

THE DEGREE-THREE BOUNDED COHOMOLOGY OF COMPLEX LIE GROUPS OF CLASSICAL TYPE

CARLOS DE LA CRUZ MENGUAL

ABSTRACT. We establish Monod’s isomorphism conjecture in degree-three bounded cohomology for every complex simple Lie group of classical type. Our main ingredient is a bounded-cohomological stability theorem with an optimal range in degree three that we bootstrap from previous stability results by the author and Hartnick. The bootstrapping procedure relies on the occurrence in our setting of a variant of the recently observed phenomenon of secondary stability in the sense of Galatius–Kupers–Randal-Williams.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Statement of main result. This article is the third one in a series concerned with the explicit computation of the continuous bounded cohomology of Lie groups via stabilization techniques (see prequels [11, 12]). The theory of continuous bounded cohomology was developed in the early 2000s by Burger and Monod [6, 28] as a topological refinement of the celebrated notion for discrete groups (conceived by Johnson, Trauber, and Gromov [19] independently), with powerful applications in geometry, dynamics and rigidity theory [8, 14, 28]. Despite its power, the computation of continuous bounded cohomology remains a notorious challenge. In the setting of Lie groups, the problem can be reduced to the connected semisimple case, whose behavior is predicted by the prominent

Isomorphism Conjecture. *For any connected semisimple Lie group G with finite center, the comparison map $c^* : H_b^*(G) \rightarrow H^*(G)$ is an isomorphism in every degree.*

Here we denote by $H^*(G)$ the continuous group cohomology of G with coefficients on the trivial G -module \mathbb{R} , and by $H_b^*(G)$ the corresponding continuous bounded cohomology. The comparison map c^* is defined by forgetting the boundedness of a class. The isomorphism conjecture was formulated in this form by Monod in his ICM address [27] in 2006. The surjectivity question, posed earlier by Dupont [9], has been answered affirmatively in a variety of contexts, e.g. [21, 25]. We emphasize that the continuous cohomology of Lie groups is well understood in virtue of the van Est isomorphism (see e.g. [2, Cor. XI.5.6] or [33]) and classical results on the cohomology of compact symmetric spaces (see e.g. [18, 26]).

Beyond the trivial degrees zero and one, the isomorphism conjecture has been established fully in degree two by Burger and Monod [5]. However, in degrees ≥ 3 , the conjecture has seen scarce progress in the last two decades. In degree three, it has been verified for the groups

$\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{R})$ [7, 30] and $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ [1, 30, 17, 3]. In higher degrees, our lack of understanding of the conjecture is remarkable, only known to hold in degree four for $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ [20].

The goal of this paper is to expose further evidence in favor of the isomorphism conjecture.

Theorem 1. *The isomorphism conjecture holds in degree three for every connected simple complex Lie group G of classical type. In particular, we have $H_b^3(G) \cong H^3(G) \cong \mathbb{R}$.*

This statement encompasses the four classical complex families \mathbf{A}_r , \mathbf{B}_r , \mathbf{C}_r , \mathbf{D}_r , which consist of the connected Lie groups locally isomorphic to

$$(1.1) \quad \mathrm{SL}_{r+1}(\mathbb{C}), \quad \mathrm{SO}_{2r+1}(\mathbb{C}), \quad \mathrm{Sp}_{2r}(\mathbb{C}), \quad \mathrm{SO}_{2r}(\mathbb{C}).$$

respectively. In each case, r is the rank of the group, and all are simple Lie groups whenever $r \geq 1$, except for $\mathrm{SO}_2(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ (abelian and with two simple factors, respectively).

Non-vanishing results for the continuous bounded cohomology of Lie groups find important applications in the study of representations of fundamental groups of manifolds, and in particular, of their moduli spaces and deformations. The case of surface group representations with Hermitian targets, studied extensively in existing literature, serves as the most prominent example of this claim (see, e.g., [4]). The relevant cohomological input in this setting is the non-vanishing of H_b^2 for non-compact Lie groups of Hermitian type.

A bounded-cohomological approach has been also applied successfully in the study of 3-manifold group representations into $\mathrm{PSL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ —a group with non-vanishing H_b^3 —and has been instrumental in proofs of interesting rigidity phenomena (see, e.g., [3, 13]). It is our hope that **Theorem 1** be the foundation of future investigations of representation varieties of 3-manifold groups into more general complex Lie groups.

1.2. The role of bounded-cohomological stability. Each of the four sequences of groups indexed by r and listed in (1.1) can be organized as increasing chains of inclusions

$$(1.2) \quad S_0 \xrightarrow{\iota_0} S_1 \xrightarrow{\iota_1} S_2 \xrightarrow{\iota_2} \dots \hookrightarrow S_r \xrightarrow{\iota_r} S_{r+1} \hookrightarrow \dots$$

where S_r is the group of rank r and the inclusions ι_r are block embeddings in appropriate bases. The following theorem concerning the degree-three continuous bounded cohomology of the groups in these families plays a key role in the proof of **Theorem 1**.

Theorem 2. *The embeddings ι_r in each of the classical families induce the isomorphisms*

$$\begin{array}{ll} (\mathbf{A}_r) & H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} \dots \xleftarrow{\cong} H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_{r+1}(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} \dots \\ (\mathbf{B}_r) & H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_3(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_5(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} \dots \xleftarrow{\cong} H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_{2r+1}(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} \dots \\ (\mathbf{C}_r) & H_b^3(\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} H_b^3(\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} \dots \xleftarrow{\cong} H_b^3(\mathrm{Sp}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} \dots \\ (\mathbf{D}_r) & H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_6(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_8(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} \dots \xleftarrow{\cong} H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})) \xleftarrow{\cong} \dots \end{array}$$

The property that the embeddings ι_r in a chain of inclusions as (1.2) induce isomorphisms

$$(1.3) \quad H_b^q(S_{r_0}) \xleftarrow{\cong} H_b^q(S_{r_0+1}) \xleftarrow{\cong} H_b^q(S_{r_0+2}) \xleftarrow{\cong} \dots$$

for every degree $q \in \mathbb{N}$, starting from an index $r_0 = r_0(q)$, is known as *bounded-cohomological stability* (abbrv. *bc-stability*). An assignment $q \mapsto r_0(q)$ as above is called *bc-stability range*.

Theorem 2 settles the *optimal* (i.e. lowest possible) bc-stability range $r_0(3)$ in degree $q = 3$ for the four complex classical families. In the case of the \mathbf{A}_r family, **Theorem 2** was proved by Bucher, Burger, and Iozzi [3, Thm. 2], relying on work by Monod [30]. Establishing the statement for the remaining three families is the crux of this article.

The isomorphism conjecture, if true, would imply bc-stability for all classical families of Lie groups—for which continuous cohomology is known to stabilize. Our derivation of **Theorem 1** from **Theorem 2** is a sort of converse of this implication, based on the following principle. If a classical family $(S_r)_{r \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bc-stable with range $r_0(q)$, then proving the degree- q isomorphism conjecture for all the groups $(S_r \mid r \geq r_0(q))$ within the range of bc-stability is reduced to verifying it only for $S_{r_0(q)}$. The specific feature that favors the application of this principle in our setting is that the range $r_0(3)$ established by **Theorem 2** is low enough to reach groups whose H_b^3 is well understood. Indeed, all the groups at the base of the respective isomorphism chains for the families $\mathbf{B}_r, \mathbf{C}_r, \mathbf{D}_r$ are of type \mathbf{A}_r in disguise.

1.3. A secondary stability phenomenon. To explain the structure of our proof of **Theorem 2** for the families $\mathbf{B}_r, \mathbf{C}_r, \mathbf{D}_r$, we revisit the argument in Bucher–Burger–Iozzi [3] for the \mathbf{A}_r case. In [30], Monod proved the bc-stability of the family \mathbf{A}_r , with an addition that ensures a few extra injections—instead of isomorphisms—beyond the regime of bc-stability. In degree three:

$$H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})) \hookrightarrow H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{C})) \hookrightarrow H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})) \cong H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_5(\mathbb{C})) \cong \dots \cong H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_{r+1}(\mathbb{C})) \cong \dots$$

Since $H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})) \cong \mathbb{R}$ (see [1, 7]), one deduces that $H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C}))$ must have *at most* dimension one for $n \geq 3$. That the dimension is *at least* one is the content of [3], which exhibits a non-zero class in $H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C}))$ based on a construction by Goncharov [17].

In analogy to (1.3), we call *weak* bc-stability the property that the embeddings ι_r in (1.2) induce injections starting from an index $r_1 = r_1(q)$ for every degree $q \in \mathbb{N}$. The (weak) bc-stability of the complex $\mathbf{B}_r, \mathbf{C}_r, \mathbf{D}_r$ —among other classical families—was first proved by Hartnick and the author in [12, Thm. A, Cor. B]. In recent work, Kastenholz and Sroka [22] improved the range of weak bc-stability given in [12] for those families to $r_1(q) = 2q + 2$.

As opposed to Monod’s weak bc-stability result [30] for \mathbf{A}_r , the ranges established in the references [12, 22] for the complex families $\mathbf{B}_r, \mathbf{C}_r, \mathbf{D}_r$ do not yield a reduction to a group whose H_b^3 is understood. Thus, our first step towards **Theorem 2** is the following range improvement in degree three.

Key Lemma. *The block embeddings ι_r induce injections*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} H_b^3(O_3(\mathbb{C})) & \hookrightarrow & H_b^3(O_5(\mathbb{C})) & \hookrightarrow & \dots & \hookrightarrow & H_b^3(O_{2r+1}(\mathbb{C})) & \hookrightarrow & \dots \\ H_b^3(\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{C})) & \hookrightarrow & H_b^3(\mathrm{Sp}_4(\mathbb{C})) & \hookrightarrow & \dots & \hookrightarrow & H_b^3(\mathrm{Sp}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})) & \hookrightarrow & \dots \\ H_b^3(O_4(\mathbb{C})) & \hookrightarrow & H_b^3(O_6(\mathbb{C})) & \hookrightarrow & H_b^3(O_8(\mathbb{C})) & \hookrightarrow & \dots & \hookrightarrow & H_b^3(O_{2r}(\mathbb{C})) & \hookrightarrow & \dots \end{array}$$

Remark 1.1. The omission of the determinant-one condition in the orthogonal groups in the **Key Lemma** is on purpose. Upgrading it to determinant-one groups is a technical point that we will treat later. We ask from the reader to ignore that at this stage, and assume for the sake of the introduction that the **Key Lemma** has been proven for the special orthogonal groups.

A remarkable aspect of the **Key Lemma** is the next fact that lies at the heart of its proof, given in Section 4. We will prove that if *any* of the block embeddings ι_r for the families \mathbf{B}_r , \mathbf{C}_r , \mathbf{D}_r induces an injection at the level of H_b^3 , then necessarily *all* the ι_r 's up to the ranges produced by the **Key Lemma** must induce injections. In this sense, any arbitrary range (e.g., [12, 22]) is as good as any other, for either of them will allow us to bootstrap the optimal range *a posteriori*.

The proof of this intriguing fact relies on a principle reminiscent of *secondary stability* in the sense of Galatius–Kupers–Randal-Williams [15]. A subject of ongoing research in the realm of ordinary homology, secondary stability is the event in which “the failure of stability is itself stable”. In our case, failure of weak bc-stability is measured by the kernels of the maps induced by the embeddings ι_r . We prove the stability of those kernels based on a parametrization via cross-ratios of configuration spaces of isotropic projective points, exposed in Section 3.

1.4. Non-triviality of H_b^3 and Gromov norms. In analogy with the argument for \mathbf{A}_r given above, it remains to show the non-triviality of H_b^3 for the relevant groups. We will prove:

Theorem 3. *For any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, let S_r be either $\mathrm{SO}_{2r+1}(\mathbb{C})$, $\mathrm{Sp}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$, or $\mathrm{SO}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$, and let $n = n(r)$ be the dimension of the standard S_r -representation, so that $S_r < \mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Then, the restriction*

$$(1.4) \quad \mathrm{res}_r : H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(S_r)$$

is an isomorphism, except if $S_r = \mathrm{SO}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$ and $r \in \{1, 2\}$.

Since $H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C}))$ is 1-dimensional for every $n \geq 2$, the injectivity of the map (1.4) implies the desired non-triviality statement. For groups of types \mathbf{B}_r and \mathbf{C}_r , this follows from the next proposition, which is of independent interest, for it also elucidates the norm structure of H_b^3 .

Proposition 4. *For $r \in \mathbb{N}$, if S_r in **Theorem 3** is $\mathrm{SO}_{2r+1}(\mathbb{C})$ or $\mathrm{Sp}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$, then res_r is isometric.*

The proofs of **Proposition 4** and **Theorems 2** and **3** for the families \mathbf{B}_r and \mathbf{C}_r , are given in Section 5. On the other hand, **Proposition 4** does not hold in the \mathbf{D}_r case (see **Proposition 6.12**). Thus, we give a separate argument for **Theorems 2** and **3** for that family in Section 6.

1.5. Outlook. In Section 8, we discuss the norm structure of H_b^3 for the classical complex Lie groups, and provide a conjecture in the \mathbf{D}_r case, which remains open.

With little extra bookkeeping of the various types of Levi factors of parabolic subgroups, it should be possible to apply our ideas to prove the degree-three isomorphism conjecture for the real split Lie groups $\mathrm{SO}_+(r+1, r)$, $\mathrm{Sp}_{2r}(\mathbb{R})$, and $\mathrm{SO}_+(r, r)$. In general, we expect the situation in degree three for classical groups to be fully determined by what occurs in rank one.

Finally, an exciting and potentially fruitful research avenue is the further usage of secondary stability techniques in bounded cohomology. This could serve for optimizing existing stability ranges, and, eventually, lead to new computations of bounded cohomology in higher degrees.

Acknowledgments. I extend my gratitude to Marc Burger for suggesting the problem that led to this work. I also thank Uri Bader for many helpful discussions. I am indebted to Tobias Hartnick for the collaboration that led to the two prequels [11, 12], essential to this article, and grateful for his valuable feedback throughout the development of this project. I thank Manuel Krannich for pointing me to the notion of secondary stability and for his comments on a previous version of this article. Finally, I thank Nicolas Monod for suggesting the transit over discrete bounded cohomology in the proof of Lemma 6.1.

This work contains results of my doctoral thesis [10], and was completed during a postdoctoral fellowship at the Weizmann Institute of Science, Israel. I acknowledge support of the Swiss National Science Foundation, through the Early Postdoc.Mobility Grant No. 188010.

2. NOTATION AND STANDING ASSUMPTIONS

2.1. Notation on formed spaces. In the rest of this article, we will adhere to the notation from [12, §2], which we summarize below. The notation will be slightly simplified, as we only consider symmetric or antisymmetric formed spaces over \mathbb{C} .

Let $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. An ε -symmetric formed space is a pair (V, ω) of a finite-dimensional \mathbb{C} -vector space V and an ε -symmetric bilinear form $\omega : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We write $q(v) := \omega(v, v)$ for the quadratic form. The rank of (V, ω) is the maximal dimension of a totally isotropic subspace of V . Any non-degenerate ε -symmetric space (V, ω) of dimension n splits as the direct sum of formed spaces

$$(2.1) \quad V \cong \mathcal{H}_\varepsilon^{\oplus r} \oplus \mathcal{E}^{\oplus d},$$

where r is the rank of (V, ω) , \mathcal{H}_ε is the ε -hyperbolic plane, \mathcal{E} is the Euclidean line, and $d = n - 2r \in \{0, 1\}$. Furthermore, if $\varepsilon = -1$, then $d = 0$. We denote by $(V_r^{\varepsilon, d}, \omega_r^{\varepsilon, d})$ the formed space on the right-hand side of (2.1). An ordered basis $\mathcal{B}_r^{\varepsilon, d} = \{e_r, \dots, e_1, dh, f_1, \dots, f_r\}$ of

$V_r^{\varepsilon,d}$ is an adapted basis of $(V_r^{\varepsilon,d}, \omega_r^{\varepsilon,d})$ if $\langle h \rangle \cong \mathcal{E}$ and $\langle e_i, f_i \rangle \cong \mathcal{H}$ for every i . The matrix

$$J_r^{\varepsilon,d} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \varepsilon Q_r \\ 0 & 1_d & 0 \\ Q_r & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in M_n(\mathbb{C}),$$

represents the form $\omega_r^{\varepsilon,d}$ in the basis $\mathcal{B}_r^{\varepsilon,d}$, where $Q_r \in M_r(\mathbb{C})$ is the matrix with 1's on its antidiagonal and zero elsewhere (the middle row and column are omitted if $d = 0$).

Let $G_r^{\varepsilon,d}$ be the automorphism group of $(V_r^{\varepsilon,d}, \omega_r^{\varepsilon,d})$ and $S_r^{\varepsilon,d} < G_r^{\varepsilon,d}$ its determinant-one subgroup. Both $G_r^{\varepsilon,d}$ and $S_r^{\varepsilon,d}$ are complex Lie subgroups of $\mathrm{GL}(V_r^{\varepsilon,d})$. Concretely,

$$G_r^{\varepsilon,d} = \begin{cases} \mathrm{O}_{2r+1}(\mathbb{C}), & (\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 1) \\ \mathrm{Sp}_{2r}(\mathbb{C}), & (\varepsilon, d) = (-1, 0) \\ \mathrm{O}_{2r}(\mathbb{C}), & (\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 0) \end{cases}$$

Observe that

$$(2.2) \quad G_r^{(+1,1)} \cong \{\pm I\} \times S_r^{(+1,1)} \quad \text{and} \quad G_r^{(-1,0)} = S_r^{(-1,0)}.$$

For fixed d , the inclusions $\mathcal{B}_r^{\varepsilon,d} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{r+1}^{\varepsilon,d}$ of adapted bases gives rise to the embeddings

$$(2.3) \quad G_0^{\varepsilon,d} \xrightarrow{l_0} G_1^{\varepsilon,d} \xrightarrow{l_1} G_2^{\varepsilon,d} \hookrightarrow \dots \hookrightarrow G_r^{\varepsilon,d} \xrightarrow{l_r} G_{r+1}^{\varepsilon,d} \hookrightarrow \dots$$

of automorphism groups and of their corresponding determinant-one subgroups $S_r^{\varepsilon,d}$. We abuse notation and denote by l_r also the embedding $S_r^{\varepsilon,d} \hookrightarrow S_{r+1}^{\varepsilon,d}$ (see also (1.2)).

2.2. Standing assumptions. Throughout the article, we will keep a fixed choice of a pair

$$(2.4) \quad (\varepsilon, d) \in \{(+1, 1), (-1, 0), (+1, 0)\},$$

which is equivalent to the choice of the classical family $\mathbf{B}_r, \mathbf{C}_r, \mathbf{D}_r$, respectively. We omit the indices ε, d whenever possible and write V_r, G_r, S_r , etc. instead of $V_r^{\varepsilon,d}, G_r^{\varepsilon,d}, S_r^{\varepsilon,d}$, etc. Finally, we set $n(r) := \dim(V_r)$, and

$$r_0 := \begin{cases} 3, & \text{if } (\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 0), \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad r_1 := \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } (\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 0), \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2.3. Re-statement of main results. In the notation fixed in this section, our main results admit the following compact re-statements (omitting the \mathbf{A}_r case from Theorems 1 and 2):

Key Lemma bis. For $r \geq r_1$, the induced map $\iota_r^* : H_b^3(G_{r+1}) \rightarrow H_b^3(G_r)$ is injective.

Theorem 1 bis. For $r \geq r_0$, the comparison map $c^3 : H_b^3(S_r) \rightarrow H^3(S_r)$ is an isomorphism.

Theorem 2 bis. For $r \geq r_0$, the induced map $\iota_r^* : H_b^3(S_{r+1}) \rightarrow H_b^3(S_r)$ is an isomorphism.

Theorem 3 bis. For $r \geq r_0$, the restriction $\mathrm{res}_r : H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(S_r)$ is an isomorphism.

3. CONFIGURATION SPACES OF ISOTROPIC POINTS

3.1. **The variety of isotropic points.** We will consider the following generalized flag variety.

Definition 3.1. For any $r \geq r_1$, we call the irreducible complex projective variety

$$\mathcal{P}_r = \mathcal{P}_r^{\varepsilon, d} := \{[v] \in \mathbb{P}(V_r) \mid q(v) = 0\}$$

the *variety of isotropic points* of V_r . By Witt's lemma [35, Thm. 7.4], it is a compact homogeneous G_r -space when endowed with the Hausdorff topology of its set of \mathbb{C} -points, and the Lebesgue class is its unique G_r -invariant measure class. The assumption $r \geq r_1$ excludes two pathological cases: the set \mathcal{P}_0 is empty, and $\mathcal{P}_1^{(+1,0)}$ is not irreducible as an algebraic set.

Let Q_r be the stabilizer of $[e_r] \in \mathcal{P}_r$, a maximal parabolic subgroup of G_r with Levi decomposition $Q_r = U_r \rtimes R_r$, where U_r is unipotent and R_r reductive. Represented in the basis \mathcal{B}_r , the reductive factor $R_r \cong \mathbb{C}^\times \times G_{r-1}$ consists of the block-diagonal matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ and $g \in G_{r-1}$. If Q_r^- denotes the stabilizer of $[f_r] \in \mathcal{P}_r$, then $Q_r \cap Q_r^- = R_r$.

We are interested in parametrizing generic orbits of the diagonal G_r -action on product spaces \mathcal{P}_r^k , for $k \in \{3, 4, 5\}$. Genericity is understood in the measure-theoretical sense, and therefore, the products \mathcal{P}_r^k will be regarded as objects in the category of *Lebesgue G_r -spaces*.

Definition 3.2. We call *Lebesgue space* a standard Borel space X endowed with the measure class of a Borel probability measure. If X admits a Borel action of a lcsc group G , and the measure class is G -invariant, we call X a *Lebesgue G -space*. Morphisms of Lebesgue (G -)spaces are equivalence classes (up to null sets) of measure-class preserving Borel (G -)maps.

Example 3.3. An algebraic \mathbb{C} -variety X with the regular action of an algebraic group G is a Lebesgue G -space if we endow X with its Lebesgue measure class. The Borel σ -algebra of the set of orbits $G \backslash X$ with respect to the Hausdorff topology on X is standard (see [38, Thm. 3.1.3]), and hence $G \backslash X$ is a Lebesgue space.

If v_0, \dots, v_k are all non-zero vectors in V_r , we will write $[v_0, \dots, v_k]$ as a shorthand for the tuple $([v_0], \dots, [v_k])$ of points in $\mathbb{P}(V_r)$. We will say the tuple is in general position if so are the vectors v_0, \dots, v_k (or any choices of lifts). We define the subsets

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{P}_r^{(k+1)} := \{[v_0, \dots, v_k] \in \mathcal{P}_r^{k+1} \mid \omega(v_i, v_j) \neq 0 \ \forall i \neq j\},$$

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{P}_r^{\{k+1\}} := \{\vec{v} \in \mathcal{P}_r^{(k+1)} \mid \vec{v} \text{ is in general position}\}$$

Both are G_r -invariant, \mathfrak{S}_k -invariant¹, Zariski-open subsets of \mathcal{P}_r^{k+1} . In particular, they are also Hausdorff-open and co-null. Moreover, if $\partial_i : \mathcal{P}_r^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r^k$ are the (G_r -equivariant) face maps that forget the i -th entry for $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, then $\partial_i(\mathcal{P}_r^{(k+1)}) = \mathcal{P}_r^{(k)}$ and $\partial_i(\mathcal{P}_r^{\{k+1\}}) = \mathcal{P}_r^{\{k\}}$.

Our first observation is that there is only one generic G_r -orbit of triples of points in \mathcal{P}_r .

Lemma 3.4. *The group G_r acts transitively on $\mathcal{P}_r^{\{3\}}$ for any $r \geq r_1$. Moreover, the point stabilizer $M_r < G_r$ admits a continuous surjection $M_r \twoheadrightarrow M'_r$ with solvable kernel, where*

$$M'_r = \begin{cases} G_{r-1}^{(+1,0)} & \text{if } (\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 1), \\ G_{r-2} & \text{if } (\varepsilon, d) = (-1, 0), \\ G_{r-2}^{(+1,1)} & \text{if } (\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 0). \end{cases}$$

Proof. For $r \geq r_1$, we set

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \phi_2 &:= e_r + f_r + x_0 \in \mathcal{P}_r \quad \text{where} \\ x_0 &:= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (\varepsilon, d) = (-1, 0) \text{ and } r = 1, \\ \sqrt{-2}h & \text{if } (\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 1) \text{ and } r = 1, \\ e_{r-1} - f_{r-1} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

We show that for any $\mathbf{p} = [v_0, v_1, v_2] \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{3\}}$, there exists $g \in G_r$ such that $g\mathbf{p} = [e_r, f_r, \phi_2]$. Indeed, since $\langle v_0, v_1 \rangle < V_r$ is hyperbolic and $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^2 = \mathbb{C}^\times$, there exists $g_1 \in G_r$ such that

$$g_1[v_0, v_1, v_2] = [e_r, f_r, e_r + f_r + x]$$

for some $x \in V_{r-1} < V_r$. Here $x = 0$ if and only if $n(r) = 2$, which holds only when $(\varepsilon, d) = (-1, 0)$ and $r = 1$. If $n(r) > 2$, then $q(x) = -(1 + \varepsilon) = q(x_0)$. Now, by Witt's lemma, we find $g_2 \in G_{r-1} < G_r$ such that $g_2x = x_0$, proving the claim.

Up to index two, the stabilizer M_r is isomorphic to the point stabilizer of the G_{r-1} -action on

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{x \in V_{r-1} \mid q(x) = -(1 + \varepsilon)\}$$

If $\varepsilon = -1$, then $e_{r-1} \in \mathcal{Q}$ and, hence, M_r projects onto G_{r-2} with solvable kernel. If $\varepsilon = +1$ and $x \in \mathcal{Q}$ is arbitrary, the orthogonal decomposition $V_{r-1} = \langle x \rangle \oplus \langle x \rangle^\perp$ implies that M_r is isomorphic to $\text{Aut}(\langle x \rangle^\perp, \omega|_{\langle x \rangle^\perp})$ up to index two. This yields the claim, since $\langle x \rangle^\top$ is non-degenerate and of codimension one in V_{r-1} . \square

3.2. Cross-ratio coordinates on configurations of 4- and 5-tuples. We will describe the quotients $G_r \backslash \mathcal{P}_r^4$ and $G_r \backslash \mathcal{P}_r^5$ as Lebesgue spaces in terms of the ω -cross-ratios, introduced by Korányi and Reimann [23] in the realm of complex hyperbolic geometry; see e.g. [16].

¹As customary in homological algebra, we adopt the convention that $0 \in \mathbb{N}$. The symmetric group of the set $\{0, \dots, k\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ will be denoted by \mathfrak{S}_k .

Definition 3.5. For any $\mathbf{p} = (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) \in \mathcal{P}_r^{(4)}$ with $p_i = [v_i]$, the ratios

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cr}_0(\mathbf{p}) &:= \frac{\omega(v_0, v_2) \cdot \omega(v_1, v_3)}{\omega(v_0, v_3) \cdot \omega(v_1, v_2)}, \\ \text{cr}_1(\mathbf{p}) &:= \text{cr}_0(p_1, p_2, p_0, p_3)^{-1}, \\ \text{cr}_2(\mathbf{p}) &:= \text{cr}_0(p_2, p_0, p_1, p_3), \end{aligned}$$

are independent of the choices of line representatives v_i , thus giving rise to the G_r -invariant, holomorphic functions $\text{cr}_j : \mathcal{P}_r^{(4)} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times$, called ω -cross-ratios. We will regard them as G_r -invariant morphisms $\text{cr}_j : \mathcal{P}_r^4 \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ of Lebesgue spaces. We also write $\text{cr}_j^{-1} := 1/\text{cr}_j$.

The next lemma explains dependencies between ω -cross-ratios, including the effect of the permutation of their arguments. It shows that the only ω -cross-ratios associated to any generic choice of four points in \mathcal{P}_r are $\text{cr}_0, \text{cr}_1, \text{cr}_2$, and that any two of them determine the third one. Its proof is a verification left as an exercise to the reader.

Lemma 3.6. *The following identities hold everywhere in $\mathcal{P}_r^{(4)}$:*

- (i) $\text{cr}_0 \circ (01) = \text{cr}_0 \circ (23) = \text{cr}_1^{-1} \circ (02) = \text{cr}_1^{-1} \circ (13) = \text{cr}_2 \circ (12) = \text{cr}_2 \circ (03) = \text{cr}_0^{-1}$.
- (ii) $\text{cr}_1 \circ (12) = \text{cr}_1 \circ (03) = \text{cr}_2^{-1} \circ (01) = \text{cr}_2^{-1} \circ (23) = \text{cr}_1^{-1}$.
- (iii) $\text{cr}_2 \circ (02) = \text{cr}_2 \circ (13) = \text{cr}_2^{-1}$.
- (iv) $\text{cr}_0 \cdot \text{cr}_1^{-1} \cdot \text{cr}_2 = \varepsilon$.

Remark 3.7. Let us consider the rank-one examples (i.e. $r = 1$) among the families treated in **Theorem 2**. If $(\varepsilon, d) = (-1, 0)$, then the ω -cross-ratios coincide with the classical cross-ratios on the complex projective line, since $G_1 = \text{Sp}_2(\mathbb{C}) = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathcal{P}_1 = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$. We will continue to refer to this as the *classical setting*. **Lemma 3.4** recovers the well-known fact that any triple in $\mathcal{P}_1^{\{3\}}$ is in the orbit of $(\infty, 0, 1) \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}^3$. As usual, we identify $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ with $\hat{\mathbb{C}}$ by

$$(3.4) \quad [f_1] \equiv \infty, \quad \text{and} \quad [e_1 + z \cdot f_1] \equiv z \text{ for any } z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Recall that for every $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_1^{\{4\}}$, the cross-ratio $\text{cr}_0(\mathbf{p})$ is the only number $a \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ such that $G_1 \cdot \mathbf{p} = G_1 \cdot (\infty, 0, 1, a)$. In the language of Lebesgue spaces, this means that the map cr_0 descends to a isomorphism $G_1 \backslash \mathcal{P}_1^4 \cong \hat{\mathbb{C}}$. In fact, due to the low dimension of V_1 in the classical setting, just one of the ω -cross-ratios determines the value of the remaining two.

The only other rank-one example appears for $(\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 1)$, which gives $G_1 = \text{O}_3(\mathbb{C})$. As in the classical setting, we have an isomorphism $G_1 \backslash \mathcal{P}_1^4 \cong \hat{\mathbb{C}}$.

In contrast to the rank-one situation, one single ω -cross-ratio does not suffice to parametrize generic 4-tuples in higher-rank. However, two of them are enough.

Proposition 3.8. *For any $r \geq 2$, the G_r -invariant morphism $\pi_3 : \mathcal{P}_r^4 \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}^2$ of Lebesgue spaces defined as $\pi_3 := (\text{cr}_1, \text{cr}_2)$ descends to an isomorphism $G_r \backslash \mathcal{P}_r^4 \cong \hat{\mathbb{C}}^2$.*

We explain now how the ω -cross-ratios parametrize generic orbits of 5-tuples of points in \mathcal{P}_r .

Definition 3.9. For $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, we define morphisms $\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j : \mathcal{P}_r^5 \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}$

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha_j(\mathbf{p}) &:= \text{cr}_j \circ \partial_4(\mathbf{p}) = \text{cr}_j(p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3), \\ \beta_j(\mathbf{p}) &:= \text{cr}_j \circ \partial_3(\mathbf{p}) = \text{cr}_j(p_0, p_1, p_2, p_4), \\ \gamma_j(\mathbf{p}) &:= \text{cr}_j \circ \partial_2(\mathbf{p}) = \text{cr}_j(p_0, p_1, p_3, p_4),\end{aligned}$$

for $\mathbf{p} = (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) \in \mathcal{P}_r^{(5)}$, where $\partial_i : \mathcal{P}_r^5 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r^4$ denote the usual face operators. As in [Definition 3.5](#), we set $\alpha_j^{-1} := 1/\alpha_j$ and define similarly $\beta_j^{-1}, \gamma_j^{-1}$.

We can express in terms of the ω -cross-ratios from [Definition 3.9](#) all the remaining cross-ratios associated to a 5-tuple. This fact, recorded in the next lemma, is readily verified.

Lemma 3.10. *The following identities hold everywhere in $\mathcal{P}_r^{(5)}$:*

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(i)} \quad \text{cr}_0 \circ \partial_1 &= \alpha_2 \beta_2^{-1} & \text{(iv)} \quad \text{cr}_0 \circ \partial_0 &= \alpha_1 \beta_1^{-1} & \text{(vii)} \quad \alpha_0 \gamma_0 &= \beta_0 \\ \text{(ii)} \quad \text{cr}_1 \circ \partial_1 &= \beta_1^{-1} \gamma_1 & \text{(v)} \quad \text{cr}_1 \circ \partial_0 &= \varepsilon(\alpha_1 \alpha_2^{-1} \beta_1^{-1} \gamma_1) \\ \text{(iii)} \quad \text{cr}_2 \circ \partial_1 &= \varepsilon(\alpha_2^{-1} \beta_1^{-1} \beta_2 \gamma_1) & \text{(vi)} \quad \text{cr}_2 \circ \partial_0 &= \alpha_2^{-1} \gamma_1\end{aligned}$$

We conclude from [Lemmas 3.6](#) and [3.10](#) that at most five cross-ratios suffice to describe generic orbits of 5-tuples. The next theorem states that five are also necessary as long as $\dim(V_r)$ is large. Recall that r_1 was defined as a function of (ε, d) at the end of [Subsection 2.1](#).

Proposition 3.11. *For any $r \geq r_1 + 1$, the G_r -invariant morphism $\pi_4 : \mathcal{P}_r^5 \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{C}}^5$ of Lebesgue spaces defined as $\pi_4 := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1)$ descends to an isomorphism $G_r \backslash \mathcal{P}_r^5 \cong \hat{\mathbb{C}}^5$.*

Remark 3.12. In rank one, the isomorphism $G_1 \backslash \mathcal{P}_1^5 \cong \hat{\mathbb{C}}^2$ holds for $(\varepsilon, d) \in \{(+1, 1), (-1, 0)\}$. For instance, in the classical setting (see [Remark 3.7](#)), any $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_1^{(5)}$ is in the G_1 -orbit of the tuple $(\infty, 0, 1, a, b) \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}^5$ with $a = \alpha_0(\mathbf{p})$ and $b = \beta_0(\mathbf{p})$. In rank two for $(\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 0)$, the low dimension of V_2 yields one extra relation, which forces the isomorphism $G_2 \backslash \mathcal{P}_2^5 \cong \hat{\mathbb{C}}^4$.

Both [Propositions 3.8](#) and [3.11](#) will be essential in our proof of [Key Lemma](#). Their proof, in turn, consist of elementary, yet fairly lengthy and technical computations. For the sake of readability, we have opted to present them in [Appendix A](#).

4. PROOF OF KEY LEMMA

4.1. Cohomological characterization of $\ker \iota_r^*$. For any $r \geq 1$, we consider the complex

$$(4.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_r) \xrightarrow{d_r^0} L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_r^2) \xrightarrow{d_r^1} L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_r^3) \rightarrow \dots$$

of dual Banach G_r -modules, with G_r -equivariant coboundary maps defined by the alternating sum $d_r^k := \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} (-1)^i \cdot \partial^i$. Here ∂^i is the operator induced by the face maps $\partial_i : \mathcal{P}_r^{k+1} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r^k$.

The complex (4.1) is *acyclic* in the sense that the homology of its augmented complex

$$(4.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{d_r^{-1}} L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_r) \xrightarrow{d_r^0} L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_r^2) \xrightarrow{d_r^1} L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_r^3) \rightarrow \dots$$

vanishes in every degree. This follows from the observation that integration over the first variable of $L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_r^{k+1})$ with respect to a quasi-invariant probability measure on \mathcal{P}_r is a contracting homotopy of (4.2). We denote by $H_b^q(G_r \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_r)$ the q -th homology of the complex $L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_r^{\bullet+1})^{G_r}$ of G_r -invariants of (4.1), and call it the *bounded cohomology of the action* $G_r \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_r$.

In the rank-one cases, the action $G_1 \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_1$ is amenable, and hence, there exists a canonical isomorphism $H_b^*(G_1) \cong H_b^*(G_1 \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_1)$; see [28, Thm. 7.5.3]. Beyond rank one, the isomorphism needs not hold since the action is no longer amenable. However, the bounded cohomology of that action—or any other G_r -action on an acyclic complex—may still contain interesting information about $H_b^*(G_r)$. The precise relationship between $H_b^*(G_r)$ and $H_b^*(G_r \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_r)$ is given by a spectral sequence [11, Prop. 2.15], with which we prove the following

Lemma 4.1. *For any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a linear isomorphism $\ker \iota_r^* \cong H_b^3(G_{r+1} \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_{r+1})$.*

Proof. There exists a spectral sequence $E_1^{\bullet,\bullet}$ that abuts to zero, with first-page terms

$$E_1^{p,q} = H_b^q(G_{r+1}; L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_{r+1}^p))$$

and differentials $d_1^{p,q} : E_1^{p,q} \rightarrow E_1^{p+1,q}$ induced by the operators d_{r+1}^{p-1} [11, Prop. 2.15]. Note first that $E_2^{p,0} \cong H_b^{p-1}(G_{r+1} \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_{r+1})$ for all $p \geq 1$. Furthermore, as a consequence of the Eckmann–Shapiro lemma [28, Prop. 10.1.3], Lemma 3.4, and [28, Corollary 8.5.2], we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E_1^{0,q} &= H_b^q(G_{r+1}), \\ E_1^{1,q} &\cong H_b^q(Q_{r+1}) \cong H_b^q(G_r), & E_1^{3,q} &\cong H_b^q(M_{r+1}) \cong \begin{cases} H_b^q(G_r^{(+1,0)}) & \text{if } (\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 1), \\ H_b^q(G_{r-1}) & \text{if } (\varepsilon, d) = (-1, 0), \\ H_b^q(G_{r-1}^{(+1,1)}) & \text{if } (\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 0). \end{cases} \\ E_1^{2,q} &\cong H_b^q(R_{r+1}) \cong H_b^q(G_r), \end{aligned}$$

Here, Q_{r+1} , R_{r+1} , M_{r+1} are as defined in Subsection 3.1. For $p \leq 3$, we have $E_2^{p,1} = E_1^{p,1} = 0$ and $E_2^{p,2} = E_1^{p,2} = 0$. The latter equality holds from the isomorphism conjecture in degree two [5, Lem. 6.1]. In fact, for any (ε, d) as in (2.4) and any r , the group $G_r^{\varepsilon,d}$ is of non-Hermitian type, and therefore $H_b^2(G_r^{\varepsilon,d}) \cong H^2(G_r^{\varepsilon,d}) = 0$. Finally, the map $d_1^{0,3}$ is conjugated by the isomorphisms above to the map ι_r^* (e.g. by [11, Lem. 3.7]), and hence, $E_2^{0,3} \cong \ker \iota_r^*$. Summarizing, we have showed that the second page $E_2^{\bullet,\bullet}$ has terms as displayed below.

3	ker ι_r^*				
2		0	0		
1			0	0	
0					$H_b^3(G_{r+1} \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_{r+1})$
	0	1	2	3	4

Blank spaces indicate that the terms are not relevant to our computation. Observe that all the displayed terms will remain unchanged until the fourth page $E_4^{*,*}$. Then, the arrow

$$d_4^{0,3} : \ker i_r^* \rightarrow H_b^3(G_{r+1} \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_{r+1})$$

must be an isomorphism, for otherwise the limits $E_\infty^3 \neq 0$ or $E_\infty^4 \neq 0$ would be non-zero. \square

4.2. Secondary stability argument. Propositions 3.8 and 3.11 enter the proof of the **Key Lemma bis** in the form of the next statement, reminiscent of secondary stability in the sense of Galatius–Kupers–Randal-Williams [15].

Lemma 4.2. *For every $r \geq r_1$, the linear isomorphism $\ker i_r^* \cong \ker i_{r_1}^*$ holds.*

Proof. In virtue of Lemma 4.1, we must prove the isomorphism

$$H_b^3(G_{r+1} \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_{r+1}) \cong H_b^3(G_{r_1+1} \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_{r_1+1}).$$

By Lemma 3.4, the space of invariants $L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_{r+1}^3)^{G_{r+1}}$ consists solely of constants, and hence, there are no coboundaries in $H_b^3(G_{r+1} \curvearrowright \mathcal{P}_{r+1})$. Let now D_{r+1}^3 be the bounded operator defined by the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_{r+1}^4)^{G_{r+1}} & \xrightarrow{d_{r+1}^3} & L^\infty(\mathcal{P}_{r+1}^5)^{G_{r+1}} \\ \pi_3^* \uparrow \cong & & \cong \uparrow \pi_4^* \\ L^\infty(\hat{\mathbb{C}}^2) & \xrightarrow{D_{r+1}^3} & L^\infty(\hat{\mathbb{C}}^5) \end{array}$$

Here, π_3^* and π_4^* are the isomorphisms induced by the morphisms of Lebesgue spaces from Propositions 3.8 and 3.11, respectively. Observe that $\ker d_{r+1}^3 \cong \ker D_{r+1}^3$.

The proof is completed upon showing that D_{r+1}^3 is independent of $r \geq r_1$. In fact, after applying Lemma 3.10, the map D_{r+1}^3 can be expressed as

$$(4.3) \quad D_{r+1}^3 f(\mathbf{x}) = f\left(\varepsilon \frac{a_1 c_1}{a_2 b_1}, \frac{c_1}{a_2}\right) - f\left(\frac{c_1}{b_1}, \varepsilon \frac{b_2 c_1}{a_2 b_1}\right) + f\left(c_1, \varepsilon \frac{a_1 b_2 c_1}{a_2 b_1}\right) - f(b_1, b_2) + f(a_1, a_2)$$

for any $f \in L^\infty(\hat{\mathbb{C}}^2)$ and a.e. $\mathbf{x} = (a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1) \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}^5$. \square

Proof of Key Lemma bis. The (weak) bc-stability of the complex classical families—proved in [12, Thm. A]—implies that $\ker i_r^* = 0$ for large enough r . This fact combined with Lemma 4.2 finishes the proof. \square

In the classical setting (see Remark 3.7), the coboundary d_1^3 is conjugated to an operator $D_1^3 : L^\infty(\hat{\mathbb{C}}) \rightarrow L^\infty(\hat{\mathbb{C}}^2)$ in virtue of the isomorphisms discussed in Remarks 3.7 and 3.12. The functional equation $D_1^3 f = 0$ for $f \in L^\infty(\mathbb{C})$ is known as the *Spence–Abel functional equation*. Under a specific parametrization, it is given by

$$(4.4) \quad f\left(\frac{a(1-b)}{b(1-a)}\right) - f\left(\frac{1-b}{1-a}\right) + f\left(\frac{b}{a}\right) - f(b) + f(a) = 0 \quad \text{for a.e. } (a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2,$$

and its only solution up to a constant factor is the *Bloch–Wigner dilogarithm* \mathcal{D} (see e.g. [37, §3]). The expression of $D_\infty^3 := D_r^3$ given by (4.3) for any $r \geq r_1 + 1$ produces a higher-rank analogue of the Spence–Abel equation. A byproduct of the proof of the **Key Lemma** is the inexistence of non-trivial solutions for this equation.

Corollary 4.3. *Let $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. If $f \in L^\infty(\hat{\mathbb{C}}^2)$ satisfies the functional equation $D_\infty^3 f = 0$ a.e., then f is a.e. the identically zero function. \square*

5. PROOF OF THEOREMS 2 AND 3 FOR THE COMPLEX FAMILIES \mathbf{B}_r AND \mathbf{C}_r

In Subsection 2.2, we fixed a pair $(\varepsilon, d) \in \{(+1, 1), (-1, 0), (+1, 0)\}$ as a standing assumption. In this section, we will only consider the cases $(+1, 1)$ and $(-1, 0)$, which correspond to the two complex classical families \mathbf{B}_r and \mathbf{C}_r , respectively. In both cases, we have $r_0 = r_1 = 1$.

We first prove that $\text{res}_r : H_b^3(\text{SL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(S_r)$ is isometric for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, which is the statement of **Proposition 4**. We rely on the following result from [3]. Below, we denote by $\Pi_n : \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ the irreducible n -dimensional $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -representation, and by b_n the *bounded Borel class*, defined in [3], which generates $H_b^3(\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C}))$ as a vector space.

Theorem 5.1 (see [3, Thm. 2]). *For any $n \geq 2$, the map $\Pi_n^* : H_b^3(\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}))$ induced by Π_n is an isometric isomorphism that maps the bounded Borel class b_n to*

$$\Pi_n^*(b_n) = \frac{n(n^2 - 1)}{6} \cdot b_2.$$

In particular, the Gromov norm of b_n is $\|b_n\| = n(n^2 - 1)/6 \cdot v_3$, where $v_{\mathbb{H}^3} \approx 1.0149\dots$ is the maximal volume of an ideal tetrahedron in \mathbb{H}^3 .

Consider now the irreducible representation $\Pi_{n(r)} : \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{SL}(V_r) \cong \text{SL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C})$ for $r \geq 1$. The parity of $n(r)$ depends on the choice of $(\varepsilon, d) \in \{(+1, 1), (-1, 0)\}$. It is important to note that (up to conjugation) $\Pi_{n(r)}$ preserves the form ω_r on V_r , which implies that its image is contained in S_r . We will use the notation $\bar{\Pi}_r : \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow S_r$ for the co-restriction of $\Pi_{n(r)}$.

Proof of Proposition 4. Note that $\Pi_{n(r)}^* = \bar{\Pi}_r^* \circ \text{res}_r$. Since $H_b^3(\text{SL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C}))$ is generated by the bounded Borel class $b_{n(r)}$, it suffices to show the equality $\|\text{res}_r(b_{n(r)})\| = \|b_{n(r)}\|$. Indeed, in virtue of **Theorem 5.1** and the fact that both res_r and $\bar{\Pi}_r^*$ are norm non-increasing, we have

$$\|b_{n(r)}\| = \|\Pi_{n(r)}^*(b_{n(r)})\| = \|\bar{\Pi}_r^*(\text{res}_r(b_{n(r)}))\| \leq \|\text{res}_r(b_{n(r)})\| \leq \|b_{n(r)}\|,$$

completing the proof. \square

For (ε, d) as in this section, the restriction map $H_b^*(G_r) \rightarrow H_b^*(S_r)$ is an isomorphism as a result of (2.2) and [28, Cor. 8.5.2]. This implies immediately that **Key Lemma bis** holds *verbatim* for S_r instead of G_r in these two cases:

Lemma 5.2. *For $r \geq r_1 = 1$, the induced map $i_r^* : H_b^3(S_{r+1}) \rightarrow H_b^3(S_r)$ is injective.* \square

Recall also that, depending on (ε, d) , the group S_1 equals $\mathrm{Sp}_2(\mathbb{C})$ or $\mathrm{SO}_3(\mathbb{C})$. The former group equals $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ and the latter admits an isogeny $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{SO}_3(\mathbb{C})$, as seen in, e.g., [36, 34]. Thus, S_1 is of type \mathbf{A}_1 , and, in particular, $\dim H_b^3(S_1) = 1$.

Proof of Theorem 3 bis for $\mathbf{B}_r, \mathbf{C}_r$. If $r \geq r_0 = 1$, then $n(r) \geq 2$, so that $\|b_{n(r)}\| > 0$. Together with Proposition 4, this establishes the injectivity of res_r . Surjectivity follows then from the fact that $\dim H_b^3(S_r) \leq 1$ for all $r \geq 1$. This, in turn, is a consequence of Lemma 5.2 and the equality $\dim H_b^3(S_1) = 1$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2 bis for $\mathbf{B}_r, \mathbf{C}_r$. Theorem 3 bis implies that $\dim H_b^3(S_r) = 1$ for all $r \geq 1$. Thus, the induced maps $i_r^* : H_b^3(S_{r+1}) \rightarrow H_b^3(S_r)$ —injective by Lemma 5.2—are isomorphisms. \square

6. PROOF OF THEOREMS 2 AND 3 FOR THE COMPLEX FAMILY \mathbf{D}_r

In this section, we consider the case $(\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 0)$, which corresponds to the \mathbf{D}_r family, and recall that $n(r) = 2r$, $r_0 = 3$, and $r_1 = 2$. Note that the images of the irreducible representations $\Pi_{2r} : \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathrm{SL}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$ are not contained in $S_r = \mathrm{SO}_{2r}(\mathbb{C})$ for any r . This limitation prevents the adaptation of the argument in Section 5 to the \mathbf{D}_r family.

We will establish Theorem 3 bis by induction on the rank r without relying on norm considerations. The induction will be based on the following statement.

Lemma 6.1. *The restriction map $\mathrm{res}_2 : H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C}))$ is injective.*

To prove Lemma 6.1, we will realize res_2 over the Furstenberg boundaries of the involved groups. Subsection 6.1 collects relevant background on the Goncharov–Bucher–Burger–Iozzi volume cocycle of $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$, which represents the bounded Borel class $b_n \in H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C}))$. Then, in Subsection 6.2, we will discuss the Furstenberg boundary of $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$.

6.1. The Goncharov–Bucher–Burger–Iozzi volume cocycle. The content of this subsection is extracted entirely from the references [17, 3]. We abbreviate by \mathbb{P} the complex projective line $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$, isomorphic to the boundary of the hyperbolic 3-space \mathbb{H}^3 . We let $\mathrm{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}} : \mathbb{P}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function that assigns to a 4-tuple $(p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) \in \mathbb{P}^4$ the oriented volume of the ideal tetrahedron in \mathbb{H}^3 with vertices p_i . Up to rescaling, $\mathrm{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}}$ is the unique alternating, $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -invariant, continuous bounded cocycle $\mathbb{P}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; see [1, 7].

We may write $\text{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}}$ in terms of the Bloch–Wigner dilogarithm $\mathcal{D} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (see [37, §3]) as

$$(6.1) \quad \text{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}} = \mathcal{D} \circ \text{cr}_0,$$

where cr_0 is the classical cross-ratio on \mathbb{P} (see [Definition 3.5](#) and [Remark 3.7](#)). Under the identification $\mathbb{P} \cong \hat{\mathbb{C}}$ from (3.4), the equality (6.1) corresponds to $\text{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}}(\infty, 0, 1, z) = \mathcal{D}(z)$. Thus, the cocycle equation for $\text{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}}$ implies that \mathcal{D} satisfies Spence–Abel functional equation (4.4), and the alternation of $\text{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}}$ translates into the symmetries

$$(6.2) \quad \mathcal{D}(z) = \mathcal{D}\left(1 - \frac{1}{z}\right) = \mathcal{D}\left(\frac{1}{1-z}\right) = -\mathcal{D}\left(\frac{1}{z}\right) = -\mathcal{D}(1-z) = -\mathcal{D}\left(\frac{-z}{1-z}\right).$$

A complete flag in \mathbb{C}^n is a sequence $F^0 \subset F^1 \subset \dots \subset F^{n-1} \subset F^n$ of subspaces $F^j \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ such that $\dim(F^j) = j$. The group $\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ acts transitively on the variety \mathbb{F}_n of complete flags in \mathbb{C}^n , and the stabilizer of the standard flag $\{0\} \subset \langle e_1 \rangle \subset \dots \subset \langle e_1, \dots, e_{n-1} \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is the upper-triangular subgroup $P_n < \text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$, a minimal parabolic subgroup. This identifies \mathbb{F}_n with the Furstenberg boundary of $\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$. Now, a complete *affine* flag (F, \vec{v}) is a pair that consists of a complete flag F , and a tuple of spanning vectors $\vec{v} = (v^1, \dots, v^n)$ in the sense that

$$F^j = F^{j-1} \oplus \langle v^j \rangle \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n.$$

We write $\mathbb{F}_{n,\text{aff}}$ for the set of affine flags, which comes equipped with a projection $\mathbb{F}_{n,\text{aff}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{F}_n$.

Definition 6.2. Let σ_3 denote the collection of equivalence classes $[V; (v^0, \dots, v^3)]$, where V is a \mathbb{C} -vector space, $v^0, \dots, v^3 \in V$ are vectors that span V . The equivalence $[V, (v^j)] \sim [W, (w^j)]$ holds if there exists a linear isomorphism

$$\phi : V \xrightarrow{\cong} W \quad \text{with } \phi(v^j) = w^j \quad \text{for all } j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}.$$

Note that σ_3 is a set since every class $[V; (v^j)]$ admits a representative $[\mathbb{C}^m; (\vec{v}^j)]$ for $0 \leq m \leq 4$.

Now, for any $J = (j_0, \dots, j_3) \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}^4$, we set $T_J : \mathbb{F}_{\text{aff}}(\mathbb{C}^n)^4 \rightarrow \sigma_3$ as

$$(6.3) \quad T_J((F_0, \vec{v}_0), \dots, (F_3, \vec{v}_3)) := \left[\frac{\langle F_0^{j_0+1}, \dots, F_3^{j_3+1} \rangle}{\langle F_0^{j_0}, \dots, F_3^{j_3} \rangle}; (v_0^{j_0+1}, \dots, v_3^{j_3+1}) \right],$$

where each $(F_i, \vec{v}_i) \in \mathbb{F}_{n,\text{aff}}$ is such that $F_i = (F_i^0 \subset \dots \subset F_i^n)$ and $\vec{v}_i = (v_i^1, \dots, v_i^n)$, and the vectors in the right-hand side of (6.3) are regarded as classes modulo $\langle F_0^{j_0}, \dots, F_3^{j_3} \rangle$.

Definition 6.3. Let $n \geq 2$, and let $\text{Vol} : \sigma_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the map defined as

$$\text{Vol} [\mathbb{C}^m; (v^0, \dots, v^3)] := \begin{cases} \text{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}}[v^0, \dots, v^3] & \text{if } m = 2 \text{ and all } v^i \neq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We let $\tilde{B}_n^J : \mathbb{F}_{n,\text{aff}}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the composition $\text{Vol} \circ T_J$ for any $J \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}^4$. This function is independent of the choices of spanning vectors, and thus, descends to a bounded Borel function $B_n^J : \mathbb{F}_n^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, the sum

$$B_n := \sum_J B_n^J$$

descends to an alternating, $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ -invariant, bounded strict Borel cocycle $B_n : \mathbb{F}_n^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (see [3, Cor. 13]). Observe that $B_2 = \mathrm{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}}$, so by analogy, we will call B_n the (Goncharov–Bucher–Burger–Iozzi) *volume cocycle*. The *bounded Borel class* $b_n \in H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})) \cong H_b^3(\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C}))$, mentioned in [Theorem 5.1](#) above, is defined as $b_n := [B_n]$.

Whilst B_n is not everywhere continuous, it is so in the following generic locus.

Definition 6.4. We say that a 4-tuple $(F_0, F_1, F_2, F_3) \in \mathbb{F}_n^4$ is in *general position* if

$$\dim\langle F_0^{j_0}, \dots, F_3^{j_3} \rangle = j_0 + \dots + j_3$$

as long as the right-hand side is at most n . We will denote by $\mathbb{F}_n^{\{4\}}$ the Zariski-open (hence Hausdorff-open and co-null) subset of \mathbb{F}_n^4 of 4-tuples in general position.

Lemma 6.5. *For any $n \geq 2$ and $J = (j_0, \dots, j_3) \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}^4$, the restriction of B_n^J to the open subset $\mathbb{F}_n^{\{4\}}$ is continuous, and vanishes identically unless the equality*

$$(6.4) \quad \|J\|_1 = j_0 + \dots + j_3 = n - 2$$

holds. In particular, the volume cocycle $B_n : \mathbb{F}_n^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous on $\mathbb{F}_n^{\{4\}}$.

Proof. See discussion preceding [3, Lem. 16]. The restriction $B_n^J|_{\mathbb{F}_n^{\{4\}}}$ reduces to a hyperbolic volume function $\mathrm{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}}$ when (6.4) holds, and vanishes otherwise. This implies the continuity statement. Note that there are precisely $n(n^2 - 1)/6$ tuples J that fulfill (6.4). \square

6.2. The Furstenberg boundary of $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$. The content of this subsection is classical, and can be found e.g. in [36, §I.7]. We continue to abbreviate $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$. Observe first that $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ acts on the variety of totally isotropic *projective lines* in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^4)$ (i.e. 2-dimensional linear subspaces of \mathbb{C}^4) with two orbits, O^+ and O^- . Respectively, these consist of elements

$$\begin{aligned} l_a^+ &:= \{[1, -t, a, at]^\top \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^4) \mid t \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}\} \in O^+, \\ l_a^- &:= \{[1, a, -t, at]^\top \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^4) \mid t \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}\} \in O^-, \end{aligned}$$

with $a \in \hat{\mathbb{C}} \cong \mathbb{P}$, given in coordinates with respect to the basis $\mathcal{B}_2^{(+1,0)} = \{e_1, e_2, f_2, e_1\}$. These lines satisfy the properties

$$\begin{cases} l_a^+ \cap l_b^+ = l_a^- \cap l_b^- = \emptyset & \text{for } a \neq b, \\ l_a^+ \cap l_b^- = [1, b, -a, ab]^\top. \end{cases}$$

The $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ -action on the product $\mathcal{F} := O^+ \times O^-$ is transitive, and the stabilizer of the pair $(l_0^+, l_0^-) \in \mathcal{F}$ equals the subgroup of upper-triangular orthogonal matrices. Thus, we identify the Furstenberg boundary of $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ with \mathcal{F} .

There exists an exceptional isogeny $\theta : \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ that descends to an isomorphism of Lebesgue $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -spaces,

$$(6.5) \quad \partial\theta : \mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}, \quad \partial\theta(a, b) := (l_a^+, l_b^-), \quad a, b \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}.$$

The following embedding of the Furstenberg boundary \mathcal{F} into the full flag variety of \mathbb{C}^4 plays a key role in our proof of [Lemma 6.1](#).

Definition 6.6. Let $\rho : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_4$ be the $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ -equivariant embedding defined as

$$\rho(l^+, l^-) := (\{0\} \subset l^+ \cap l^- \subset l^+ \subset l^+ + l^- \subset \mathbb{C}^4).$$

An analogous map can be obtained if we choose l^- instead of l^+ as the 2-dimensional subspace.

Remark 6.7. The image of ρ is a null set. In particular, ρ does not preserve measure classes.

6.3. Generic values of the volume cocycle of $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$. We introduce a notion of genericity for tuples of points in the Furstenberg boundary \mathcal{F} .

Definition 6.8. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we set

$$\mathcal{F}^{\{k+1\}} := \partial\theta^{\times(k+1)}(\mathbb{P}^{\{k+1\}} \times \mathbb{P}^{\{k+1\}}) \subset \mathcal{F}^{k+1},$$

where the brackets in the upper index of \mathbb{P} refer to the generic subsets [\(3.2\)](#) in the classical setting. The product $\mathbb{P}^{\{k+1\}} \times \mathbb{P}^{\{k+1\}}$ is regarded as a subset of $(\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P})^{k+1}$ in the obvious way.

Lemma 6.9. *The following statements hold:*

- (i) *The set $\mathcal{F}^{\{k+1\}}$ is an $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ -invariant, co-null Borel subset of \mathcal{F}^{k+1} , and the equality $\partial_i(\mathcal{F}^{\{k+1\}}) = \mathcal{F}^{\{k\}}$ holds for every $i \in \{0, \dots, k+1\}$.*
- (ii) *The action $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C}) \curvearrowright \mathcal{F}^{\{3\}}$ is transitive.*
- (iii) *The image $\rho^{\times 4}(\mathcal{F}^{\{4\}})$ is contained in the set $\mathbb{F}_4^{\{4\}}$ of 4-tuples in general position.*

Proof. Item (i) follows from the fact that $\partial\theta$ is an isomorphism of Lebesgue $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -spaces, and $\mathbb{P}^{\{k+1\}} \times \mathbb{P}^{\{k+1\}}$ is invariant, Borel and co-null in $(\mathbb{P} \times \mathbb{P})^{k+1}$. Item (ii) is a consequence of the transitivity of the action $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \curvearrowright \mathbb{P}^{\{3\}}$. For (iii), we let $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_3)$ and $\mathbf{b} = (b_0, \dots, b_3) \in \mathbb{P}^{\{4\}}$. The genericity of these tuples means that their entries are pairwise distinct when regarded under the identification $\mathbb{P} \cong \hat{\mathbb{C}}$. Set $l_i^+ := l_{a_i}^+$ and $l_i^- := l_{b_i}^-$, so that

$$((l_0^+, l_0^-), \dots, (l_3^+, l_3^-)) = (\partial\theta_0)^4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) \in \mathcal{F}^4.$$

We claim that the image under $\rho^{\times 4}$ of the tuple $((l_0^+, l_0^-), \dots, (l_3^+, l_3^-))$ is in general position. Indeed, if we set $p_i := l_i^+ \cap l_i^- \in \mathcal{P}_2$, then, for instance, for distinct $i, j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$, we have

$$\dim(p_i + p_j) = 1 + 1 - \dim(l_i^+ \cap l_i^- \cap l_j^+ \cap l_j^-) = 2,$$

$$\dim(p_i + l_j^+) = 1 + 2 - \dim(l_i^+ \cap l_i^- \cap l_j^+) = 3,$$

$$\dim(p_i + (l_j^+ + l_j^-)) = 1 + 3 - \dim(l_i^+ \cap l_i^- \cap (l_j^+ + l_j^-)) = 4,$$

where we used that $l_i^+ \cap l_j^+ = l_i^- \cap l_j^- = \{0\}$ and

$$l_i^+ \cap l_i^- \cap (l_j^+ + l_j^-) \subset (l_i^+ \cap l_i^- \cap l_j^+) + (l_i^+ \cap l_i^- \cap l_j^-) = \{0\}.$$

The remaining verifications are completely analogous to the three given above. \square

In the following lemma, we examine the values of the volume cocycle B_n over the image of the generic set $\mathcal{F}^{(4)}$ via the inclusion $\rho^{\times 4} : \mathcal{F}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_4^4$. For simplicity, in its proof we will write 4-tuples of indices (j_0, \dots, j_3) as $j_0 \cdots j_3$, omitting parentheses and commas.

Lemma 6.10. *For any $(a, b) \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}^2$, let $F_{(a,b)} := \rho(\partial\theta(a, b))$ and $F_a := F_{(a,a)}$. Then for all $(a, b) \in (\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\})^2$, the equality*

$$B_4(F_\infty, F_0, F_1, F_{(a,b)}) = 2(D(a) + D(b))$$

holds. In particular, the map $B_4 \circ \rho^{\times 4}|_{\mathcal{F}^{(4)}} : \mathcal{F}^{(4)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is non-zero.

Proof. We claim the following values for the non-vanishing summands B_4^J of B_4 (see [Lemma 6.5](#)):

$$(6.6) \quad B_4^J(F_\infty, F_0, F_1, F_{(a,b)}) = \begin{cases} D(b) & \text{if } J \in \{2000, 0200, 0020, 0002\}, \\ -D(b/a) & \text{if } J \in \{1100, 0011\}, \\ D\left(\frac{1-b}{1-a}\right) & \text{if } J \in \{1010, 0101\}, \\ -D\left(\frac{a(1-b)}{b(1-a)}\right) & \text{if } J \in \{1001, 0110\}. \end{cases}$$

First, if we let $\phi_{ab} := e_1 + b e_2 - a f_2 + ab f_1$ for any $a, b \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}$, then

$$l_a^+ = \langle e_1 - a f_2, e_2 + a f_1 \rangle, \quad l_b^- = \langle e_1 + b e_2, b f_1 - f_2 \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad l_a^+ \cap l_b^- = \langle \phi_{ab} \rangle,$$

and therefore, for $a, b \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$,

$$F_\infty = (\{0\} \subset \langle f_1 \rangle \subset \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle \subset \langle f_1, f_2, e_2 \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}^4),$$

$$F_0 = (\{0\} \subset \langle e_1 \rangle \subset \langle e_1, e_2 \rangle \subset \langle e_1, e_2, f_2 \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}^4),$$

$$F_{(a,b)} = (\{0\} \subset \langle \phi_{ab} \rangle \subset \langle \phi_{ab}, e_1 - a f_2 \rangle \subset \langle \phi_{ab}, e_1 - a f_2, e_1 + b e_2 \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}^4).$$

Now, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} B_4^{2000}(F_\infty, F_0, F_1, F_{(a,b)}) &= \text{Vol} \left[\frac{\langle f_1, f_2, e_2 \rangle + \langle e_1 \rangle + \langle \phi_{11} \rangle + \langle \phi_{ab} \rangle}{\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle + \{0\} + \{0\} + \{0\}}; (e_2, e_1, \phi_{11}, \phi_{ab}) \right] \\ &= \text{Vol} \left[V_2^{(+1,0)} / \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle; (e_2, e_1, \phi_{11}, \phi_{ab}) \right] \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \text{Vol} \left[\mathbb{C}^2; \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & b \end{pmatrix} \right] \\ &= \text{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}}(\infty, 0, 1, b) = D(b), \quad \text{and} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
B_4^{0011}(F_\infty, F_0, F_1, F_{(a,b)}) &= \\
&= \text{Vol} \left[\frac{\langle f_1 \rangle + \langle e_1 \rangle + \langle \phi_{11}, e_1 - f_2 \rangle + \langle \phi_{ab}, e_1 - af_2 \rangle}{\{0\} + \{0\} + \langle \phi_{11} \rangle + \langle \phi_{ab} \rangle}; (f_1, e_1, e_1 - f_2, e_1 - af_2) \right] \\
&= \text{Vol} [V_2 / \langle \phi_{11}, \phi_{ab} \rangle; (f_1, e_1, e_1 - f_2, e_1 - af_2)] \\
&\stackrel{(**)}{=} \text{Vol} \left[\mathbb{C}^2; \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{a-b}{a-1} & 1 & b \\ -b^{-1} & 0 & 1 & a \end{pmatrix} \right] \\
&= \text{Vol}_{\mathbb{P}}(\infty, 0, 1, a/b) = D(a/b) = -D(b/a).
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality in the case $J = 0011$ follows from one of the symmetries in (6.2). The equalities (*) and (**) follow from the notion of equivalence in σ_3 , implemented respectively by the epimorphisms $T_1, T_2 : V_2 \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 : e_1 &\mapsto (1, 0)^\top, & e_2 &\mapsto (0, 1)^\top, & f_2 &\mapsto (0, 0)^\top, & f_1 &\mapsto (0, 0)^\top; \\
T_2 : e_1 &\mapsto \left(\frac{a-b}{a-1}, 0\right)^\top, & e_2 &\mapsto \left(-1, \frac{1-b}{b}\right)^\top, & f_2 &\mapsto \left(\frac{1-b}{a-1}, -1\right)^\top, & f_1 &\mapsto (0, -b^{-1})^\top.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\ker T_1 = \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$ and $\ker T_2 = \langle \phi_{11}, \phi_{ab} \rangle$. To conclude, we add the terms in (6.6) and use the fact that D satisfies the Spence–Abel equation (4.4):

$$\begin{aligned}
B_4(F_\infty, F_0, F_1, F_{(a,b)}) &= 4D(b) + 2 \left(-D\left(\frac{a(1-b)}{b(1-a)}\right) + D\left(\frac{1-b}{1-a}\right) - D\left(\frac{b}{a}\right) \right) \\
&= 4D(b) + 2(D(a) - D(b)) = 2(D(a) + D(b)). \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

6.4. Proof of Lemma 6.1. If $\rho : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_4$ induced a morphism of L^∞ -complexes, then it would, by virtue of functoriality [28, Prop. 8.4.2], implement the map res_2 from Lemma 6.1 at the cocycle level, and the injectivity of res_2 would be a consequence of Lemma 6.10. However, since ρ does not preserve measure classes, it cannot possibly induce a map of L^∞ -spaces. To circumvent this measure-theoretical difficulty, we will consider the commutative diagram

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
H_b^3(\text{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})) & \xrightarrow{\text{res}_2} & H_b^3(\text{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})) \\
\text{id}^* \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{id}^* \\
H_b^3(\text{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})^\delta) & \xrightarrow{\text{res}_2^\delta} & H_b^3(\text{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})^\delta)
\end{array}$$

where the upper indices $(-)^\delta$ on groups indicate that they are being regarded as discrete. In words, the map res_2 “factors” over its discrete analogue res_2^δ . This observation proves advantageous for us, as the latter map is more tractable than the former at the level of cocycles. As actions of discrete groups, $\text{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})^\delta \curvearrowright \mathbb{F}_4$ and $\text{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})^\delta \curvearrowright \mathcal{F}$ are amenable. In fact, their point-stabilizers are isomorphic to upper-triangular subgroups, and hence abstractly solvable.

Thus, we have canonical isomorphisms

$$H_b^*(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})^\delta) \cong H^*(\ell^\infty(\mathbb{F}_n^{\bullet+1})^{\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})}) \quad \text{and} \quad H_b^*(\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})^\delta) \cong H^*(\ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}^{\bullet+1})^{\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})}).$$

Moreover, the now well-defined morphism of complexes

$$(6.8) \quad \rho^* : \ell^\infty(\mathbb{F}_4^{\bullet+1}) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}^{\bullet+1})$$

implements the restriction $\mathrm{res}_2^\delta : H_b^*(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})^\delta) \rightarrow H_b^*(\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})^\delta)$ (see [14, Thms. 4.23, 4.15]).

Our last ingredient in the proof of [Lemma 6.1](#) is an ‘‘equivariant lifting’’ theorem, due to Monod [29], that will enable the realization at the level of cocycles of the maps id^* in the diagram (6.7). For any measure space X , we denote the Banach space of bounded measurable functions $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (without identification modulo null sets) by $\mathcal{L}^\infty(X)$. If $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(X)$, we write $[\varphi]$ for its equivalence class in $L^\infty(X)$.

Theorem 6.11 (see [29]). *Let G be a locally compact group with an amenable C^1 -action on a differentiable manifold X . Then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a G -equivariant lifting*

$$s^k : L^\infty(X^{k+1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}^\infty(X^{k+1})$$

of the canonical projection $\mathcal{L}^\infty(X^{k+1}) \twoheadrightarrow L^\infty(X^{k+1})$ such that:

- (i) s^* is a morphism of complexes, and
- (ii) if $x \in X^{k+1}$ is a continuity point of a function $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(X^{k+1})$, then $(s[\varphi])(x) = \varphi(x)$.

About the proof. The existence of the s^k is [29, Thm. A]. For (i), see [29, Rem. 1]. For (ii), see the comment at the end of the proof of [29, Thm. B]. \square

Let us fix a morphism of complexes s that results from the composition of an equivariant lifting as in [Theorem 6.11](#) and the surjection $\mathcal{L}^\infty \twoheadrightarrow \ell^\infty$:

$$(6.9) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} L^\infty(\mathbb{F}_4^{\bullet+1}) & \twoheadrightarrow & \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{F}_4^{\bullet+1}) & \twoheadrightarrow & \ell^\infty(\mathbb{F}_4^{\bullet+1}) \\ & & \downarrow s & & \downarrow \end{array}$$

Again by functoriality, the morphism s implements $\mathrm{id}^* : H_b^*(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^*(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})^\delta)$ at the level of cocycles. Observe that $s[B_4] = B_4$ on $\mathbb{F}_4^{\{4\}}$ by [Lemma 6.5](#).

Proof of Lemma 6.1. Since $H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})) \cong \mathbb{R}$, it suffices to prove that the composition $\mathrm{res}^\delta \circ \mathrm{id}^*$ in the diagram (6.7) is not the zero map. This will follow from exhibiting a non-trivial 3-cocycle in the image of $\rho^* \circ s$, for ρ^* and s as introduced in (6.8) and (6.9), respectively.

Let $[B_4]$ be the class up to null sets of the volume cocycle $B_4 \in \mathcal{L}^\infty(\mathbb{F}_4^4)$, and set $B_2 := (\rho^* \circ s)[B_4] \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}^4)$. Observe that B_2 is an $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ -invariant bounded 3-cocycle. Moreover,

$$B_2(x) = s[B_4](\rho^{\times 4}(x)) = B_4(\rho^{\times 4}(x)) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{F}^{\{4\}},$$

in virtue of [Lemma 6.5](#) and [Lemma 6.9](#) (iii). Thus, we deduce from [Lemma 6.10](#) that \mathcal{B}_2 does not vanish identically on $\mathcal{F}^{(4)}$, and this implies that \mathcal{B}_2 is not a coboundary. Indeed, by [Lemma 6.9](#) (ii), any $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ -invariant function $\varphi \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}^3)$ must take a constant value c on $\mathcal{F}^{(3)}$, and therefore, for every $x \in \mathcal{F}^{(4)}$, any coboundary $d\varphi$ must satisfy the equality

$$d\varphi(x) = \sum_{i=0}^3 (-1)^i \varphi(\partial_i(x)) = c - c + c - c = 0. \quad \square$$

We finish this subsection by computing the norm of the restricted class $\mathrm{res}_2(b_4) \in H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C}))$. In particular, this proves that the restrictions res_r need not be isometric in the \mathbf{D}_r case.

Proposition 6.12. *The restricted class $\mathrm{res}_2(b_4) \in H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C}))$ has Gromov norm equal to $4v_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, and the map $\mathrm{res}_2 : H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})) \hookrightarrow H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C}))$ has operator norm equal to $2/5$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B}_2 \in \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}^4)$ be the cocycle defined in the proof of [Lemma 6.1](#). Since \mathcal{B}_2 is the restriction of a Borel cocycle, its class $[\mathcal{B}_2] \in L^\infty(\mathcal{F}^4)$ is well-defined. Now, as in [\(6.9\)](#), let

$$s' : L^\infty(\mathcal{F}^{**+1}) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\mathcal{F}^{**+1})$$

be the $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ -equivariant morphism of complexes defined by the composition of a lifting as in [Theorem 6.11](#) and the surjection $\mathcal{L}^\infty \twoheadrightarrow \ell^\infty$. Moreover, the equality $s'[\mathcal{B}_2] = \mathcal{B}_2$ holds since \mathcal{B}_2 is continuous on the co-null set $\mathcal{F}^{(4)} \subset \mathcal{F}^4$. By [\[28, Thm. 7.5.3\]](#) and the commutativity of the diagram [\(6.7\)](#), we deduce that the norm of $\mathrm{res}_2(b_4)$ must equal the norm of the cohomology class defined by $[\mathcal{B}_2]$.

Now, by the essential transitivity of the action $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C}) \curvearrowright \mathcal{F}^3$ (see [Lemma 6.9](#) (ii)), there are no non-trivial invariant 3-coboundaries in $L^\infty(\mathcal{F}^{**+1})$. Hence, $\|\mathrm{res}_2(b_4)\| = \|[\mathcal{B}_2]\|_\infty = 4 \cdot v_3$ by [Lemma 6.10](#). For the operator norm of res_2 , note simply that $\|b_4\| = 10 \cdot v_3$. \square

6.5. End of proof of Theorems 2 and 3. For any $r \geq r_1 = 2$, consider the commutative cube

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & H_b^3(G_{r+1}) & \longleftarrow & H_b^3(\mathrm{GL}_{n(r+1)}(\mathbb{C})) \\ & \swarrow & \uparrow \mathrm{res}_{r+1} & \searrow \cong & \downarrow \\ H_b^3(S_{r+1}) & \longleftarrow & H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_{n(r+1)}(\mathbb{C})) & \cong & H_b^3(\mathrm{GL}_{n(r+1)}(\mathbb{C})) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ & & H_b^3(G_r) & \longleftarrow & H_b^3(\mathrm{GL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C})) \\ & \swarrow & \uparrow \mathrm{res}_r & \searrow \cong & \downarrow \\ H_b^3(S_r) & \longleftarrow & H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C})) & \cong & H_b^3(\mathrm{GL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C})) \end{array}$$

where the horizontal arrows correspond to the restriction maps

$$\mathrm{res}_s : H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_{n(s)}(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(S_s) \quad \text{and} \quad H_b^3(\mathrm{GL}_{n(s)}(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(G_s),$$

the arrows pointing frontwards to the restriction maps

$$\sigma_{n(s)} : H_b^3(\mathrm{GL}_{n(s)}(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_{n(s)}(\mathbb{C})) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_s : H_b^3(G_s) \rightarrow H_b^3(S_s)$$

for $s \in \{r, r+1\}$, and the vertical arrows to the maps induced by the block inclusions

$$\begin{aligned} \iota_r : \mathcal{S}_r &\hookrightarrow \mathcal{S}_{r+1}, & j_r : \mathrm{SL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C}) &\hookrightarrow \mathrm{SL}_{n(r+1)}(\mathbb{C}), \\ \iota_r : \mathcal{G}_r &\hookrightarrow \mathcal{G}_{r+1}, & j_r : \mathrm{GL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C}) &\hookrightarrow \mathrm{GL}_{n(r+1)}(\mathbb{C}), \end{aligned}$$

Observe that $\sigma_{n(s)}$ is an isomorphism by [28, Cor. 8.5.5] and that τ_s is an injection by [28, Prop. 8.6.2] for both $s \in \{r, r+1\}$, since $\mathcal{S}_s < \mathcal{G}_s$ is a finite-index normal subgroup. Moreover, the maps j_r^* induced in degree three by j_r , both for GL and SL, are isomorphisms due to **Theorem 2** for the \mathbf{A}_r case. By **Key Lemma bis**, the map $\iota_r^* : H_b^3(\mathcal{G}_{r+1}) \rightarrow H_b^3(\mathcal{G}_r)$ is an injection.

The next lemma will serve as the induction step in the proofs of **Theorems 2 bis** and **3 bis**.

Lemma 6.13. *If, for any $r \geq 1$, the map $\mathrm{res}_r : H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(\mathcal{S}_r)$ is an isomorphism, then all the arrows in the diagram (6.10) are isomorphisms.*

Proof. Note, by examining the bottom face of the cube, that if res_r is an isomorphism, then τ_r is surjective. This, in turn, implies that all the arrows in the bottom face are isomorphisms. Relying on these isomorphisms, a similar analysis of, first, the back face; then, the left face; and finally, the front face of (6.10), complete the proof of the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 3 bis for \mathbf{D}_r . We prove by induction that $\mathrm{res}_r : H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(\mathcal{S}_r)$ is an isomorphism for every $r \geq r_0 = 3$. By **Lemma 6.13**, if res_r is an isomorphism for any $r \geq 3$, then so is res_{r+1} . Thus, the claim follows once we establish that

$$\mathrm{res}_{r_0} = \mathrm{res}_3 : H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_6(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_6(\mathbb{C}))$$

is an isomorphism. The group $\mathrm{SO}_6(\mathbb{C})$ admits an exceptional isogeny $\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{SO}_6(\mathbb{C})$, as in e.g. [36, 34], which induces an isomorphism in bounded cohomology [28, Cor. 8.5.2]. After applying **Theorem 2** for \mathbf{A}_r , we deduce the chain of isomorphisms

$$H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_6(\mathbb{C})) \cong H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})) \cong H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_6(\mathbb{C})) \cong \mathbb{R}.$$

Thus, it suffices to prove that res_3 is not identically zero. For this purpose, consider the front face of the commutative cube (6.10), with $r = 2$. Since the bottom arrow res_2 is injective by **Lemma 6.1**, we deduce our claim. \square

Proof of Theorem 2 bis for \mathbf{D}_r . By **Lemma 6.13**, if res_r is an isomorphism for any $r \geq r_0 = 3$, then so is the map $\iota_r^* : H_b^3(\mathcal{S}_{r+1}) \rightarrow H_b^3(\mathcal{S}_r)$. **Theorem 3 bis** finishes the proof. \square

Remark 6.14. We note that $\mathrm{res}_2 : H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})) \hookrightarrow H_b^3(\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C}))$ is not an isomorphism, since $H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})) \cong \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathrm{SO}_4(\mathbb{C})$ is isogenous to $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$, which has 2-dimensional H_b^3 .

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let $(\varepsilon, d) \in \{(+1, 1), (-1, 0), (+1, 0)\}$. We will prove **Theorem 1 bis**, that is, that the comparison map $c^3 : H_b^3(S_r) \rightarrow H^3(S_r)$ is an isomorphism for all $r \geq r_0$, by induction on r .

The base case $r = r_0$ holds due to the exceptional Lie algebra isomorphisms in low rank, which place S_{r_0} inside the A_r family. For the induction step, consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_b^3(S_{r+1}) & \xrightarrow{c^3} & H^3(S_{r+1}) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \cong \downarrow \\ H_b^3(S_r) & \xrightarrow[c^3]{\cong} & H^3(S_r) \end{array}$$

The induction hypothesis is the fact that the bottom arrow is an isomorphism. That the left arrow is an isomorphism is **Theorem 2**. That the right one is an isomorphism is the stability of classical families in continuous cohomology, for which we argue as follows. For any non-compact semisimple Lie group G , the continuous cohomology $H^*(G)$ is isomorphic to the cohomology of its compact symmetric space (see e.g. [33, §5]). In the cases covered by **Theorem 1**, such compact symmetric spaces are diffeomorphic to compact classical groups. The stability of the (space) cohomology of those groups is recorded in [26, Thm. III.6.5]. \square

8. ABOUT THE GROMOV NORM ON H_b^3 OF COMPLEX CLASSICAL GROUPS

For the purpose of this final section, let us adapt the notation introduced in Section 2 to cover also the complex family A_r , as follows. For $\mathcal{F} \in \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}\}$, let $S_{\mathcal{F}_r}$ denote, respectively, the group

$$\mathrm{SL}_{r+1}(\mathbb{C}), \quad \mathrm{SO}_{2r+1}(\mathbb{C}), \quad \mathrm{Sp}_{2r}(\mathbb{C}), \quad \mathrm{SO}_{2r}(\mathbb{C}),$$

in the complex family \mathcal{F}_r . As explained in Subsection 2.2, the choice of $\mathcal{F} \in \{\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{D}\}$ corresponds, respectively, to choosing $(\varepsilon, d) \in \{(+1, 1), (-1, 0), (+1, 0)\}$, and we will assume the notation introduced in Section 2 for those cases.

Let $b_{\mathcal{F}_r} \in H_b^3(S_{\mathcal{F}_r})$ be the continuous bounded cohomology class defined as

$$b_{\mathcal{F}_r} := \begin{cases} b_{r+1} & \text{if } \mathcal{F} = \mathbf{A}, \\ \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{res}_r(b_{2r+1}) & \text{if } \mathcal{F} = \mathbf{B}, \\ \mathrm{res}_r(b_{2r}) & \text{if } \mathcal{F} = \mathbf{C}, \\ \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{res}_r(b_{2r}) & \text{if } \mathcal{F} = \mathbf{D}, \end{cases}$$

where $b_n \in H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C}))$ is the bounded Borel class, and $\mathrm{res}_r : H_b^3(\mathrm{SL}_{n(r)}(\mathbb{C})) \rightarrow H_b^3(S_{\mathcal{F}_r})$ is the restriction map.

The next statement is an immediate corollary of Bucher–Burger–Iozzi [3, Thm. 2] (see [Theorem 5.1](#)), which gives the computation of the Gromov norm of the bounded Borel class, and of [Proposition 4](#).

Corollary 8.1. *For $\mathcal{F} \in \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}\}$ and $r \geq 1$, the Gromov norm of $b_{\mathcal{F}_r} \in H_b^3(S_{\mathcal{F}_r})$ is*

$$\|b_{\mathcal{F}_r}\| = \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_r) \cdot v_{\mathbb{H}^3},$$

where $v_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ is the maximal volume of an ideal tetrahedron in \mathbb{H}^3 , and the number $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_r) \in \mathbb{Z}$ is given in the table

\mathcal{F}_r	\mathbf{A}_r	\mathbf{B}_r	\mathbf{C}_r
$\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_r)$	$\frac{r(r+1)(r+2)}{6}$	$\frac{r(r+1)(2r+1)}{3}$	$\frac{r(4r^2-1)}{3}$

It was indicated to us by Marc Burger that the number $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{F}_r)$ equals the Dynkin index of the principal $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -homomorphism $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow S_{\mathcal{F}_r}$. We refer the reader to [31] for the definition of Dynkin index, and [24] for the theory of principal $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -homomorphisms. The Dynkin index of the principal $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -homomorphisms has been computed for all complex simple Lie groups [32], including exceptional ones. For $\mathcal{F} = \mathbf{D}$, it is given by the formula

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{D}_r) = \frac{r(r-1)(2r-1)}{3}.$$

Relying on the equality $\|b_{\mathbf{D}_2}\| = 2v_{\mathbb{H}^3} = \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{D}_2)v_{\mathbb{H}^3}$ established in [Proposition 6.12](#), we conjecture that [Corollary 8.1](#) holds also for $\mathcal{F} = \mathbf{D}$.

APPENDIX A. PROOFS OF CROSS-RATIO PARAMETRIZATION STATEMENTS

This appendix is devoted to the proof of the parametrizations via ω -cross-ratios of the configuration spaces of four and five points in the variety \mathcal{P}_r of isotropic points. These were stated in the main text as [Proposition 3.8](#) and [Proposition 3.11](#), respectively. We continue to adhere to the notation and standing assumptions in Subsections [2.1](#) and [2.2](#).

A.1. Proof of [Proposition 3.8](#). Let us assume that $r \geq 2$. We consider the Borel functions $\Gamma, \Delta, \Delta^{1/2}, \varphi_-, \varphi_+ : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, defined as

$$(A.1) \quad \Gamma(z_1, z_2) := 1 - z_1 - z_2,$$

$$(A.2) \quad \Delta(z_1, z_2) := \Gamma(z_1, z_2)^2 - 2(1 + \varepsilon) \cdot z_1 z_2,$$

$$(A.3) \quad \Delta^{1/2}(z_1, z_2) := \begin{cases} \Gamma(z_1, z_2) & \text{if } \varepsilon = -1, \\ \sqrt{\Delta(z_1, z_2)} & \text{if } \varepsilon = +1, \end{cases}$$

$$(A.4) \quad \varphi_\eta(z_1, z_2) := \left(\frac{\Delta^{1/2} + \eta\Gamma}{2} \right) (z_1, z_2), \quad \eta \in \{\pm 1\},$$

where $\sqrt{\cdot} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a Borel choice of complex square root. Abusively, we will use the same symbols to denote the Borel functions $\mathcal{P}_r^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined a.e. by precomposing with $\pi_3 = (cr_1, cr_2)$.

Definition A.1. We let $\mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}$ be the subset of $\mathcal{P}_r^{(4)}$ consisting of tuples (p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) such that the subspace $\langle p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3 \rangle < V_r$ is non-degenerate (see (3.2) for the definition of $\mathcal{P}_r^{(4)}$).

Lemma A.2. A tuple $[v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3] \in \mathcal{P}_r^{(4)}$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}$ if and only if the associated Gram matrix $(\omega(v_i, v_j))_{i,j}$ is non-singular. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}} = \{(p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) \in \mathcal{P}_r^{(4)} \mid \Delta(p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) \neq 0\},$$

and in particular, $\mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}$ is a G_r -invariant, co-null Borel subset of \mathcal{P}_r^4 .

Proof. The matrix $(\omega(v_i, v_j))_{i,j}$ is singular if and only if there exists a non-trivial linear combination $v = \sum_i \alpha_i v_i$ such that $\omega(v_k, v) = 0$ for every $k \in \{0, \dots, 3\}$. This means precisely that either $v = 0$ and the vectors v_0, \dots, v_3 are linearly dependent, or $\langle v_0, \dots, v_3 \rangle$ is degenerate. The second part of the lemma follows from the fact that the Gram determinant of $\{v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ equals the quotient $\Delta[v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3] / (\omega(v_0, v_1) \omega(v_2, v_3))^2$. \square

The subspace $L < V_r$ generated by any four lines $(p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3) \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}$ is isomorphic to the sum $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$. In Lemma A.5 below, we will construct an adapted basis of L in terms of any such points p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3 . For that purpose, we introduce perpendicular projections with respect to ω onto hyperbolic planes, and list relevant properties.

Definition A.3. Let $\mathcal{H}_0 < V_r$ be a hyperbolic plane and $\{v_0, v_1\}$ a basis of isotropic vectors of \mathcal{H}_0 . The *perpendicular projection* $\text{proj} = \text{proj}_{\mathcal{H}_0} : V_r \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{H}_0$ onto \mathcal{H}_0 is given by

$$\text{proj}(v) := \frac{\omega(v_1, v)}{\omega(v_1, v_0)} v_0 + \frac{\omega(v_0, v)}{\omega(v_0, v_1)} v_1,$$

with kernel \mathcal{H}_0^\perp . We also let $\hat{\cdot} : V_r \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_0^\perp$ be the *complement map*, defined as $\hat{v} := v - \text{proj}(v)$.

Lemma A.4. Let $[v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3] \in \mathcal{P}_r^{(4)}$, let $\hat{\cdot}$ denote the complement map to $\langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$, let $v, w \in V_r$ be any two vectors, and let $u \in V_r$ be isotropic. Then the following identities hold:

- (i) $\omega(\hat{v}, \hat{w}) = \omega(\hat{v}, w) = \omega(v, \hat{w})$.
- (ii) $q(\hat{u}) = -(1 + \varepsilon) (\omega(v_1, u) \omega(u, v_0) / \omega(v_0, v_1))$.
- (iii) $\omega(\hat{v}_2, \hat{v}_3) = \omega(v_2, v_3) \cdot \Gamma[v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3]$.
- (iv) $\omega(\hat{v}_2, \hat{v}_3)^2 - q(\hat{v}_2) q(\hat{v}_3) = \omega(v_2, v_3)^2 \cdot \Delta[v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3]$.

Proof. Since $\omega(\hat{v}, \text{proj}(w)) = 0$, we have $\omega(\hat{v}, \hat{w}) = \omega(\hat{v}, w) - \omega(\hat{v}, \text{proj}(w)) = \omega(\hat{v}, w)$, the first equality in (i). The second one is analogous. Items (ii) and (iii) follow immediately from

(i) and the definition of the complement map. For $\varepsilon = -1$, the identity (iv) holds since $\Delta = \Gamma^2$ and $q(\widehat{v}_2)q(\widehat{v}_3) = 0$. If $\varepsilon = +1$, then (iv) follows from (iii) and the next computation:

$$\begin{aligned} q(\widehat{v}_2)q(\widehat{v}_3) &= 4 \cdot \frac{\omega(v_1, v_2)\omega(v_2, v_0)}{\omega(v_0, v_1)} \cdot \frac{\omega(v_1, v_3)\omega(v_3, v_0)}{\omega(v_0, v_1)} \\ &= 4 \cdot \omega(v_2, v_3)^2 \cdot \frac{\omega(v_1, v_3)\omega(v_2, v_0)}{\omega(v_1, v_0)\omega(v_2, v_3)} \cdot \frac{\omega(v_2, v_1)\omega(v_0, v_3)}{\omega(v_2, v_3)\omega(v_0, v_1)} \\ &= 4 \cdot \omega(v_2, v_3)^2 \cdot (\text{cr}_1^{-1} \cdot \text{cr}_2)[v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3]. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

The following technical lemma plays a key role in the proof of [Proposition 3.8](#).

Lemma A.5. *Let $\mathbf{p} = [v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3] \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{4\}}$, let $\mathcal{H}_0 := \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$ be the hyperbolic plane generated by the first two vectors, and let $\widehat{\cdot}$ denote the complement map to \mathcal{H}_0 . We also let the quantities $\Pi = \Pi(v_0, v_1, v_2)$, $\lambda = \lambda(v_0, v_1, v_2)$, $\mu = \mu(v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3)$ be defined as*

$$(A.5) \quad \Pi := \omega(v_0, v_1)\omega(v_1, v_2)\omega(v_2, v_0),$$

$$(A.6) \quad \lambda := \frac{\sqrt{\Pi}}{\omega(v_1, v_0)} = \frac{\omega(v_1, v_2)\omega(v_0, v_2)}{\sqrt{\Pi}},$$

$$(A.7) \quad \mu := \lambda^{-1} \cdot \omega(v_3, v_2).$$

Then $\mathcal{H}'_0 := \mathcal{H}_0^\perp \cap \langle v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3 \rangle = \langle \widehat{v}_2, \widehat{v}_3 \rangle$ is a hyperbolic plane, and the unique solutions $e', f' \in \mathcal{H}'_0$ of the next linear systems form an adapted basis of \mathcal{H}'_0 :

$$(A.8) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \omega(e', v_2) = \lambda \\ \omega(e', v_3) = \mu \varphi_-(\mathbf{p}) \end{array} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \omega(f', v_2) = -\lambda, \\ \omega(f', v_3) = \varepsilon \mu \varphi_+(\mathbf{p}), \end{array} \right\}$$

Proof. After writing e' and f' as linear combinations of the basis $\{\widehat{v}_2, \widehat{v}_3\}$ of \mathcal{H}' , one obtains that the coefficient matrix of both systems in (A.8) has determinant

$$q(\widehat{v}_2)q(\widehat{v}_3) - \omega(\widehat{v}_2, \widehat{v}_3)^2 = -\omega(v_2, v_3)^2 \cdot \Delta(\mathbf{p}).$$

This quantity is non-zero in virtue of [Lemma A.2](#). Their explicit solutions are:

$$(A.9) \quad \text{For } \varepsilon = -1 : \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} e' = (\lambda/\omega(\widehat{v}_3, \widehat{v}_2)) \cdot \widehat{v}_3, \\ f' = (-\mu/\omega(v_2, v_3)) \cdot \widehat{v}_2 - (\lambda/\omega(\widehat{v}_3, \widehat{v}_2)) \cdot \widehat{v}_3. \end{array} \right.$$

$$(A.10) \quad \text{For } \varepsilon = +1 : \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} e' = \lambda/q(\widehat{v}_2) \cdot (\widehat{v}_2 - r), \\ f' = -\lambda/q(\widehat{v}_2) \cdot (\widehat{v}_2 + r), \end{array} \right.$$

where

$$r := \frac{\omega(\widehat{v}_2, \widehat{v}_3) \cdot \widehat{v}_2 - q(\widehat{v}_2) \cdot \widehat{v}_3}{\omega(v_2, v_3) \cdot \Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{p})} \in \mathcal{H}'.$$

The next identities are consequences of [Lemma A.4](#) and facilitate the computations that verify that e' and f' as above are actually solutions of [\(A.8\)](#) and an adapted basis of \mathcal{H}'_0 :

$$\begin{aligned}
(\varepsilon = -1) \quad & \omega(\widehat{v}_2, v_2) = q(\widehat{v}_2) = 0, \quad \omega(\widehat{v}_3, v_3) = q(\widehat{v}_3) = 0, \\
& \omega(\widehat{v}_2, v_3) = \omega(v_2, \widehat{v}_3) = \omega(\widehat{v}_2, \widehat{v}_3) = \omega(v_2, v_3) \cdot \Gamma(\mathbf{p}) \\
& \quad = \omega(v_2, v_3) \cdot \Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{p}) \neq 0. \\
(\varepsilon = +1) \quad & \omega(r, v_2) = \omega(r, \widehat{v}_2) = 0, \quad q(r) = -q(\widehat{v}_2) = 2\lambda^2 \neq 0, \\
& \omega(r, v_3) = \omega(r, \widehat{v}_3) = \omega(v_2, v_3) \cdot \Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{p}) \neq 0. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of [Proposition 3.8](#). Let $r \geq 2$. The theorem is proven once we establish the existence of a co-null subset $\Omega_3 \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ and a Borel map $\Phi_3 : \Omega_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r^4$ with the next three properties:

- (i) $\pi_3(\mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}) \subset \Omega_3$.
- (ii) $\Phi_3(\Omega_3) \subset \mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}$ and $\pi_3 \circ \Phi_3 = \text{id}$.
- (iii) For all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}$, there exists $g \in G_r$ such that $\Phi_3 \circ \pi_3(\mathbf{p}) = g \mathbf{p}$.

We proceed now to their construction. Let us define

$$(A.11) \quad \Omega_3 := \{(a_1, a_2) \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^2 \mid \Delta(a_1, a_2) \neq 0\}.$$

Note that Ω_3 is a non-empty Zariski-open subset of \mathbb{C}^2 , hence co-null, and condition (i) follows immediately from [Lemma A.2](#). We define the isotropic vector ϕ_2 and the Borel map $\phi_3 : \Omega_3 \rightarrow \langle e_r, e_{r-1}, f_{r-1}, f_r \rangle$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_2 & := e_r + e_{r-1} - f_{r-1} + f_r, \\
\phi_3(a_1, a_2) & := a_1 e_r + \varphi_-(a_1, a_2) e_{r-1} + \varepsilon \varphi_+(a_1, a_2) f_{r-1} + \varepsilon a_2 f_r.
\end{aligned}$$

The vector $\phi_3(a_1, a_2)$ is isotropic for any $(a_1, a_2) \in \Omega_3$. We let now $\Phi_3 : \Omega_3 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r^4$ be the map

$$(A.12) \quad \Phi_3(a_1, a_2) := [e_r, f_r, \phi_2, \phi_3(a_1, a_2)].$$

The first three points in the triple are precisely the representative generic 3-tuple used in the proof of [Lemma 3.4](#). After abbreviating $\phi_3 \equiv \phi_3(a_1, a_2)$, the identities given below hold true, implying that none of those quantities is zero and, hence, that Φ_3 ranges onto $\mathcal{P}_r^{\{4\}}$.

$$(A.13) \quad
\begin{aligned}
\omega(e_r, f_r) & = 1, & \omega(e_r, \phi_2) & = 1, & \omega(e_r, \phi_3) & = \varepsilon a_2, \\
\omega(f_r, \phi_2) & = \varepsilon, & \omega(f_r, \phi_3) & = \varepsilon a_1, & \omega(\phi_2, \phi_3) & = \varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

From [\(A.13\)](#), we also derive that $\text{cr}_i(\Phi_3(a_1, a_2)) = a_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Together with [Lemma A.2](#), this implies that $\Phi_3(a_1, a_2)$ is in $\mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}$ and that $\pi_4 \circ \Phi_3(a_1, a_2) = (a_1, a_2)$, establishing (ii).

For (iii), we fix an arbitrary $\mathbf{p} = [v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3] \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}$. As in [Lemma A.5](#), we let λ, Π, μ be the quantities defined in function of (v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3) from [\(A.5\)](#)–[\(A.7\)](#), and e', f' be the

solutions of the systems (A.8). Then we set

$$(A.14) \quad e'_r := \frac{\lambda v_1}{\omega(v_1, v_2)}, \quad e'_{r-1} := e', \quad f'_{r-1} := f', \quad f'_r := \frac{\omega(v_1, v_2) v_0}{\sqrt{\Pi}}.$$

Observe that $\{e'_r, f'_r\}$ is an adapted basis of the hyperbolic plane $\mathcal{H}_r := \langle v_0, v_1 \rangle < V_r$, and that $\{e'_{r-1}, f'_{r-1}\}$ is an adapted basis of $\mathcal{H}_{r-1} := \mathcal{H}_r^\perp \cap \langle v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3 \rangle$. By Witt's lemma, we extend $\{e'_r, e'_{r-1}, f'_{r-1}, f'_r\}$ to a full adapted basis \mathcal{B}'_r of V_r . The automorphism $T \in \text{GL}(V_r)$ that maps the standard adapted basis \mathcal{B}_r to \mathcal{B}'_r lies in G_r , and therefore, so does

$$(A.15) \quad g = g(v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3) := T^\top J_r.$$

Note that for every $i \in \{0, \dots, 3\}$, we have

$$g \cdot v_i = \omega(e'_r, v_i) e_r + \omega(e'_{r-1}, v_i) e_{r-1} + \omega(f'_{r-1}, v_i) f_{r-1} + \omega(f'_r, v_i) f_r.$$

Writing in coordinates with respect to the standard adapted basis \mathcal{B}_r , we have the equalities below, where the second one follows after multiplying the fourth vector by μ^{-1} :

$$g \cdot \mathbf{p} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \lambda & \lambda \omega(v_1, v_3) / \omega(v_1, v_2) \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda & \mu \varphi_-(\mathbf{p}) \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ 0 & 0 & -\lambda & \varepsilon \mu \varphi_+(\mathbf{p}) \\ 0 & 1 & \lambda & \omega(v_1, v_2) \omega(v_0, v_3) / \sqrt{\Pi} \end{bmatrix} = \Phi_3 \circ \pi_3(\mathbf{p}). \quad \square$$

A.2. Proof of Proposition 3.11. Recall the cross-ratios $\alpha_j, \beta_j, \gamma_j : \mathcal{P}_r^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ from Definition 3.9.

With the notation established in (A.1)–(A.4), we set $\psi_-, \psi_+ : \mathbb{C}^6 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ to be a.e.

$$(A.16) \quad \psi_\eta(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}) := \eta \varphi_\eta(\mathbf{a}) \cdot \Gamma(\mathbf{b}) + a_2 b_1 c_1^{-1} \cdot \Gamma(\mathbf{c}), \quad \eta \in \{\pm 1\},$$

for $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2)$, $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, b_2)$, $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2)$. Let also $\Gamma_\alpha, \Gamma_\beta, \Gamma_\gamma : \mathcal{P}_r^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the functions defined a.e. as

$$\Gamma_\alpha := \Gamma \circ (\alpha_1, \alpha_2), \quad \Gamma_\beta := \Gamma \circ (\beta_1, \beta_2), \quad \Gamma_\gamma := \Gamma \circ (\gamma_1, \gamma_2).$$

In this subsection, we will consider $\Delta, \Delta^{1/2}, \varphi_\eta, \psi_\eta$ a.e. defined functions $\mathcal{P}_r^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of 5-tuples after precomposing the expressions from (A.2)–(A.4) with the function (α_1, α_2) , and the expression from (A.16) with $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_2)$.

The proof of Proposition 3.11 builds up on the computations of the previous subsection. The next lemma establishes the result of pairing the vectors e', f' obtained in Lemma A.5 from a tuple $[v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3] \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{(4)\}}$ with a fifth vector v_4 . Its proof is a direct computation that we shall omit, relying on the explicit expressions of e' and f' given in (A.9) and (A.10).

Lemma A.6. Let $[v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3] \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}$, let $\hat{\cdot}$ be the complement map onto the hyperbolic plane $\langle v_0, v_1 \rangle$ spanned by the first two vectors, and let λ, μ, e', f' be as in [Lemma A.5](#). If an isotropic vector $v_4 \in V_r \setminus \{0\}$ is such that $\mathbf{p} := [v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4]$ lies in $\mathcal{P}_r^{(5)}$, then

$$\omega(e', v_4) = \varepsilon \frac{\omega(v_2, v_4)}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{\psi_-(\mathbf{p})}{\Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{p})} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega(f', v_4) = \frac{\omega(v_2, v_4)}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{\psi_+(\mathbf{p})}{\Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{p})}.$$

We give our definition of genericity for 5-tuples at this point, and then prove [Proposition 3.11](#).

Definition A.7. We let $\mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{5\}\}}$ be the set of 5-tuples $(p_0, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) \in \mathcal{P}_r^{(5)}$ such that every 4-subtuple is in $\mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}}$. In virtue of [Lemma 3.10](#), such a tuple is in $\mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{5\}\}}$ if and only if

$$(p_0, p_1, p_i, p_j) \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{4\}\}} \quad \text{for } i, j \in \{2, 3, 4\} \text{ with } i < j.$$

One verifies that $\mathcal{P}_5^{\{\{5\}\}}$ is a G_r -invariant, co-null subset of $\mathcal{P}_r^{(5)}$.

Proof of Proposition 3.11. For every $r \geq r_1 + 1$, we must define a co-null subset $\Omega_4 \subset \mathbb{C}^5$ and a Borel map $\Phi_4 : \Omega_4 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r^{(5)}$ such that:

- (i) $\pi_4(\mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{5\}\}}) \subset \Omega_4$.
- (ii) $\Phi_4(\Omega_4) \subset \mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{5\}\}}$ and $\pi_4 \circ \Phi_4 = \text{id}$.
- (iii) For all $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{5\}\}}$, there exists $g \in G_r$ such that $\Phi_4 \circ \pi_4(\mathbf{p}) = g \mathbf{p}$.

We leave out the case $(\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 1)$, $r = 2$ for individual consideration, and assume that

$$r \geq \begin{cases} 3 & \text{if } \varepsilon = +1, \\ 2 & \text{if } \varepsilon = -1, \end{cases}$$

Similarly to the definition of Ω_3 in [\(A.11\)](#), we let

$$(A.17) \quad \Omega_4 := \{(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1) \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^5 \mid \Delta(a_1, a_2), \Delta(b_1, b_2), \Delta(c_1, c_2) \neq 0\},$$

where $c_2 := \varepsilon(a_1 b_2 c_1)/(a_2 b_1)$. Being an intersection of finitely many non-empty Zariski-open subsets of \mathbb{C}^5 , the set Ω_4 is itself non-empty and Zariski-open, in particular co-null.

[Definition A.7](#) and [Lemma A.2](#) imply that $\Delta(\alpha_1(\mathbf{p}), \alpha_2(\mathbf{p}))$, $\Delta(\beta_1(\mathbf{p}), \beta_2(\mathbf{p}))$, $\Delta(\gamma_1(\mathbf{p}), \gamma_2(\mathbf{p})) \neq 0$ for every $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{\{5\}\}}$, establishing (i).

We define the functions $\tilde{\phi}_4 : \Omega_4 \rightarrow \langle e_r, e_{r-1}, f_{r-1}, f_r \rangle$ and $\phi_4 : \Omega_4 \rightarrow V_r$ as

$$(A.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1) &:= b_1 e_r + \frac{\psi_-(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})}{\Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{a})} e_{r-1} + \varepsilon \frac{\psi_+(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})}{\Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{a})} f_{r-1} + \varepsilon b_2 f_r, \\ \phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1) &:= \tilde{\phi}_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1) + \left\{ e_{r-2} - \left(\frac{q(\tilde{\phi}_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1))}{2} \right) \cdot f_{r-2} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}$ as in [\(A.16\)](#) and $c_2 := \varepsilon(a_1 b_2 c_1)/(a_2 b_1)$. Observe that if $\varepsilon = +1$, the vector $\tilde{\phi}_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)$ is not necessarily isotropic. In virtue of the assumption that $r \geq 3$ in that setting, we are able to incorporate in $\phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)$ a correction that makes it isotropic for any $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)$.

We define $\Phi_4 : \Omega_4 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r^5$,

$$\Phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1) := [e_r, f_r, \phi_2, \phi_3(\mathbf{a}), \phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)].$$

Note that the first four lines in $\Phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)$ correspond to the tuple $\Phi_3(\mathbf{a})$ introduced in (A.12). Abbreviating $\phi_3 \equiv \phi_3(\mathbf{a})$ and $\phi_4 \equiv \phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)$, we obtain, in addition to (A.13), the identities

$$(A.19) \quad \omega(e_r, \phi_4) = \varepsilon b_2, \quad \omega(f_r, \phi_4) = \varepsilon b_1, \quad \omega(\phi_2, \phi_4) = \varepsilon, \quad \omega(\phi_3, \phi_4) = a_2 b_1 c_1^{-1}.$$

In particular, this proves that Φ_4 ranges in $\mathcal{P}_r^{(5)}$. From (A.13) and (A.19), we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1(\Phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)) &= a_1, & \beta_1(\Phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)) &= b_1, & \gamma_1(\Phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)) &= c_1, \\ \alpha_2(\Phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)) &= a_2, & \beta_2(\Phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)) &= b_2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\pi_4 \circ \Phi_4 = \text{id}$ and that every 4-subtuple of $\Phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)$ lies in $\mathcal{P}_r^{\{(4)\}}$. In order to conclude that $\Phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1) \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{(5)\}}$ holds, it suffices to observe that if $\dim(V_r) = 2r + d \geq 5$, then necessarily $r > 2$, so that the correction term in (A.18) is non-zero, and hence, the lines in $\Phi_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)$ are linearly independent. This proves point (ii).

For (iii), fix an arbitrary $\mathbf{p} = [v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4] \in \mathcal{P}_r^{\{(5)\}}$ and let $\{e'_r, e'_{r-1}, f'_{r-1}, f'_r\}$ be the adapted basis of the subspace $\langle v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3 \rangle$,

$$e'_r := \frac{\lambda v_1}{\omega(v_1, v_2)}, \quad e'_{r-1} := e', \quad f'_{r-1} := f', \quad f'_r := \frac{\omega(v_1, v_2) v_0}{\sqrt{\Pi}},$$

defined as in (A.14), where $\Pi, \lambda, \mu, e', f'$ are functions of (v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3) as in Lemma A.5. Let also $g = g(v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3) \in G_r$ be the element from (A.15), so that

$$g \cdot [v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3] = \Phi_3(\pi_3(\mathbf{p})).$$

Let $x_0 \in \langle v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3 \rangle^\perp$ be the vector such that

$$g \cdot v_4 = x_0 + \omega(e'_r, v_4) e_r + \omega(e'_{r-1}, v_4) e_{r-1} + \omega(f'_{r-1}, v_4) f_{r-1} + \omega(f'_r, v_4) f_r.$$

Since the span of the lines in $g[v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3]$ equals $\langle e_r, e_{r-1}, f_{r-1}, f_r \rangle$, we have that $x_0 \neq 0$ whenever $r > 2$. In coordinates with respect to \mathcal{B}_r , we have

$$g \cdot [v_4] = \begin{bmatrix} \omega(e'_r, v_4) \\ \omega(e'_{r-1}, v_4) \\ x_0 \\ \omega(f'_{r-1}, v_4) \\ \omega(f'_r, v_4) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \omega(v_1, v_4) / \omega(v_1, v_2) \\ \varepsilon \frac{\omega(v_2, v_4)}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{\psi_-(\mathbf{p})}{\Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{p})} \\ x_0 \\ \frac{\omega(v_2, v_4)}{\lambda} \cdot \frac{\psi_+(\mathbf{p})}{\Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{p})} \\ \omega(v_1, v_2) \omega(v_0, v_4) / \sqrt{\Pi} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_1(\mathbf{p}) \\ \frac{\psi_-(\mathbf{p})}{\Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{p})} \\ x'_0 \\ \varepsilon \frac{\psi_+(\mathbf{p})}{\Delta^{1/2}(\mathbf{p})} \\ \varepsilon \beta_2(\mathbf{p}) \end{bmatrix} = [\tilde{\phi}_4(\pi_4(\mathbf{p})) + x'_0]$$

where $x'_0 := \varepsilon \lambda / \omega(v_2, v_4) \cdot x_0 \neq 0$. Indeed, the last equality holds by Lemma 3.10, which implies that $\gamma_2(\mathbf{p}) = \varepsilon(\alpha_1 \alpha_2^{-1} \beta_1^{-1} \beta_2 \gamma_1)(\mathbf{p})$.

Note that there exists an element $g' \in G_{r-2} < G_r$ such that $g'x_0 = e_{r-2} + (q(x'_0)/2)f_{r-2}$, and that

$$q(x'_0) = -q(\tilde{\phi}_4(\pi_4(\mathbf{p}))).$$

Therefore, $(g'g) \cdot \mathbf{p} = \Phi_4 \circ \pi_4(\mathbf{p})$, completing the proof of (iii).

The proof for the case $(\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 1)$, $r = 2$ is analogous, but requires a few modifications. We must replace everywhere in the argument above the set Ω_4 as in (A.17) by its co-null subset $\Omega'_4 \subset \Omega_4$ defined below, and the map ϕ_4 from (A.18) by $\phi'_4 : \Omega'_4 \rightarrow V_r$:

$$\Omega'_4 := \left\{ (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1) \in \Omega_4 \mid q(\tilde{\phi}_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1)) \neq 0 \right\},$$

$$\phi'_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1) := \tilde{\phi}_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1) + \sqrt{-q(\tilde{\phi}_4(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, c_1))} \cdot h. \quad \square$$

Remark A.8. The isomorphism $G_1 \backslash \mathcal{P}_1^5 \cong \mathbb{C}^2$ of Lebesgue spaces holds for the parameters $(\varepsilon, d) \in \{(+1, 1), (-1, 0)\}$. Indeed, in the classical setting (see Remark 3.7), any 5-tuple $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{P}_1^{\{(5)\}}$ is in the G_1 -orbit of the tuple $(\infty, 0, 1, a, b) \in \hat{\mathbb{C}}^5$ with $a = \alpha_0(\mathbf{p})$ and $b = \beta_0(\mathbf{p})$.

In the other case that is not covered by Proposition 3.11, namely $(\varepsilon, d) = (+1, 0)$ and $r = 2$, low dimensionality forces the extra relation $q(\tilde{\phi}_4(\pi_4(\mathbf{p}))) = 0$, which causes that $G_2 \backslash \mathcal{P}_2^5 \cong \mathbb{C}^4$.

REFERENCES

- [1] S.J. Bloch. *Higher regulators, algebraic K-theory, and zeta functions of elliptic curves*. CRM Monograph Series, 11. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000. (Cited on pages 2, 3, and 14.)
- [2] A. Borel, N. Wallach. *Continuous cohomology, discrete subgroups, and representations of reductive groups*. Second edition. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 67. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000. (Cited on page 1.)
- [3] M. Bucher, M. Burger, A. Iozzi. *The bounded Borel class and 3-manifold groups*. Duke Math. J. 167, no. 17 (2018), 3129–3169. (Cited on pages 2, 3, 13, 14, 16, and 24.)
- [4] M. Burger, A. Iozzi, A. Wienhard. *Surface group representations with maximal Toledo invariant*. Ann. Math. 172 (2010), no. 1, 517–566. (Cited on page 2.)
- [5] M. Burger, N. Monod. *Bounded cohomology of lattices in higher rank Lie groups*. J. Eur. Math. Soc. 1 (1999), no. 2, 199–235. (Cited on pages 1 and 11.)
- [6] M. Burger, N. Monod. *Continuous bounded cohomology and applications to rigidity theory*. Geom. Funct. Anal. 12 (2002), no. 2, 219–280. (Cited on page 1.)
- [7] M. Burger, N. Monod. *On and around the bounded cohomology of SL_2* . Rigidity in dynamics and geometry, 19–37, Springer, Berlin, 2002. (Cited on pages 2, 3, and 14.)
- [8] C. Campagnolo, F. Fournier-Facio, N. Heuer, M. Moraschini. *Bounded Cohomology and Simplicial Volume*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2022. (Cited on page 1.)
- [9] J. L. Dupont. *Bounds for characteristic numbers of flat bundles*. Algebraic topology, Aarhus 1978 (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Aarhus, Aarhus, 1978), pp. 109–119, Lecture Notes in Math., 763, Springer, Berlin, 1979. (Cited on page 1.)

- [10] C. De la Cruz Mengual, *On Bounded-Cohomological Stability for Classical Groups*. ETH Zurich (2019), Zurich. (Cited on page 5.)
- [11] C. De la Cruz Mengual, T. Hartnick. *A Quillen stability criterion for bounded cohomology*. arXiv preprint (2023), [arXiv:2307.12808](https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.12808). (Cited on pages 1, 5, and 11.)
- [12] C. De la Cruz Mengual, T. Hartnick. *Stabilization of Bounded Cohomology for Classical Groups*. arXiv preprint (2022), [arXiv:2201.03879](https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.03879). (Cited on pages 1, 3, 4, 5, and 12.)
- [13] J. Farre. *Relations in bounded cohomology*. J. Topol. 13 (2020), no. 3, 1084–1118. (Cited on page 2.)
- [14] R. Frigerio. *Bounded cohomology of discrete groups*. Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 227. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017. (Cited on pages 1 and 20.)
- [15] S. Galatius, A. Kupers, O. Randal-Williams. E_2 -cells and mapping class groups. Publ. Math., Inst. Hautes Étud. Sci. 130 (2019), 1–61. (Cited on pages 4 and 12.)
- [16] W. M. Goldman. *Complex hyperbolic geometry*. Oxford Mathematical Monographs. Oxford Science Publications. Clarendon Press. xx, 316 p.m Oxford, 1999. (Cited on page 8.)
- [17] A.B. Goncharov. *Explicit construction of characteristic classes*. I. M. Gel'fand Seminar, 169–210, Adv. Soviet Math., 16 (1993), Part 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI. (Cited on pages 2, 3, and 14.)
- [18] W. Greub, S. Halperin, R. Vanstone. *Connections, curvature and cohomology, Volume III: Cohomology of principal bundles and homogeneous spaces*. Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 47-III. Academic Press [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York–London, 1976. (Cited on page 1.)
- [19] M. Gromov. *Volume and bounded cohomology*. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. 56 (1982), 5–99. (Cited on page 1.)
- [20] T. Hartnick, A. Ott. *Bounded cohomology via partial differential equations, I*. Geom. Topol. 19 (2015), no. 6, 3603–3643. (Cited on page 2.)
- [21] T. Hartnick, A. Ott. *Surjectivity of the Comparison Map in Bounded Cohomology for Hermitian Lie Groups*. Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2012 (2012), no. 9, 2068–2093. (Cited on page 1.)
- [22] T. Kastenholz, R. J. Sroka. *Simplicial bounded cohomology and stability*. arXiv preprint (2023), [arXiv:2309.05024](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.05024). (Cited on pages 3 and 4.)
- [23] A. Korányi, H. M. Reimann. *The complex cross ratio on the Heisenberg group*. Enseign. Math., II. Sér. (1987), no. 33, 291–300. (Cited on page 8.)
- [24] B. Kostant. *The principal three-dimensional subgroup and the Betti numbers of a complex simple Lie group*. Am. J. Math. 81 (1959), 973–1032. (Cited on page 24.)
- [25] J-F. Lafont, B. Schmidt. *Simplicial volume of closed locally symmetric spaces of noncompact type*. Acta Math. 197 (2006), no. 1, 129–143. (Cited on page 1.)
- [26] M. Mimura, H. Toda. *Topology of Lie groups. I, II*. Translated from the 1978 Japanese edition by the authors. Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 91. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1991. (Cited on pages 1 and 23.)
- [27] N. Monod. *An invitation to bounded cohomology*. International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. II, 1183–1211, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006. (Cited on page 1.)
- [28] N. Monod. *Continuous bounded cohomology of locally compact groups*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1758. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. (Cited on pages 1, 11, 14, 19, 21, and 22.)
- [29] N. Monod. *Equivariant measurable liftings*. Fundam. Math. 230 (2015), no. 2, 149–165. (Cited on page 20.)
- [30] N. Monod. *Stabilization for SL_n in bounded cohomology*. Contemp. Math. 347 (2004), 191–202. (Cited on pages 2 and 3.)

- [31] A. L. Onishchik. *Topology of Transitive Transformation Groups*. Johann Ambrosius Barth Verlag GmbH, Leipzig (1994). (Cited on page 24.)
- [32] D. I. Panyushev. *On the Dynkin index of a principal \mathfrak{sl}_2 -subalgebra*. Adv. Math. 221 (2009), no. 4, 1115–1121. (Cited on page 24.)
- [33] J. D. Stasheff. *Continuous cohomology of groups and classifying spaces*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 84 (1978), no. 4, 513–530. (Cited on pages 1 and 23.)
- [34] T. Tao. *Exceptional isogenies between the classical groups*. Blog entry in "What's new" (11 March, 2011) <https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2011/03/11/exceptional-isogenies-between-the-classical-lie-groups/>. (Cited on pages 14 and 22.)
- [35] D.E. Taylor. *The geometry of the classical groups*. Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics, 9. Heldermann Verlag, Berlin, 1992. (Cited on page 7.)
- [36] B. L. van der Waerden. *Gruppen von Linearen Transformationen*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1935. (Cited on pages 14, 16, and 22.)
- [37] D. Zagier. *The dilogarithm function*. Frontiers in number theory, physics, and geometry. II, 3–65, Springer, Berlin, 2007. (Cited on pages 13 and 15.)
- [38] R. J. Zimmer. *Ergodic theory and semisimple groups*. Monographs in Mathematics, Vol. 81. Birkhäuser, Boston-Basel-Stuttgart, 1984. (Cited on page 7.)

FACULTY OF ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING, TECHNION, HAIFA, ISRAEL

Email address: c.delacruz@technion.ac.il