} (\Delta_{a_1,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_1,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k + s' - 2) g_{k,s'} \\
&= (\Delta_{a_1,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_1,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m e_{a_1} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k + s' - 2) g_{k,s'} \\
&= (\Delta_{a_1,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_1,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m e_{a_1} U(b_2 + \cdots + b_k + s' - 1) g_{k,s'} \\
&= (\Delta_{a_1,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_1,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} \left(x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} - e_{a_1} g_{1,1} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
F_3^{(1,3)} &= \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{s'=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m e_{a_1} \left(-(\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} \delta_{s',0} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k + s + s' - 2) \right) g_{k,s+s'} \\
&= - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} e_{a_1} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k + s - 2) g_{k,s} \\
&= - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} e_{a_1} W(t; b_1 + \cdots + b_k + s - 2) g_{k,s} \\
&= - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=2}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} Y_{k,t}(s) \\
&= - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} Y_{k,t}(s) + \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} Y_{1,t}(s) \\
&= - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} Y_{k,t}(s) + \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} e_{a_1} W(t; c_1 + 1 + s - 2) g_{1,s} \\
&= - \sum_{s=0}^1 \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 (\Delta_{a_{s+1},0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{s+1},1}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_k,1} Y_{k,t}(s) + 2(\Delta_{a_{2,0}}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_{2,1}}^{\alpha,\beta}) \delta_{b_1,1} e_{a_1} g_{1,1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, finally we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_{\alpha,\beta}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) \\
&= F_1 + F_2^{(1,1)} + F_2^{(1,2)} + F_2^{(2)} + F_3^{(1,1)} + F_3^{(1,2)} + F_3^{(1,3)} + F_3^{(2)} + F_3^{(3)} \\
&= \delta_{b_1,1} (\Delta_{a_1,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_1,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) (x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) - \delta_{b_m,1} (\Delta_{a_n,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_n,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{t=0}^1 \left(\Delta_{a_1,t}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_1,t}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_1,t^k(1-t)}^{\alpha,\beta} - \Delta_{a_1,t^k(t)}^{\alpha,\beta} \right) \left(Y_{k,t}(0) + Y_{k,t}(1) \right) \\
&= \delta_{b_1,1} (\Delta_{a_1,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_1,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) (x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) - \delta_{b_m,1} (\Delta_{a_n,0}^{\alpha,\beta} + \Delta_{a_n,1}^{\alpha,\beta}) (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}),
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proposition 35. *Assume that $n > 1$. For $s \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, $m > 0$ and $b_1, \dots, b_m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have*

$$\partial_{a_s, a_{s+1}}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) = x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond \partial_{a_s, a_{s+1}}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}).$$

Proof. We put

$$\begin{aligned}
c_k &:= \sum_{j=1}^k (b_j - 1), \\
d_k &:= \sum_{j=1}^k b_j = c_k + k,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
X_{i,j} &= X'_{i,j} \iota^{c_i}(e_{a_j}) = x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_i} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_j} \\
Y_{i,j} &= e_{a_{j+1}} Y'_{i,j} = x_{b_{i+1}} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_{j+1}} \cdots e_{a_n}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 27

$$x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} = \sum_{k=0}^m X_{k,s} \cdot \iota^{c_k}(Y_{k,s}) + \sum_{0 \leq k < l \leq m} (-1)^{l-k} X_{k,s} \cdot U(d_l - d_k) \cdot \iota^{c_l}(Y_{l,s}).$$

Since

$$\partial_{a_s, a_{s+1}}(X_{k,s} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}(Y_{k,s})) = \begin{cases} X'_{k,s} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}_{\mathcal{A}}(Y_{k,s}) & (k, s) \neq (0, 1) \\ 0 & (k, s) = (0, 1) \end{cases} - \begin{cases} X_{k,s} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}_{\mathcal{A}}(Y'_{k,s}) & (k, s) \neq (m, n-1) \\ 0 & (k, s) = (m, n-1) \end{cases}$$

and

$$\partial_{a_s, a_{s+1}}(X_{k,s} U(d_l - d_k) \mathbf{t}^{c_l}(Y_{l,s})) = 0,$$

we have

$$\partial_{a_s, a_{s+1}}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) = \sum_{k=0}^m X'_{k,s} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}(Y_{k,s}) - \sum_{k=0}^m X_{k,s} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}(Y'_{k,s}) - \delta_{s,1} Y_{0,1} + \delta_{s,n-1} X_{m,n-1}.$$

By the second formula of Proposition 26,

$$X'_{k,s} = - \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (-1)^{k-l} X_{l,s} U(d_k - d_l - 1) + \begin{cases} X_{k,s-1} + \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (-1)^{k-l} X_{l,s-1} U(d_k - d_l) & s > 1 \\ \delta_{k,0} & s = 1, \end{cases}$$

and by the first formula of Proposition 26,

$$\mathbf{t}^{c_k}(Y'_{k,s}) = - \sum_{l=k+1}^m (-1)^{l-k} U(d_l - d_k - 1) \mathbf{t}^{c_l}(Y_{l,s}) + \begin{cases} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}(Y_{k,s+1}) + \sum_{l=k+1}^m (-1)^{l-k} U(d_l - d_k) \mathbf{t}^{c_l}(Y_{l,s+1}) & s+1 < n \\ \delta_{k,m} & s+1 = n. \end{cases}$$

Thus we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^m X'_{k,s} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}(Y_{k,s}) = G + F_1$$

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^m X_{k,s} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}_{\mathcal{A}}(Y'_{k,s}) = G + F_2$$

where

$$G = - \sum_{0 \leq p < q \leq m} (-1)^{q-p} X_{p,s} U(d_q - d_p - 1) \mathbf{t}^{c_q}(Y_{q,s}),$$

$$F_1 = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^m X_{k,s-1} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}(Y_{k,s}) + \sum_{k=0}^m \left(\sum_{l=0}^{k-1} (-1)^{k-l} X_{l,s-1} U(d_k - d_l) \right) \mathbf{t}^{c_k}(Y_{k,s}) & s > 1 \\ \sum_{k=0}^m \delta_{k,0} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}(Y_{k,s}) & s = 1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$F_2 = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^m X_{k,s} \mathbf{t}^{c_k}(Y_{k,s+1}) + \sum_{k=0}^m X_{k,s} \left(\sum_{l=k+1}^m (-1)^{l-k} U(d_l - d_k) \mathbf{t}^{c_l}(Y_{l,s+1}) \right) & s+1 < n \\ \sum_{k=0}^m X_{k,s} \delta_{k,m} & s+1 = n. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, by Proposition 27, we find

$$F_1 = x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots \widehat{e_{a_s}} \cdots e_{a_n}$$

and

$$F_2 = x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots \widehat{e_{a_{s+1}}} \cdots e_{a_n}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_{a_s, a_{s+1}}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) \\
&= (G + F_1) - (G + F_2) - \delta_{s,1} Y_{0,1} + \delta_{s,n-1} X_{m,n-1} \\
&= (F_1 - \delta_{s,1} Y_{0,1}) - (F_2 - \delta_{s,n-1} X_{m,n-1}) \\
&= x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond \left(\begin{cases} e_{a_1} \cdots \widehat{e_{a_s}} \cdots e_{a_n} & s > 1 \\ 0 & s = 1 \end{cases} - \begin{cases} e_{a_1} \cdots \widehat{e_{a_{s+1}}} \cdots e_{a_n} & s < n-1 \\ 0 & s = n-1 \end{cases} \right) \\
&= x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond (\partial_{a_s, a_{s+1}}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n})).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 36. For $\alpha \in S$, we have

$$\partial_{\alpha, \alpha}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) = \left(-\delta_{b_1,1} \Delta_{a_1, a_1}^{\alpha, \alpha} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} + \delta_{b_m,1} \Delta_{a_n, a_n}^{\alpha, \alpha} x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \right) \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}.$$

Proof. Put $c = (b_1 - 1) + \cdots + (b_m - 1)$ and

$$w = x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} \in e_{a_1} \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{A} e_{\iota^c(a_n)}.$$

By the definition of $\partial_{\alpha, \alpha}$, (since all intermediate terms cancel out) we have

$$\partial_{\alpha, \alpha}(w) = -\Delta_{a_1, a_1}^{\alpha, \alpha} w_1 + \Delta_{a_n, a_n}^{\alpha, \alpha} w_2$$

where $e_{a_1} w_1$ is the sum of the monomials in w starting from $e_{a_1} e_{a_1}$ and $w_2 e_{\iota^c(a_n)}$ is the sum of monomials in w ending with $e_{\iota^c(a_n)} e_{\iota^c(a_n)}$. By Proposition 26, such w_1 and w_2 are exactly

$$\begin{aligned}
w_1 &= \delta_{b_1,1} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}, \\
w_2 &= \delta_{b_m,1} x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \square

Lemma 37. We have

$$\partial_{0,1}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $S' := S \setminus \{0, 1\} = \{a_1, \dots, a_n, 1 - a_1, \dots, 1 - a_n\}$. Then, $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}$ is a linear combination of the elements of the form

$$w_1 U(t_1) \cdots w_k U(t_k) w_{k+1} \quad (k \geq 0, w_1, \dots, w_{k+1} \in \mathcal{A}^+(S'), t_1, \dots, t_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}).$$

Now, by definition

$$\partial_{0,1}(w_1 U(t_1) \cdots w_k U(t_k) w_{k+1}) = \sum_{i=1}^k w_1 U(t_1) \cdots w_i V(t_i) w_{i+1} \cdots U(t_k) w_{k+1}$$

where

$$V(t_i) = \widehat{e_0} \overbrace{e_1 e_0 e_1 \cdots}^{t_i-1} + \widehat{e_1} \overbrace{e_0 e_1 e_0 \cdots}^{t_i-1} - \overbrace{\cdots e_1 e_0 e_1}^{t_i-1} \widehat{e_0} - \overbrace{\cdots e_0 e_1 e_0}^{t_i-1} \widehat{e_1}.$$

Since $V(t_i) = 0$, it follows that

$$\partial_{0,1}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) = 0. \quad \square$$

Theorem 38 (Algebraic differential formula for \diamond). For $\alpha, \beta \in S$, $m \geq 0$ and $b_1, \dots, b_m > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{\alpha, \beta}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) &= x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond \partial_{\alpha, \beta}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) \\
&+ (\Delta_{a_1, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a_1, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{a_1, a_1}^{\alpha, \beta}) \delta_{b_1, 1} x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} \\
&- (\Delta_{a_n, 0}^{\alpha, \beta} + \Delta_{a_n, 1}^{\alpha, \beta} - \Delta_{a_n, a_n}^{\alpha, \beta}) \delta_{b_m, 1} x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\partial_{\alpha, \beta}(x_{\mathbb{k}} \diamond v) = x_{\mathbb{k}} \diamond \partial_{\alpha, \beta}(v)$$

for an admissible index \mathbb{k} and $v \in \mathcal{A}^+$.

Proof. Putting $S' = \{a_1, \dots, a_n, 1 - a_1, \dots, 1 - a_n\}$ and $S'' = \{0, 1\}$, the claim of the theorem can be divided into the following four cases:

- (1) $\alpha \neq \beta$ and
 - (a) $(\alpha, \beta) \in S' \times S'' \cup S'' \times S'$,
 - (b) $(\alpha, \beta) \in S' \times S'$,
 - (c) $(\alpha, \beta) \in S'' \times S''$.
- (2) $\alpha = \beta$.

The cases (1-a), (1-b), (1-c) and (2) follow from Lemmas 34, 35, 37 and 36, respectively. \square

Theorem 39. *Assume $(m, n) \neq (0, 1)$. Let $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \in \mathfrak{X}$ and a_1, \dots, a_n be complex variables such that $a_1, \dots, a_n, 1 - a_1, \dots, 1 - a_n, 0, 1$ are all distinct. Fix $\gamma \in \Pi(\mathbb{C} \setminus S; a_1, t^{b_1 + \cdots + b_m - m}(a_n))$. Then as a function of complex variables a_1, \dots, a_n , the total differential of $L_\gamma(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n})$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} dL_\gamma(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) &= \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} L_\gamma(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots \widehat{e_{a_i}} \cdots e_{a_n}) d \log\left(\frac{a_i - a_{i+1}}{a_i - a_{i-1}}\right) \\ &\quad + \delta_{b_1, 1} L_\gamma(x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) d \log(a_1(1 - a_1)) \\ &\quad - \delta_{b_m, 1} L_\gamma(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) d \log(a_n(1 - a_n)). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we regard the first term of the right-hand side as 0 for $n = 1, 2$. Notice that, when $m = n = 1$ and $b_1 = 1$, the second and the third terms of the right-hand side becomes

$$L_\gamma(e_{a_1}) d \log(a_1(1 - a_1)) - L_\gamma(e_{a_1}) d \log(a_1(1 - a_1))$$

which we consider as 0, although it contains an undefined expression $L_\gamma(e_{a_1})$.

Proof. It follows from 4.1 and Theorem 38. \square

4.2. Analytic multivariable block shuffle identity.

Theorem 40. *Let b_1, \dots, b_m be positive integers such that $(b_1, \dots, b_m) \neq (1, \dots, 1)$, and a_1, \dots, a_n complex numbers such that $a_1, \dots, a_n, 1 - a_1, \dots, 1 - a_n, 0, 1$ are all distinct. Put $S = \{a_1, \dots, a_n, 1 - a_1, \dots, 1 - a_n, 0, 1\}$. Then, for $\gamma \in \Pi(\mathbb{C} \setminus ((-\infty, 0] \cup (1, \infty) \cup S); a_1, t^{b_1 + \cdots + b_m - m}(a_n))$, we have*

$$L_\gamma(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) = 0.$$

Proof. For $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, put $g_\alpha(z) = \frac{1}{2} + \alpha(z - \frac{1}{2})$. For $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, consider the function

$$f(\alpha) = L_{\gamma_\alpha}(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{g_\alpha(a_1)} \cdots e_{g_\alpha(a_n)})$$

where γ_α is a path defined by $\gamma_\alpha(t) = g_\alpha(\gamma(c(t)))$ where $c(t)$ is $\min(\alpha^{-1}t, 1/2)$ is for $t \leq 1/2$ and $\max(1 - \alpha^{-1}(1 - t), 1/2)$ for $t > 1/2$, so that $\gamma'_\alpha(0) = \gamma'(0)$ and $\gamma'_\alpha(1) = \gamma'(1)$. Notice that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} L_{\gamma_\alpha}(w_\alpha) = 0$ for any word w_α in e_0, e_1 and $e_{g_\alpha(a)}$'s with $a \in S \setminus \{0, 1\}$, containing at least one e_0 or e_1 . By the assumption $(b_1, \dots, b_m) \neq (1, \dots, 1)$, every term that appears in $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{g_\alpha(a_1)} \cdots e_{g_\alpha(a_n)}$ satisfy this condition, and thus

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} f(\alpha) = 0.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{d\alpha} f(\alpha) &= \delta_{b_1, 1} L_\gamma(x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{g_\alpha(a_1)} \cdots e_{g_\alpha(a_n)}) \frac{d}{d\alpha} \log(g_\alpha(a_1)(1 - g_\alpha(a_1))) \\ &\quad - \delta_{b_m, 1} L_\gamma(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_{m-1}} \blacklozenge e_{g_\alpha(a_1)} \cdots e_{g_\alpha(a_n)}) \frac{d}{d\alpha} \log(g_\alpha(a_n)(1 - g_\alpha(a_n))) \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 39. Thus by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\frac{d}{d\alpha} f(\alpha) = 0.$$

Therefore $f(\alpha)$ is a constant function, and the constant is 0 by letting $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$L_\gamma(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) = f(1) = 0. \quad \square$$

Of course, we can extend the scope of the theorem by the identity theorem of complex functions. Fix an integer $n \geq 1$ and tangential vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. For $\bullet \in \{\text{ev}, \text{od}\}$, let C_n^\bullet be the certain modified configuration space consisting of the tuples $(a_1, \dots, a_n; \gamma)$ where a_1, \dots, a_n are complex numbers such that $S := \{a_1, \dots, a_n, 1 - a_1, \dots, 1 - a_n, 0, 1\}$ has $2n - 2$ distinct elements, and γ is an element of $\pi_1(\mathbb{C} \setminus S, s, t)$ where s and t are the tangential base points

$$s = \overrightarrow{u}_{a_1}, \quad t = \begin{cases} \overrightarrow{v}_{a_n} & \bullet = \text{ev} \\ \overrightarrow{v}_{\iota(a_n)} & \bullet = \text{od}. \end{cases}$$

Then we can regard C_n^\bullet as a complex manifold, and for any $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \in \mathfrak{X}_\bullet$, we can view $L_\gamma(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n})$ as a holomorphic function on C_n^\bullet . We define a subspace $C_n^{\bullet, \text{good}} \subset C_n^\bullet$ consisting of $(a'_1, \dots, a'_n; \gamma')$ such that there exists $(a_1, \dots, a_n; \gamma)$ belonging to the same connected component as $(a'_1, \dots, a'_n; \gamma')$ and satisfying the same conditions as in Theorem 40.

Example 41. Let $(a_1, \dots, a_n; \gamma) \in C_n^\bullet$. If $n \geq 2$, $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$, and γ is a path on $\{z \mid \text{Im}(z) \geq 0\}$ then $(a_1, \dots, a_n; \gamma) \in C_n^{\bullet, \text{good}}$ by the following reason. Notice that γ starts from a_1 and ends at a_n or $\iota(a_n)$ according to the parity. In either case, we can slightly move the entire path slightly upward so that the resulting path satisfies the condition of Theorem 40.

Now we have:

Theorem 42 (Analytic multivariable block shuffle identity). *Let $\bullet \in \{\text{od}, \text{ev}\}$ and $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \in \mathfrak{X}_\bullet$ with $(b_1, \dots, b_m) \neq (1, \dots, 1)$. Then for $(a_1, \dots, a_n; \gamma) \in C_n^{\bullet, \text{good}}$, we have*

$$L_\gamma(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) = 0.$$

Remark 43. From the perspective of Grothendieck's period conjecture, the motivic version of the theorem with $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is presumably true. Also, we expect that the case with $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{Q}$ should follow from the theory of motivic confluence relations discussed in another article [14] by the authors. However, the main theme of this article is to prove the original block shuffle relation, and so we will not discuss the detail of the multivariable block shuffle relation in the motivic setting.

5. PROOF OF THE BLOCK SHUFFLE IDENTITY

5.1. Proof of the first form of the block shuffle identity. The purpose of this section is to prove the first form of block shuffle identity

$$L_B^{\text{sh}}(u \diamond v) = 0$$

(Theorem 9). The real-valued version of the block shuffle identity can also be regarded as a special instance of the (analytic) multivariable block shuffle identity stated in the previous section (Theorem 42), since $L_B^{\text{sh}}(u \diamond v) = L_{\text{dch}}(u \diamond B(v))$ with $\text{dch}(t) = t$ by Theorem 29 and $L_\gamma(u \diamond w) = 0$ by Theorem 42. Strictly speaking, the case $\gamma = \text{dch}$ and $w = B(v)$ itself is not contained in Theorem 42 since it does not satisfy the assumption of the theorem, but such cases can be derived from the generic statement by a suitable limiting argument. In this section, however, we specify ourselves to the motivic setting and will not discuss the real-valued version. Our proof below is based on the motivicity of general confluence relations proved in [14].

Let \mathcal{H} be the ring of motivic periods of mixed Tate motives over \mathbb{Q} . Fix a real number z between 0 and $1/2$. We put $\mathcal{A}_z = e_z \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1 - z\}) e_{1-z}$. For $c \in \{0, 1, 1/2\}$, define a \mathbb{Q} -linear map $\partial_c : \mathcal{A}_z \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_z$ by

$$\partial_c(e_{a_0} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} e_{a_{k+1}}) = \sum_{r \in \{\pm 1\}} r \sum_{i=1}^k \text{ord}_{z-c}(a_i - a_{i+r}) e_{a_0} \cdots \widehat{e_{a_i}} \cdots e_{a_{k+1}}.$$

Here we understand $\text{ord}_{z-c}(0)$ as 0. The operators ∂_0 , ∂_1 and $\partial_{1/2}$ are essentially equal to $\partial_{z,0}$, $\partial_{z,1}$ and $\partial_{z,1-z}$ defined in Section 4.1. Now we define $\text{ev}_0^{\text{m}}, \text{ev}_{1/2}^{\text{m}} : \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1 - z\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. We remark that only the properties (1), (2), (3) of Definition 44 and (1), (3) of Definition 44 will be used in our proof. Hereafter, we mean by $I^{\text{m}}(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k, a_{k+1})$ the motivic iterated integral along the straight line path from a_0 to a_{k+1} .

Definition 44. Define $\text{ev}_0^{\text{m}} : \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1 - z\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ as the unique \mathbb{Q} -linear map satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $\text{ev}_0^{\text{m}}(1) = 1$.

(2) For $u, v \in \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1 - z\})$, we have

$$\mathrm{ev}_0^m(u \sqcup v) = \mathrm{ev}_0^m(u) \cdot \mathrm{ev}_0^m(v).$$

(3) Assume $k > 0$. If $a_1 \notin \{0, z\}$ and $a_k \notin \{1, 1 - z\}$ then

$$\mathrm{ev}_0^m(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) = I^m(0, a'_1, \dots, a'_k, 1)$$

where $a'_j = a_j|_{z=0}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$.

(4) Assume $k > 0$. If $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \{0, z\}$ and $a_1 \neq z$. Then

$$\mathrm{ev}_0^m(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) = I^m(1, a'_1, \dots, a'_k, \infty')$$

where $a'_j = \delta_{a_j, z}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and ∞' is the tangential base point at $+\infty$ such that $I^m(1, 0, \infty') = 0$.

(5) $\mathrm{ev}_0^m(e_z) = 0$.

(6) Assume $k > 0$. If $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \{1, 1 - z\}$ and $a_k \neq 1 - z$. Then

$$\mathrm{ev}_0^m(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) = I^m(\infty', a'_1, \dots, a'_k, 1)$$

where $a'_j = \delta_{a_j, 1-z}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ and ∞' is the tangential base point at $+\infty$ such that $I^m(1, 0, \infty') = 0$.

(7) $\mathrm{ev}_0^m(e_{1-z}) = 0$.

Definition 45. Define $\mathrm{ev}_{1/2}^m : \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1 - z\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ as the unique \mathbb{Q} -linear map satisfying the following conditions:

(1) $\mathrm{ev}_{1/2}^m(1) = 1$.

(2) For $u, v \in \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1 - z\})$, we have

$$\mathrm{ev}_{1/2}^m(u \sqcup v) = \mathrm{ev}_{1/2}^m(u) \cdot \mathrm{ev}_{1/2}^m(v).$$

(3) If $0 \in \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ or $1 \in \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ then

$$\mathrm{ev}_{1/2}^m(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) = 0.$$

(4) Assume $k > 0$. If $a_1 \neq z$, $a_k \neq 1 - z$, and $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\} \subset \{z, 1 - z\}$, then

$$\mathrm{ev}_{1/2}^m(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) = I^m(0, a'_1, \dots, a'_k, 1)$$

where $a'_j = a_j|_{z=0}$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$.

(5) $\mathrm{ev}_{1/2}^m(e_z) = \log^m(2) := I^m(1, 0, 2)$.

(6) $\mathrm{ev}_{1/2}^m(e_{1-z}) = -\log^m(2)$.

Remark 46. The definitions of $\mathrm{ev}_x^m (x \in \{0, 1/2\})$ are compatible with the definition of ev_x^m in [14] in the sense that

$$\mathrm{ev}_x^m(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) = \widetilde{\mathrm{ev}}_x^m \left(\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{dch}}(\vec{1}_z; a_1, \dots, a_k; -\vec{1}_{1-z}) \right),$$

where dch is a linear path from $\vec{1}_z$ to $-\vec{1}_{1-z}$ (here we write $\widetilde{\mathrm{ev}}_x^m$ for ev_x^m in [14] to avoid confusion), which guarantees the well-definedness of ev_x^m .

The value of $\mathrm{ev}_0^m(w)$ for a general $w \in \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1 - z\})$ is decomposed as follows. We put

$$\mathcal{A}^0 := \mathbb{Q} \oplus \bigoplus_{\substack{a \in \{1, 1-z\} \\ b \in \{0, z\}}} e_a \mathcal{A}(\{0, z, 1, 1 - z\}) e_b.$$

Let reg be the composite map

$$\mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1 - z\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\{0, z\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}^0 \otimes \mathcal{A}(\{1, 1 - z\}) \xrightarrow{c \otimes \mathrm{id} \otimes c} \mathcal{A}^0$$

where the first map is inverse of the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{A}(\{0, z\}) \otimes \mathcal{A}^0 \otimes \mathcal{A}(\{1, 1 - z\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1 - z\}); w_1 \otimes w_2 \otimes w_3 \mapsto w_1 \sqcup w_2 \sqcup w_3,$$

and c is a \mathbb{Q} -linear map defined by $c(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) = \delta_{n,0}$. Then by [19, (3.2.20)] we have an explicit decomposition

$$w = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_n \in \{0, z\}} \sum_{b_1, \dots, b_m \in \{1, 1-z\}} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} \sqcup e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_m} \sqcup \mathrm{reg}(\mathrm{Cut}_{(a_1, \dots, a_n; b_1, \dots, b_m)}(w))$$

where $w \mapsto \text{Cut}_{(a_1, \dots, a_n; b_1, \dots, b_m)}(w)$ is a \mathbb{Q} -linear map from $\mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1-z\})$ to $\mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1-z\})$ defined by

$$\text{Cut}_{(a_1, \dots, a_n; b_1, \dots, b_m)}(e_{s_1} \cdots e_{s_t}) = \begin{cases} w' & e_{s_1} \cdots e_{s_t} \text{ can be written as } e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n} w' e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_m} \\ \text{otherwise} & 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ev}_0^m(w) &= \sum_{n, m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_n \in \{0, z\}} \sum_{b_1, \dots, b_m \in \{1, 1-z\}} \text{ev}_0^m(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) \text{ev}_0^m(e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_m}) \text{ev}_0^m(\text{reg}(\text{Cut}_{(a_1, \dots, a_n; b_1, \dots, b_m)}(w))) \\ &= \sum_{n, m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_n \in \{0, z\}} \sum_{b_1, \dots, b_m \in \{1, 1-z\}} \text{ev}_0^m(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) \text{ev}_0^m(e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_m}) \tilde{L}(\text{reg}(\text{Cut}_{(a_1, \dots, a_n; b_1, \dots, b_m)}(w)) |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \\ &= \sum_{n, m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_n \in \{0, z\}} \sum_{b_1, \dots, b_m \in \{1, 1-z\}} \text{ev}_0^m(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) \text{ev}_0^m(e_{b_1} \cdots e_{b_m}) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(a_1, \dots, a_n; b_1, \dots, b_m)}(w) |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

where $\tilde{L} : \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is a linear map defined by $\tilde{L}(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_n}) := I^m(0, a_1, \dots, a_n, 1)$ and $u \mapsto u |_{z \rightarrow 0}$ is a ring homomorphism from $\mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1-z\})$ to $\mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$ defined by $e_0, e_z \mapsto e_0$ and $e_1, e_{1-z} \mapsto e_1$. We define a \mathbb{Q} -linear map $\llbracket - \rrbracket : \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1-z\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1, z, 1-z\})$ by $\llbracket e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \rrbracket := e_{a_2} \cdots e_{a_{k-1}}$ for $k \geq 2$ and 0 for $k = 0, 1$.

Lemma 47. For $u \in \mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}}$ and $v \in \mathcal{A}_z$, we have

$$\text{ev}_0^m(\llbracket u \diamond v \rrbracket) = 0.$$

Proof. By the motivicity of generalized confluence relation ([14, Theorem 6.21]), we have,

$$\text{ev}_0^m(\llbracket w \rrbracket) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in \{0, 1, 1/2\}} \text{ev}_{1/2}^m(\llbracket \partial_{c_1} \cdots \partial_{c_l} w \rrbracket) \cdot I^m(1/2; c_1, \dots, c_l; 0) \quad (5.2)$$

for $w \in \mathcal{A}_z$. By applying (5.2) to the case $w = u \diamond v$, we have

$$\text{ev}_0^m(\llbracket u \diamond v \rrbracket) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{c_1, \dots, c_l \in \{0, 1, 1/2\}} \text{ev}_{1/2}^m(\llbracket \partial_{c_1} \cdots \partial_{c_l} (u \diamond v) \rrbracket) \cdot I^m(1/2; c_1, \dots, c_l; 0).$$

By the algebraic differential formula (Theorem 38), we have

$$\partial_c(\mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}} \diamond \mathcal{A}_z) \subset \mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}} \diamond \mathcal{A}_z$$

for $c \in \{0, 1, 1/2\}$, and especially we have

$$\partial_{c_1} \cdots \partial_{c_l} (u \diamond v) \in \mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}} \diamond \mathcal{A}_z,$$

and thus

$$\text{ev}_{1/2}^m(\llbracket \partial_{c_1} \cdots \partial_{c_l} (u \diamond v) \rrbracket) = 0$$

for all $l \geq 0$, $c_1, \dots, c_l \in \{0, 1, 1/2\}$. Hence,

$$\text{ev}_0^m(\llbracket u \diamond v \rrbracket) = 0. \quad \square$$

We put $\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{Q}\langle\langle X_1, X_2, \dots \rangle\rangle$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &:= \sum_{m, n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{b_1, \dots, b_m, c_1, \dots, c_n \geq 1 \\ b_1 + \dots + b_m - m: \text{even} > 0 \\ c_1 + \dots + c_n - n: \text{odd} > 0}} X_{b_1} \cdots X_{b_m} \otimes X_{c_1} \cdots X_{c_n} \otimes \llbracket x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \diamond B_z(x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n}) \rrbracket \\ &\in \mathcal{X} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{X} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{A}(\{0, z, 1, 1-z\}) \end{aligned}$$

where $B_z(x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n})$ is the unique element of $\mathcal{A}(\{z, 1-z\})$ such that $B_z(x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n}) |_{z \rightarrow 0} = B(x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n})$. Given a \mathbb{Q} -algebra R and \mathbb{Q} -linear map $f : \mathcal{A}(\{0, z, 1, 1-z\}) \rightarrow R$, we also denote by f its natural extension to $\mathcal{X} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{X} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{A}(\{0, z, 1, 1-z\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{X} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{X} \hat{\otimes} R$ i.e., $f(W \otimes W' \otimes w) := W \otimes W' \otimes f(w)$ by an abuse of notation. Let $u = X_1 \otimes 1 \otimes 1$ and $v = 1 \otimes X_1 \otimes 1$ be two elements of $\mathcal{X} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{X} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{A}(\{0, z, 1, 1-z\})$.

Lemma 48. *We have*

$$\text{Cut}_{(0,0;\emptyset)}(\psi) = 0, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset;1,1)}(\psi) = 0, \quad (5.4)$$

$$\text{Cut}_{(z;\emptyset)}(\psi) = (2u + v)\psi, \quad (5.5)$$

$$\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset;1-z)}(\psi) = \psi(2u + v), \quad (5.6)$$

$$\text{Cut}_{(0,z;\emptyset)}(\psi) = -uv\psi, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset;1-z,1)}(\psi) = -\psi uv, \quad (5.8)$$

$$\text{Cut}_{(0;\emptyset)}(\psi) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} = -u \cdot (\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}), \quad (5.9)$$

$$\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset;1)}(\psi) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} = -(\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot u, \quad (5.10)$$

$$\text{Cut}_{(0;1)}(\psi) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} = u \cdot (\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot u. \quad (5.11)$$

Proof. Notice that the terms that appear in $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge B(x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n})$ are words consisting of e_z, e_{1-z} and alternating sequences of $\{e_0, e_1\}$ being separated by e_z or e_{1-z} , thus contain no subsequences of the forms e_0e_0 or e_1e_1 . Hence (5.3) and (5.4) holds. Writing $B_z(x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n})$ as $e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_N}$ ($a_1 = z, a_N = 1 - z$), the first formula of Proposition 26 says that the terms of $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_N}$ starting as $e_z e_z \cdots$ only occur as

$$(-1)^{k-1} e_{a_1} U(b_1 + \cdots + b_k - 1) \cdot \iota^{b_1 + \cdots + b_k - k} (x_{b_{k+1}} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_N}) \quad (k = b_1 = 1)$$

or as

$$e_{a_1} (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_2} \cdots e_{a_N}) \quad (a_2 = z).$$

From this observation, we find (5.5). Similarly, the first formula of Proposition 26 also says that the terms of $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_N}$ starting as $e_z e_0 e_z \cdots$ only occur as

$$\sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^k e_{a_1} W(0; b_1 + \cdots + b_k) \cdot \iota^{b_1 + \cdots + b_k - k} (x_{b_{k+1}} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_2} \cdots e_{a_N}) \quad (k = b_1 = 1, a_2 = z),$$

from which we obtain (5.7). By the same argument for the tail of $x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_N}$ using the second formula of Proposition 26, we get (5.6) and (5.8). Note that

$$\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} = \sum_{m,n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{b_1, \dots, b_m, c_1, \dots, c_n \geq 1 \\ b_1 + \cdots + b_m - m: \text{even} > 0 \\ c_1 + \cdots + c_n - n: \text{odd} > 0}} X_{b_1} \cdots X_{b_m} \otimes X_{c_1} \cdots X_{c_n} \otimes \llbracket B(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n}) \rrbracket$$

by 29. Since

$$x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n} = x_{b_1} (x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n}) + x_{c_1} (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge x_{c_2} \cdots x_{c_n}) - s_{b_1+c_1} (x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge x_{c_2} \cdots x_{c_n}),$$

the terms of $B(x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n})$ which start as $e_0 e_0 \cdots$ only occur as

$$B(x_{b_1} (x_{b_2} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge x_{c_1} \cdots x_{c_n})) \quad (b_1 = 1)$$

or

$$B(x_{c_1} (x_{b_1} \cdots x_{b_m} \blacklozenge x_{c_2} \cdots x_{c_n})) \quad (c_1 = 1),$$

and thus

$$\text{Cut}_{(0;\emptyset)}(\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}) = (u + v) \cdot (\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}). \quad (5.12)$$

Similarly, we also have

$$\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset;1)}(\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}) = (\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot (u + v). \quad (5.13)$$

Then (5.9) follows from the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cut}_{(0;\emptyset)}(\psi) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} &= \text{Cut}_{(0;\emptyset)}(\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}) - \text{Cut}_{(z;\emptyset)}(\psi) \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0} \\ &= (u + v) \cdot (\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}) - (2u + v) \cdot (\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}) \quad (\text{using (5.12) and (5.5)}) \\ &= -u \cdot (\psi \Big|_{z \rightarrow 0}), \end{aligned}$$

and (5.10) also follows from the similar calculation. Finally, (5.11) follows from the following calculation:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cut}_{(0;1)}(\psi) |_{z \rightarrow 0} &= \text{Cut}_{(0;1)}(\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) - \text{Cut}_{(z;1-z)}(\psi) |_{z \rightarrow 0} - \text{Cut}_{(z;1)}(\psi) |_{z \rightarrow 0} - \text{Cut}_{(0;1-z)}(\psi) |_{z \rightarrow 0} \\
&= (u+v) \cdot (\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot (u+v) - (2u+v) \cdot (\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot (2u+v) \\
&\quad - \text{Cut}_{(\emptyset;1)}((2u+v)\psi) |_{z \rightarrow 0} - \text{Cut}_{(0;\emptyset)}(\psi(2u+v)) |_{z \rightarrow 0} \\
&\quad \text{(using (5.12), (5.13), (5.5), and (5.6))} \\
&= (u+v) \cdot (\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot (u+v) - (2u+v) \cdot (\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot (2u+v) \\
&\quad + (2u+v) \cdot (\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot u + u \cdot (\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot (2u+v) \\
&\quad \text{(using (5.10), and (5.9))} \\
&= u \cdot (\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot u.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Now we are ready to prove the first form of the block shuffle relation.

Proof of Theorem 9. By Theorem 29, it is enough to show $\tilde{L}(\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) = 0$. By (5.1), we have

$$\text{ev}_0^m(\psi) = \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n \in \{0, z\} \\ \mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_m \in \{1, 1-z\}}} (1 \otimes 1 \otimes \text{ev}_0^m(e_{\mathbf{a}_1} \cdots e_{\mathbf{a}_n}) \text{ev}_0^m(e_{\mathbf{b}_1} \cdots e_{\mathbf{b}_m})) \cdot \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n; \mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_m)}(\psi) |_{z \rightarrow 0})$$

For sequence $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \{0, z\}^n$, define $p_{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{Q}[u, v]$ by

$$p_{\mathbf{a}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \mathbf{a} = \emptyset \\ -u & \mathbf{a} = (0) \\ -uv \cdot p_{\mathbf{a}'} & \mathbf{a} = (0, z, \mathbf{a}') \\ 0 & \mathbf{a} = (0, 0, \mathbf{a}') \\ (2u+v) \cdot p_{\mathbf{a}'} & \mathbf{a} = (z, \mathbf{a}') \end{cases}$$

and for sequence $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \{1, 1-z\}^m$, define $q_{\mathbf{b}}$ by

$$q_{\mathbf{b}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \mathbf{b} = \emptyset \\ -u & \mathbf{b} = (1) \\ -uv \cdot q_{\mathbf{b}'} & \mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b}', 1-z, 1) \\ 0 & \mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b}', 1, 1) \\ (2u+v) \cdot q_{\mathbf{b}'} & \mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b}', 1-z). \end{cases}$$

Then by Lemma 48, for any $\mathbf{a} \in \{0, z\}^n$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \{1, 1-z\}^m$, we have

$$\text{Cut}_{(\mathbf{a}; \mathbf{b})}(\psi) |_{z \rightarrow 0} = p_{\mathbf{a}} \cdot (\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot q_{\mathbf{b}}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{ev}_0^m(\psi) &= \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{a}=(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n) \in \{0, z\}^n \\ \mathbf{b}=(\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_m) \in \{1, 1-z\}^m}} (1 \otimes 1 \otimes \text{ev}_0^m(e_{\mathbf{a}_1} \cdots e_{\mathbf{a}_n}) \text{ev}_0^m(e_{\mathbf{b}_1} \cdots e_{\mathbf{b}_m})) \cdot \tilde{L}(p_{\mathbf{a}} \cdot (\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot q_{\mathbf{b}}) \\
&= \Theta_L \cdot \tilde{L}(\psi |_{z \rightarrow 0}) \cdot \Theta_R
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Theta_L &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{a}=(\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n) \in \{0, z\}^n} (1 \otimes 1 \otimes \text{ev}_0^m(e_{\mathbf{a}_1} \cdots e_{\mathbf{a}_n})) \cdot p_{\mathbf{a}}, \\
\Theta_R &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{b}=(\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_m) \in \{1, 1-z\}^m} (1 \otimes 1 \otimes \text{ev}_0^m(e_{\mathbf{b}_1} \cdots e_{\mathbf{b}_m})) \cdot q_{\mathbf{b}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, by Lemma 47 we have

$$\text{ev}_0^m(\psi) = 0.$$

Since the constant terms of

$$\Theta_L, \Theta_R \in \mathcal{H}[[u, v]] \quad (\subset \mathcal{X} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{X} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{H})$$

are both 1, Θ_L and Θ_R are invertible. Hence, we find

$$\tilde{L}(\psi|_{z \rightarrow 0}) = 0. \quad \square$$

5.2. Proof of the second form of the block shuffle identity. The purpose of this section is to prove the second form of the block shuffle identity (Theorem 10). The second form of the block shuffle identity is a statement about the block regularized value, which is defined via generating function, and thus it is convenient to work on the dual side. We denote by $\text{dec} : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X} \otimes \mathfrak{X}$ the deconcatenation coproduct. Then $(\mathfrak{X}, \diamond, \text{dec})$ is a commutative Hopf algebra (see [18]). Let $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{H}\langle\langle X_1, X_2, \dots \rangle\rangle$ be the dual \mathcal{H} -module of $\mathfrak{X} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{H}$. Then $(\mathcal{R}, \cdot, \hat{\Delta})$ is a co-commutative Hopf \mathcal{H} -algebra where \cdot is concatenation and $\hat{\Delta} : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R} \otimes_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{R}$ is defined by $\hat{\Delta}(uv) = \hat{\Delta}(u)\hat{\Delta}(v)$ and

$$\hat{\Delta}X_k = X_k \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes X_k - \sum_{\substack{i, j, k' \geq 1 \\ i+j+k'=k}} (X_i \otimes X_j) \cdot \hat{\Delta}(X_{k'}).$$

For an index $\mathbb{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^d$, we put $x_{\mathbb{k}} = x_{k_1} \cdots x_{k_d}$ and $X_{\mathbb{k}} = X_{k_1} \cdots X_{k_d}$. By definition,

$$\hat{\Delta}\Phi^{\sqcup} = \sum_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'} L_B^{\sqcup}(x_{\mathbb{k}} \diamond x_{\mathbb{k}'}) X_{\mathbb{k}} \otimes X_{\mathbb{k}'}$$

and

$$\hat{\Delta}\Phi = \sum_{\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}'} L_B(x_{\mathbb{k}} \diamond x_{\mathbb{k}'}) X_{\mathbb{k}} \otimes X_{\mathbb{k}'}$$

where \mathbb{k} and \mathbb{k}' runs all indices with different parities.

Lemma 49. *We have*

$$L_B(u \diamond v) = 0$$

for $u \in \mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}}$ and $v \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}$.

Proof. By the first form of the block shuffle identity (Theorem 9), we have

$$\hat{\Delta}(\Phi^{\sqcup}) \in \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} X_1^k \otimes \mathcal{R} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{R} \otimes X_1^k.$$

Since $\hat{\Delta}(X_1) = X_1 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes X_1$,

$$\hat{\Delta}(\Phi) = \hat{\Delta}(\Gamma_1(X_1)^{-2}) \cdot \hat{\Delta}(\Phi^{\sqcup}) \cdot \hat{\Delta}(\Gamma_1(-X_1)^{-2}) \in \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} X_1^k \otimes \mathcal{R} + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{R} \otimes X_1^k$$

which implies $L_B(u \diamond v) = 0$ for all $u \in \mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}}$ and $v \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}$. □

We define a derivation D on $\mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$ (with respect to the concatenation product) by

$$D(e_a) = e_a e_a - e_a e_0 - e_1 e_a = -e_1 e_0 \quad (a \in \{0, 1\}).$$

Lemma 50. *For $w \in \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$, we have*

$$\tilde{L}(D(w)) = \sum_{N \geq 2} (-1)^N \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\{0\}^{N-1}, \emptyset)}(w)) + \sum_{N \geq 2} \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset, \{1\}^{N-1})}(w)).$$

Proof. Let $*$ be a binary operation on $\mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$ defined in [13]. First, note that

$$D(w) = w * e_1 - w \sqcup e_1$$

for $w \in \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$ since

$$\begin{aligned} D(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) &= \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_i} e_{a_i} \cdots e_{a_k} - \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_i} e_0 e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_k} - \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}} e_1 e_{a_i} \cdots e_{a_k} \\ e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} * e_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_i} e_{a_i} \cdots e_{a_k} - \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_i} e_0 e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_k} + e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} e_1, \\ e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \sqcup e_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}} e_1 e_{a_i} \cdots e_{a_k} + e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} e_1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\tilde{L}(D(w)) = 0$$

for $w \in \mathbb{Q} \oplus e_1 \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\}) e_0$ by the regularized double shuffle relation (for motivic multiple zeta values). Let $\text{reg}_0 : \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^1(\{0, 1\}) := \mathbb{Q} \oplus e_1 \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$ be the unique \sqcup -homomorphism satisfying $\text{reg}_0(e_0) = 0$ and $\text{reg}_0(w) = w$ for $w \in \mathcal{A}^1(\{0, 1\})$. By comparing the coefficients of A^n of the formula in [11, Lemma 19], we have

$$\text{reg}_0(e_0^n(w_1 * w_2)) = \sum_{i+j=n} \text{reg}_0(e_0^i w_1) * \text{reg}_0(e_0^j w_2)$$

for $w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{A}^1(\{0, 1\})$. Fix $u \in \mathcal{A}^1(\{0, 1\})$ and $n \geq 0$. Letting $w_1 = u$ and $w_2 = e_1$ in the equality above, we obtain

$$\text{reg}_0(e_0^n(u * e_1)) = \sum_{i+j=n} \text{reg}_0(e_0^i u) * \text{reg}_0(e_0^j e_1) = \sum_{i+j=n} (-1)^j \text{reg}_0(e_0^i u) * e_1 e_0^j.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}(D(e_0^n u)) &= \tilde{L}(e_0^n u * e_1 - e_0^n u \sqcup e_1) \\ &= \tilde{L}(e_0^n u * e_1) \\ &= \tilde{L}(e_0^n(u * e_1)) \\ &= \sum_{i+j=n} (-1)^j \tilde{L}(\text{reg}_0(e_0^i u) * e_1 e_0^j). \end{aligned}$$

Here, by the regularized double shuffle relation,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{i+j=n \\ j \geq 1}} (-1)^j \tilde{L}(\text{reg}_0(e_0^i u) * e_1 e_0^j) &= \sum_{\substack{i+j=n \\ j \geq 1}} (-1)^j \tilde{L}(\text{reg}_0(e_0^i u)) \tilde{L}(e_1 e_0^j) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i+j=n \\ j \geq 1}} (-1)^{j+1} \tilde{L}(e_0^i u) \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(j+1) \\ &= \sum_{N \geq 2} (-1)^N \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\{0\}^{N-1}, \emptyset)}(e_0^n u)). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand

$$\sum_{\substack{i+j=n \\ j=0}} (-1)^j \tilde{L}(\text{reg}_0(e_0^i u) * e_1 e_0^j) = \tilde{L}(\text{reg}_0(e_0^n u) * e_1) = \tilde{L}(D(\text{reg}_0(e_0^n u))).$$

Thus

$$\tilde{L}(D(e_0^n u)) = \sum_{N \geq 2} (-1)^N \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\{0\}^{N-1}, \emptyset)}(e_0^n u)) + \tilde{L}(D(\text{reg}_0(e_0^n u)))$$

for any $u \in \mathcal{A}^1(\{0, 1\})$ and $n \geq 0$, or equivalently

$$\tilde{L}(D(w)) = \sum_{N \geq 2} (-1)^N \zeta^{\mathfrak{m}}(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\{0\}^{N-1}, \emptyset)}(w)) + \tilde{L}(D(\text{reg}_0(w))) \quad (5.14)$$

for any $w \in \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$. Let τ be the anti-automorphism of $\mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$ defined by $\tau(e_0) = -e_1$ and $\tau(e_1) = -e_0$. By definition $\tau \circ D(w) = -D \circ \tau(w)$. Since

$$\tilde{L}(D(\tau(w))) = -\tilde{L}(\tau(D(w))) = -\tilde{L}(D(w)),$$

and

$$\tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\{0\}^{N-1}, \emptyset)}(\tau(w))) = (-1)^{N-1} \tilde{L}(\tau(\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset; \{1\}^{N-1})}(w))),$$

we have

$$-\tilde{L}(D(w)) = -\sum_{N \geq 2} \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset; \{1\}^{N-1})}(w)) + \tilde{L}(D(\text{reg}_0(\tau(w)))),$$

and especially,

$$\tilde{L}(D(w)) = \sum_{N \geq 2} \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset; \{1\}^{N-1})}(w)) \quad (5.15)$$

for $w \in \mathcal{A}^1$. By replacing w with $\text{reg}_0(w)$ in (5.15), the last term of the right-hand side of (5.14) now becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}(D(\text{reg}_0(w))) &= \sum_{N \geq 2} \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset; \{1\}^{N-1})}(\text{reg}_0(w))) \\ &= \sum_{N \geq 2} \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{reg}_0(\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset; \{1\}^{N-1})}(w))) \\ &= \sum_{N \geq 2} \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset; \{1\}^{N-1})}(w)), \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}(D(w)) &= \sum_{N \geq 2} (-1)^N \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\{0\}^{N-1}, \emptyset)}(w)) + \tilde{L}(D(\text{reg}_0(w))) \\ &= \sum_{N \geq 2} (-1)^N \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\{0\}^{N-1}, \emptyset)}(w)) + \sum_{N \geq 2} \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset; \{1\}^{N-1})}(\text{reg}_0(w))). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Lemma 51. For $u \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}$, we have

$$L_B(x_1 \diamond u) = 0.$$

Proof. For $a_0, \dots, a_{k+1} \in \{0, 1\}$ with $a_0 = 0$ and $a_{k+1} = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 \diamond e_{a_0} \cdots e_{a_{k+1}} &= 2 \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} e_{a_0} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}} e_{a_i} e_{a_i} e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_{k+1}} - \sum_{i=0}^k e_{a_0} \cdots e_{a_i} (e_0 + e_1) e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_{k+1}} \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_0} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}} e_{a_i} e_{a_i} e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_{k+1}} + 2e_{a_0} e_{a_0} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{k+1}} + 2e_{a_0} \cdots e_{a_k} e_{a_{k+1}} e_{a_{k+1}} \\ &\quad - e_0 (e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \sqcup (e_0 + e_1)) e_1 \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_0} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}} (D(e_{a_i}) + e_{a_i} e_0 + e_1 e_{a_i}) e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_{k+1}} \\ &\quad + 2e_{a_0} e_{a_0} e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_{k+1}} + 2e_{a_0} \cdots e_{a_k} e_{a_{k+1}} e_{a_{k+1}} - e_0 (e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \sqcup (e_0 + e_1)) e_1 \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^k e_{a_0} \cdots e_{a_{i-1}} D(e_{a_i}) e_{a_{i+1}} \cdots e_{a_{k+1}} + e_0 (e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \sqcup (-e_0 - e_1 + 2e_0 + 2e_1)) e_1 \\ &= e_0 (2D(e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k}) + e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} \sqcup (e_0 + e_1)) e_1. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, we have

$$x_1 \diamond e_0 u e_1 = e_0 (2D(u) + u \sqcup (e_0 + e_1)) e_1$$

for $u \in \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$. Thus, by Lemma 50,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}([x_1 \diamond e_0 u e_1]) &= 2\tilde{L}(D(u)) \\ &= 2 \sum_{N \geq 2} (-1)^N \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\{0\}^{N-1}, \emptyset)}(u)) + 2 \sum_{N \geq 2} \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{Cut}_{(\emptyset, \{1\}^{N-1})}(u)) \end{aligned}$$

for $u \in \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})$, or equivalently,

$$L_B^\sqcup(x_1 \diamond w) = 2 \sum_{N \geq 2} (-1)^N \zeta^m(N) L_B^\sqcup(\text{cut}_{(x_1^{N-1}; 1)}(w)) + 2 \sum_{N \geq 2} \zeta^m(N) \tilde{L}(\text{cut}_{(1; x_1^{N-1})}(w)) \quad (5.16)$$

where $\text{cut}_{(u;v)} : \mathfrak{X} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ is a linear map defined by

$$\text{cut}_{(u;v)}(w) := \begin{cases} w' & \text{if } w = uw'v \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for monomials $u, v, w \in \mathfrak{X}$. Define $f : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ by the composition

$$\mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{\hat{\Delta}} \mathcal{R} \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{R} \xrightarrow{u_1 \otimes u_2 \mapsto (u_1, x_1) \cdot u_2} \mathcal{R}.$$

Then by (5.16), we have

$$f(\Phi^\sqcup) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}: \text{odd}} L_B^\sqcup(x_1 \diamond x_{\mathbf{k}}) \cdot X_{\mathbf{k}} = 2\psi_1(X_1) \cdot \Phi^\sqcup - \Phi^\sqcup \cdot 2\psi_1(-X_1)$$

where

$$\psi_1(t) := \frac{d}{dt} \log \Gamma_1(t) = - \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \zeta^m(n) (-t)^{n-1}.$$

Note that f is an derivation on \mathcal{R} , i.e.,

$$f(w_1 \cdot w_2) = f(w_1)w_2 + w_1 f(w_2) \quad (w_1, w_2 \in \mathcal{R})$$

and in particular

$$f(p(X_1)) = \frac{d}{dX_1} p(X_1) \quad (p \in \mathcal{H}[[t]]).$$

Thus for $\Phi_{p,q} := p(X_1)\Phi^\sqcup q(X_1)$ with general $p(t), q(t) \in 1 + t\mathcal{H}[[t]]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\Phi_{p,q}) &= \left(\frac{p'(X_1)}{p(X_1)} + 2\psi_1(X_1) \right) \cdot \Phi_{p,q} + \Phi_{p,q} \cdot \left(\frac{q'(X_1)}{q(X_1)} - 2\psi_1(-X_1) \right) \\ &= \frac{d}{dX_1} \log(p(X_1)\Gamma_1(X_1)^2) \cdot \Phi_{p,q} + \Phi_{p,q} \cdot \frac{d}{dX_1} \log(q(X_1)\Gamma_1(-X_1)^2). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the choice $p(t) = \Gamma_1(t)^{-2}$, $q(t) = \Gamma_1(-t)^{-2}$,

$$f(\Phi) = 0,$$

which is equivalent to the claim of the lemma. \square

With the lemma above, we can finally complete the proof of the second form of the block shuffle identity (Theorem 10) as follows:

Proof of Theorem 10. By Lemma 49, it is enough to show

$$L_B(x_1^n \diamond v) = 0$$

for $n \geq 1$ and $v \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}$. Since

$$x_1^n - \frac{1}{n} x_1 \diamond x_1^{n-1} \in \mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}},$$

by Lemma 49 and 51, we have

$$L_B(x_1^n \diamond v) = \frac{1}{n} L_B(x_1 \diamond x_1^{n-1} \diamond v) = 0. \quad \square$$

Remark 52. In terms of the generating series, Theorem 10 is equivalent to the Lie-like property $\hat{\Delta}\Phi = \Phi \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes \Phi$.

5.3. Proof of the full version of Charlton's generalized cyclic insertion conjecture. In this section, we derive the full version of Charlton's generalized cyclic insertion conjecture [8, Conjecture 6.3] from Theorem 10.

Proposition 53. *Suppose that $d > 0$ and $l_1, \dots, l_d \geq 1$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^d (l_i - 1)$ is odd, and let*

$$A_r = \begin{cases} \frac{2\mu^r}{(r+2)!} & r: \text{ even}, \\ 0 & r: \text{ odd}, \end{cases}$$

where $\mu \in \mathcal{H}$ is the motivic $2\pi i$. Then,

$$\sum_{r=0}^d A_r \sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^r \delta_{l_{\sigma+j}, 1} \right) L_B^{\sqcup} (x_{l_{\sigma+r+1}} \cdots x_{l_{\sigma+d}}) = \begin{cases} L_B^{\sqcup} (x_{l_1+\dots+l_d}) & d: \text{ odd} \\ 0 & d: \text{ even}. \end{cases}$$

Here, the subscripts of l 's are regarded as elements of $\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. By Theorem 10 and Proposition 16, we have

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} L_B(x_{l_{\sigma+1}} \cdots x_{l_{\sigma+d}}) \equiv \begin{cases} L_B(x_{l_1+\dots+l_d}) & d: \text{ odd} \\ 0 & d: \text{ even}, \end{cases}$$

and since $L_B^{\sqcup}(x_l) = L_B(x_l)$ for $l \geq 1$, it suffices to show

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} L_B(x_{l_{\sigma+1}} \cdots x_{l_{\sigma+d}}) = \sum_{r=0}^d A_r \sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \left(\prod_{j=1}^r \delta_{l_{\sigma+j}, 1} \right) L_B^{\sqcup}(x_{l_{\sigma+r+1}} \cdots x_{l_{\sigma+d}}).$$

We define c_k, c'_k by $\Gamma_1(t)^{-2} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k t^k$ and $\Gamma_1(-t)^{-2} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c'_k t^k$. Then, by definition,

$$L_B(x_{l_1} \cdots x_{l_d}) = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq p, q \\ p+q \leq d}} \left(c_p \prod_{j=1}^p \delta_{l_j, 1} \right) L_B^{\sqcup}(x_{l_{p+1}} \cdots x_{l_{d-q}}) \left(c'_q \prod_{j=d-q+1}^d \delta_{l_j, 1} \right)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} L_B(x_{l_{\sigma+1}} \cdots x_{l_{\sigma+d}}) &= \sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq p, q \\ p+q \leq d}} c_p c'_q \left(\prod_{-q < j \leq p} \delta_{l_{\sigma+j}, 1} \right) L_B^{\sqcup}(x_{l_{\sigma+p+1}} \cdots x_{l_{\sigma+d-q}}) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{0 \leq p \leq r \leq d} c_p c'_{r-p} \left(\prod_{0 < j \leq r} \delta_{l_{\sigma'+j}, 1} \right) L_B^{\sqcup}(x_{l_{\sigma'+r+1}} \cdots x_{l_{\sigma'+d}}) \quad (\text{by } \sigma' = \sigma - q, r = p + q) \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sum_{0 \leq p \leq r} c_p c'_{r-p}$ is the coefficient of t^r of

$$\Gamma_1(t)^{-2} \Gamma_1(-t)^{-2} = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} A_r t^r,$$

it follows that

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} L_B(x_{l_{\sigma+1}} \cdots x_{l_{\sigma+d}}) = \sum_{\sigma' \in \mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z}} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq d} A_r \cdot \left(\prod_{0 < j \leq r} \delta_{l_{\sigma'+j}, 1} \right) L_B^{\sqcup}(x_{l_{\sigma'+r+1}} \cdots x_{l_{\sigma'+d}}). \quad \square$$

5.4. Block shuffle relation for refined symmetric multiple zeta values. In this section, we discuss a closed path analog of the block shuffle identity. Let $0'$ and $1'$ be the standard tangential basepoints $\vec{1}_0$ and $-\vec{1}_1$, respectively. Define a \mathbb{Q} -linear map

$$L^{\circ, \sqcup} : \mathbb{Q}e_0 \oplus e_0 \mathcal{A}(\{0, 1\})e_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$$

by

$$L^{\circ, \sqcup}(e_0) = 0 \text{ and } L^{\circ, \sqcup}(e_0 e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} e_0) = I_{\gamma}^m(0'; a_1, \dots, a_k; 0') - \delta_{k,0}$$

where γ is a closed path from $0'$ to $0'$ that runs along the real axis to $1 - \varepsilon$ with $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ and encircles 1 once counter-clockwisely. Now, define $L_B^{\circ, \sqcup} : \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by $L^{\circ, \sqcup} \circ B$ and let

$$\Phi^{\circ, \sqcup} := \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq \emptyset: \text{even}} L_B^{\circ, \sqcup}(x_{\mathbf{k}}) X_{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathcal{R}.$$

As before, we define Φ° and the block regularization $L_B^\circ : \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ by

$$\sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq \emptyset: \text{even}} L_B^\circ(x_{\mathbf{k}}) X_{\mathbf{k}} := \Phi^\circ := \Gamma_1(X_1)^{-2} \Phi^{\circ, \sqcup} \Gamma_1(-X_1)^{-2}.$$

Based on a numerical investigation, we conjecture the following:

Conjecture 54. For $u, v \in \mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}} \times \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}^+ \cup \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}} \times \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}^+$,

$$L_B^\circ(u \diamond v) \stackrel{?}{=} \begin{cases} 0 & (u, v) \in \mathfrak{X}'_{\text{ev}} \times \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}^+ \\ \mu^2 L_B(u) L_B(v) & (u, v) \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}} \times \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}^+. \end{cases}$$

As a supporting fact of this conjecture, here we prove that at least its ‘‘real part’’ is true. Let τ denote the complex conjugation on \mathcal{H} , $\mathcal{H}^{\tau, +}$ the real part $\mathcal{H}^{\tau, +} := \{x \in \mathcal{H} \mid \tau(x) = x\}$, and $\mathfrak{r} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}^{\tau, +}$ the map defined by $\mathfrak{r}(x) := x + \tau(x)$. By definition $\tau(\mu) = -\mu$. We extend the definition of \mathfrak{r} to

$$\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{\tau, +} := \mathcal{H}^{\tau, +} \langle\langle X_1, X_2, \dots \rangle\rangle$$

by $\mathfrak{r}(\sum_{\mathbf{k}} c_{\mathbf{k}} X_{\mathbf{k}}) = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \mathfrak{r}(c_{\mathbf{k}}) X_{\mathbf{k}}$.

Theorem 55. For $u, v \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}^+ \times \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}^+ \cup \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}} \times \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}^+$, we have

$$\mathfrak{r}(L_B^\circ(u \diamond v)) = \begin{cases} 0 & u, v \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{ev}}^+ \\ 2\mu^2 L_B(u) L_B(v) & u, v \in \mathfrak{X}_{\text{od}}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We will prove the theorem in the equivalent form

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\mathfrak{r}(\Phi^\circ)) = 1 \otimes \mathfrak{r}(\Phi^\circ) + 2\mu^2 \Phi \otimes \Phi + \mathfrak{r}(\Phi^\circ) \otimes 1.$$

First, notice that $\gamma = \text{dch} \circ C_1 \circ \text{dch}^{-1}$ where C_1 is a closed path from $1'$ to $1'$ that encircles 1 once counter-clockwisely without encircling 0, and $\text{dch}(t) = t$ is a standard straight path from $0'$ to $1'$. Hence, by the path composition formula,

$$I_\gamma^{\mathfrak{m}}(0'; a_1, \dots, a_k; 0') = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j \leq k} I_{\text{dch}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(0'; a_1, \dots, a_i; 1') I_{C_1}^{\mathfrak{m}}(1'; a_{i+1}, \dots, a_j; 1') I_{\text{dch}^{-1}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(1'; a_{j+1}, \dots, a_k; 0').$$

Since

$$I_{C_1}^{\mathfrak{m}}(1'; a_{i+1}, \dots, a_j; 1') = \begin{cases} \frac{\mu^{j-i}}{(j-i)!} & \text{if } a_{i+1} = \dots = a_j = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} I_{\text{dch}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(0'; a_1, a_2, \dots, a_i; 1') I_{\text{dch}^{-1}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(1'; a_{i+1}, \dots, a_k; 0') = I_{\text{dch} \circ \text{dch}^{-1}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(0'; a_1, \dots, a_k; 0') = \delta_{k,0},$$

we deduce that

$$\mathfrak{r}(L^{\circ, \sqcup}(e_0 e_{a_1} \cdots e_{a_k} e_0)) = 2 \sum_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq j \leq k \\ j-i \geq 2, \text{ even} \\ a_{i+1} = \dots = a_j = 1}} I_{\text{dch}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(0'; a_1, \dots, a_i; 1') \frac{\mu^{j-i}}{(j-i)!} I_{\text{dch}^{-1}}^{\mathfrak{m}}(1'; a_{j+1}, \dots, a_k; 0').$$

Rewriting this equation in terms of $\Phi^{\circ, \sqcup}$,

$$\mathfrak{r}(\Phi^{\circ, \sqcup}) = 2 \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}': \text{ odd} \\ r \geq 0}} L_B^{\sqcup}(x_{\mathbf{k}}) \frac{\mu^{2r+2}}{(2r+2)!} L_B^{\sqcup}(x_{\mathbf{k}'}) X_{\mathbf{k}} X_1^{2r} X_{\mathbf{k}'} = \Phi^{\sqcup} \cdot \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{2\mu^{2r+2}}{(2r+2)!} X_1^{2r} \right) \cdot \Phi^{\sqcup}.$$

By noting

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{2\mu^{2r+2}}{(2r+2)!} X_1^{2r} = \left(\frac{e^{\mu X_1/2} - e^{-\mu X_1/2}}{X_1} \right)^2 = \mu^2 \Gamma_1(-X_1)^{-2} \Gamma_1(X_1)^{-2},$$

we find that

$$\mathfrak{r}(\Phi^{\circ, \sqcup}) = \mu^2 \Phi^{\sqcup} \cdot \Gamma_1(-X_1)^{-2} \Gamma_1(X_1)^{-2} \cdot \Phi^{\sqcup},$$

or equivalently,

$$\mathfrak{r}(\Phi^{\circ}) = \mu^2 \Phi^2.$$

Hence, by Theorem 10, it readily follows that

$$\widehat{\Delta}(\mathfrak{r}(\Phi^{\circ})) = \mu^2 \widehat{\Delta}(\Phi)^2 = \mu^2 (1 \otimes \Phi + \Phi \otimes 1)^2 = 1 \otimes \mathfrak{r}(\Phi^{\circ}) + 2\mu^2 \Phi \otimes \Phi + \mathfrak{r}(\Phi^{\circ}) \otimes 1. \quad \square$$

6. SEVERAL REMARKS ON THE BLOCK SHUFFLE RELATION

In this final section, we would like to make some remarks on the block shuffle relation to discuss its significance. In the first part, we will show that the block shuffle relation is an ultimate generalization of Charlton's conjectures in a certain sense. Then in the second part, we will discuss the space of the relations between I_{bl}^{m} 's of block degree (= the number of entries minus one) at most two, make some observations based on numerical experimentations, and state some expectations about higher block degree case.

6.1. A certain maximality of the block shuffle relation. Let us refer to a multiple zeta value $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(l_1, \dots, l_d)$ with $l_1, \dots, l_d \geq 2$ and $\#\{l_i : \text{even}\} = 1$ as *quasi-Hoffman*. One important feature of the block shuffle relation is that it gives all linear relations among quasi-Hoffman multiple zeta values. We have already mentioned this fact in Remark 15, but we restate it as a theorem in light of its importance.

Theorem 56. *Define $\mathfrak{X}' \subset \mathfrak{X}$ as a direct sum*

$$\bigoplus_{d=1}^{\infty} \bigoplus_{\substack{l_1, \dots, l_d \geq 2 \\ \#\{l_i : \text{even}\} = 1}} \mathbb{Q} \cdot x_{l_1} \cdots x_{l_d}.$$

Then,

$$\ker L_B \cap \mathfrak{X}' = (\mathfrak{X}^+ \diamond \mathfrak{X}^+) \cap \mathfrak{X}'.$$

In other words, all \mathbb{Q} -linear relations among quasi-Hoffman multiple zeta values are \mathbb{Q} -linear combinations of the block shuffle relations.

This theorem implies that the block shuffle relations is an ‘‘ultimate’’ generalization of Conjectures 6 and 7 in the following sense: Fix a positive integer d and let \mathfrak{Y}_d be the set of formal \mathbb{Q} -linear sums of the sequences (S_1, \dots, S_r) where S_1, \dots, S_r are disjoint subsets of $\{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $S_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup S_r = \{1, \dots, d\}$ and $\#S_j$ are odd. Define a \mathbb{Q} -linear map

$$M_d : \mathfrak{Y}_d \rightarrow \prod_{l_1, \dots, l_d \geq 2} \mathcal{H}$$

by

$$M_d((S_1, \dots, S_r)) = \left(I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}} \left(\sum_{j \in S_1} l_j, \dots, \sum_{j \in S_r} l_j \right) \right)_{l_1, \dots, l_d \geq 2},$$

where we regard $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(b_1, \dots, b_k)$ as 0 if $b_1 + \dots + b_k - k$ is even. For example, Conjectures 6 and 7 say that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} (\{i+1\}, \dots, \{d\}, \{1\}, \dots, \{i\}) = \begin{cases} (\{1, \dots, d\}) & d : \text{odd} \\ 0 & d : \text{even} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+1}} \text{sgn}(\sigma) (\{\sigma(1)\}, \{n+2\}, \{\sigma(2)\}, \{n+3\}, \dots, \{\sigma(n)\}, \{2n+1\}, \{\sigma(n+1)\})$$

are elements of $\ker M_d$ and $\ker M_{2n+1}$, respectively.

Theorem 57. *All elements of $\ker M_d$ come from the block shuffle relation, i.e.,*

$$\ker M_d = \sum_{0 < i < n} \sum_{\substack{S_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup S_n = \{1, \dots, d\} \\ \#S_j: \text{odd}}} \mathbb{Q} \cdot (S_1, \dots, S_i) \hat{\sqcup} (S_{i+1}, \dots, S_n),$$

where $\hat{\sqcup}$ is defined by

$$(A_1, \dots, A_l) \hat{\sqcup} (B_1, \dots, B_m) = \sum_{n=0}^{l+m} (-1)^{(l+m-n)/2} \sum_{(f,g) \in \mathcal{D}_n} (C_1(f,g), \dots, C_n(f,g)),$$

where \mathcal{D}_n is the set that appeared in the definition of \diamond and $C_i(f,g) \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ is the union of A_j for $j \in f^{-1}(i)$ and B_j for $j \in g^{-1}(i)$.

Proof. Let $l_1 \geq 2$ be an even number, and $l_2, \dots, l_d \geq 3$ odd numbers such that all subsets of $\{l_1, \dots, l_d\}$ of odd cardinality have distinct sums. Then, for $x \in \ker M_d$, the (l_1, \dots, l_d) -component of $M_d(x)$ gives a relation among quasi-Hoffman multiple zeta values, hence is a linear combination of the block shuffle relation by Theorem 56. This proves $\ker M_d \subset (\text{right-hand side})$. \square

Remark 58. Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_d$ be the set of formal \mathbb{Q} -linear sums of the sequence (S_1, \dots, S_r) where S_1, \dots, S_r are disjoint subsets of $\{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $S_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup S_r = \{1, \dots, d\}$ without parity conditions on $\#S_j$. Let us denote by \tilde{M}_d the natural extension of M_d to $\tilde{\mathfrak{J}}_d$. Then, a stronger statement

$$\ker \tilde{M}_d = \sum_{0 < i < n} \sum_{S_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup S_n = \{1, \dots, d\}} \mathbb{Q} \cdot (S_1, \dots, S_i) \hat{\sqcup} (S_{i+1}, \dots, S_n)$$

seems to hold. However, we do not have a proof of this conjecture at the moment.

6.2. The space of the relations among multiples zeta values of a fixed block degree. Let us see other aspects of the block shuffle identity. One of the powerful ways to study motivic multiple zeta values is to use their filtration structures. In particular, one of the reasonable research policies is to build understanding in order from the lowest filtration. Let \mathcal{Z}^m be the \mathbb{Q} -linear space spanned by all motivic multiple zeta values. There are two important filtration structures on \mathcal{Z}^m : the depth filtration and the block filtration. The latter is a filtration introduced by Brown [5] based on Charlton's block notation defined as

$$B_n \mathcal{Z}^m = \langle I_{\text{bl}}^m(l_0, \dots, l_m) \mid m \leq n \rangle_{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

These two filtrations have very different flavors. For example, Brown [5] showed that the block filtration coincides with the coradical filtration [5] and thus has a relatively simple dimension formula, whereas the depth filtration has more complicated dimension formula conjectured by Broadhurst-Kreimer in [4]. This is one of the advantages of considering the block filtration. On the other hand, the regularized double shuffle relation works well with the depth filtration and provides a basic tool to study the depth filtration, but does not seem to work well with the block filtration.³ Thus, in order to study the block filtration structure, we need to search for other families of relations than the double shuffle relations.

In the following, we will look at concrete examples of the relations among motivic multiple zeta values in small block degrees. For simplicity, let us specify ourselves to the admissible indices here. The block degree zero case is trivial: for each even integer $w \geq 0$, there exists only one motivic multiple zeta value $I_{\text{bl}}^m(w+2)$ of block degree zero and weight w , hence there are no relations. Next, in block degree one case, there exist $w-1$ motivic multiple zeta values $I_{\text{bl}}^m(2, w), I_{\text{bl}}^m(3, w-1), \dots, I_{\text{bl}}^m(w, 2)$ in each odd weight $w \geq 1$. By Brown's theorem, $\{I(2a+1, w-2a+1) \mid 1 \leq a \leq (w-1)/2\}$ forms their basis, and so all the relations are exhausted by the duality relations

$$I_{\text{bl}}^m(a, b) + I_{\text{bl}}^m(b, a) = 0 \quad (a + b = w + 2, a, b \geq 2). \quad (6.1)$$

³For example, the double shuffle relation for the product of depth m and depth n motivic multiple zeta values produces relations among motivic multiple zeta values of depth at most $m+n$, but the double relation for the product of block degree m and n motivic multiple zeta values does not have such a property (even for $m=n=0$ case, both the shuffle and harmonic products contain terms of arbitrarily high block degrees).

Since (6.1) is a special case of the block shuffle relation, we can say that all the \mathbb{Q} -linear relations among motivic multiple zeta values of degree one come from the block shuffle relations.

Now, let us consider the degree two case. For each even integer $w \geq 2$, there are $\binom{w-1}{2}$ indices of block degree two, which are classified into the four patterns $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{even}, \text{odd}, \text{odd})$, $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{odd}, \text{even}, \text{odd})$, $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{odd}, \text{odd}, \text{even})$ and $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{even}, \text{even}, \text{even})$ according to the parity of their entries. The block shuffle relation gives linear relations among the first three patterns and $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)$, or those among the last pattern and $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)$. By Theorem 56, all the linear relation among the first three patterns and $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)$ are exhausted by the block shuffle relations except for those containing the indices of the form $(a, 1, b)$ with odd $a+b$. Moreover, such exceptional values can be expressed as

$$I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, 1, b) = -I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a+b+1) - \sum_{j=2}^{a-1} I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(j, a+1-j, b) - \sum_{j=2}^{b-1} I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b+1-j, j) \quad (6.2)$$

by Hoffman's relation⁴ [15, Theorem 5.1]. Thus, all the linear relations among $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{even}, \text{odd}, \text{odd})$, $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{odd}, \text{even}, \text{odd})$, $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{odd}, \text{odd}, \text{even})$ and $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)$ are exhausted by the block shuffle relations and (6.2). How about the linear relations among $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{even}, \text{even}, \text{even})$ and $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)$? Numerical experiments suggest that all the linear relations among $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{even}, \text{even}, \text{even})$ and $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)$ are exhausted by the block shuffle relations.

Finally, let us consider the "mixed" case, i.e., all the linear relations among $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{even}, \text{odd}, \text{odd})$, $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{odd}, \text{even}, \text{odd})$, $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{odd}, \text{odd}, \text{even})$, $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(\text{even}, \text{even}, \text{even})$, and $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)$. The block shuffle relation and the relation (6.2) reduces any $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c)$ with $a+b+c = w+2$ into a linear combination of

$$\{I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) \mid (a, b, c) \in \mathbb{I}_{\text{ooe}}^{(w)} \cup \mathbb{I}_{\text{eee}}^{(w)}\} \cup \{I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)\} \quad (6.3)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{I}_{\text{ooe}}^{(w)} &:= \{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}^3 \mid (a, b, c) \equiv (1, 1, 0) \pmod{2}, a+b+c = w+2\}, \\ \mathbb{I}_{\text{eee}}^{(w)} &:= \{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}^3 \mid (a, b, c) \equiv (0, 0, 0) \pmod{2}, a \leq b, a < c, a+b+c = w+2\}, \end{aligned}$$

and vica versa does not give any linear relation among the elements of (6.3). Thus, finding linear relations independent of the block shuffle relations and the relations (6.2) is equivalent to finding non-trivial linear relations among (6.3). By Brown's theorem,

$$\{I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) \mid (a, b, c) \in \mathbb{I}_{\text{ooe}}^{(w)} \cup \{I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)\}\} \quad (6.4)$$

(= the Hoffman basis with at most two 3's) forms a basis of the \mathbb{Q} -linear space spanned by (6.3), and thus we see that there are exactly $\#\mathbb{I}_{\text{eee}}^{(w)}$ dimensions of such \mathbb{Q} -linear relations. Now, what exactly are they? Are there simple relations like the block shuffle relations or the relations (6.2)? One particular feature of those relations is the smallness of the coefficients, so let us investigate the relations from the perspective of the size of their coefficients. We can search for the relations with small coefficients by computer in the following way. First, by computing Brown's infinitesimal coaction and solving a system of linear equations, we can explicitly calculate a basis of the \mathbb{Z} -module of all the linear relations (congruences) among

$$\{I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) \mid (a, b, c) \in \mathbb{I}_{\text{ooe}}^{(w)} \cup \mathbb{I}_{\text{eee}}^{(w)}\}$$

modulo $\mathbb{Q}I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)$. Then, by applying the LLL-algorithm to the obtained basis, we can find a new basis consisting of (approximately) shortest vectors⁵. For instance, for weights 40, 50, 60 and 70, the norms of the congruences obtained by the algorithm explained above are as follows⁶:

- For $w = 40$, the norms of the first and second shortest vectors in the obtained basis are $1.28 \cdots \times 10^4$ and $1.17 \cdots \times 10^7$. The norms of all the other 61 vectors in the obtained basis lie between $2.08 \cdots \times 10^{13}$ and $2.98 \cdots \times 10^{13}$.

⁴It is also a consequence of the non-admissible case of the block shuffle relation

$$I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(1, a, b) + I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, 1, b) + I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, 1) - I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a+b+1) = 0$$

and the definitions of $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(1, a, b)$ and $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, 1)$.

⁵Given an integer relation $\sum c_{a,b,c} I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) \equiv 0 \pmod{I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2)}$, we identify it with the vector $(c_{a,b,c})$ and define its norm as the square root of the sum of the squares of $c_{a,b,c}$'s. The adjective "short" then means having a small norm.

⁶The outcome of the computation may slightly depend on the implementation of the LLL-algorithm and the setting of parameters.

- For $w = 50$, the norms of the first and second shortest vectors in the obtained basis are $2.55 \cdots \times 10^4$ and $3.73 \cdots \times 10^7$. The norms of all the other 98 vectors in the obtained basis lie between $2.32 \cdots \times 10^{17}$ and $3.47 \cdots \times 10^{17}$.
- For $w = 60$, the norms of the first and second shortest vectors in the obtained basis are $4.45 \cdots \times 10^4$ and $9.53 \cdots \times 10^7$. The norms of all the other 143 vectors in the obtained basis lie between $3.15 \cdots \times 10^{21}$ and $5.52 \cdots \times 10^{21}$.
- For $w = 70$, the norms of the first and second shortest vectors in the obtained basis are $7.12 \cdots \times 10^4$ and $2.09 \cdots \times 10^8$. The norms of all the other 196 vectors in the obtained basis lie between $7.34 \cdots \times 10^{25}$ and $1.13 \cdots \times 10^{26}$.

The data above suggest the existence of a two-dimensional family of relations with conspicuously small norms in each weight. By careful observation of the coefficients of those relations, we can find their exact forms as follows (For the simplicity of the expression, we also used other multiple zeta values than those in (6.3))⁷:

Conjecture 59. Let $p_{a,b,c}$ and $q_{a,b,c}$ be polynomials in a, b, c defined by

$$p_{a,b,c} = (a - b)(a + b - 6c + 3)$$

and

$$q_{a,b,c} = \frac{1}{12}(a - b) \left(17(a^3 + b^3) + 197ab(a + b) + 12(a^2 + b^2 - 16ab)c - 222(a + b)c^2 - 168c^3 \right. \\ \left. - 362(a^2 + b^2) - 1238ab + 798(a + b)c + 1674c^2 + 1075(a + b) - 3774c + 590 \right),$$

which has symmetries $p_{a,b,c} + p_{b,a,c} = p_{a,b,c} + p_{c,a,b} + p_{b,c,a} = 0$ and $q_{a,b,c} + q_{b,a,c} = q_{a,b,c} + q_{c,a,b} + q_{b,c,a} = 0$.

i) For an even integer $w \geq 0$,

$$3 \sum_{\substack{(a,b,c) \equiv (1,1,0) \pmod{2} \\ a+b+c=w+2, b>1}} (p_{a,1,b} + \delta_{a,1}\delta_{b,3}) \cdot I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) - \sum_{\substack{(a,b,c) \equiv (0,0,0) \pmod{2} \\ a+b+c=w+2}} p_{a,b,c} \cdot I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) \\ \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{w^2(w-2)(5w-11)}{24} I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2). \quad (6.5)$$

ii) For an even integer $w \geq 4$,

$$3 \sum_{\substack{(a,b,c) \equiv (1,1,0) \pmod{2} \\ a+b+c=w+2, a,b>1}} r_{a,b,c} I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) - \sum_{\substack{(a,b,c) \equiv (0,0,0) \pmod{2} \\ a+b+c=w+2}} r'_{a,b,c} I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) \\ \stackrel{?}{=} \frac{-220w^6 + 2751w^5 - 10375w^4 + 16620w^3 - 35620w^2 - 7536w + 285120}{1440} I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2) \quad (6.6)$$

where $r_{a,b,c}$ and $r'_{a,b,c}$ are integers defined by

$$r_{a,b,c} := q_{a,1,b} + (a-1)(c-1)(a^2 + 19ab - 3b^2 + ac - 6bc - 26a - 17b + 4c + 30) \\ + 26\delta_{a,5} + 39\delta_{b,5} - 21\delta_{a,3}\delta_{b,3} + 2(b+c-b^2+2bc-c^2)\delta_{a,3} + 3c(3-c)\delta_{b,3}$$

⁷Of course, we can also rewrite the relations as those among (6.3) using the block shuffle relation and the relation (6.2) (and also the definition of $I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(1, 3, w-2)$ for the first equation), but the descriptions get more complicated. For example, the first formula (6.5) is equivalent to

$$p_{w+2} \cdot I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w+2) \stackrel{?}{=} 3 \sum_{(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{1}_{\text{ooo}}^{(w)}} (p_{a,1,b} - 2\delta_{a,3} - 3\delta_{b,3}) \cdot I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) \\ - 3 \sum_{(a,b,c) \in \mathbb{1}_{\text{eee}}^{(w)}} p_{a,b,c} \cdot I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) - 3 \sum_{(a,a,c) \in \mathbb{1}_{\text{eee}}^{(w)}} (p_{c,a,a} - 3\delta_{a,2}) \cdot I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, a, c),$$

where $p_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is given by

$$p_n := \frac{41}{216}n^4 - \frac{91}{108}n^3 + \frac{17}{12}n^2 + \begin{cases} -\frac{11}{3}n + 9 & n \equiv 0 \pmod{6} \\ -\frac{107}{27}n + \frac{161}{27} & n \equiv 2 \pmod{6} \\ -\frac{139}{27}n + \frac{169}{27} & n \equiv 4 \pmod{6} \end{cases}$$

for $n > 2$.

and

$$r'_{a,b,c} := q_{a,b,c} + 18\delta_{a,2}\delta_{b,2} + 63\delta_{a,2}\delta_{b,4} + 117\delta_{a,4}\delta_{b,2}.$$

As the weight w increases, the norms of the block shuffle relations, the relations (6.2), and the conjectural relations (6.5), (6.6) increase only at a rate of polynomial order of w , whereas the data seem to suggest that the norm of any other (= linearly independent) relation of block degree 2 increases at a higher speed than any polynomial function of w .

Let us estimate the dimension of the relations of each kind. As $w \rightarrow \infty$, we have approximately $\frac{1}{2}w^2$ generators out of which $\#\mathbb{I}_{\text{ooe}} \doteq \frac{1}{8}w^2$ are independent, by the fact that (6.4) forms a basis. Thus, the dimension of all the relations among $\{I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(a, b, c) \mid a + b + c = w + 2\} \cup \{I_{\text{bl}}^{\text{m}}(w + 2)\}$ is approximately $\frac{3}{8}w^2$. Now:

- The block shuffle relations have approximately $\frac{1}{3}w^2$ dimensions (which make up $\frac{8}{9}$ of the dimension of all relations).
- The dimension of the exceptional relations (6.2), (6.5), (6.6) is about w in total.
- Hence, the remaining mysterious relations have approximately $\frac{1}{24}w^2$ dimensions. It seems that such relations have “very large” norms as we have explained above.

Thus, we can say that roughly $\frac{8}{9}$ (resp. 0, $\frac{1}{9}$) of the relations in block degree two comes from the block shuffle relations (resp. the exceptional relations, the remaining relations) as w grows large.

More generally, let us consider the higher block degree case. Fix a block degree $n \geq 3$. Then for a large w , we have approximately $g_n(w) := \frac{w^n}{n!}$ generators and $\frac{1}{2^n}g_n(w)$ basis. Thus, the dimension of the space of all relations is approximately $(1 - \frac{1}{2^n})g_n(w)$, out of which the block shuffle relations span around $\frac{n}{n+1}g_n(w)$ dimensions. Thus, the space of the remaining relations has approximately $(\frac{1}{n+1} - \frac{1}{2^n})g_n(w)$ dimensions. Although it is merely an optimistic guess, we expect that the situation is similar to the block degree two case so that the block shuffle relations make up a majority of the relations having “small” coefficients. More precisely, given a weight w and a real number $\alpha > 0$, let $V^{(w)}$ be the \mathbb{Z} -module spanned by all the integer relations of weight w and block degree at most n , $V_1^{(w)}$ and $V_2^{(w)}$ its \mathbb{Z} -submodules spanned by the block shuffle relations, and all the relations whose norms are bounded by w^α , respectively. Then, for sufficiently large w , $V_1^{(w)} \subset V_2^{(w)}$, and our expectation is that the elements of $V_2^{(w)}$ which are not in $V_1^{(w)}$ are “relatively rare” i.e., the ratio $\dim(V_1^{(w)}) : \dim(V_2^{(w)}/V_1^{(w)}) : \dim(V^{(w)}/V_2^{(w)})$ converges to $\frac{n}{n+1} : 0 : \frac{1}{n+1} - \frac{1}{2^n}$ as $w \rightarrow \infty$ for any α .

Acknowledgements. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP18J00982, JP18K13392, JP19J00835, JP20K14293, JP22K03244, and MOST Grant Number 111-2115-M-002-003-MY3.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Blümlein, D. J. Broadhurst, and J. A. M. Vermaseren. The Multiple Zeta Value data mine. *Comput. Phys. Comm.*, 181(3):582–625, 2010.
- [2] Jonathan M Borwein, David M Bradley, David J Broadhurst, et al. Evaluations of k-fold euler/zagier sums: a compendium of results for arbitrary k. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 4(2):R5, 1997.
- [3] Jonathan M. Borwein, David M. Bradley, David J. Broadhurst, and Petr Lisoněk. Combinatorial aspects of multiple zeta values. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 5:Research Paper 38, 12, 1998.
- [4] D. J. Broadhurst and D. Kreimer. Association of multiple zeta values with positive knots via Feynman diagrams up to 9 loops. *Phys. Lett. B*, 393(3-4):403–412, 1997.
- [5] Francis Brown. Letter to Charlton. 11/10/2016.
- [6] Francis Brown. Mixed Tate motives over \mathbb{Z} . *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 175(2):949–976, 2012.
- [7] Steven Charlton. $\zeta(\{\{2\}^m, 1, \{2\}^m, 3\}^n, \{2\}^m)/\pi^{4n+2m(2n+1)}$ is rational. *J. Number Theory*, 148:463–477, 2015.
- [8] Steven Charlton. The alternating block decomposition of iterated integrals and cyclic insertion on multiple zeta values. *Q. J. Math.*, 72(3):975–1028, 2021.
- [9] Steven Paul Charlton. Identities arising from coproducts on multiple zeta values and multiple polylogarithms. *Durham theses*, 2016. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/11834/>.
- [10] A. B. Goncharov. Galois symmetries of fundamental groupoids and noncommutative geometry. *Duke Math. J.*, 128(2):209–284, 2005.
- [11] Minoru Hirose, Hideki Murahara, and Shingo Saito. Ohno relation for regularized multiple zeta values. *preprint*, 2021. [arXiv:2105.09631](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.09631) [math.NT].
- [12] Minoru Hirose and Nobuo Sato. Hoffman’s conjectural identity. *Int. J. Number Theory*, 15(1):167–171, 2019.
- [13] Minoru Hirose and Nobuo Sato. Algebraic differential formulas for the shuffle, stuffle and duality relations of iterated integrals. *J. Algebra*, 556:363–384, 2020.

- [14] Minoru Hirose and Nobuo Sato. The motivic galois group of mixed tate motives over $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ and its action on the fundamental group of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, \pm 1, \infty\}$. *preprint*, 2020. [arXiv:2007.04288v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.04288v1) [math.NT].
- [15] Michael Hoffman. Multiple zeta values. *Hoffman's info page*. <http://www.usna.edu/Users/math/meh/mult.html>.
- [16] Adam Keilthy. Rational structures on multiple zeta values. *PhD theses*, 2020. Available at <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:f46cf1e1-f5d7-45c8-b8c3-c55b3caf139f>.
- [17] Adam Keilthy. Motivic multiple zeta values and the block filtration. *Journal of Number Theory*, 2021.
- [18] Adam Keilthy. A generalisation of quasi-shuffle algebras and an application to multiple zeta values. *preprint*, 2022. [arXiv:2202.04739](https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.04739) [math.NT].
- [19] Erik Panzer. Feynman integrals and hyperlogarithms. *PhD thesis*, 2014. [arXiv:1506.07243v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.07243v1) [math-ph].

(Minoru Hirose) INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH, NAGOYA UNIVERSITY, FURO-CHO, CHIKUSA-KU, NAGOYA, 464-8602, JAPAN
Email address: minoru.hirose@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp

(Nobuo Sato) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL TAIWAN UNIVERSITY, No. 1, Sec. 4, ROOSEVELT RD., TAIPEI 10617, TAIWAN (R.O.C.)
Email address: nbsato@ntu.edu.tw