

A gentle introduction to Drinfel'd associators

Martin Bordemann, Andrea Rivezzi and Thomas Weigel

Abstract

In this paper we give an introduction to Drinfel'd's associator coming from the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connections and a self-contained proof of the hexagon and pentagon equations by means of minimal amounts of analysis or differential geometry: we rather use limits of concrete parallel transports.

Contents

Introduction	1
1 Some analysis for formal parallel transports	5
1.1 Elementary analysis of piecewise C^∞ -functions	5
1.2 Formal linear ODE's	8
1.3 Norms and limits	12
1.4 Formal connections and parallel transports	18
1.5 Flat formal connections	23
2 The Drinfel'd associator and its identities	24
2.1 The Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connection and the Drinfel'd-Kohno (Lie) algebras	24
2.2 The Drinfel'd associator: Definition and elementary properties	27
2.3 The Hexagon Equation	32
2.4 The Pentagon Equation	38
A Some Proofs of Theorems in Section 1.	49
A.1 Proof of Proposition 10	49
A.2 Proof of Proposition 12	49
A.3 Proof of Theorem 13	50
A.4 Proof of Corollary 14	51

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16T05, 16W60, 34M25, 53B05.

Keywords: Drinfel'd associator, Pentagon equation, Hexagon equation, Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connection, Parallel transports.

Introduction

This work will not contain any new result since the mid-1990s, but is meant to be a pedagogical approach to the celebrated work by V.G.Drinfel'd about the associator Φ (constructed by means of the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connections) satisfying the hexagon and pentagon equations, see [8] and [9].

Since its introduction, Drinfel'd's associator has seen many important applications such as the solution of the problem of the quantization of Lie bialgebras by P.I.Etingof and D.A.Kazhdan [12] (1996) (see also P. Ševera's work [30] (2016)), D.E.Tamarkin's approach [32] (1999) to M.L.Kontsevich's formality theorem in deformation quantization [24] (1997), and the solution of the problem of the quantization of Lie quasibialgebras by B.Enriquez and G.Halbout [10] and [11] in 2010, see also [29]. Moreover, regarding the associator as a formal power series in the free algebra generated by two distinct elements, its coefficients are directly related to multiple zeta values, see e.g. [13, p.209-213], thus establishing an important link to number theory.

The aim of this work is to give a detailed and –as we hope– self-contained account of the definition of the particular associator coming from the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connections and the proof of the hexagon and pentagon identities, which –in a nutshell– means the following: let \mathcal{A} be an arbitrary complex unital associative algebra. For any given elements $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ a Drinfel'd associator $\Phi(A, B)$ is an invertible formal power series of non-commutative polynomials in A, B (with formal parameter λ) for which we assume $\Phi(A, B)^{-1} = \Phi(B, A)$ and which satisfies two identities in the following context: for a positive integer $n \geq 2$ a finite family $(A_{ij})_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n}$ of elements of \mathcal{A} satisfies the *infinitesimal braid relations* iff

$$A_{ij} - A_{ji} = 0 \quad \forall 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n, \quad (0.1a)$$

$$[A_{ij} + A_{ik}, A_{jk}] = 0 \quad \forall i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ such that } \#\{i, j, k\} = 3, \quad (0.1b)$$

$$[A_{ij}, A_{kl}] = 0 \quad \forall i, j, k, l \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ such that } \#\{i, j, k, l\} = 4. \quad (0.1c)$$

The *Hexagon Equation* for Φ is the following identity for $n = 3$,

$$e^{\lambda i\pi(A_{13}+A_{23})} = \Phi(A_{13}, A_{12}) e^{\lambda i\pi A_{13}} \Phi(A_{23}, A_{13}) e^{\lambda i\pi A_{23}} \Phi(A_{12}, A_{23}), \quad (0.2)$$

and the *Pentagon Equation* for Φ is the following identity for $n = 4$,

$$\Phi(A_{12}, A_{23} + A_{24}) \Phi(A_{13} + A_{23}, A_{34}) = \Phi(A_{23}, A_{34}) \Phi(A_{12} + A_{13}, A_{24} + A_{34}) \Phi(A_{12}, A_{23}). \quad (0.3)$$

The problem of finding solutions is quite non-trivial: for instance, the naive choice $\Phi(A, B) = 1$ would solve the pentagon equation, but for non-commuting A_{13}, A_{23} it would clearly not solve the hexagon equation.

We shall only mention, but not treat at all the following nonexhaustive list of important results: there exist rational associators, see [8], [9], and the work by Bar-Natan, [3] (1998). Other associators have been constructed linked to the Kashiwara-Vergne conjecture by A.Y.Alekseev, B.Enriquez, C.Torossian [1] (2010). Moreover, non-trivial solutions of the

pentagon equations automatically satisfy a certain hexagon equation, see H.Furusho's work [15].

Drinfel'd's original method, see [8], [9], and also e.g. [18], [13], consists in the comparison of different global solutions (in certain simply connected regions of \mathbb{R}^N) of the linear system (a first order linear partial differential equation) defined by the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connection (see [19]) with respect to their pole structure at certain complex or real hyperplanes, referred to as 'monodromy', see also T.Kohno's work [22]. This approach is partially motivated by the theory of complex differential equations with singularities, compare for instance [5] or [7]. From a point of view of differential geometry this amounts to the computation of covariantly constant sections of a trivial vector bundle with respect to a flat connection which are uniquely determined by their value at a given point.

As far as we know most of the treatments of the Drinfel'd associator and its identities in the literature are somewhat sketchy, and in the beginning it had not been so clear to us how much analysis is really needed to understand the details: for instance, we had been confused by symbols like ' $z^{\lambda B}$ ' –where z is a complex coordinate in the some open domain of the complex plane, and B is a formal series in a given associative algebra– which appear in some texts without explanation and seem to require a proper treatment of complex logarithms. They resemble 'multivalued functions' which –according to Deligne, see [7, p.37, Déf. 6.2.]– should be defined as functions on the universal cover of the domain which in turn does not seem to be easily accessible to computations already in the important case of the doubly punctured plane. Another difficulty for us has been the understanding of the details of the limiting procedure encoded in Drinfel'd's 'zones' used in particular to prove the pentagon equation.

We have chosen a slightly more elementary method requiring only rudimentary analysis which may –as we hope– be interesting even to the most misoanalytic algebraist: since the value of a covariantly constant section (the solutions of the linear system) at some point x can be defined by the parallel transport along a continuous piecewise smooth path joining a reference point to x , we find it reasonable to focus on formal parallel transports (in the algebra of all formal power series in a given associative unital complex algebra, $\mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$), i.e. first order ordinary linear differential equations along concrete continuous piecewise smooth paths in explicitly given contractible regions of \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}^2 with respect to some flat formal connection deriving from the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connection. However, in Drinfel'd's approach the 'reference point' is –in some sense– 'at a singularity', and in order to capture that we use the well-known regularization procedure: first, we make paths within the domain depend on a strictly positive 'small' parameter δ such that in the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ these δ -dependent paths c_δ would be pushed to the boundary of these regions where the connection becomes singular. Then we compute the δ -dependent parallel transports within the domain where as usual a composition of paths corresponds to multiplication of the corresponding parallel transports in $\mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$. It will turn out that each such parallel transport $W^{(c_\delta)}$ factorizes in a product of invertible formal power series as

$$W^{(c_\delta)} = S^{(c_\delta)} G^{(c_\delta)} H^{(c_\delta)} \tag{0.4}$$

where $S^{(c_\delta)}$ is 'singular', i.e. diverging –in powers of $|\ln(\delta)|$ – for $\delta \rightarrow 0$, $G^{(c_\delta)}$ is 'good',

i.e. converging to a wanted term for $\delta \rightarrow 0$, and $H^{(c_\delta)}$ is ‘harmless’, i.e. converging to 1 for $\delta \rightarrow 0$ where the terms proportional to λ^n , $n > 0$, tend to zero dominated by a ‘power law’ δ^β , $\beta > 0$. Harmless terms will turn out to be stable by conjugation with singular terms. Parallel transports along different (composed) paths having the same initial and final points will be equal due to the flatness of the used connection –for instance the famous Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connection– thereby inducing algebraic identities: in all the important identities the singular terms cancel out for all strictly positive δ , and the remaining terms give the wanted identities in the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$.

The paper is organised as follows: §1 is an introduction to (formal) linear parallel transports in open subsets of \mathbb{R}^N to make explicit the methods used in §2 where Drinfel’d’s associator and its Hexagon and Pentagon identities are treated.

We recall in §1.1 the analysis of *piecewise C^∞ functions* (in the particular sense of a finite number of discontinuities where left-hand and right-hand limits exist): it turns out to be quite useful to view them as functions only defined on the open subset of the defining interval given by the complement of the finite set of singularities and not to define values at the singularities except when they are continuous. We believe that mentioning some details about these functions may be useful when later smooth paths are composed in the sense of algebraic topology thereby remaining continuous but being in general only piecewise smooth at the glueing points, see for instance [21, p.71, Prop.3.3]. It comes with no surprise that there is a Theorem completely analogous to the Fundamental Theorem of Analysis for the piecewise case, see Theorem 1.

In §1.2 we briefly review certain *formal linear ordinary differential equations* (which is a particular case of K.-T.Chen’s classical work [4]) defined by a left multiplication in the space of all formal power series with coefficients in an arbitrary associative unital algebra \mathcal{A}

$$\frac{dW_{\cdot\alpha}}{ds} = \lambda Y W_{\cdot\alpha} \quad \text{and} \quad W_{\alpha\alpha} = 1$$

where Y is a suitable formal power series of piecewise C^∞ -functions taking values in \mathcal{A} : here each component Y_r , $r \in \mathbb{N}$, is in the algebraic tensor product of the algebra of piecewise smooth complex valued functions on an interval and \mathcal{A} . Thanks to the presence of the formal parameter, the existence and uniqueness theory of the solutions $s \mapsto W_{s\alpha}$ (which are required to be continuous) is quite elementary and algebraic and does not require any additional topological structures on \mathcal{A} . The formulation by the well-known *iterated integrals* (see (1.14)) is automatical, and the relations with the ‘vector fields’ Y and their ‘propagators’ $W_{\beta\alpha}$ with respect to reparametrization is resumed in Proposition 2.

§1.3 is devoted to a simple framework to consider *limits of propagators* when the vector fields Y depend on one or more nonformal ‘small’ parameters $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta, \epsilon, \dots)$: for these limits, an arbitrary norm is chosen on the complex vector space \mathcal{A} (which will in general not be a normed algebra), and there can be many non equivalent ones. However, for each power of the formal parameter the limits will be done separately, and it is crucial from the choice of the restricted frame in which Y and hence W are considered that for each power of the formal parameter the subspace of \mathcal{A} spanned by all the relevant coefficients is always finite-dimensional, hence the restriction of the chosen norm to these subspaces

is well-known to be equivalent to the restriction of any other norm on \mathcal{A} to the same subspaces. This allows to define limits $\delta, \epsilon \rightarrow 0$ compatible with the algebra structure independently on the norm chosen on \mathcal{A} , see Proposition 3. We also include a definition and some properties of the subspace of parameter dependent elements whose norm (order by order) is bounded by powers of the parameter or by powers of its logarithm, see Proposition 4 and Lemma 7. This will become important to make precise the terms appearing in the factorization equation (0.4).

The last two Sections §1.4 and §1.5 deal with *formal linear connections* Γ (in trivial bundles) linking given *continuous piecewise smooth paths* with formal linear ODEs: their propagators are the well-known parallel transports of differential geometry, see e.g. [21, p.68]. We recall their invariance by reparametrization and their multiplicativity with respect to composition of paths and the simple relations with pull-backs, see Theorem 9. In case the connection is flat (see e.g. [21, p.92]) parallel transports are independent of paths in star-shaped open sets of \mathbb{R}^N . We provide the proofs of these theorems, see Theorem 13, Lemma 25, and Corollary 14 in detail as well as the relation to complex coordinates in the Appendix.

In the second part we recall the *Drinfel'd-Kohno (Lie) algebras*, *complex configuration spaces* Y_n , and the *Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connections* in §2.1. In §2.2 we give a definition of the *Drinfel'd associator* as the non singular part of a parallel transport in the open unit interval from $\delta > 0$ to $1 - \epsilon < 1$ with $0 < \delta, \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{4}$: this has been inspired by the quantity $G_a(1 - a)$ (for $0 < a < 1$) in [18, p.465], and we prove the factorization equation (see [18, p.465, Lemma XIX.6.3]) in Theorem 20: we are using the trick to split the path $\delta \rightarrow 1 - \epsilon$ in two halves (using the midpoint $1/2$) parametrized in an ‘exponential way’ which give two ‘square roots’ of the parallel transport each having only one singular factor, see Lemma 19, and are surprisingly easy to estimate. By parametrization invariance of parallel transports this leads to Drinfel'd’s original definition [9, p.833, equation (2.1)]. Having two parameters proves to be useful later when proving the Hexagon and Pentagon identities: this will be done in Sections §2.3 and §2.4.

For the proof of the *Hexagon equation*, see (0.2) and (2.27), in §2.3 one chooses a pull-back of the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connection from Y_3 to the doubly punctured plane $\mathbb{C}^{\times \times}$, and we consider the parallel transport along a loop (dependent on the small parameter δ) in the complement of the upper half plane composed of three line segments and three lower half circles. Using a certain cyclic symmetry of the doubly punctured plane (given by three simple explicit complex rational functions) we just have to compute the parallel transport along one of the half circles which gives an exponential function times a ‘harmless’ term going to 1 for $\delta \rightarrow 0$ whereas the parallel transports along the line segments give associators and singular terms: the latter are shown to cancel out of the equation.

Finally, §2.4 is devoted to the proof of the *Pentagon Equation*, see (0.3): here, as in Drinfel'd’s work [9, p.834] we first use the wedge $x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4$ in \mathbb{R}^4 , set $x_1 = 0$ and $x_4 = 1$, and choose five line segments in the remaining x_2 - x_3 -plane depending on two scales δ and δ^2 according to an interpretation of Drinfel'd’s ‘zones’, cf. [8, p.1454] or [9, p.834]. The identities of the parallel transports along these five paths (w.r.t the pull-back of the Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connection on Y_4) will give the Pentagon Equation in the limit

$\delta \rightarrow 0$ after having shown the factorization into singular, bounded, and harmless terms and the cancellation of the singular terms, see Theorems 23 and 24.

Conventions and Notations

The symbol \mathcal{A} will always denote a unital associative algebra over the field of all complex numbers \mathbb{C} . Unadorned tensor products will always refer to tensor products over \mathbb{C} , i.e. $\otimes = \otimes_{\mathbb{C}}$. For a non-empty set M and a complex vector space E the symbol $\text{Fun}(M, E)$ will denote the complex vector space of all E -valued maps $M \rightarrow E$. Next, our formal parameter λ is equal to Drinfel'd's $\frac{\hbar}{2\pi i}$, the latter being denoted by \bar{h} in [18].

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank A.Appel, P.Clavier, F.Corniquel, S.Goette, B.Hurle, D.Manchon, D.Panazzolo and S.Waldmann for useful discussions.

1 Some analysis for formal parallel transports

Let \mathcal{A} be a fixed associative unital complex algebra. We write $\mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$ for the $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -module of all formal power series with coefficients in \mathcal{A} which itself is an associative unital algebra over the ring $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$.

1.1 Elementary analysis of piecewise \mathcal{C}^∞ -functions

This Section recalls piecewise smooth functions because later on we shall need parallel transports along composed paths which are in general not smooth at the ‘gluing point’. The generalization to piecewise \mathcal{C}^k -functions is immediate, but not necessary for the sequel. For two given real numbers $a < b$ let $]a, b[$ denote the open interval of all real numbers s such that $a < s < b$. Recall the complex vector space $\mathcal{C}^k(]a, b[, \mathbb{C})$ of all complex-valued functions on $]a, b[$ whose r th derivatives all exist and are continuous for all orders r if $k = \infty$, respectively. By means of pointwise multiplication it is a unital commutative and associative complex algebra. Write $\mathcal{C}^\infty(U, \mathbb{C})$ for the obvious generalization whenever $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ is a finite union of open intervals.

Next, we have to speak about piecewise such functions in the more restricted sense of finitely many ‘nice’ discontinuities, see e.g. [2, p.158, Def. IV.4.2]: we have chosen a formulation avoiding the choice of values at the ‘singular points’. More precisely: let $[a, b]$ be the closed interval of all real numbers s such that $a \leq s \leq b$. Choose a finite subset $D \subset [a, b]$ which contains a, b , hence D is of the general form $D = \{a = a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_m < a_{m+1} := b\}$ where m is a non-negative integer. We shall refer to D as the (potential) *singular set* and to its open dense complement $[a, b] \setminus D$ as the *regular set*. Define the space of all **piecewise**

\mathcal{C}^∞ -functions on $[a, b]$ with singular set $D \subset [a, b]$ in the following slightly unusual way:

$$\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty([a, b] \setminus D, \mathbb{C}) \mid \forall r, i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } 1 \leq i \leq m+1 : \right. \\ \left. \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} f^{(r)}(a_i - \epsilon) \text{ exists and } \forall 0 \leq i \leq m : \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} f^{(r)}(a_i + \epsilon) \text{ exists} \right\} \quad (1.1)$$

where $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ means that only strictly positive real numbers ϵ are considered in the limit. In other words, each element f of $\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$ is a \mathcal{C}^∞ -function outside the singular set D , and left-side and right-side limits of all the higher derivatives at the singular points both have to exist, but need not be equal. It follows that the restriction of each $f^{(r)}$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$, to each open interval $]a_i, a_{i+1}[$, $0 \leq i \leq m$, uniquely extends to a continuous function $f_i^{(r)}$ defined on the closed interval $[a_i, a_{i+1}]$ by means of the right-side limit at a_i and the left-side limit at a_{i+1} . It is clear that for each finite set D such that $\{a, b\} \subset D \subset [a, b]$ the complex vector space $\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$ is a unital commutative associative algebra (with respect to pointwise multiplication on the regular subset) thanks to the Leibniz rule of higher order derivatives, see e.g. [2, p. 178], and we have the canonical maps

$$\forall D \subset D' : \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}_{D'}^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$$

induced by the obvious restrictions which are injections since the regular sets are dense in the closed interval $[a, b]$. These injections are morphisms of unital complex algebras. We shall not denote them explicitly. Moreover, the usual derivative (defined only on the regular set $[a, b] \setminus D$) clearly is compatible with left- and right-sided limits and thus induces a derivation of algebras

$$\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) : f \mapsto \frac{df}{ds}. \quad (1.2)$$

We shall very often need the following subalgebra of $\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$:

$$\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0 := \{ f \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \mid f \text{ extends to a continuous function } [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \}. \quad (1.3)$$

Clearly, the existence of this continuous extension is equivalent to the fact that left-side and right-side limits at the singular points of f (but not necessarily of its higher order derivatives) coincide, whence it is unique if it exists. Note that for these spaces the usual evaluation at $\alpha \in [a, b]$ of a function makes sense as opposed to the general case where no value at the singular points is defined. We shall also need to compose these piecewise \mathcal{C}^∞ -functions: in addition to the closed interval $[a, b]$ and the singular subset $\{a, b\} \subset D \subset [a, b]$ choose another closed interval $[a', b']$ (where $a' < b'$ are real numbers) and a finite subset $D' = \{a' = a'_0 < a'_1 < \dots < a'_{m'} < a'_{m'+1} = b'\}$ of $[a', b']$ such that $\{a', b'\} \subset D' \subset [a', b']$. We shall call a piecewise \mathcal{C}^∞ function θ on $[a', b']$ with singular set D' *compatible with* $[a, b]$ and D if the following condition is satisfied:

$$\theta([a', b'] \setminus D) \subset [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta|^{-1}(D) \text{ is finite subset of } [a', b'] \quad (1.4)$$

where $\theta|$ denotes the \mathcal{C}^∞ -function $[a', b'] \setminus D' \rightarrow [a, b]$ outside its singular set. It is immediate that the composition $f \circ \theta$ is a well-defined function on $[a', b'] \setminus (D' \cup \theta|^{-1}(D))$, and the iterated chain rule (also called Faa di Bruno Theorem, see e.g. [2, p.291, equation (3)]) shows that it is a \mathcal{C}^∞ -function. The left-side and right-side limits of the r th derivative $f \circ \theta$ at the singular points in $D' \cup \theta|^{-1}(D)$ exist which easily follows from the continuity of the continuous extensions $\theta_j^{(r)} : [a'_j, a'_{j+1}] \rightarrow [a, b]$ of the restriction of $\theta^{(r)}$ to $]a'_j, a'_{j+1}[$ for all integers $r \geq 0$ and $0 \leq j \leq m'$. Hence, we can define the composition

$$f \circ \theta \in \mathcal{C}_{D' \cup \theta|^{-1}(D)}^\infty([a', b'], \mathbb{C}). \quad (1.5)$$

It is not hard to see that the chain rule works for this composition and differentiation (1.2). Next, we need to use the well-known *Riemann integral*: note that for every element $f \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$ and $\alpha, \beta \in [a, b]$ we can define the Riemann integral

$$I_\alpha^\beta(f) := \begin{cases} \int_\alpha^\beta \hat{f}(s) ds & \text{if } \alpha \leq \beta \\ -\int_\beta^\alpha \hat{f}(s) ds & \text{if } \alpha \geq \beta \end{cases} \quad (1.6)$$

where \hat{f} is any extension of f from $[a, b] \setminus D$ to $[a, b]$ (for instance $\hat{f}(a_i) = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq N + 1$: it is well-known that any such extension is Riemann integrable and that the integral does not depend on the extension, that is which values of \hat{f} are chosen at the singular points contained in the domain of integration, see e.g. [25, p.273]. Recall Chasles's rule for any $f \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$:

$$\forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in [a, b] : \quad I_\alpha^\gamma(f) = I_\alpha^\beta(f) + I_\beta^\gamma(f).$$

Recall that the complex-valued function $[a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined for every $f \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$ by

$$I_\alpha(f)(s) := I_\alpha^s(f)$$

is the usual *primitive of f* . We resume the following properties of the primitive which are well-known variants of the fundamental theorem of calculus and standard integration techniques:

Theorem 1. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a < b$, and let $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a finite set such that $\{a, b\} \subset D \subset [a, b]$. Then for any $f, g \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$ and $h \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0$ the following holds:*

i.) *For any $\alpha \in [a, b]$ the primitive I_α defines a \mathbb{C} -linear map $\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0$ whence $I_\alpha(f)$ is always continuous. Moreover,*

$$I_\alpha(f)(\alpha) = 0. \quad (1.7)$$

ii.) *Fundamental theorem of calculus: for the derivatives (in the sense of (1.2)) we get*

$$\frac{dI_\alpha(f)}{ds} = f \quad \text{and} \quad I_\alpha\left(\frac{dh}{ds}\right) = h - h(\alpha). \quad (1.8)$$

Moreover, any element $F \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0$ satisfying $\frac{dF}{ds} = f$ and $F(\alpha) = 0$ is equal to $I_\alpha(f)$.

iii.) Let $a', b' \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a' < b'$, let D' be a finite set with $\{a', b'\} \subset D' \subset [a', b']$, let $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_{D'}^\infty([a', b'], \mathbb{R})^0$ such that θ is compatible with $[a, b]$ and D , see (1.4). Then the composition $f \circ \theta$ (see (1.5)) is in $\mathcal{C}_{D' \cup \theta^{-1}(D)}^\infty([a', b'], \mathbb{C})$. Moreover, for each $\alpha' \in [a', b']$ there is the usual ‘change-of-variables-rule’

$$I_{\theta(\alpha')}(f) \circ \theta = I_{\alpha'} \left((f \circ \theta) \frac{d\theta}{ds} \right) \quad (1.9)$$

where both sides of the preceding equation are elements of $\mathcal{C}_{D' \cup \theta^{-1}(D)}^\infty([a', b'], \mathbb{C})^0$.

Remark for the proof: see e.g. Lang’s book [25, p.272-274] for the proof of all the statements. The fact that the primitive of a piecewise continuous function is continuous is standard and follows from Chasles’s rule and the fact that piecewise continuity of f implies that any extension \hat{f} of f is bounded on $[a, b]$. The other statements follow on the regular set from their well-known analogues for continuous functions. Note that the continuity of F in statement ii.) is crucial: the derivative of $F - I_\alpha(f)$ vanishes on the regular points which implies by continuity that $F - I_\alpha(f)$ is an overall constant continuous function being zero thanks to $F(\alpha) = 0 = I_\alpha(f)(\alpha)$. The last equation (1.9) follows from the preceding consideration by derivation of both sides on the regular points, the fundamental theorem (left equation in (1.8) and the normalization condition (1.7).

We shall call a triple $(\theta, [a', b'], D')$ consisting of a continuous map $\theta : [a', b'] \rightarrow [a, b]$ satisfying the hypotheses of statement iii.) of the preceding Theorem 1 a **continuous piecewise \mathcal{C}^∞ reparametrization of $([a, b], D)$** .

1.2 Formal linear ODE’s

In this Section we review a particular case of the general theory described in K.-T.Chen’s classical work [4, p.110-115].

Fix an arbitrary associative unital complex algebra \mathcal{A} , two arbitrary real numbers a, b such that $a < b$, an arbitrary finite subset D of the real numbers such that $\{a, b\} \subset D \subset [a, b]$. Consider the complex commutative associative unital algebra $\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$ of all piecewise complex-valued \mathcal{C}^∞ -functions on $[a, b]$ with potential singular set D , see §1.1 for details. Form the algebraic tensor product $\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}$ and consider the $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -module of all formal power series with coefficients in $\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}$,

$$\left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]]. \quad (1.10)$$

Note that the preceding $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -module is again an associative unital algebra over $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ (with respect to the tensor product multiplication and the Cauchy product of formal power series). Note further that each element F in this algebra can canonically be considered as a function from $[a, b] \setminus D$ to $\mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$, and we shall sometimes use the notation $s \mapsto F(s) = \sum_{r=0}^\infty F_r(s) \lambda^r$. However, the algebra (1.10) is in general much smaller than the space of

all ‘suitable’ functions $[a, b] \setminus D$ to $\mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$ where things like continuity are more delicate to deal with, in particular in the important case of an infinite-dimensional \mathcal{A} . Observe that every element F in the algebra (1.10) is thus a formal power series $F = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} F_r \lambda^r$ such that for each non-negative integer r the component F_r is a **finite sum of terms** of the form $f \otimes A$ with $f \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}$. We shall discuss this important point in more detail in §1.3.

Tensoring the usual derivative $\frac{d}{ds}$, see (1.2), with the identity map on \mathcal{A} and extending on formal power series in the usual ‘componentwise’ way we get a ‘derivative’ of the algebra (1.10) which is again a derivation of algebras. We shall denote it by the same symbol $\frac{d}{ds}$. In a completely analogous way we can extend the Riemann integral I_α^β and the primitive I_α to the algebras (1.10) where we shall continue to use the same symbols. It is obvious that I_α^β takes its values in $\mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$ and that all the statements of Theorem 1 remain true when f, g and h are replaced by elements in the corresponding algebras (1.10).

Fix $Y \in \left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}\right)[[\lambda]]$. We consider the following formal linear ordinary differential equation (formal linear ODE)

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\omega}{ds} &= \lambda Y \omega \\ \omega(\alpha) &= \omega_\alpha \end{cases} \quad (1.11)$$

where $\alpha \in [a, b]$, the ‘initial value’ ω_α is an element of $\mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$, and we look for solutions

$$\omega \in \left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0 \otimes \mathcal{A}\right)[[\lambda]],$$

of the differential equation (1.11) whence ω **is required to be continuous** and piecewise \mathcal{C}^∞ . The theory of existence and uniqueness of these formal linear ODEs is well-known to be much simpler than the one of the usual differential equations. Indeed, first there is the usual reformulation in terms of integral equations known from usual ODE theory: suppose first that ω is a continuous piecewise \mathcal{C}^∞ solution of (1.11). Taking primitives on both sides gives –using in Theorem 1 the second equation of (1.8)– the ‘integral equation’

$$\omega = \omega_\alpha + \lambda I_\alpha(Y\omega) \quad (1.12)$$

where ω_α is considered as the constant function on $[a, b]$ with value ω_α . On the other hand, if the continuous piecewise \mathcal{C}^∞ element ω is a solution of the formal integral equation (1.12), then $\omega(\alpha) = \omega_\alpha$ by (1.7), and differentiation of the integral equation –using the first equation of (1.8)– gives the formal linear ODE (1.11).

Next, solving the formal integral equation (1.12) is quite simple due to the presence of the factor λ in front of Y : consider the following $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -linear maps

$$\begin{aligned} L_Y : \left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0 \otimes \mathcal{A}\right)[[\lambda]] &\rightarrow \left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}\right)[[\lambda]] \\ F &\mapsto L_Y(F) := YF \end{aligned}$$

and

$$I_\alpha : \left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]] \rightarrow \left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0 \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]].$$

Then the composition $I_\alpha \circ L_Y$ is a well-defined $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -linear endomorphism of the $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -module $\left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0 \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]]$. Hence, the formal integral equation (1.12) can be rewritten as

$$(\text{id} - \lambda I_\alpha \circ L_Y)(\omega) = \omega_\alpha, \quad \text{hence} \quad \omega = (\text{id} - \lambda I_\alpha \circ L_Y)^{-1}(\omega_\alpha) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r (I_\alpha \circ L_Y)^{or}(\omega_\alpha) \quad (1.13)$$

since it is obvious –thanks to the presence of the factor λ – that the formal series $\text{id} - \lambda I_\alpha \circ L_Y$ is always invertible in the algebra of all $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -linear endomorphisms of $\left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0 \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]]$ seen as a $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -module by the usual geometric series formula. Note that the formula (1.13) is very often written out in terms of **iterated integrals**:

$$\omega(s) = \omega_\alpha + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \lambda^r \left(\int_\alpha^s \left(\hat{Y}(s_1) \int_\alpha^{s_1} \left(\hat{Y}(s_2) \int_\alpha^{s_2} \left(\cdots \int_\alpha^{s_{r-1}} \hat{Y}(s_r) ds_r \right) \cdots ds_3 \right) ds_2 \right) ds_1 \right) \omega_\alpha \quad (1.14)$$

where \hat{Y} denotes any extension of Y from $[a, b] \setminus D$ to $[a, b]$. We shall write $W_\alpha := (s \mapsto W_{s\alpha})$ for the particular solution ω of the formal ODE (1.11) with initial condition $\omega_\alpha = 1$, the unit element of the algebra $\left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0 \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]]$, hence

$$\begin{cases} \frac{dW_\alpha}{ds} = \lambda Y W_\alpha \\ W_\alpha(\alpha) = W_{\alpha\alpha} = 1 \end{cases} \quad (1.15)$$

and refer to it as the *fundamental solution of the formal ODE (1.11) normalized at α* , see e.g. [5, p.69]. Moreover, we shall refer to the value of the fundamental solution W_α at $\beta \in [a, b]$,

$$W_{\beta\alpha} := W_\alpha(\beta) \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]] \quad (1.16)$$

as the *propagator* (from α to β).

We collect some properties of the above formal linear ODE's in the following

Proposition 2. *With the above-mentioned hypotheses and notations we have the following:*

- i.) *Every formal linear ODE (1.11) has a unique (continuous!) solution ω given by the formulas (1.13) or (1.14). It can be expressed by the fundamental solution W_α normalized at α in the following way:*

$$\omega = W_\alpha \omega_\alpha. \quad (1.17)$$

- ii.) **Groupoid properties:** *Every fundamental solution W_α has only invertible values in $\mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$, and for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in [a, b]$ we have the following identities for the propagators*

$$W_{\alpha\alpha} = 1, \quad W_{\gamma\beta} W_{\beta\alpha} = W_{\gamma\alpha}, \quad W_{\alpha\beta} = W_{\beta\alpha}^{-1}. \quad (1.18)$$

iii.) **Reparametrization:** Let $a', b' \in \mathbb{R}$ with $a' < b'$, let D' be a finite set with $\{a', b'\} \subset D' \subset [a', b']$, let $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a', b'], \mathbb{R})^0$ be a continuous piecewise \mathcal{C}^∞ reparametrization of $([a, b], D)$, see (1.4). Let $\alpha' \in [a', b']$, and let $W_{\theta(\alpha')}$ the fundamental solution of (1.15) normalized at $\theta(\alpha')$. Then $W'_{\alpha'} := W_{\theta(\alpha')} \circ \theta$ is a fundamental solution normalized at α' of the formal linear ODE

$$\frac{dW'_{\alpha'}}{ds'} = (Y \circ \theta) \frac{d\theta}{ds'} W'_{\alpha'}, \quad \text{hence } \forall \alpha, \beta \in [a, b]: \quad W'_{\beta'\alpha'} = W_{\theta(\beta')\theta(\alpha')} \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]. \quad (1.19)$$

Moreover, the propagator $W_{\beta\alpha}$ only depends on the values of Y between α and β .

iv.) **Factorization:** Let $Y = Y_0 + Z$ with $Y_0, Z \in (\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A})[[\lambda]]$, and let W_α and U_α be the fundamental solutions normalized at α for the formal linear ODE's

$$\frac{dW_\alpha}{ds} = \lambda Y W_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{dU_\alpha}{ds} = \lambda Y_0 U_\alpha.$$

Then W_α factorizes in the following way:

$$W_\alpha = U_\alpha \Xi_\alpha \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{d\Xi_\alpha}{ds} = \lambda (U_\alpha^{-1} Z U_\alpha) \Xi_\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \Xi_{\alpha\alpha} = 1. \quad (1.20)$$

v.) Suppose that $Y I_\alpha(Y) = I_\alpha(Y) Y$. Then the fundamental solution W_α of the formal linear ODE (1.15) is explicitly given by

$$W_\alpha = e^{\lambda I_\alpha(Y)}. \quad (1.21)$$

Sketch of the proof: i.) Existence and uniqueness follow from the considerations in (1.13), and (1.17) can be read off (1.14).

ii.) Again by (1.13) and (1.14) it is immediate that W_α is a formal series in the associative unital algebra $(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0 \otimes \mathcal{A})[[\lambda]]$ whose constant term is 1, hence it is obviously invertible by a similar geometric series argument. The first equation of (1.18) is part of the definition (1.15). For the second note that W_β and W_α satisfy the same formal linear ODE with initial condition (at β) 1 and $W_{\beta\alpha}$, respectively. Hence, by (1.17) we get $W_\alpha = W_\beta W_{\beta\alpha}$ which gives the second equation of (1.18) upon choosing $s = \gamma$. The third equation of (1.18) follows from the first and the second upon setting $\alpha = \gamma$.

iii.) Equation (1.19) is an easy consequence of the chain rule and equation (1.11). The last statement follows either directly from the iterated integral form (1.14) or by choosing –assuming that $\alpha \leq \beta$ without loss of generality– $[a', b'] = [\alpha, \beta]$ and $\theta : [\alpha, \beta] \rightarrow [a, b]$ the canonical injection.

iv.) Using the well-known formula $\frac{d(U_\alpha^{-1})}{ds} = -U_\alpha^{-1} \frac{dU_\alpha}{ds} U_\alpha^{-1}$ gives the result upon differentiating $\Xi_\alpha = U_\alpha^{-1} W_\alpha$.

v.) For each positive integer r , differentiating the r th power of $I_\alpha(Y)^r$ we get $r Y I_\alpha(Y)^{r-1}$ thanks to the hypothesis $Y I_\alpha(Y) = I_\alpha(Y) Y$ which shows the result when differentiating the exponential series $e^{\lambda I_\alpha(Y)} = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^r}{r!} I_\alpha(Y)^r$.

1.3 Norms and limits

We shall have to discuss limits of solutions of formal linear ODE's given by elements Y of the algebra (1.10) depending on a parameter $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ in some subset $\mathbf{J} \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$, and we are interested in 'limits' when $\boldsymbol{\delta} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\delta}_0$ where $\boldsymbol{\delta}_0$ is an accumulation point of \mathbf{J} . Since the complex associative unital algebra \mathcal{A} is completely arbitrary, we have to include a discussion to make sense of these limits.

Recall that a *norm* on a complex vector-space E is a map $\|\cdot\| : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ taking only non-negative values, satisfying $\|\xi\| = 0$ iff $\xi = 0$ for all $\xi \in E$, satisfying $\|z\xi\| = |z| \|\xi\|$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\xi \in E$, and satisfying the triangular inequality $\|\xi + \eta\| \leq \|\xi\| + \|\eta\|$ for all $\xi, \eta \in E$. Every vector subspace $V \subset E$ is automatically a normed space with respect to the restriction of the norm to V . It is easy to see that every complex vector space has at least one norm: in fact, let $\mathbf{B} := (e_i)_{i \in \mathfrak{S}}$ be a basis for E labeled by the set \mathfrak{S} : every vector $\xi \in E$ is a linear combination $\xi = \sum_{i \in \mathfrak{S}} x_i e_i$ where all the $x_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and the subset of \mathfrak{S} for which $x_i \neq 0$ is finite. Define

$$\|\xi\|_{\mathbf{B}} = \|\xi\| := \max \{|x_i| \mid i \in \mathfrak{S}\}, \quad (1.22)$$

and the norm properties are easy to check directly. E can also be considered as a subspace of the Banach space of all bounded functions $\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ equipped with the sup-norm, but this remark is not necessary for the elementary treatment presented here.

Having a norm allows us to define *limits*: more precisely, for a given positive integer ℓ let $\mathbf{J} \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$ be a non-empty set, and let $\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, E)$ denote the complex vector space of all maps $\mathbf{J} \rightarrow E$. Fix a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on E , some norm $|\cdot|$ on \mathbb{R}^ℓ , and a function $f \in \text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, E)$. Let $\boldsymbol{\delta}_0$ be an accumulation point of \mathbf{J} . For any $\zeta \in E$ recall the following definition of a limit:

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\delta}_0} f(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = \zeta \text{ w.r.t. } \|\cdot\| \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}, \epsilon > 0 \exists \epsilon' \in \mathbb{R}, \epsilon' > 0 : \forall \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbf{J} : \\ \text{if } |\boldsymbol{\delta} - \boldsymbol{\delta}_0| < \epsilon' \text{ then } \|f(\boldsymbol{\delta}) - \zeta\| < \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (1.23)$$

As usual, if the limit exists, it is unique. However, the existence of the limit a priori depends on the norms $|\cdot|$ and $\|\cdot\|$ used. Recall that two norms $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|'$ on E are called *equivalent* if:

$$\exists C_1, C_2 \in \mathbb{R}, C_1, C_2 > 0 \quad \forall \xi \in E : \quad C_1 \|\xi\| \leq \|\xi\|' \leq C_2 \|\xi\|.$$

Hence, if the norms $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|'$ on E are equivalent and if the norms $|\cdot|$ and $|\cdot|'$ on \mathbb{R}^ℓ are equivalent, it is easy to see that in (1.23) the statement using $\|\cdot\|$ and $|\cdot|$ is equivalent to the one using $\|\cdot\|'$ and $|\cdot|'$: in this case the limit does not depend on the norms used. In general, two given norms on a complex vector space are not equivalent; however, in the very important case of a *finite-dimensional* vector space it is well-known that any two norms are equivalent, see e.g. [25, p.145, Thm.4.3.]. This always applies to the norms $|\cdot|$ and $|\cdot|'$ on \mathbb{R}^ℓ in statement (1.23), but in general not to the norms $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|'$ on E . In this manuscript the relevant limits will always 'take place' in finite-dimensional subspaces

of the algebra $\mathcal{A} = E$ thereby insuring that the computation of limits will not depend on the norms chosen. More precisely, consider the following algebra

$$\left(\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}\right)[[\lambda]]. \quad (1.24)$$

Each element F of this algebra is a formal power series $F = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r F_r$ where each component F_r is an element of $\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}$, hence can be considered as a map $\mathbf{J} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, and choosing a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathcal{A} and a norm $|\cdot|$ on $\mathbb{R}^\ell \supset \mathbf{J}$ —among all the equivalent ones— we can consider limits $F_r \rightarrow \xi_r \in \mathcal{A}$ for each non-negative integer r separately in the sense of definition (1.23). For any $\xi = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r \xi_r \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$ we thus define limits componentwise for each F in the algebra (1.24):

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} F(\delta) = \xi \text{ w.r.t. } \|\cdot\| \quad \text{iff} \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{N} : \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} F_r(\delta) = \xi_r \text{ w.r.t. } \|\cdot\|. \quad (1.25)$$

We enumerate some important properties of limits in the algebra (1.24) in the following

Proposition 3. *Let $\mathbf{J} \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$ as above, let $\delta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^\ell$ be an accumulation point of \mathbf{J} , and let $F = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r F_r$ be an element of $\left(\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}\right)[[\lambda]]$.*

i.) For each $r \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a finite-dimensional subspace $V_r^{(F)} = V_r$ of \mathcal{A} such that for each $r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$F_r \in \text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes V_r. \quad (1.26)$$

ii.) Let $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|'$ be two norms on the complex vector space \mathcal{A} , and let $\xi = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r \xi_r \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$. Then the statement

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} F(\delta) = \xi \text{ w.r.t. } \|\cdot\| \quad \text{is equivalent to} \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} F(\delta) = \xi \text{ w.r.t. } \|\cdot\|',$$

hence limits in the algebra (1.24) do not depend on the norms used.

iii.) Let $\tilde{F} = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r \tilde{F}_r$ be another element of $\left(\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}\right)[[\lambda]]$, and let $\tilde{\xi} \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$ such that $\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} \tilde{F}(\delta) = \tilde{\xi}$ with respect to any norm on \mathcal{A} . Then for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$:

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} \left(\alpha F(\delta) + \beta \tilde{F}(\delta) \right) = \alpha \lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} F(\delta) + \beta \lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} \tilde{F}(\delta) = \alpha \xi + \beta \tilde{\xi} \quad (1.27)$$

and

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} \left(F(\delta) \tilde{F}(\delta) \right) = \left(\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} F(\delta) \right) \left(\lim_{\delta \rightarrow \delta_0} \tilde{F}(\delta) \right) = \xi \tilde{\xi}. \quad (1.28)$$

Proof. *i.)* By definition of the algebraic tensor product each F_r is a finite sum $F_{r1} \otimes A_{r1} + \dots + F_{rN_r} \otimes A_{rN_r}$ where N_r is a non-negative integer, F_{r1}, \dots, F_{rN_r} are functions $J \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and A_{r1}, \dots, A_{rN_r} are elements of \mathcal{A} . Defining V_r as the complex linear hull of A_{r1}, \dots, A_{rN_r} proves the statement.

ii.) We shall prove a slightly more general statement: for each non-negative integer r let V_r' be another finite-dimensional subspace of \mathcal{A} such that (1.26) is satisfied. Then each F_r clearly is an element of $\text{Fun}(J, \mathbb{C}) \otimes (V_r \cap V_r')$. We can enlarge each V_r, V_r' by at most one dimension to include ξ_r . From the definition of the limit (1.23), it is clear that it suffices to look at the restrictions of the norms $\| \cdot \|$ and $\| \cdot \|'$ on \mathcal{A} to the finite-dimensional subspaces V_r, V_r' and $V_r \cap V_r'$: the restriction of the norm $\| \cdot \|$ to $V_r \cap V_r'$ is equivalent to the restriction of the norm $\| \cdot \|'$ thanks to the finite dimension of $V_r \cap V_r'$ which shows that the limit statements w.r.t. the norms $\| \cdot \|$ and $\| \cdot \|'$ are equivalent.

iii.) The first equation (1.27) is the usual statement that in any normed vector space addition and scalar multiplication are continuous. All the limits do not depend on the norms (take for instance for each $r \in \mathbb{N}$ the finite-dimensional vector space $V_r + \tilde{V}_r$) thanks to the preceding statement ii.). The second statement (1.28) is slightly more involved since **the normed vector space $(\mathcal{A}, \| \cdot \|)$ is in general NOT a normed algebra** in the sense that $\|AA'\| \leq \|A\| \|A'\|$ for all $A, A' \in \mathcal{A}$. We shall first prove an intermediate estimate: for each $r \in \mathbb{N}$ pick a finite-dimensional subspace \tilde{V}_r such that $\tilde{F}_r \in \text{Fun}(J, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \tilde{V}_r$ (which is possible thanks to statement i.). We have for each $r \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\left(F(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \tilde{F}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \right)_r = \sum_{u=0}^r F_u(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \tilde{F}_{r-u}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \in \sum_{u=0}^r V_u \tilde{V}_{r-u} \subset (V_0 + \dots + V_r) (\tilde{V}_0 + \dots + \tilde{V}_r) =: V_{(r)} \tilde{V}_{(r)}. \quad (1.29)$$

Clearly, the subspaces $V_{(r)}$ and $\tilde{V}_{(r)}$ of \mathcal{A} are finite-dimensional. Consider the restriction of the algebra multiplication $\mu : \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ to the finite-dimensional vector space $V_{(r)} \otimes \tilde{V}_{(r)}$: the image $\mu \left(V_{(r)} \otimes \tilde{V}_{(r)} \right) = V_{(r)} \tilde{V}_{(r)}$ is again a finite-dimensional subspace of \mathcal{A} . Choosing a basis e_1, \dots, e_M of the finite-dimensional subspace $V_{(r)} + \tilde{V}_{(r)} + V_{(r)} \tilde{V}_{(r)}$ of \mathcal{A} which is compatible with the subspaces, $V_{(r)}, \tilde{V}_{(r)}$, and $V_{(r)} \tilde{V}_{(r)}$, expanding the elements $A \in V_{(r)}, \tilde{A} \in \tilde{V}_{(r)}$ in that basis, and using the norm $\| \cdot \|$ as in (1.22) by extending the chosen basis to all of \mathcal{A} we get the intermediate estimate

$$\exists C_{V_{(r)} \tilde{V}_{(r)}} \in \mathbb{R}, C_{V_{(r)} \tilde{V}_{(r)}} \geq 0 \quad \forall A \in V_{(r)} \quad \forall \tilde{A} \in \tilde{V}_{(r)} : \quad \|A \tilde{A}\| \leq C_{V_{(r)} \tilde{V}_{(r)}} \|A\| \|\tilde{A}\|.$$

This shows that the restriction of the multiplication to $V_{(r)} \otimes \tilde{V}_{(r)}$ is a continuous map onto its image $V_{(r)} \tilde{V}_{(r)}$: this fact together with (1.29) proves the statement (1.28). \square

For the rest of this Section we choose the maximum norm $\| \cdot \|$ on \mathbb{R}^ℓ , see (1.22) w.r.t. the canonical basis, and suppose that

$$\emptyset \neq \mathbf{J} \subset \{ \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^\ell \setminus \{0\} \mid \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\| \leq 1/4 \} \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \text{ is an accumulation point of } \mathbf{J}. \quad (1.30)$$

We shall now distinguish three important subsets \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B} , and \mathcal{H} of the algebra (1.24): we shall refer to them as the set of all **at most logarithmically divergent, bounded and harmless elements**, respectively: for an element $F = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} F_r \lambda^r$ of $(\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A})[[\lambda]]$

we say

$$\begin{aligned}
F \in \mathcal{L} & \text{ iff } \forall r \in \mathbb{N} \quad \exists C_r, \alpha_r \in \mathbb{R}, C_r \geq 0, \alpha_r > 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbf{J} : \|F_r(\boldsymbol{\delta})\| \leq C_r |\ln(|\boldsymbol{\delta}|)|^{\alpha_r}, \\
F \in \mathcal{B} & \text{ iff } \forall r \in \mathbb{N} \quad \exists C_r \in \mathbb{R}, C_r \geq 0, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbf{J} : \|F_r(\boldsymbol{\delta})\| \leq C_r, \\
F \in \mathcal{H} & \text{ iff } \forall r \in \mathbb{N} \quad \exists C_r, \beta_r \in \mathbb{R}, C_r \geq 0, \beta_r > 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbf{J} : \|F_r(\boldsymbol{\delta})\| \leq C_r |\boldsymbol{\delta}|^{\beta_r}.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.31}$$

In all the subsequent computations in this paper all the terms which we shall deal with are at most logarithmically divergent in the above sense. Let $\mathcal{G} := 1 + \lambda \left(\text{Fun}(J, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]]$, and define the following subsets

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}} := 1 + \lambda \mathcal{L}, \quad \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}} := 1 + \lambda \mathcal{B}, \quad \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}} := 1 + \lambda \mathcal{H}. \tag{1.32}$$

and refer to them as the *at most logarithmically divergent, bounded and harmless subgroups* of the group \mathcal{G} , respectively. These terms become clear in the following

Proposition 4. *With the above hypotheses we have the following statements for the algebra (1.24):*

i.) *The definition (1.31) does not depend on the chosen norm.*

ii.) *\mathcal{L} and \mathcal{B} are unital subalgebras over $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ of $\left(\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]]$, and \mathcal{H} is a two-sided ideal of \mathcal{L} . There are the following inclusions:*

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \mathcal{B} \supset \mathcal{H}. \tag{1.33}$$

iii.) *For all $H \in \mathcal{H}$: $\lim_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \rightarrow 0} H(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = 0$.*

iv.) *\mathcal{G} is a subgroup of the group of all invertible elements of $\left(\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]]$, and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}} \supset \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}} \supset \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ are subgroups of \mathcal{G} , where $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is a normal subgroup of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}$, i.e. it is stable by conjugations with all elements in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}$.*

v.) *For all $\Psi \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$: $\lim_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \rightarrow 0} \Psi(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = 1$.*

Before giving the proof of this Proposition we shall recall some elementary inequalities in the following

Lemma 5. *For all $\delta \in]0, 1/4]$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\alpha, \beta > 0$, we have the following inequalities*

$$\delta \leq \frac{1}{2} \leq |\ln(\delta)|, \tag{1.34}$$

$$|\ln(\delta)|^\alpha \delta^\beta \leq \left(\frac{2\alpha}{\beta} \right)^\alpha \delta^{\beta/2}. \tag{1.35}$$

Proof. Recall the following elementary inequalities for every real number t such that $0 < t \leq 1$

$$1 \leq \frac{1}{t} \quad \text{hence} \quad 1 - \delta = \int_{\delta}^1 dt \leq \int_{\delta}^1 \frac{1}{t} dt = -\ln(\delta) = |\ln(\delta)|$$

which proves (1.34) upon noting that $\delta \leq 1/4 < 1/2 < 1 - \delta$. Moreover, since $\frac{1}{t} \leq \left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^{1+\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}}$ we get

$$|\ln(\delta)| = -\ln(\delta) = \int_{\delta}^1 \frac{1}{t} dt \leq \int_{\delta}^1 \left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^{1+\frac{\beta}{2\alpha}} dt = \frac{2\alpha}{\beta} (\delta^{-\beta/(2\alpha)} - 1) \leq \frac{2\alpha}{\beta} \delta^{-\beta/(2\alpha)},$$

from which –upon multiplying both sides of this inequality by $\delta^{\beta/\alpha}$ and then raising to the power of α – we deduce the result (1.35). \square

Proof (of Proposition 4):

i.) Since each F_r takes its values in a finite dimensional vector space the restriction of any other norm to this subspace is equivalent to the norm $\|\cdot\|$: this would only change the ‘ C -constants’ of the definition, but not the criterion to be an element of \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{B} or \mathcal{H} .

ii.) It is immediate that \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{H} are complex vector spaces: if F, F' are in one of the three subsets then by means of the upper bounds of the norms of each $F_r(j)$ and $F'_r(j)$ we get an upper bound of the norm of each $zF_r + z'F'_r$ (where $z, z' \in \mathbb{C}$) by passing to twice the maximum of the two constants $|z|C_r, |z'|C_r$ and to the maximum of the exponents α_r, α'_r of $|\ln(|\delta|)|$ –the latter being > 1 – (resp. to the minimum of the exponents β_r, β'_r of $|\delta|$ –the latter being < 1). Next, for the multiplication of FF' we have that each $(F(\delta)F'(\delta))_r$ ($r \in \mathbb{N}$) is equal to the sum $\sum_{u=0}^r F_u(\delta)F'_{r-u}(\delta)$. Suppose first that $F, F' \in \mathcal{L}$. Since by Proposition 3 for each $\delta \in \mathbf{J}$ every $F_u(\delta)$ is an element of some finite-dimensional subspace V_u (only depending on F_u) and every $F'_{r-u}(\delta)$ is an element of some other finite-dimensional subspace V'_{r-u} (only depending on F'_{r-u}) it follows as in the proof of Proposition 3, equation (1.29) that –upon setting $V_{(r)} = V_0 + \dots + V_r$ and $V'_{(r)} = V'_0 + \dots + V'_r$ – the following estimate holds for all $\delta \in \mathbf{J}$

$$\|(F(\delta)F'(\delta))_r\| \leq \sum_{u=0}^r C_u C'_{r-u} C_{V_{(r)} V'_{(r)}} |\ln(|\delta|)|^{\alpha_u + \alpha'_{r-u}} \leq C |\ln(|\delta|)|^\alpha$$

where C is $r + 1$ times the maximum of all the triple products of the ‘ C -constants’ and α is the maximum of all the numbers $\alpha_u + \alpha'_{r-u}$. This is done in an analogous way for \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{H} proving that \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{H} are closed under multiplication. Evidently, $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ belongs to \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{B} , hence \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{B} in particular are $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -submodules and unital associative algebras. The inclusion (1.33) follows at once from inequality (1.34). Finally, for any $F \in \mathcal{L}$ and $F' \in \mathcal{H}$ it is shown in a similar way as above that FF' and $F'F$ are in \mathcal{H} upon using the second inequality (1.35). This shows that \mathcal{H} is a two-sided ideal of \mathcal{L} and hence also a $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -submodule.

iii.) and *v.)* immediately follow from the upper bounds defining \mathcal{H} .

iv.) We only have to observe that every element $1 + \lambda F$ (where F is in a $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$ -subalgebra)

always has an inverse, namely the well-known geometric series $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (-\lambda)^r F^r$, for which the terms of positive order are all in the given subalgebra, which proves that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}$, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ are subgroups of \mathcal{G} . The normality of $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$ follows from the fact that \mathcal{H} is a two-sided ideal of \mathcal{L} . \square

We shall now apply these limit considerations to the term Y appearing in a formal linear ODE, see (1.11). Y normally belongs to the algebra (1.10). In order to incorporate limits we shall make Y dependent on the parameter $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ in the set $\mathbf{J} \subset \mathbb{R}^\ell$, see (1.30), i.e. we consider

$$Y \in \left(\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})) \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]]. \quad (1.36)$$

Hence, each element Y is a formal power series $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} Y_r \lambda^r$, where each Y_r is a (non unique) finite sum $Y_r = Y_{r1} \otimes A_{r1} + \cdots + Y_{rN_r} \otimes A_{rN_r}$ where N_r is a non-negative integer, $A_{r1}, \dots, A_{rN_r} \in \mathcal{A}$ and Y_{r1}, \dots, Y_{rN_r} are functions on \mathbf{J} with values in $\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$ (see (1.1)) where $a < b$ are two fixed real numbers, and D is a finite set such that $\{a, b\} \subset D \subset [a, b]$. It makes sense to consider the formal linear ODE (1.11) for these \mathbf{J} -dependent Y :

Proposition 6. *Let Y be an element of the algebra (1.36).*

For each $\alpha \in [a, b]$ there exists a unique element

$$W_{\cdot\alpha} \in \left(\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})^0) \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]] \quad (1.37)$$

satisfying the formal linear \mathbf{J} -dependent ODE (1.15) w.r.t. the parameter $s \in [a, b]$ for each $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbf{J}$ such that $W_{\alpha\alpha} = 1$. We shall call $W_{\cdot\alpha}$ the fundamental solution of the formal linear \mathbf{J} -dependent ODE (1.15) normalized at α . Moreover, for each $\beta \in [a, b]$ the \mathbf{J} -dependent propagator $W_{\beta\alpha} := W_{\cdot\alpha}(s = \beta)$ satisfies

$$W_{\beta\alpha} \in \left(\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]]. \quad (1.38)$$

Proof. This is done in complete analogy to the treatment in §1.2 where we can literally follow (1.11), the integral equation (1.12) –the primitive I_α being extended to the algebra occurring in (1.36) by first composing it with the functions of \mathbf{J} with values in $\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})$ on the left tensor factor, then tensoring with the identity on \mathcal{A} , and finally extending componentwise– and the iterated integrals equation (1.14). This proves the existence of a unique fundamental solution $W_{\cdot\alpha}$ as in (1.37). Evaluating s at β gives (1.38). \square

The following elementary Lemma will be the key criterion later on to prove that certain factors in a propagator are in the ‘harmless group’ $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{H}}$. First, as usual, having fixed a norm $\| \cdot \|$ on \mathcal{A} we shall denote by the same symbol $\| \cdot \|$ the map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})) \otimes \mathcal{A} &\rightarrow \text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathcal{C}_D^0([a, b], \mathbb{R})) : \\ \left((\boldsymbol{\delta}, s) \mapsto G(\boldsymbol{\delta}, s) \right) &\mapsto \left((\boldsymbol{\delta}, s) \mapsto \|G(\boldsymbol{\delta}, s)\| \right) \end{aligned}$$

for all $s \in [a, b] \setminus D$. Writing G in $\text{Fun}(\mathbf{J}, \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C})) \otimes \mathcal{A}$ in a basis $((e_i)_{i \in \mathfrak{S}})$ of \mathcal{A} as $G = G_0 e_0 + \dots + G_N e_N$ we get the well-known estimate –using the monotonicity of the Riemann integral– for any $\alpha \leq s \leq \beta \in [a, b]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \int_\alpha^s \hat{G}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, s_1) \mathbf{d}s_1 \right\| &\leq \int_\alpha^s \|\hat{G}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, s_1)\| \mathbf{d}s_1 \\ &\leq \int_\alpha^\beta \|\hat{G}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, s_1)\| \mathbf{d}s_1 \leq (\beta - \alpha) \sup \left\{ \|\hat{G}(\boldsymbol{\delta}, s_1)\| \mid s_1 \in [0, 1] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (1.39)$$

where –as usual– we have written \hat{G} for any extension of the function G from $\mathbf{J} \times ([a, b] \setminus D)$ to $\mathbf{J} \times [a, b]$.

Lemma 7. *Let $Y = \sum_{r=0} \lambda^r Y_r$ be an element of the algebra (1.36). Fix an arbitrary norm $\|\cdot\|$ on \mathcal{A} and two arbitrary elements $\alpha, \beta \in [a, b]$. Consider the following three conditions on Y referred to as **upper bounds for Y** : there is an extension \hat{Y} of Y to $[a, b]$ such that for each non-negative integer r :*

$$\begin{aligned} (L) : \quad &\exists C_r, \alpha_r \in \mathbb{R}, C_r \geq 0, \alpha_r > 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbf{J} : \sup \left\{ \|\hat{Y}_r(\boldsymbol{\delta}, s)\| \mid s \in [a, b] \right\} \leq C_r |\ln(|\boldsymbol{\delta}|)|^{\alpha_r}, \\ (B) : \quad &\exists C_r \in \mathbb{R}, C_r \geq 0, \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbf{J} : \sup \left\{ \|\hat{Y}_r(\boldsymbol{\delta}, s)\| \mid s \in [a, b] \right\} \leq C_r, \\ (H) : \quad &\exists C_r, \beta_r \in \mathbb{R}, C_r \geq 0, \beta_r > 0 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbf{J} : \sup \left\{ \|\hat{Y}_r(\boldsymbol{\delta}, s)\| \mid s \in [a, b] \right\} \leq C_r |\boldsymbol{\delta}|^{\beta_r}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.40)$$

Then the three conditions do not depend on the norms used. Moreover, if condition (L) (resp. (B) resp. (H)) is satisfied then the propagator $W_{\beta\alpha}$ (see (1.38)) for Y belongs to the subgroup \mathcal{G}_L (resp. \mathcal{G}_B resp. \mathcal{G}_H) of \mathcal{G} .

Proof. The norm independence follows from the fact that the norms will always be restricted to finite-dimensional subspaces of \mathcal{A} . Concerning the second statement, we first do the case $\alpha \leq \beta$: writing out the propagator $W_{\beta\alpha}$ in terms of iterated integrals as in equation (1.14) (for $s = \beta$) it can be seen by an easy induction using the estimate (1.39) that each iterated integral has as upper bound a product of integrals of the form $\boldsymbol{\delta} \mapsto \int_\alpha^\beta \|\hat{Y}_i(\boldsymbol{\delta}, s)\| \mathbf{d}s$ where each such integral has an upper bound by the last inequality of (1.39) and thus the desired upper bound according to the conditions (L), (B) or (H). Passing to suitable maxima of products of constants of ‘type C ’, to suitable maxima of sums of exponents of ‘type α_i ’, and to suitable minima of exponents of ‘type β ’ we get the desired upper bounds for (1.31). The case $\alpha \geq \beta$ is done in a completely analogous manner by using the rule (1.6). \square

1.4 Formal connections and parallel transports

Let $N \geq 1$ be an integer, and let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a non-empty open subset.

Definition 8. *A **formal connection** Γ on U is given by N elements*

$$\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_N \in (C^\infty(U, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A})[[\lambda]].$$

Here $C^\infty(U, \mathbb{C})$ denotes the unital associative commutative complex algebra of all functions of N variables $f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which are smooth, i.e. in the class C^∞ : this means that all the higher order partial derivatives of f exist and are continuous. We shall consider each Γ_i as a function $\Gamma_i : U \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$ by evaluating at $x \in U$. Note however that these functions are particular thanks to the algebraic tensor product \otimes . Every element Γ_i in the algebra $(C^\infty(U, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A})[[\lambda]]$ is thus a formal power series $\Gamma_i = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma_{ir} \lambda^r$ such that each non-negative integer r the component Γ_{ir} is a **finite sum of terms** of the form $f \otimes A$ with $f \in C^\infty(U, \mathbb{C})$ and $A \in \mathcal{A}$. A very common notation borrowed from differential geometry is $\Gamma = \sum_{i=1}^N \Gamma_i dx_i$, which relates to differential forms (connection 1-forms). We shall, however, use a sign convention for Γ which is different from the one used in differential geometry to avoid additional signs.

Next, fix two real numbers $a < b$, fix a finite subset $D \subset [a, b]$ such that $\{a, b\} \subset D$. We consider **continuous piecewise C^∞ -paths** $c : [a, b] \rightarrow U$, hence

$$c \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], U)^0. \quad (1.41)$$

This means that each real component c_1, \dots, c_N of c is an element of $\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{R})^0$ and that for each $s \in [a, b]$ the value $c(s)$ lies in $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$. The most elementary paths are *line segments*, i.e. given two points $\xi, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we can consider the **affine path joining the initial point ξ and the final point η** which is defined in the usual way by

$$c_{\eta \leftarrow \xi} = c : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N : s \mapsto (1-s)\xi + s\eta, \quad (1.42)$$

hence $c(0) = \xi$ and $c(1) = \eta$. In case ξ, η are elements of the open subset U it has of course to be checked whether all the values of the affine path also lie in U . If this is the case then it is clear that there is $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, $\epsilon > 0$, such that the right hand side of (1.42) makes sense as a C^∞ -function from the larger open interval $] - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon[$ to U .

Returning to general continuous piecewise smooth paths, we can associate to each such path c defined in (1.41) the element $Y := \Gamma^{(c)}$ for a formal linear ODE by

$$\Gamma^{(c)} := \sum_{i=1}^N (\Gamma_i \circ c) \frac{dc_i}{ds} \in \left(\mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a, b], \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A} \right) [[\lambda]].$$

Fix $\alpha, \beta \in [a, b]$, then we can consider the formal linear ODE (1.15) for the choice $Y = \Gamma^{(c)}$ and its particular solution ${}^\Gamma W_\alpha^{(c)}$ normalized at α . In differential geometry the propagator ${}^\Gamma W_{\beta\alpha}^{(c)} = W_{\beta\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$, see (1.16), is called the **parallel transport from $c(\alpha)$ to $c(\beta)$ along the path c** (with respect to the connection Γ). Since parallel transports are propagators all the statements of Proposition 2 are true for parallel transports. Note that for a **constant path** $c_\xi(s) = \xi \in U$ for all $s \in [a, b]$, the element $\Gamma^{(c_\xi)} = 0$, and the parallel transport is reduced to the unit element of \mathcal{A} .

Next, we shall need a very important tool for the computations to come, namely the **composition of two continuous piecewise smooth paths** $c_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow U$ with singular set D_1 and $c_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow U$ with singular set D_2 which are compatible in the groupoid sense

$c_2(0) = c_1(1)$. Recall the classical definition from algebraic topology (in the convention ‘from right-to-left’) of the *composed path* $c_2 * c_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow U$ with singular set $D_{12} := (\frac{1}{2}D_1) \cup (\frac{1}{2}D_2 + \frac{1}{2})$:

$$\text{if } c_1(1) = c_2(0) : \quad (c_2 * c_1)(s) := \begin{cases} c_1(2s) & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ c_2(2s - 1) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq 1. \end{cases} \quad (1.43)$$

It is evident from the definition that $c_2 * c_1$ is continuous (thanks to the condition $c_2(0) = c_1(1)$) and piecewise smooth with singular set D_{12} . **The crucial fact is that composition may create new singularities at the point** $s = \frac{1}{2}$ for the higher k -fold derivatives of the path for $k \geq 1$.

We now mention another important tool, the **pull-back of formal connections**: Let N' be a positive integer, let U' be a non-empty open subset of $\mathbb{R}^{N'}$, and let $\Theta : U' \rightarrow U$ be a \mathcal{C}^∞ -map. For any formal connection Γ on U define the *pulled-back connection* $\Gamma' := \Theta^*\Gamma$ on U' defined by

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq j \leq N' : \quad (\Theta^*\Gamma)_j := \sum_{i=1}^N (\Gamma_i \circ \Theta) \frac{\partial \Theta_i}{\partial x'_j}. \quad (1.44)$$

We now state how the above operations on formal connections and paths translate to parallel transports:

Theorem 9. *Let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a non-empty open subset and let Γ be a formal connection defined on U . Let $c : [a, b] \rightarrow U$ and $c_1, c_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow U$ be continuous piecewise smooth paths. Then we have the following:*

- i.) *Let θ be a continuous piecewise \mathcal{C}^∞ -reparametrization of $([a, b], D)$ (i.e. $a' < b'$ are real numbers, $\{a', b'\} \subset D' \subset [a', b']$ is a finite subset, and $\theta \in \mathcal{C}_D^\infty([a', b'], \mathbb{R})^0$ satisfying (1.4)). Then*

$$\Gamma^{(c\circ\theta)} = (\Gamma^{(c)} \circ \theta) \frac{d\theta}{ds'}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma W_{\theta(\beta')\theta(\alpha')}^{(c)} = \Gamma W_{\beta'\alpha'}^{(c\circ\theta)} \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]. \quad (1.45)$$

This shows that reparametrizations (in the sense of (1.4)) of these paths do not change parallel transport as long as the initial and final points remain the same.

- ii.) *In the previous statement suppose that $a' = a, b' = b, D' = D$ such that the continuous piecewise smooth reparametrization θ of $([a, b], D)$ satisfying in addition the inversion condition*

$$\theta(\alpha) = \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \theta(\beta) = \alpha.$$

*Then we get the well-known **inversion formula***

$$\Gamma W_{\beta\alpha}^{(c\circ\theta)} = \left(\Gamma W_{\beta\alpha}^{(c)} \right)^{-1} \quad (1.46)$$

iii.) The parallel transport along the composed path $c_2 * c_1 : [0, 1] \rightarrow U$, see (1.43) is given as follows

$$\Gamma W_{10}^{(c_2 * c_1)} = \Gamma W_{10}^{(c_2)} \Gamma W_{10}^{(c_1)}. \quad (1.47)$$

iv.) Let $U' \subset \mathbb{R}^{N'}$ be a non-empty open subset, let $\Theta : U' \rightarrow U$ be a smooth, let $\Gamma' = \Theta^* \Gamma$ be the pulled-back formal connection, and let $c' : [a, b] \rightarrow U'$ be a continuous piecewise smooth path. Then for all $\alpha, \beta \in [a, b]$

$$(\Theta^* \Gamma)^{(c')} = \Gamma^{(\Theta \circ c')} \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta^* \Gamma_{\beta\alpha}^{(c')} = \Gamma_{\beta\alpha}^{(\Theta \circ c')}. \quad (1.48)$$

Proof. i.) The formula for $\Gamma^{(c \circ \theta)}$ is straight-forward and the equation for the parallel transport is deduced from (1.19).

ii.) This is an immediate consequence of (1.45) and the last equation of (1.18).

iii.) Define the two smooth reparametrizations $\theta_1, \theta_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ given by $\theta_1(s) = \frac{1}{2}s$ and $\theta_2(s) = \frac{1}{2}s + \frac{1}{2}$. We have (suppressing the symbol Γ)

$$W_{10}^{(c_2 * c_1)} \stackrel{(1.18)}{=} W_{1\frac{1}{2}}^{(c_2 * c_1)} W_{\frac{1}{2}0}^{(c_2 * c_1)} \stackrel{(1.45)}{=} W_{10}^{((c_2 * c_1) \circ \theta_2)} W_{10}^{((c_2 * c_1) \circ \theta_1)} = W_{10}^{(c_2)} W_{10}^{(c_1)}.$$

iv.) This is straight-forward from the definitions and the chain rule for partial derivatives. \square

For instance, the usual **affine inversion j of the interval** $[a, b]$ given by $\iota(s) = a + b - s$ for all $s \in [a, b]$ serves as such a reparametrization for the choice $\alpha = a$ and $\beta = b$ for an inversion in ii.).

It is well-known that composition of paths is in general NOT associative, i.e. if $c_3 : [0, 1] \rightarrow U$ is a third path with $c_2(1) = c_3(0)$ then in general $c_3 * (c_2 * c_1) \neq (c_3 * c_2) * c_1$, but the corresponding product of parallel transports does not depend on the bracketing, i.e.

$$W_{10}^{(c_3 * (c_2 * c_1))} \stackrel{(1.47)}{=} W_{10}^{(c_3)} W_{10}^{(c_2)} W_{10}^{(c_1)} \stackrel{(1.47)}{=} W_{10}^{((c_3 * c_2) * c_1)}.$$

It turns out that certain connections are formulated by *complex coordinates* which allow for much more compact computations: we do not have to go into the detail of general holomorphic connections, since for this work it suffices to study complex rational ones. More precisely, let $U \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a non-empty open set. Recall that a *complex rational function* in N complex variables $z = (z_1, \dots, z_N)$ defined on U is a quotient $f(z) = \frac{g(z)}{h(z)}$ where $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[z_1, \dots, z_N]$, hence are complex polynomials in N variables such that g is different from the zero polynomial, and the zeros of g all belong to $\mathbb{C}^N \setminus U$. Hence, the function $z \mapsto \frac{g(z)}{h(z)}$ is a well-defined function on U . Decomposing each complex variable in real and imaginary part as usual,

$$z_1 = x_1 + \mathbf{i}y_1, \dots, z_N = x_N + \mathbf{i}y_N \quad \text{or} \quad z = x + \mathbf{i}y,$$

it is clear that each complex rational function f is a particular complex-valued rational function in $2N$ real variables $x_1, \dots, x_N, y_1, \dots, y_N =: (x, y)$ which we can write in the following way

$$f(z) = f(x + \mathbf{i}y) =: \check{f}(x, y) =: f^{(1)}(x, y) + \mathbf{i}f^{(2)}(x, y) \quad (1.49)$$

with unique real rational functions $f^{(1)}, f^{(2)}$. Hence, each complex rational function is a \mathcal{C}^∞ -function in the real variables. Let $\mathbb{C}_U(z)$ denote the set of all complex rational functions which are well-defined on U . It is easy to check that they form a complex unital subalgebra of $\mathcal{C}^\infty(U, \mathbb{C})$. Recall the following well-known rules for the complex derivatives for all integers $1 \leq j \leq N$:

$$\left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j}\right)^\vee = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \check{f}}{\partial x_j} - \mathbf{i}\frac{\partial \check{f}}{\partial y_j}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \check{f}}{\partial x_j} + \mathbf{i}\frac{\partial \check{f}}{\partial y_j} = 0, \quad \text{hence} \quad \frac{\partial \check{f}}{\partial x_j} = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j}\right)^\vee = -\mathbf{i}\frac{\partial \check{f}}{\partial y_j} \quad (1.50)$$

for all complex rational functions f where the first two equations are easy to check on polynomials and the second is nothing but the well-known ‘holomorphicity condition’ $\partial f / \partial \bar{z}_j = 0$ for the complex conjugate variables. Next, let Γ be a formal connection on U which is complex rational in the following way:

$$\Gamma(z) = \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j(z) dz_j \quad \text{and} \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq N : \quad \Gamma_j \in \left(\mathbb{C}_U(z) \otimes \mathcal{A}\right)[[\lambda]]. \quad (1.51)$$

Note that the linear combination is over the complex dz_j ! We can rewrite this expression in the $2N$ real x and y coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(z) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j(z) dz_j = \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j(x + \mathbf{i}y) (dx_j + \mathbf{i}dy_j) = \sum_{j=1}^N \check{\Gamma}_j(x, y) dx_j + \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{i}\check{\Gamma}_j(x, y) dy_j \\ &=: \sum_{j=1}^N \check{\Gamma}_j^{[1]}(x, y) dx_j + \sum_{j=1}^N \check{\Gamma}_j^{[2]}(x, y) dy_j =: \check{\Gamma}(x, y). \end{aligned} \quad (1.52)$$

and get an ordinary formal connection with components $\check{\Gamma}_j^{[1]} = \check{\Gamma}_j$ in the x_j -directions, and $\check{\Gamma}_j^{[2]} = \mathbf{i}\check{\Gamma}_j$ in the y_j -directions.

We have the following completely unsurprising, but useful result for complex pull-backs: let N' be a positive integer, let $U' \subset \mathbb{C}^{N'}$ be a non-empty open set, let $z' = x' + \mathbf{i}y' = (z'_1, \dots, z'_{N'})$ be complex coordinates, and let $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_{N'} : U' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be complex rational functions such that the map $\Theta = (\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_{N'}) : U' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{N'}$ takes its values in U . We shall write

$$\Theta(z') = \Theta(x' + \mathbf{i}y') = \check{\Theta}(x', y') = \Theta^{(1)}(x', y') + \mathbf{i}\Theta^{(2)}(x', y') \quad (1.53)$$

where $\Theta^{(1)}, \Theta^{(2)} : U' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{N'}$ are real rational functions. See the Appendix for the proof of the following

Proposition 10. *Let Γ be a complex rational connection on $U \subset \mathbb{C}^N$, and define the complex pullback $\Theta^*\Gamma$ by formula (1.44) with x'_j replaced by z'_j . Then*

$$(\Theta^*\Gamma)^\vee = \check{\Theta}^*\check{\Gamma}. \quad (1.54)$$

1.5 Flat formal connections

Let N be a positive integer, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ a non-empty open subset, and Γ a formal connection on U . Γ is called **flat** (more precisely *formally flat*) if the following conditions hold:

$$\forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq i, j \leq N : \quad 0 = \frac{\partial \Gamma_i}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \Gamma_j}{\partial x_i} + \lambda \left(\Gamma_i \Gamma_j - \Gamma_j \Gamma_i \right). \quad (1.55)$$

Obviously, **any formal connection on an open set of \mathbb{R}^1 is flat**. Moreover, complex rational flatness is equivalent to flatness in the following sense:

Proposition 11. *Let $U \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be an open set and let Γ be a formal connection which is complex rational in the sense of (1.51). Let $\check{\Gamma}$ be the formal connection in the sense of (1.52). Then Γ is flat in the complex sense, i.e.*

$$\forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq i, j \leq N : \quad 0 = \frac{\partial \Gamma_i}{\partial z_j} - \frac{\partial \Gamma_j}{\partial z_i} + \lambda \left(\Gamma_i \Gamma_j - \Gamma_j \Gamma_i \right) \quad (1.56)$$

if and only if $\check{\Gamma}$ is flat in the normal ‘real sense’, see (1.55) for $2N$ real variables (x, y) .

Proof. We denote the right-hand side of (1.56) by R_{ij} . Equation (1.50) allows to replace complex derivatives $\partial/\partial z_i$ by the real ones, and thanks to (1.52) \check{R}_{ij} equals

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \check{\Gamma}_i^{[1]}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \check{\Gamma}_j^{[1]}}{\partial x_i} + \lambda [\check{\Gamma}_i^{[1]}, \check{\Gamma}_j^{[1]}] &= - \left(\frac{\partial \check{\Gamma}_i^{[2]}}{\partial y_j} - \frac{\partial \check{\Gamma}_j^{[2]}}{\partial y_i} + \lambda [\check{\Gamma}_i^{[2]}, \check{\Gamma}_j^{[2]}] \right) \\ &= -\mathbf{i} \left(\frac{\partial \check{\Gamma}_i^{[2]}}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \check{\Gamma}_j^{[1]}}{\partial y_i} + \lambda [\check{\Gamma}_i^{[2]}, \check{\Gamma}_j^{[1]}] \right) \end{aligned}$$

which exactly gives the components of the right hand side of (1.55) for $\check{\Gamma}$ whence the result. \square

In particular, **any complex rational formal connection on an open subset of \mathbb{C}^1 is flat**. Moreover, we mention the following well-known result (see the Appendix for a proof):

Proposition 12. *Let N, N' be positive integers, let $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $U' \subset \mathbb{R}^{N'}$ be non-empty open subsets, let $\Theta : U' \rightarrow U$ be a \mathcal{C}^∞ -map, and let Γ be a flat formal connection on U . Then the pulled-back formal connection $\Gamma' := \Phi^* \Gamma$, see (1.44), is also flat.*

The significance of flat connections is the following well-known result about the **path-independence of parallel transports**, for which we give a proof in the Appendix:

Theorem 13. *Let $N \geq 1$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a non-empty open subset and Γ be a flat formal connection. Let $p, q \in U$, $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, $\epsilon > 0$, and $c_0, c_1 :]a - \epsilon, b + \epsilon[\rightarrow U$ be two smooth paths (NOT only piecewise smooth!) such that*

$$(i) \quad c_0(a) = p = c_1(a), \quad c_0(b) = q = c_1(b);$$

(ii) there exists a **smooth homotopy** F between c_0 and c_1 : more precisely, there is an open subset $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with $]a - \epsilon, b + \epsilon[\times]-\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon[\subset \mathcal{O}$, and $F : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow U$ is a \mathcal{C}^∞ -map satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \forall s \in]a - \epsilon, b + \epsilon[& : F(s, 0) = c_0(s) \quad \text{and} \quad F(s, 1) = c_1(s), \\ \forall t \in]-\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon[& : F(a, t) = p \quad \text{and} \quad F(b, t) = q. \end{aligned} \tag{1.57}$$

Then the parallel transport with respect to Γ from p to q along c_0 is equal to the parallel transport along c_1 with respect to Γ from p to q :

$$\Gamma W_{ba}^{(c_0)} = \Gamma W_{ba}^{(c_1)}.$$

We shall give a corollary to the preceding Theorem which will cover all the cases we shall discuss later: we need to establish first a relation between continuous piecewise smooth paths (which will turn up while doing composition of paths), and overall smooth paths: specializing to $[a, b] = [0, 1]$ (which will be only parameter interval in the sequel) we can prove the following very useful Corollary, see the Appendix for a proof:

Corollary 14. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a non-empty open set, Γ a flat formal connection on U , and $c_1, c_2 : [0, 1] \rightarrow U$ two continuous piecewise smooth paths having the same initial point p and final point q . Suppose that there is an open set $U' \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and a point $\varpi \in U'$ such that c_1 and c_2 take all their values in $U' \subset U$ and which is **star-shaped around** $\varpi \in U'$, i.e.*

$$\forall t \in [0, 1] \forall x \in U' : (1 - t)x + t\varpi \in U'.$$

Then the parallel transports $p \rightarrow q$ along c_1 and along c_2 are equal. In particular, the parallel transport along any continuous piecewise smooth loop $c_3 : [0, 1] \rightarrow U' \subset U$ (recall $c_3(0) = c_3(1)$) is trivial, i.e. equal to $1 \in \mathcal{A}$.

2 The Drinfel'd associator and its identities

2.1 The Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov connection and the Drinfel'd-Kohno (Lie) algebras

We shall only need the material of this Section for the treatment of the pentagon equations, see §2.4. The geometric considerations, however, may serve as motivations for the constructions in all the ensuing sections. The following definition appears in the work of T.Kohno, [23, p.142, eqn (1.1.4)] and [23, p.146, eqn (1.3.2)]:

Definition 15. *Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and let \mathbb{K} be a field of characteristic zero. The **n th Drinfel'd-Kohno algebra** is the unital associative \mathbb{K} -algebra \mathcal{T}_n generated by $n^2 - n$ elements*

$$t_{ij}, \quad 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$$

subject to the relations, sometimes called *infinitesimal braid relations*:

$$t_{ij} - t_{ji} = 0 \quad \forall 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$[t_{ij} + t_{ik}, t_{jk}] = 0 \quad \forall i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ such that } \#\{i, j, k\} = 3, \quad (2.1b)$$

$$[t_{ij}, t_{kl}] = 0 \quad \forall i, j, k, l \in \{1, \dots, n\} \text{ such that } \#\{i, j, k, l\} = 4. \quad (2.1c)$$

where $[,]$ denotes the commutator $[A, B] = AB - BA$ in associative algebras.

In view of the first relation (2.1a) one could have defined the Drinfel'd-Kohno algebra just by $\binom{n}{2}$ generators t_{ij} with $i < j$. However, for concrete computations it is much more practical to use 'unordered' generators $t_{ij} = t_{ji}$ (one may think of the index being the two-element set $\{i, j\}$). The Lie counterpart of the definition above is better known:

Definition 16. *Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer and let \mathbb{K} be a field of characteristic zero. The **n th Drinfel'd-Kohno Lie algebra** is the \mathbb{K} -Lie algebra \mathfrak{t}_n generated by $n^2 - n$ generators t_{ij} , $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ subject to the relations (2.1a), (2.1b), and (2.1c), seen as Lie brackets in the free Lie algebra generated by the t_{ij} .*

It is not hard to see (but not necessary for the proofs of the ensuing subsections), that the Drinfel'd-Kohno (Lie) algebras are *free* (Lie) algebras with relations in the usual sense of a left adjoint functor, that is that for any unital associative algebra \mathcal{A} (resp. Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}) the set of morphisms of algebras $\mathcal{T}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ (resp. of Lie algebras $\mathfrak{t}_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$) is in natural bijection with the set of elements $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$ ($1 \leq i < j \leq n$) of A (resp. of \mathfrak{g}) satisfying relations (2.1a), (2.1b), and (2.1c) which is defined by evaluation of a morphism on the generators (t_{ij}) .

In the sequel we shall prefer the more general situation of a general unital associative complex algebra \mathcal{A} with elements $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$ satisfying the above-mentioned relations. It is not hard to check that each \mathcal{T}_n is isomorphic to the universal enveloping algebra of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{t}_n , but we shall not need this result.

For example, denoting by $\mathbb{K}\langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$ (resp. $\mathbb{K}[a_1, \dots, a_n]$) the free unital associative algebra (resp. the free unital associative commutative algebra) generated by the symbols a_1, \dots, a_n there are the following isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{T}_2 \cong \mathbb{K}\langle t_{12} \rangle \cong \mathbb{K}[t_{12}] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T}_3 \cong \mathbb{K}\langle t_{12}, t_{23} \rangle \otimes \mathbb{K}[t_{12} + t_{13} + t_{23}].$$

The first isomorphism is obvious. For the second, use first relation (2.1a) to express everything in terms of t_{ij} with $i < j$, perform the base change from (t_{12}, t_{13}, t_{23}) to $(t_{12}, t_{23}, \Lambda := t_{12} + t_{13} + t_{23})$ and observe that the relations (2.1b) of Definition 15 for \mathcal{T}_3 are equivalent to $[t_{12}, \Lambda] = 0$ and $[t_{23}, \Lambda] = 0$. Condition (2.1c) is of course empty for $n = 3$.

Returning to general n , note further that the group of all permutations n letters, S_n , **acts on the left** on \mathcal{T}_n by sending each generator t_{ij} to $t_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)}$ by automorphisms of unital algebras. Next, for each integer $n \geq 2$ let $Y_n \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be the open subset (see e.g. [18, p.267])

$$Y_n := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq i, j \leq n : \text{if } i \neq j \text{ then } z_i \neq z_j\}$$

which is the well-known **ordered configuration space**: every element of Y_n contains the information of the coordinates of n distinguishable particles in the plane where no two particles occupy the same position.

Recall that the usual permutation of coordinates defines a well-defined **right action of the permutation group** S_n on \mathbb{C}^n given by $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \mapsto (z_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, z_{\sigma(n)}) =: z\sigma$ for each permutation $\sigma \in S_n$. This right action obviously preserves Y_n on which it acts freely, and the quotient $X_n := Y_n/S_n$ is a complex n -dimensional manifold called the (unordered) **configuration space**. Configuration spaces have been studied a lot, see e.g. the book [14]. The fundamental groups of X_n and of Y_n are well-known to be isomorphic to the **braid group of n strands**, B_n , and to the **pure braid group of n strands**, $P_n \subset B_n$, respectively. Moreover, but this fact is not necessary for the sequel, the naming ‘infinitesimal braid relations’ stems from the fact that the completion of the n th Drinfel’d-Kohno algebra with respect to the obvious filtration induced by the free algebra is isomorphic to the completion of the group algebra of the pure braid group P_n with respect to its augmentation ideal, see e.g. [22] and [23, p.147, Prop. 1.3.3] for details.

The following well-known (formal) connection is very important, see [19]:

Definition 17. Let $n \geq 2$ and \mathcal{A} a unital associative complex algebra containing $n(n-1)/2$ elements $A_{ij} = A_{ji}$ (indexed by $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$) satisfying the infinitesimal braid relations (2.1b) and (2.1c) where the generators t_{ij} are replaced by the elements A_{ij} . The formal **Knizhnik–Zamolodchikov (KZ3a)-connection** ${}^{(n)}\Gamma_{\text{KZ3a}}$ on Y_n (with respect to \mathcal{A}) is defined as follows:

$${}^{(n)}\Gamma_{\text{KZ3a}}(z_1, \dots, z_n) := \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \frac{A_{ij}}{z_i - z_j} (dz_i - dz_j). \quad (2.2)$$

Clearly, the KZ3a-connection is complex rational in the sense of (1.51). We have the following

Theorem 18. For all integers $n \geq 2$ the Knizhnik–Zamolodchikov connection is (formally) flat.

A very detailed proof of this statement can be found in C.Kassel’s book [18, p.452-454]. It is easy to see that for all integers $n \geq 2$ the KZ3a-connection ${}^{(n)}\Gamma_{\text{KZ3a}}$ is **invariant by all pull-backs** with respect to **translations** $T_v : Y_n \rightarrow Y_n : z \mapsto z + (v, v, \dots, v)$ (for all $v \in \mathbb{C}$) and with respect to all **complex homotheties** $H_p : Y_n \rightarrow Y_n$ given by $z \mapsto pz$ for all $p \in \mathbb{C}^\times = \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$, in the sense that $T_v^* ({}^{(n)}\Gamma_{\text{KZ3a}}) = {}^{(n)}\Gamma_{\text{KZ3a}}$ and $H_p^* ({}^{(n)}\Gamma_{\text{KZ3a}}) = {}^{(n)}\Gamma_{\text{KZ3a}}$. Note further that, for any integers $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$, if ‘particle i is near to particle j ’, (i.e. the distance $|z_i - z_j|$ becomes ‘very small’) then the term containing A_{ij} in the KZ3a-connection will be ‘very large’ compared to the others: this intuition will motivate the choice of paths in the following sections.

For $n = 2$ and $n = 3$ there are the following isomorphisms of open sets of \mathbb{C}^2 and of \mathbb{C}^3 which are given by explicit bijective complex rational maps:

$$Y_2 \cong \mathbb{C}^\times \times \mathbb{C} \quad \text{and} \quad Y_3 \cong \mathbb{C}^{\times \times} \times \mathbb{C}^\times \times \mathbb{C}$$

where $\mathbb{C}^\times := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{\times\times} := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ are the simply punctured complex plane and the **doubly punctured complex plane** -which will be important in the sequel-, respectively. In fact, the invertible linear map $(z_1, z_2) \mapsto (z_1 - z_2, z_1 + z_2)$ gives the first isomorphism. For $n = 3$ the invertible rational map $Y_3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\times\times} \times \mathbb{C}^\times \times \mathbb{C}$ given by

$$(z_1, z_2, z_3) \mapsto \left(\frac{z_2 - z_1}{z_3 - z_1}, z_3 - z_1, z_1 \right) \quad \text{with inverse} \quad \vartheta : (z, v, w) \mapsto (w, zv + w, v + w) \quad (2.3)$$

defines an isomorphism concerning Y_3 , see also [8, p.1453] or [18, p.469, eqn (7.3)]. An elementary computation shows that for $n = 3$ the pullback of ${}^{(3)}\Gamma_{\text{Kh3a}}$ with respect to the rational map $\vartheta : \mathbb{C}^{\times\times} \times \mathbb{C}^\times \times \mathbb{C} \rightarrow Y_3$, see (2.3), is equal to

$$(\vartheta^* ({}^{(3)}\Gamma_{\text{Kh3a}})) (z, v, w) = \left(\frac{A_{12}}{z} + \frac{A_{23}}{z-1} \right) dz + \frac{A_{12} + A_{13} + A_{23}}{v} dv \quad (2.4)$$

where we have used Proposition 10 and equations (1.44) and (1.54). It provides an important motivation for the connections used in the following Sections since they resemble the first summand on the right hand side of the previous equation (2.4). Note further that the right action of the permutation group S_3 on Y_3 can be transferred to $\mathbb{C}^{\times\times} \times \mathbb{C}^\times \times \mathbb{C}$ and projected to the doubly punctured plane $\mathbb{C}^{\times\times}$ by means of the maps (2.3). This gives the following maps on $\mathbb{C}^{\times\times}$ as can easily be computed:

$$\tau_{12}(z) = \frac{z}{z-1}, \quad \tau_{23}(z) = \frac{1}{z}, \quad \tau_{13}(z) = 1 - z, \quad \zeta(z) = \frac{1}{1-z}, \quad \zeta^{-1}(z) = \zeta(\zeta(z)) = \frac{z-1}{z} \quad (2.5)$$

where τ_{ij} denotes the transposition exchanging i and j , and ζ denotes the cyclic permutation $(1, 2, 3) \mapsto (3, 1, 2)$. The fact that the maps in (2.5) are well-defined complex rational bijections on the doubly punctured plane satisfying the identities of a right action of the symmetric group S_3 can also be shown directly without reference to the configuration space Y_3 .

2.2 The Drinfel'd associator: Definition and elementary properties

In this Section the Drinfel'd associator is treated: we are not following the usual definition, but use the statement of [18, p.465, Lemma XIX.6.3] as a definition. The parallel transport we are interested in is denoted there by $G_a(1 - a)$ with $a = \delta$.

Let \mathcal{A} be an arbitrary complex unital associative algebra. Set $U :=]0, 1[\subset \mathbb{R}$. For any two given elements $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ define the formal connection

$$\Gamma(B, A)(x) := \left(\frac{1}{x} A + \frac{1}{x-1} B \right) dx \quad (2.6)$$

on U which is obviously well-defined and in addition a flat formal connection, see §1.5, because U is one-dimensional. One of the motivations to use it is the real version of the

first summand of (2.4). Note further that the interval inversion $\iota :]0, 1[\rightarrow]0, 1[$ defined by

$$\iota(x) = 1 - x \quad (2.7)$$

is well-defined and smooth, and it is easy to compute the pulled-back connection

$$\iota^*\Gamma(B, A) = \Gamma(A, B). \quad (2.8)$$

For all $\delta, \epsilon \in J :=]0, 1/4]$ we define the affine path $c_{(\delta\epsilon)} : [0, 1] \rightarrow U$ from δ to $1 - \epsilon$, viz.

$$c_{(\delta\epsilon)}(s) := (1 - s)\delta + s(1 - \epsilon) = \delta + s(1 - \delta - \epsilon). \quad (2.9)$$

Then

$$\Gamma(B, A)^{c_{(\delta\epsilon)}}(s) = \frac{1 - \delta - \epsilon}{\delta + s(1 - \delta - \epsilon)}A + \frac{1 - \delta - \epsilon}{\delta - 1 + s(1 - \delta - \epsilon)}B. \quad (2.10)$$

We are interested in the parallel transport $\Gamma^{(B,A)}W_{10}^{c_{(\delta\epsilon)}}$ along the path $c_{(\delta\epsilon)}$ from δ to $1 - \epsilon$, see §1.4 for definitions and notations. Setting $J' := J \times J$ it follows from the general theory described in §1.3 that the map $(\delta, \epsilon) \mapsto \Gamma^{(B,A)}W_{10}^{c_{(\delta\epsilon)}}$ is an element of the algebra $(\text{Fun}(J', \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A})[[\lambda]]$, see (1.38). It can be expressed in terms of iterated integrals in the following way: we make a change of variables $u := \delta + s(1 - \delta - \epsilon)$, and we set $A_0 := A$, $A_1 := B$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{(B,A)}W_{10}^{c_{(\delta\epsilon)}} &= 1 \\ &+ \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \lambda^r \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_r=0}^1 \left(\int_{\delta}^{1-\epsilon} \frac{1}{u_1 - i_1} \left(\int_{\delta}^{u_1} \frac{1}{u_2 - i_2} \left(\dots \left(\int_{\delta}^{u_{r-1}} \frac{1}{u_r - i_r} du_r \right) \dots \right) du_2 \right) du_1 \right) \\ &\quad A_{i_1} \cdots A_{i_r} \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

It is to be expected that the preceding expression becomes singular whenever $\delta \rightarrow 0$ or $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$: in order to see this assume for a moment that A and B commute. Clearly, $\Gamma(B, A)^{c_{(\delta\epsilon)}}$ commutes with its primitive, and a straight-forward computation following formula (1.21) of Proposition 2 gives

$$\text{if } AB = BA \quad \text{then} \quad \Gamma^{(B,A)}W_{10}^{c_{(\delta\epsilon)}} = e^{\lambda \ln(\epsilon)B} e^{\lambda(\ln(1-\epsilon)A - \ln(1-\delta)B)} e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)A} \quad (2.12)$$

showing that the divergences of the parallel transport are the left and the right factors and are logarithmic for $\delta \rightarrow 0$ or $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ in that particular case whereas the middle factor converges to 1.

Returning to the general case, in order to capture the singular terms we shall break the computation in two parts separated by the mid-point $1/2$: consider the following ‘exponential half-paths’ $\tilde{c}_{(1,\delta)}, \tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)} : [0, 1] \rightarrow U$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{c}_{(1,\delta)}(s) &:= \frac{1}{2}e^{\ln(2\delta)(1-s)} \quad \text{joining } \delta \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}, \\ \tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)}(s) &:= 1 - \frac{1}{2}e^{\ln(2\epsilon)s} \quad \text{joining } \frac{1}{2} \rightarrow 1 - \epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Hence, the composed path $\tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)} * \tilde{c}_{(1,\delta)}$ is continuous and piecewise smooth with singular set $D = \{0, 1/2, 1\}$ and joins $\delta \rightarrow 1 - \epsilon$. The following continuous piecewise smooth reparametrization $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ (with singular set $\{0, 1/2, 1\}$) obviously links the affine path $c_{(\delta\epsilon)}$ with $\tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)} * \tilde{c}_{(1,\delta)}$:

$$\gamma(s) := \begin{cases} \frac{\frac{1}{2}e^{\ln(2\delta)(1-2s)} - \delta}{1 - \delta - \epsilon} & \text{if } 0 \leq s \leq \frac{1}{2}, \\ \frac{1 - \frac{1}{2}e^{\ln(2\delta)(2s-1)} - \delta}{1 - \delta - \epsilon} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq s \leq 1 \end{cases} \quad \text{hence } c_{(\delta\epsilon)} \circ \gamma = \tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)} * \tilde{c}_{(1,\delta)}. \quad (2.14)$$

Using the interval inversion ι as a continuous piecewise smooth reparametrization $[0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ given by (2.7) we can write

$$\tilde{c}_{(1,\delta)} = \iota \circ \tilde{c}_{(2,\delta)} \circ \iota.$$

Since parallel transport is independent on reparametrizations, see (1.45), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{(B,A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\delta\epsilon)})} &= \Gamma_{(B,A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\delta\epsilon)} \circ \gamma)} \stackrel{(2.14)}{=} \Gamma_{(B,A)} W_{10}^{(\tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)} * \tilde{c}_{(1,\delta)})} \\ &\stackrel{(1.47)}{=} \Gamma_{(B,A)} W_{10}^{(\tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)})} \Gamma_{(B,A)} W_{10}^{(\iota \circ \tilde{c}_{(2,\delta)} \circ \iota)} \\ &\stackrel{(1.48), (2.8), (1.46)}{=} \Gamma_{(B,A)} W_{10}^{(\tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)})} \left(\Gamma_{(A,B)} W_{10}^{(\tilde{c}_{(2,\delta)})} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

It follows that it suffices to compute the parallel transport along the exponential half-path $\tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)}$, the parallel transport along the other half $\tilde{c}_{(1,\delta)}$ follows from the symmetry and an exchange of A and B .

The choice of the exponential function in the path $\tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)}$ becomes clear when computing

$$\Gamma(B, A)^{(\tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)})}(s) = \ln(2\epsilon)B + \frac{-\ln(2\epsilon)}{2e^{-\ln(2\epsilon)s} - 1}A, \quad (2.16)$$

and we see that **the term in front of B does not depend on s .**

Lemma 19. *We have the following factorization of the parallel transport $s \mapsto \Gamma_{s0}^{(B,A)} W_{s0}^{(\tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)})}$ in the algebra $(\text{Fun}([0, 1/4], \mathcal{C}_{\{0,1\}}^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{C})) \otimes \mathcal{A})[[\lambda]]$*

$$\Gamma_{s0}^{(B,A)} W_{s0}^{(\tilde{c}_{(2,\epsilon)})} = e^{\lambda \ln(\epsilon)sB} \psi_\epsilon(B, A)(s) \quad (2.17)$$

where $(s, \epsilon) \mapsto \psi_\epsilon(B, A)(s)$ is in the group $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{B}}$ of bounded terms (w.r.t. (s, ϵ) , see (1.31) and (1.32)). We set

$$\psi_\epsilon(B, A) := \psi_\epsilon(B, A)(1).$$

Moreover, there is a well-defined element $\psi(B, A) \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]$ such that the following limit exists

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \psi_\epsilon(B, A)(s) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = 0, \\ \psi(B, A) \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]] & \text{if } 0 < s \leq 1, \end{cases} \quad (2.18)$$

in the sense of limits discussed in §1.3, see (1.23), (1.25) and Proposition 3.

Proof. In (2.16) we set

$$Y_\epsilon(s) := \ln(2\epsilon)B \quad \text{and} \quad Z_\epsilon(s) := \frac{-\ln(2\epsilon)}{2e^{-\ln(2\epsilon)s} - 1}A$$

and use the factorization statement (1.20):

$$\Gamma(B,A)W_{s_0}^{(\tilde{c}(2,\epsilon))} = U_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)}\Xi_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)}. \quad (2.19)$$

Clearly, the formal linear ODE $dU_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)}/ds = \lambda Y_\epsilon U_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)}$ with initial condition 1 is trivially given by the exponential function $U_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)} = e^{\lambda \ln(2\epsilon)sB}$, and we have to solve the formal linear ODE with initial condition 1,

$$\frac{d\Xi_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)}}{ds}(s) = e^{-\lambda \ln(2\epsilon)sB} Z_\epsilon(s) e^{\lambda \ln(2\epsilon)sB} \Xi_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)} = e^{-\lambda \ln(2\epsilon)s \text{ad}_B} (Z_\epsilon(s)) \Xi_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)}$$

where $\text{ad}_B : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ denotes the usual adjoint map $\xi \mapsto B\xi - \xi B$, and we have used the well-known identity that conjugation with exponentials is the exponential of ad which is standard in Lie group theory, see e.g. [20, p.38, Cor.4.25], and can easily be proved algebraically. We can compute the solution $\Xi_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)}$ in terms of iterated integrals, see (1.14), where the following abbreviations make computations easier: set

$$\nu := -\ln(2\epsilon) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau := \nu s, \tau_i := \nu s_i \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Since $0 < 2\epsilon \leq 1/2 < 1$ it follows that $\nu > 0$ and that the limit $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0}$ corresponds to $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow +\infty}$. Then Ξ_ϵ is given by the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)} &= 1 + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \lambda^r \sum_{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_r=0}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda^{\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_r}}{\ell_1! \dots \ell_r!} \text{ad}_B^{\ell_1}(A) \dots \text{ad}_B^{\ell_r}(A) \\ &\quad \underbrace{\left(\int_0^{\nu s} \frac{\tau_1^{\ell_1}}{2e^{\tau_1} - 1} \left(\int_0^{\tau_1} \frac{\tau_2^{\ell_2}}{2e^{\tau_2} - 1} \left(\dots \left(\int_\delta^{\tau_{r-1}} \frac{\tau_r^{\ell_r}}{2e^{\tau_r} - 1} d\tau_r \right) \dots \right) d\tau_2 \right) d\tau_1 \right)}_{:= I_{r, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(s, \nu)} \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

We shall prove that for all non-negative integers r, ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_r with $r \geq 1$ and all $s \in [0, 1]$ the iterated real integral $I_{r, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(s, \nu)$ at the end of (2.20) converges to a non-negative real number for $\nu \rightarrow +\infty$: this will prove that the limit $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Xi_\epsilon(s)$ exists. In case $s = 0$ this is of course obvious since all these integrals vanish. For $s > 0$, the crucial observation is that all the real numbers τ_1, \dots, τ_r are non-negative whence all the functions $\tau_i \mapsto \frac{\tau_i^{\ell_i}}{2e^{\tau_i} - 1}$, $i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, take non-negative values on the interval $[0, \nu s]$. Thanks to the monotonicity of the Riemann integral it follows that enlarging ν makes the interval $[0, \nu s]$ bigger which in turn makes the value of the iterated integral larger: hence the function $[\ln(2), +\infty[\mapsto [0, +\infty[$ given by $\nu \mapsto I_{r, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_r}(s, \nu)$ is strictly increasing. By the well-known principle stating that every increasing bounded sequence of real numbers converges

it suffices to show that all the integrals $I_{r,\ell_1,\dots,\ell_r}(s,\nu)$ admit an upper bound independent on all $s \in [0, 1]$ and $\nu \in [\ln(2), +\infty[$: indeed, the elementary inequality $e^{\tau_i} - 1 \geq 0$ for all positive integer i (since $\tau_i \geq 0$) implies

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} : 2e^{\tau_i} - 1 = e^{\tau_i} + e^{\tau_i} - 1 \geq e^{\tau_i}, \quad \text{hence} \quad \frac{\tau_i^{\ell_i}}{2e^{\tau_i} - 1} \leq \tau_i^{\ell_i} e^{-\tau_i},$$

and the integral $I_{r,\ell_1,\dots,\ell_r}(s,\nu)$ can be bounded by

$$I_{r,\ell_1,\dots,\ell_r}(s,\nu) \leq \left(\int_0^{\nu s} \tau_1^{\ell_1} e^{-\tau_1} d\tau_1 \right) \cdots \left(\int_0^{\nu s} \tau_r^{\ell_r} e^{-\tau_r} d\tau_r \right) \leq \ell_1! \cdots \ell_r!$$

thanks to the well-known integral (for all non-negative integers n)

$$\int_0^\infty \tau^n e^{-\tau} d\tau = n!.$$

This shows that the limit $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \Xi_\epsilon(s)$ exists and does not depend on $0 < s \leq 1$. Using the factorization equation (2.19), the trivial fact that $\ln(2\epsilon) = \ln(2) + \ln(\epsilon)$ and defining

$$\psi_\epsilon(B, A)(s) := e^{\lambda \ln(2)sB} \Xi_\epsilon(s)$$

shows the factorization equation (2.17) and the limit (2.18). In particular, it implies that $\epsilon \mapsto \psi_\epsilon(B, A)$ is bounded, i.e. it is an element of \mathcal{G}_B . \square

This Lemma –together with the factorization equation (2.15)– has the following immediate and very important consequence

Theorem 20. *With the above notations: The parallel transport $\Gamma^{(B,A)} W_{10}^{(c(\delta\epsilon))}$ along the path $c(\delta\epsilon)$, see (2.9), factorizes in the following way*

$$\Gamma^{(B,A)} W_{10}^{(c(\delta\epsilon))} = e^{\lambda \ln(\epsilon)B} \Phi_{\delta,\epsilon}(A, B) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)A}, \quad (2.21)$$

with

$$\Phi_{\delta,\epsilon}(A, B) := \psi_\epsilon(B, A) (\psi_\delta(A, B))^{-1}. \quad (2.22)$$

The following limit exists,

$$\lim_{(\delta,\epsilon) \rightarrow (0,0)} \Phi_{\delta,\epsilon}(A, B) := \Phi(A, B) \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]], \quad (2.23)$$

and is called the **Drinfel'd associator** w.r.t. $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$.

We kept the notation for the Drinfel'd associator used in all the literature although a transposition of the arguments, $\Phi(B, A)$, would ‘better concatenate’ in the identities.

We collect some properties of the Drinfel'd associator:

$$\Phi_{\delta,\epsilon}(A, B)^{-1} = \Phi_{\epsilon,\delta}(B, A) \quad \text{hence} \quad \boxed{\Phi(A, B)^{-1} = \Phi(B, A)} \quad (2.24)$$

which immediately follows from the definitions (2.22) and (2.23). Next, computing the coefficient of λ^1 of (2.21) we get from the right hand side

$$\ln(\epsilon)B + (\Phi_{\delta,\epsilon}(A, B))_1 - \ln(\delta)A$$

and from the left hand side the integral (compare (2.11))

$$\int_{\delta}^{1-\epsilon} \frac{du}{u} A - \int_{\delta}^{1-\epsilon} \frac{du}{1-u} B = \ln(1-\epsilon)A - \ln(\delta)A + \ln(\epsilon)B - \ln(1-\delta)B$$

showing

$$(\Phi_{\delta,\epsilon}(A, B))_1 = \ln(1-\epsilon)A - \ln(1-\delta)B, \quad \text{hence} \quad \boxed{\Phi(A, B) - 1 \in \lambda^2 \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]]}.$$

because obviously $\ln(1-x) \rightarrow 0$ if $x \rightarrow 0$ whence $\lim_{(\delta,\epsilon) \rightarrow (0,0)} (\Phi_{\epsilon,\delta}(B, A))_1 = 0$.

Suppose furthermore that there are elements $\Lambda, \Lambda' \in \mathcal{A}$ which are **central for** A, B in the sense that

$$[\Lambda, A] = 0 = [\Lambda', A] \quad \text{and} \quad [\Lambda, B] = 0 = [\Lambda', B] \quad \text{and} \quad [\Lambda, \Lambda'] = 0.$$

Since the connection $\Gamma(B + \Lambda', A + \Lambda)$ evaluated on the path $c_{(\delta\epsilon)}$, $\Gamma(B + \Lambda', A + \Lambda)^{(c_{(\delta\epsilon)})}$, see (2.10) is equal to $\Gamma(\Lambda', \Lambda)^{(c_{(\delta\epsilon)})} + \Gamma(B, A)^{(c_{(\delta\epsilon)})}$ we can use the factorization statement (1.20) with $Y = \Gamma(\Lambda', \Lambda)^{(c_{(\delta\epsilon)})}$, $Z = \Gamma(B, A)^{(c_{(\delta\epsilon)})}$, and the fact that Λ and Λ' commute with all words in \mathcal{A} whose letters are A, B, Λ or Λ' (hence $U_{\cdot 0}^{-1} Z U_{\cdot 0} = Z$ in (1.20)) we can use (1.21) and (2.12) to conclude that

$$\Phi_{\delta,\epsilon}(A + \Lambda, B + \Lambda') = e^{\lambda(\ln(1-\epsilon)\Lambda - \ln(1-\delta)\Lambda')} \Phi_{\delta,\epsilon}(A, B)$$

hence, passing to the limit $(\delta, \epsilon) \rightarrow (0, 0)$,

$$\text{if } \Lambda, \Lambda' \text{ are central for } A, B : \quad \boxed{\Phi(A + \Lambda, B + \Lambda') = \Phi(A, B)}. \quad (2.25)$$

Note that –but this is not needed later on– if \mathcal{A} carries the structure of a bialgebra (see [18], Sect. III.2) and $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ are primitive elements then $\Phi(A, B)$ is a (formally) group-like element (see [9], p. 836). In particular, when $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{C}\langle A, B \rangle$ the Drinfel'd associator is thus a formal exponential series whose exponent is an element of the formal power series with coefficients in the free Lie algebra generated by two elements.

2.3 The Hexagon Equation

Let \mathcal{A} be an arbitrary complex unital associative algebra. Let $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$ be three arbitrary elements such that the sum $\Lambda := A + B + C$ commutes with all the three, i.e.

$$A\Lambda = \Lambda A, \quad B\Lambda = \Lambda B, \quad C\Lambda = \Lambda C. \quad (2.26)$$

An important particular case would be a free choice of A and B , and $C = -A - B$ whence $\Lambda = 0$. Another important particular case is $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{T}_3$ with $A = t_{12}$, $B = t_{23}$, and $C = t_{13}$. We wish to prove the **Hexagon Equation for the Drinfel'd associator**, i.e.

$$e^{\lambda\pi\mathbf{i}\Lambda} = e^{\lambda\pi\mathbf{i}A} \Phi(C, A) e^{\lambda\pi\mathbf{i}C} \Phi(B, C) e^{\lambda\pi\mathbf{i}B} \Phi(A, B). \quad (2.27)$$

The equation has an obvious cyclic symmetry $A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow A$, and contains the complex numbers π and \mathbf{i} . It is not so far-fetched to choose the following data: let $U \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the doubly punctured complex plane, namely

$$U := \mathbb{C}^{\times\times} := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}.$$

Choose the complex version of the connection $\Gamma(B, A)$, see (2.6), i.e.

$$\Gamma(B, A) := \left(\frac{1}{z}A + \frac{1}{z-1}B \right) dz \quad (2.28)$$

which is flat, see Proposition 11. The original motivation is the use of the $\text{K}\mathbb{H}\mathbb{Z}\mathfrak{a}$ -connection ${}^{(3)}\Gamma_{\text{K}\mathbb{H}\mathbb{Z}\mathfrak{a}}$ on the configuration space Y_3 , see (2.2), and its pull-back, see the first summand of (2.4). Some formulas would look more natural on Y_3 , but the computations are quicker in the doubly punctured complex plane.

Recall the rational maps $\zeta, \zeta \circ \zeta = \zeta^{-1} : \mathbb{C}^{\times\times} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\times\times}$ defined by $\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{1-z}$ and $\zeta^{-1}(z) = \frac{z-1}{z}$ coming from the cyclic permutations in Y_3 , see (2.5). We compute the pull-backs of the connection (2.28): using Proposition 10 we get, upon setting $\tilde{C} := -A - B = C - \Lambda$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\zeta^*\Gamma(B, A))(z) &= \Gamma(B, A) \left(\frac{1}{1-z} \right) \frac{1}{(1-z)^2} = \frac{1}{1-z}A + \frac{1}{z(1-z)}B \\ &\stackrel{\text{partial fraction dec.}}{=} \frac{1}{z}B + \frac{-A-B}{z-1} = \Gamma(\tilde{C}, B)(z). \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

Iterating this formula (recall that $\zeta \circ \zeta = \zeta^{-1}$) gives

$$((\zeta^{-1})^*\Gamma(B, A))(z) = \Gamma(A, \tilde{C})(z). \quad (2.30)$$

We shall now consider the parallel transport w.r.t. the connection $\Gamma(B, A)$ along a continuous piecewise smooth loop c_δ depending on a parameter $\delta \in J =]0, 1/4]$ based at the point $\delta \in \mathbb{C}^{\times\times}$, which is the composition of six paths,

$$c_\delta := c_{(\text{VI}, \delta)} * \left(c_{(\text{V}, \delta)} * \left(c_{(\text{IV}, \delta)} * \left(c_{(\text{III}, \delta)} * \left(c_{(\text{II}, \delta)} * c_{(\text{I}, \delta)} \right) \right) \right) \right) \quad (2.31)$$

given by

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{(I,\delta)}(s) &:= (1-s)\delta + s(1-\delta) = \delta + s(1-2\delta) && \text{joining } \delta \rightarrow 1-\delta, \\
c_{(II,\delta)}(s) &:= \frac{1-\frac{\delta}{2}-\frac{\delta}{2}e^{i\pi s}}{1-\frac{\delta}{2}+\frac{\delta}{2}e^{i\pi s}} = 1 - \frac{\delta}{(1-\frac{\delta}{2})e^{-i\pi s}+\frac{\delta}{2}} && \text{joining } 1-\delta \rightarrow \frac{1}{1-\delta}, \\
c_{(III,\delta)}(s) &:= \zeta(c_{(I,\delta)}(s)) = \frac{1}{1-\delta-s(1-2\delta)} && \text{joining } \frac{1}{1-\delta} \rightarrow \frac{1}{\delta}, \\
c_{(IV,\delta)}(s) &:= \zeta(c_{(II,\delta)}(s)) = \frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}\right) e^{-i\pi s} && \text{joining } \frac{1}{\delta} \rightarrow -\frac{1}{\delta} + 1, \\
c_{(V,\delta)}(s) &:= \zeta(\zeta(c_{(I,\delta)}(s))) = \frac{\delta-1+s(1-2\delta)}{\delta+s(1-2\delta)} && \text{joining } -\frac{1}{\delta} + 1 \rightarrow -\frac{\delta}{1-\delta}, \\
c_{(VI,\delta)}(s) &:= \zeta(\zeta(c_{(II,\delta)}(s))) = \frac{\delta}{-(1-\frac{\delta}{2})e^{-i\pi s}+\frac{\delta}{2}} && \text{joining } -\frac{\delta}{1-\delta} \rightarrow \delta.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

It is fairly easy to check that all the six paths take all their values in the lower half plane (including the x axis and excluding 0 and 1).

The singular set D for the loop c_δ is thus equal to $\{0, \frac{1}{32}, \frac{1}{16}, \frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$.




Figure 1: The paths (2.32) at $\delta = 1/4$

The following geometric description of the paths, see Figure 1, may perhaps clarify the whole procedure: the three ‘odd’ paths $c_{(I,\delta)}$, $c_{(III,\delta)}$, and $c_{(V,\delta)}$ parametrize the closed intervals $[\delta, 1-\delta]$, $\zeta([\delta, 1-\delta]) = [1/(1-\delta), 1/\delta]$, and $\zeta^2([\delta, 1-\delta]) = [-(1/\delta)+1, -\delta/(1-\delta)]$, respectively, all along the x -axis. Note that $c_{(III,\delta)}$ and $c_{(V,\delta)}$ are not affine paths in the sense of (1.42). The three ‘even’ paths $c_{(II,\delta)}$, $c_{(IV,\delta)}$, and $c_{(VI,\delta)}$ parametrize lower half circles with centres $1 + \frac{\delta^2}{2-2\delta}$, $\frac{1}{2}$, and $-\frac{\delta^2}{2-2\delta}$, respectively, having radii $\frac{2\delta-\delta^2}{2-2\delta}$, $\frac{1}{\delta} - \frac{1}{2}$, and $\frac{2\delta-\delta^2}{2-2\delta}$, respectively, as can be checked by a lengthy, but elementary computation. $c_{(II,\delta)}$ and $c_{(VI,\delta)}$ are traced counterclockwise (where the parametrization is NOT uniform), and $c_{(IV,\delta)}$ is traced clockwise with uniform parametrization. If one likes to get a motivation –which is not necessary for the arguments we are going to give– on the ‘funny’ form of the lower half cycle $c_{(II,\delta)}$: if we consider the uniformly parametrized half cycle $[0, 1] \rightarrow Y_3$ in the

configuration space Y_3 given by

$$s \mapsto \left(0, 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} - \frac{\delta}{2} e^{i\pi s}, 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} e^{i\pi s} \right)$$

and apply the first component of the isomorphism (2.3), $(z_1, z_2, z_3) \mapsto \frac{z_2 - z_1}{z_3 - z_1}$, then we get the path $c_{(\text{II}, \delta)}$. The picture in C.Kassel's book [18, p.474, Fig. 8.1] illustrating these paths in Y_3 in a qualitative manner had proved to be very inspiring for us. Note finally that the whole picture of the six paths in the doubly punctured plane has also an obvious reflection symmetry (the 'antiholomorphic' map $\mathbf{s} : z \mapsto 1 - \bar{z}$) with respect to the straight line $x = \frac{1}{2}$. Hence, with the usual interval inversion ι of the interval $[0, 1]$, $\iota(s) = 1 - s$, it is easy to see that the following holds by using the concrete formulas (2.32): $\mathbf{s} \circ c_{(\text{I}, \delta)} \circ \iota = c_{(\text{I}, \delta)}$, $\mathbf{s} \circ c_{(\text{II}, \delta)} \circ \iota = c_{(\text{VI}, \delta)}$, $\mathbf{s} \circ c_{(\text{III}, \delta)} \circ \iota = c_{(\text{V}, \delta)}$, and $\mathbf{s} \circ c_{(\text{IV}, \delta)} \circ \iota = c_{(\text{IV}, \delta)}$.

We shall now compute the six parallel transports along the six paths. First, it is immediate that the parallel transport $\Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{I}, \delta)})}$ coincides with the parallel transport $\Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{\delta\delta})}$ of the preceding Section, see (2.11): this can be seen by using the smooth injection $]0, 1[\rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\times \times}$ to pull back the connection (2.28) to the interval. Using the formulas (2.29) and (2.30) and the fact that $c_{(\text{III}, \delta)} = \zeta \circ c_{(\text{I}, \delta)}$ and $c_{(\text{V}, \delta)} = \zeta \circ \zeta \circ c_{(\text{I}, \delta)}$, see (2.32) we get –upon using (1.48)– the following formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{I}, \delta)})} & \stackrel{(2.21)}{=} \Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{\delta\delta})} e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) B} \Phi_{\delta, \delta}(A, B) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) A}, \\ \Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{III}, \delta)})} & \stackrel{(2.29)}{=} \Gamma_{10}^{(\tilde{C}, B)} W_{10}^{(c_{\delta\delta})} \stackrel{(2.21)}{=} e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) \tilde{C}} \Phi_{\delta, \delta}(B, \tilde{C}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) B}, \\ \Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{V}, \delta)})} & \stackrel{(2.30)}{=} \Gamma_{10}^{(A, \tilde{C})} W_{10}^{(c_{\delta\delta})} \stackrel{(2.21)}{=} e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) A} \Phi_{\delta, \delta}(\tilde{C}, A) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) \tilde{C}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.33)$$

For the even paths we can proceed in exactly the same way: the fact that $c_{(\text{IV}, \delta)} = \zeta \circ c_{(\text{II}, \delta)}$ and $c_{(\text{VI}, \delta)} = \zeta \circ \zeta \circ c_{(\text{I}, \delta)}$, see (2.32) we get –upon using (1.48)– the following formulas:

$$\Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{IV}, \delta)})} = \Gamma_{10}^{(\tilde{C}, B)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{II}, \delta)})} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{VI}, \delta)})} = \Gamma_{10}^{(A, \tilde{C})} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{II}, \delta)})}, \quad (2.34)$$

hence it suffices to compute $\Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{II}, \delta)})}$.

Lemma 21. *With the above definitions and notations: the parallel transport $\Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{II}, \delta)})}$ along the path $c_{(\text{II}, \delta)}$ with respect to the connection $\Gamma(B, A)$ factorizes in the following way*

$$\Gamma_{10}^{(B, A)} W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{II}, \delta)})} = e^{\lambda i\pi B} H^{(\delta)}(B, A) \quad (2.35)$$

where the element $\delta \mapsto H^{(\delta)}(B, A)$ of $\left(\text{Fun}([0, 1/4], \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A} \right)[[\lambda]]$ is a harmless group term, see (1.31), (1.32), and Proposition 4.

Proof. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma(B, A)^{(c(\Pi, \delta))}(s) &= -\mathbf{i}\pi \frac{\delta \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) e^{\mathbf{i}\pi s}}{\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{\delta^2}{4} e^{\mathbf{i}2\pi s}} A + \mathbf{i}\pi \frac{1 - \frac{\delta}{2}}{1 - \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} e^{\mathbf{i}\pi s}} B \\
&= \underbrace{\mathbf{i}\pi B}_{=: Y_0(s)} \underbrace{-\mathbf{i}\pi \delta \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2} e^{\mathbf{i}\pi s}}{1 - \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} e^{\mathbf{i}\pi s}} B + \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) e^{\mathbf{i}\pi s}}{\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{\delta^2}{4} e^{\mathbf{i}2\pi s}} A \right)}_{=: Z^{(\delta)}(s)}. \quad (2.36)
\end{aligned}$$

We can now apply the factorization statement *iv*) of Proposition 2, see (1.20): clearly, the fundamental solution $U_{\cdot 0}(s)$ of the formal linear ODE $\mathbf{d}U_{\cdot 0}/\mathbf{d}s = \lambda Y_0 U_{\cdot 0}$ is simply given by the formal exponential $U_{\cdot 0}(s) = e^{\lambda \mathbf{i}\pi s B}$, and the parallel transport $\Gamma(B, A) W_{\cdot 0}^{(c(\Pi, \delta))}$ thus factorizes thanks to (1.20) as follows for all $s \in [0, 1]$

$$\Gamma(B, A) W_{s0}^{(c(\Pi, \delta))} = e^{\lambda \mathbf{i}\pi s B} H^{(\delta)}(B, A)(s)$$

where $H^{(\delta)}(B, A)(s)$ is a fundamental solution for the formal linear ODE

$$\frac{\mathbf{d}H^{(\delta)}(B, A)}{\mathbf{d}s}(s) = \lambda e^{-\lambda \mathbf{i}\pi s B} Z^{(\delta)}(s) e^{\lambda \mathbf{i}\pi s B} H^{(\delta)}(B, A)(s) = \lambda \underbrace{\left(e^{-\lambda \mathbf{i}\pi s \mathbf{ad}_B} (Z^{(\delta)}(s)) \right)}_{=: \tilde{Z}^{(\delta)}(s)} H^{(\delta)}(B, A)(s)$$

with initial condition $H^{(\delta)}(B, A)(0) = 1$. We shall make the upper bound test (1.40) for $\tilde{Z}^{(\delta)}(s)$, see Lemma 7: writing $\tilde{Z}^{(\delta)}(s) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r \tilde{Z}_r^{(\delta)}(s)$ we get –upon using an arbitrary norm $\|\cdot\|$ on the complex vector space \mathcal{A} (see §1.3 for more details)– for each $r \in \mathbb{N}$ upon setting $d_{r0} := 1$ if $r = 0$ and $d_{r0} := 0$ otherwise:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \tilde{Z}_r^{(\delta)}(s) \right\| &= \left\| \frac{\mathbf{i}^r \pi^r s^r}{r!} \mathbf{ad}_B^{\text{or}} (Z^{(\delta)}(s)) \right\| \\
(2.36) \quad &= \frac{\pi^{r+1} s^r}{r!} \delta \left\| \frac{d_{r0} \frac{1}{2} e^{\mathbf{i}\pi s}}{1 - \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} e^{\mathbf{i}\pi s}} B + \frac{\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) e^{\mathbf{i}\pi s}}{\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{\delta^2}{4} e^{\mathbf{i}2\pi s}} \mathbf{ad}_B^{\text{or}} (A) \right\| \\
&\leq \underbrace{\frac{\pi^{r+1}}{r!} (\|B\| + 2 \|\mathbf{ad}_B^{\text{or}} (A)\|)}_{=: \check{C}_r} \delta
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $|e^{\mathbf{i}\tau}| = 1$ for each real number τ , and the elementary lower bounds

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} e^{\mathbf{i}\pi s} \right| &\geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2} - \left| \frac{\delta}{2} e^{\mathbf{i}\pi s} \right| = 1 - \delta \geq \frac{1}{2}, \\
\left| \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{\delta^2}{4} e^{\mathbf{i}2\pi s} \right| &\geq \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)^2 - \left| \frac{\delta^2}{4} e^{\mathbf{i}2\pi s} \right| = 1 - \delta \geq \frac{1}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

for the denominators. It follows that $\delta \mapsto H^{(\delta)}(B, A)$ is a harmless group term. \square

We now need to put the loop c_δ in a star-shaped open set U' of $\mathbb{C}^{\times\times}$ because $\mathbb{C}^{\times\times}$ is NOT star-shaped (it is not even simply connected). Define

$$U' := \mathbb{C} \setminus \left\{ \frac{1-\mathbf{i}}{2} + t(\gamma + \mathbf{i}) \in \mathbb{C} \mid t \in \mathbb{R}, t \geq \frac{1}{2}, \gamma \in \{-1, 1\} \right\} \quad (2.37)$$

which is the complex plane minus two closed half-lines emanating from 0 with slope -1 and from 1 with slope 1, both in the direction of non-negative imaginary part. Clearly, 0 and 1 do not belong to U' whence $U' \subset \mathbb{C}^{\times\times}$ is an open subset. By elementary linear algebra it is shown that every point z of the plane \mathbb{C} lies on a straight (real) line passing through the point $q = (1 - \mathbf{i})/2$. If z does not lie on one of the two straight lines having slope 1 or -1 , it is clear by the definition of U' that the unique straight line passing through q and z belongs to U' . On the other hand, if a point of $z \in U'$ is on one of the straight lines with slope 1 or -1 , its imaginary part is necessarily strictly negative. Clearly, the so-called lower half plane H^- (i.e. the subset of all points having strictly negative imaginary part) belongs to U' , contains q , and is obviously convex, i.e. the line segment joining two distinct points $z_1, z_2 \in H^-$ is again contained in H^- . It follows from the preceding discussion that U' is star-shaped around $q = \frac{1-\mathbf{i}}{2}$ and $\forall \delta \in]0, 1/4]$ we have $c_\delta(s) \in U'$. We now have all the necessary information to prove the following

Theorem 22 (Hexagon Equation). *Let \mathcal{A} be an arbitrary complex associative unital algebra, and let $A, B, C \in \mathcal{A}$ be three elements satisfying (2.26). Then the Hexagon equation (2.27) for the Drinfel'd associator holds.*

Proof. Since the composed loop c_δ , see (2.31), is contained in the star-shaped open subset U' , see (2.37), we can apply Corollary 14 to conclude that the parallel transport around the loop c_δ along the flat connection $\Gamma(B, A)$, see (2.28), is equal to 1. Abbreviating ${}^{\Gamma(B,A)}W_{10}^{(c)}$ by $W_{10}^{(c)}$ for any piecewise smooth path $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow U'$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = W_{10}^{(c_\delta)} & \stackrel{(1.47)}{=} W_{10}^{(c_{\text{VI},\delta})} W_{10}^{(c_{\text{V},\delta})} W_{10}^{(c_{\text{IV},\delta})} W_{10}^{(c_{\text{III},\delta})} W_{10}^{(c_{\text{II},\delta})} W_{10}^{(c_{\text{I},\delta})} \\ & \stackrel{(2.34),(2.35),(2.33)}{=} e^{\lambda i \pi A} H^{(\delta)}(A, \tilde{C}) e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) A} \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(\tilde{C}, A) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) \tilde{C}} \\ & e^{\lambda i \pi \tilde{C}} H^{(\delta)}(\tilde{C}, B) e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) \tilde{C}} \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(B, \tilde{C}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) B} \\ & e^{\lambda i \pi B} H^{(\delta)}(B, A) e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) B} \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(A, B) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) A}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

Clearly, the three singular terms $\delta \mapsto e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) A}$, $\delta \mapsto e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) B}$, and $\delta \mapsto e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) \tilde{C}}$ belong to the at most logarithmically diverging group terms, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{L}}$, see (1.32) for $J =]0, 1/4]$. Hence, the following three conjugations again define harmless group terms according to statement *iv.*) of Proposition 4:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}^{(\delta)}(A, \tilde{C}) & := e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) A} H^{(\delta)}(A, \tilde{C}) e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) A}, \\ \tilde{H}^{(\delta)}(\tilde{C}, B) & := e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) \tilde{C}} H^{(\delta)}(\tilde{C}, B) e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) \tilde{C}}, \\ \tilde{H}^{(\delta)}(B, A) & := e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) B} H^{(\delta)}(B, A) e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) B}. \end{aligned}$$

Rewriting (2.38) by means of these harmless group terms we see that the three singular terms mentioned above, $e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)A}$, $e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)B}$, and $e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)\tilde{C}}$, cancel out, and we are left with the following identity:

$$1 = e^{\lambda i\pi A} \tilde{H}^{(\delta)}(A, \tilde{C}) \Phi_{\delta, \delta}(\tilde{C}, A) e^{\lambda i\pi \tilde{C}} \tilde{H}^{(\delta)}(\tilde{C}, B) \Phi_{\delta, \delta}(B, \tilde{C}) e^{\lambda i\pi B} \tilde{H}^{(\delta)}(B, A) \Phi_{\delta, \delta}(A, B).$$

Passing to the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ we get –thanks to the limit rules (1.28), the definition of the Drinfel'd associator (2.23), and the fact that harmless group terms tend to 1 for $\delta \rightarrow 0$ (see statement *v.*) of Proposition 4)– the following equation (recall that $\tilde{C} = C - \Lambda$)

$$1 = e^{\lambda \pi i A} \Phi(C - \Lambda, A) e^{\lambda \pi i (C - \Lambda)} \Phi(B, C - \Lambda) e^{\lambda \pi i B} \Phi(A, B).$$

This equation immediately results in the Hexagon equation (2.27) thanks to the fact that Λ commutes with A, B and C whence $\Phi(C - \Lambda, A) = \Phi(C, A)$, $\Phi(B, C - \Lambda) = \Phi(B, C)$ by (2.25). \square

2.4 The Pentagon Equation

Let \mathcal{A} be an arbitrary complex unital associative algebra. Let $A_{12} = A_{21}, A_{13} = A_{31}, A_{14} = A_{41}, A_{23} = A_{32}, A_{24} = A_{42}, A_{34} = A_{43} \in \mathcal{A}$ six elements satisfying the infinitesimal braid relations (0.1b) and (0.1c). We wish to prove the **Pentagon Equation for the Drinfel'd associator**, see (0.3).

The first naive observations are the following: the element A_{14} does not occur in the equation, and there is an obvious symmetry by passing to the inverse and sending $(1, 2, 3, 4)$ to $(4, 3, 2, 1)$ where (2.24) is used. Moreover, the right associator on the right hand side only depends on the numbers 1, 2, 3 and the left associator on the right hand side only depends on the numbers 2, 3, 4. Finally, the element A_{23} does not occur in the middle factor on the right hand side.

We shall try to represent each side of the Pentagon Equation (0.3) by the parallel transport along the composition of three paths, $c_{(\text{III}, \delta)} * (c_{(\text{II}, \delta)} * c_{(\text{I}, \delta)})$, for the right hand side, and along the composition of two paths $c_{(\text{V}, \delta)} * c_{(\text{IV}, \delta)}$ for the left hand side, both having the same initial and final points. Since the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4 occur it seems plausible to use the open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^4$,

$$U := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^4 \mid x_1 < x_2 < x_3 < x_4\},$$

which can be interpreted as the space of all ordered configurations of four particles on the real line, see [9, p. 834, line 2]. Clearly, U is a subset of the configuration space Y_4 . Following Drinfel'd we shall use the pull-back of the $\text{K}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{a}$ -connection ${}^{(4)}\Gamma_{\text{K}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{a}}$ from Y_4 to U (with respect to the canonical injection $U \rightarrow Y_4$) which is still flat, see Theorem 18 and Proposition 12. Since the $\text{K}\mathfrak{H}\mathfrak{Z}\mathfrak{a}$ -connections are invariant under simultaneous translations, it is not unreasonable to assume that the first coordinate x_1 of all the paths is fixed to be 0. Next, the fact that A_{14} does not occur in the Pentagon equation may lead us to the ansatz that the difference $x_4 - x_1$ should remain constant; on the other hand the fact that there are terms in the Pentagon Equation not containing 1 and not containing 4 suggests

that x_4 should be ‘far away from $x_1 = 0$ ’, hence we set $x_1 = 0$ and $x_4 = 1$. Define the open full triangle

$$U' := \{(x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid 0 < x_2 < x_3 < 1\}.$$

Note that U' is invariant under the involutive diffeomorphism

$$\Theta : U' \rightarrow U' : (x_2, x_3) \mapsto (1 - x_3, 1 - x_2).$$

Moreover, it is easy to see that U' is convex, i.e. that for each pair of elements (x_2, x_3) and (y_2, y_3) the line segment $s \mapsto ((1-s)x_2 + sy_2, (1-s)x_3 + sy_3)$ is contained in U' . Moreover, the point $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3})$ is contained in U' whence U' is **star-shaped around** $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3})$.

Using the injection $i : U' \rightarrow U \rightarrow Y_4 : (x_2, x_3) \mapsto (0, x_2, x_3, 1)$ we can pull back the KH3a -connection ${}^{(4)}\Gamma_{\text{KH3a}}$ to U' . Writing (A_{ij}) for $(A_{12}, A_{13}, A_{14}, A_{23}, A_{24}, A_{34})$ an easy computation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(x_2, x_3) := \Gamma((A_{ij}))(x_2, x_3) &:= (i^* ({}^{(4)}\Gamma_{\text{KH3a}}))(x_2, x_3) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{x_2} A_{12} + \frac{1}{x_2 - x_3} A_{23} + \frac{1}{x_2 - 1} A_{24} \right) dx_2 \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{x_3} A_{13} - \frac{1}{x_2 - x_3} A_{23} + \frac{1}{x_3 - 1} A_{34} \right) dx_3. \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

Clearly, Γ is (formally) flat according to Theorem 18 and Proposition 12, but its (formal) flatness can easily be computed directly from formula (2.39). Moreover, it is easy to compute that

$$\Theta^*(\Gamma((A_{ij}))) = \Gamma((A_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)})) \quad \text{with } \sigma : (1, 2, 3, 4) \mapsto (4, 3, 2, 1). \quad (2.40)$$

Next, we would like to substantiate in terms of paths the five ‘zones’ which Drinfel’d mentions in his articles, see cf. [8, p.1454] or [9, p.834, line 3,4] (where the fifth zone in [9] has been forgotten in the English translation, see the original article in Russian language, p.154, paragraph before the Lemma, for a complete description): here certain pairs of coordinates are ‘very close’ to each others, others are ‘medium close’ and still others are ‘far’ which is expressed in terms of inequalities using the symbol \ll : using the real number $\delta \in]0, 1/4]$ –which is meant to be sent to zero– we interpret –as a rule of thumb– ‘very close’ as $\approx \delta^2$, ‘medium close’ as around $\approx \delta$, and ‘far’ as ≈ 1 . Inspired by the picture [18, p.478, Fig.8.2.] we first use the following subdivision of the interval $]0, 1[$, in which we imagine that both x_2 and x_3 ‘move’ between the selected positions,

$$0 < \delta^2 < \delta - \delta^2 < \delta < 1 - \delta < 1 - \delta + \delta^2 < 1 - \delta^2 < 1,$$

and –being fully aware of the nonuniqueness of our choice– associate the following five points in U' (as part of the (x_2, x_3) plane) as an interpretation of the five zones (recall that

$x_1 = 0$ and $x_4 = 1$):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{zone 1 : } & \text{"}x_2 - x_1 \ll x_3 - x_1 \ll x_4 - x_1\text{" interpreted as } (\delta^2, \delta) =: p_1, \\
\text{zone 2 : } & \text{"}x_3 - x_2 \ll x_3 - x_1 \ll x_4 - x_1\text{" interpreted as } (\delta - \delta^2, \delta) =: p_2, \\
\text{zone 3 : } & \text{"}x_3 - x_2 \ll x_4 - x_2 \ll x_4 - x_1\text{" interpreted as } (1 - \delta, 1 - \delta + \delta^2) =: p_3, \\
\text{zone 4 : } & \text{"}x_4 - x_3 \ll x_4 - x_2 \ll x_4 - x_1\text{" interpreted as } (1 - \delta, 1 - \delta^2) =: p_4, \\
\text{zone 5 : } & \text{"}x_2 - x_1 \ll \ll x_4 - x_1 \text{ and} \\
& \quad \quad \quad x_4 - x_3 \ll \ll x_4 - x_1\text{" interpreted as } (\delta^2, 1 - \delta^2) =: p_5.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.41}$$

There is thus the following simple ansatz for the following five affine paths subsequently joining the above five points by the unique line segments between them, see (1.42), where $\iota : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ denotes the usual interval inversion $s \mapsto 1 - s$:

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{(I,\delta)} & := c_{p_2 \leftarrow p_1}, & c_{(II,\delta)} & := c_{p_3 \leftarrow p_2} = \Theta \circ c_{(II,\delta)} \circ \iota, & c_{(III,\delta)} & := c_{p_4 \leftarrow p_3} = \Theta \circ c_{(I,\delta)} \circ \iota, \\
c_{(IV,\delta)} & := c_{p_5 \leftarrow p_1}, & c_{(V,\delta)} & := c_{p_4 \leftarrow p_5} = \Theta \circ c_{(IV,\delta)} \circ \iota.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

which can be depicted in Figure 2 describing a non-regular pentagon whose vertices are the five ‘zone’ points (2.41) and whose edges are the images of the five affine paths (2.42). Note that the symmetry Θ –which is a symmetry of the pentagon– is the reflection with respect to the straight line whose equation is $x_3 = 1 - x_2$. Note furthermore that the second path is the only path where both coordinates x_2, x_3 are moving, but their distance is kept constant (inspired by the observation of the absence of A_{23} in the middle factor on the right hand side of the Pentagon Equation (0.3)).

We are now going to compute the parallel transports along the five paths of (2.42) with respect to the connection Γ , see (2.39). Thanks to (2.40), (1.46), and (1.48) it suffices to compute the parallel transports $W_{10}^{(c_{(I,\delta)})}$, $W_{10}^{(c_{(II,\delta)})}$, and $W_{10}^{(c_{(IV,\delta)})}$ –we henceforth suppress the symbol Γ attached to W –, the other two will be immediate from the above identities for symmetries and reparametrizations of parallel transports.

We get the following Lemma:

Lemma 23. *With the above notations, we get the following results for the five parallel*




Figure 2: The paths (2.42) in the x_2 - x_3 -plane

transports for all $\delta \in \mathbf{J} =]0, 1/4]$:

$$\begin{aligned}
W_{10}^{(c(I,\delta))} &= e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) A_{23}} \psi_{\delta}(A_{23}, A_{12}) H^{(I,\delta)} \psi_{\delta}(A_{12}, A_{23})^{-1} e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) A_{12}}, \\
W_{10}^{(c(II,\delta))} &= e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{24}+A_{34})} \psi_{\delta}(A_{24} + A_{34}, A_{12} + A_{23}) H^{(II,\delta)} \psi_{\delta}(A_{12} + A_{13}, A_{24} + A_{34})^{-1} \\
&\quad e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{12}+A_{13})}, \\
W_{10}^{(c(III,\delta))} &= e^{\lambda \ln(\delta) A_{34}} \psi_{\delta}(A_{34}, A_{23}) H^{(III,\delta)} \psi_{\delta}(A_{23}, A_{34})^{-1} e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta) A_{23}}, \\
W_{10}^{(c(IV,\delta))} &= e^{\lambda \ln(\delta^2) A_{34}} \psi_{\delta^2}(A_{34}, A_{13} + A_{23}) H^{(IV,\delta)} \psi_{\delta}(A_{13} + A_{23}, A_{34})^{-1} e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{13}+A_{23})}, \\
W_{10}^{(c(V,\delta))} &= e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{23}+A_{24})} \psi_{\delta}(A_{23} + A_{24}, A_{12}) H^{(V,\delta)} \psi_{\delta^2}(A_{12}, A_{23} + A_{24})^{-1} e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta^2) A_{12}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

where the ψ -terms are defined in (2.17), see also (2.18) and (2.22), and the terms $\delta \mapsto H^{(i,\delta)}$ for $i = \text{I, II, III, IV, V}$ are harmless group terms, see (1.31), (1.32), and Proposition 4. Note that the appearance of δ^2 in the terms $W_{10}^{(c(IV,\delta))}$ and $W_{10}^{(c(V,\delta))}$ is crucial for Theorem 24.

Proof. In order to compute the parallel transports we shall again use the half exponential paths already used in §2.2, of the type (2.13). More precisely, for each of the three paths $c(I,\delta)$, $c(II,\delta)$, $c(IV,\delta)$ –recall that the parallel transport along $c(III,\delta)$ and $c(V,\delta)$ can be computed using the symmetry indicated in (2.42)– we choose a mid-point on the corresponding line

segment in U' , and we replace each affine path $c_{(i,\delta)}$ by a composition of two exponential half paths tracing the same line segment, $\tilde{c}_{(i,2,\delta)} * (\check{c}_{(i,1,\delta)} \circ \iota)$ where $i = \text{I, II, III, IV, V}$, $\iota : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1] : s \mapsto 1 - s$ is the usual interval inversion, $\check{c}_{(i,1,\delta)}$ joins the midpoint to the initial point, and $\tilde{c}_{(i,2,\delta)}$ joins the midpoint to the final point. Since $c_{(i,\delta)}$ and $\tilde{c}_{(i,2,\delta)} * (\check{c}_{(i,1,\delta)} \circ \iota)$ just differ by a reparametrization they induce the same parallel transport, see (1.45), which implies

$$W_{10}^{(c_{(i,\delta)})} = W_{10}^{(\tilde{c}_{(i,2,\delta)})} \left(W_{10}^{(\check{c}_{(i,1,\delta)})} \right)^{-1} \quad (2.44)$$

where the inversion fomula (1.46) has been used. Hence, we choose the following paths (where $\hat{\delta} := \delta(1 - \delta/2)$)

$$\begin{aligned} \check{c}_{(\text{I},1,\delta)}(s) &:= \left(\frac{\delta}{2} e^{\ln(2\delta)s}, \delta \right) && \text{joining} && \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \delta \right) && \rightarrow && (\delta^2, \delta), \\ \check{c}_{(\text{I},2,\delta)}(s) &:= \left(\delta - \frac{\delta}{2} e^{\ln(2\delta)s}, \delta \right) && \text{joining} && \left(\frac{\delta}{2}, \delta \right) && \rightarrow && (\delta - \delta^2, \delta), \\ \check{c}_{(\text{II},1,\delta)}(s) &:= \Theta(\tilde{c}_{(\text{II},2,\delta)}(s)) && \text{joining} && \left(\frac{1-\delta^2}{2}, \frac{1+\delta^2}{2} \right) && \rightarrow && (\delta - \delta^2, \delta), \\ \tilde{c}_{(\text{II},2,\delta)}(s) &:= \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{\ln(2\hat{\delta})s} \right) (1, 1) + \left(-\frac{\delta^2}{2}, \frac{\delta^2}{2} \right) && \text{joining} && \left(\frac{1-\delta^2}{2}, \frac{1+\delta^2}{2} \right) && \rightarrow && (1 - \delta, 1 - \delta + \delta^2), \\ \check{c}_{(\text{IV},1,\delta)}(s) &:= \left(\delta^2, \frac{1}{2} e^{\ln(2\delta)s} \right) && \text{joining} && \left(\delta^2, \frac{1}{2} \right) && \rightarrow && (\delta^2, \delta), \\ \tilde{c}_{(\text{IV},2,\delta)}(s) &:= \left(\delta^2, 1 - \frac{1}{2} e^{\ln(2\delta^2)s} \right) && \text{joining} && \left(\delta^2, \frac{1}{2} \right) && \rightarrow && (\delta^2, 1 - \delta^2). \end{aligned} \quad (2.45)$$

When we compute $\Gamma^{(c_{(i,u,\delta)})}(s)$ (for $i = \text{I, II, III, IV, V}$ and $u = 1, 2$) we shall see further down that we always get the following form –writing d for the paths $\check{c}_{(i,1,\delta)}$ or $\tilde{c}_{(i,2,\delta)}$:

$$\Gamma^{(d)}(s) = \underbrace{\ln(2\epsilon(\delta))B + \frac{-\ln(2\epsilon(\delta))}{2e^{-\ln(2\epsilon(\delta))s} - 1}A}_{=: Y_0(B,A)(s,\epsilon)} + \underbrace{\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4} f_{ij}(s, \delta) A_{ij}}_{=: Z(s,\delta)} \quad (2.46)$$

–which is well-known from §2.2, (2.16)– where $\epsilon : J \rightarrow J$ is a monomial of δ of the form $\epsilon(\delta) = \delta^\ell$ where ℓ is a positive integer, A, B are certain linear combinations of the algebra elements A_{ij} , and f_{ij} are real-valued functions of $s \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta \in J :=]0, 1/4]$. From the general factorization statement (1.20) and the solution (2.17) of Lemma 19 –which lead to associators– we have the factorization

$$W_{s_0}^{(c_{(i,u,\delta)})} = \underbrace{e^{\lambda \ln(\epsilon)sB} \psi_\epsilon(B, A)(s)}_{=: U_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)}} H_{s_0}^{(i,u,\delta)}, \quad (2.47)$$

where $s \mapsto H_{s_0}^{(i,u,\delta)}$ is a fundamental solution to the formal linear ODE

$$\frac{dH_{s_0}^{(i,u,\delta)}}{ds} = \lambda U_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)-1} Z(s, \delta) U_{s_0}^{(\epsilon)} H_{s_0}^{(i,u,\delta)} =: \lambda \tilde{Z}(s, \delta) H_{s_0}^{(i,u,\delta)}.$$

We shall show later that all these factors $\delta \mapsto H_{10}^{(i,u,\delta)}$ are harmless group terms: first, we shall prove that it suffices to show that for each $1 \leq i < j \leq 4$ there are non-negative real numbers C_{ij} and $\beta_{ij} > 0$ such that

$$\forall s \in [0, 1], \forall \delta \in J: |f_{ij}(s, \delta)| \leq C_{ij} \delta^{\beta_{ij}}. \quad (2.48)$$

Indeed, we check that the preceding condition (2.48) implies the estimate of type (H), (1.40): write $\psi_\epsilon(B, A)(s) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \psi_r(s, \epsilon) \lambda^r$ and its inverse $\psi_\epsilon(B, A)(s)^{-1}$ as $\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \hat{\psi}_r(s, \epsilon) \lambda^r$ where of course $\psi_0(s, \epsilon) = 1 = \hat{\psi}_0(s, \epsilon)$. Fix a norm $\| \cdot \|$ on the complex vector space \mathcal{A} . Since $s = |s| \leq 1$ and for each non-negative integer r there are positive real constants C_r and \hat{C}_r with $\|\psi_r(s, \epsilon)\| \leq C_r$ and $\|\hat{\psi}_r(s, \epsilon)\| \leq \hat{C}_r$ independent on s, ϵ thanks to Lemma 19 we get for each non-negative integer r

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \tilde{Z}(s, \delta)_r \right\| &= \left\| \left(e^{\lambda \ln(\epsilon) \text{ad}_B} \left(\sum_{u,v=0}^{\infty} \psi_u(s, \epsilon) Z(s, \delta) \hat{\psi}_v(s, \epsilon) \lambda^{u+v} \right) \right)_r \right\| \\ &= \left\| \sum_{v,w=0}^r \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4} f_{ij}(s, \delta) \frac{(\ln(\epsilon))^w s^w}{w!} f_{ij}(s, \delta) (\text{ad}_B)^{ow} \left(\psi_{r-v-w}(s, \epsilon) A_{ij} \hat{\psi}_v(s, \epsilon) \right) \right\| \\ &\leq \sum_{w=0}^r \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4} |f_{ij}(s, \delta)| \frac{\ell^w |\ln(\delta)|^w}{w!} \left\| \sum_{v=0}^r (\text{ad}_B)^{ow} \left(\psi_{r-v-w}(s, \epsilon) A_{ij} \hat{\psi}_v(s, \epsilon) \right) \right\| \\ &\stackrel{(2.48)}{\leq} \sum_{w=0}^r \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq 4} C_{ij} \delta^{\beta_{ij}} |\ln(\delta)|^w C'_w \stackrel{(1.35)}{\leq} C''_r \delta^{\beta_r} \end{aligned}$$

where the non-negative real constant C'_w ($0 \leq w \leq r$) is an upper bound for the finite sum over v of bounded algebra elements, $0 < \beta_r$ is the minimum of all $\beta_{ij}/2$, $1 \leq i < j \leq 4$, coming from inequality (1.35), and the non-negative real number C''_r is the maximum of all appearing non-negative multiplicative upper bounds. This proves the last inequality in (1.40) and, according to Lemma 7, the fact that each $\delta \mapsto H_{10}^{(i,u,\delta)}$ is a harmless group term. In the following we prove the criterion (2.48) for each path where the following elementary inequality will occur quite often:

$$\forall s \in [0, 1] \forall \gamma \in J =]0, 1[: 1 \leq e^{-\ln(\gamma)s} \leq \frac{1}{\gamma}. \quad (2.49)$$

Recall that the logarithms $\ln(2\delta)$, $\ln(2\hat{\delta})$, and $\ln(1 - \frac{\delta}{2})$ are non-positive numbers.

I. An elementary computation gives the following formulas for $\Gamma^{(\tilde{c}(1,1,\delta))}$ and $\Gamma^{(\tilde{c}(1,2,\delta))}$ showing that they are of the form (2.46) with $\epsilon = \delta$, with $B = A_{12}$, $A = A_{23}$ for the first path, and

with $B = A_{23}$, $A = A_{12}$ for the second path:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{(\tilde{c}_{(I,1,\delta)})}(s) &= \ln(2\delta)A_{12} + \frac{-\ln(2\delta)}{2e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} - 1}A_{23} + \underbrace{\delta \frac{(-\ln(2\delta))}{2e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} - \delta}}_{=:f_{24}^{(I,1,\delta)}(s)}A_{24}, \\ \Gamma^{(\tilde{c}_{(I,2,\delta)})}(s) &= \ln(2\delta)A_{23} + \frac{-\ln(2\delta)}{2e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} - 1}A_{12} + \underbrace{\delta \frac{\ln(2\delta)}{2(1-\delta)e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} + \delta}}_{=:f_{24}^{(I,2,\delta)}(s)}A_{24}.\end{aligned}$$

For both denominators in the expressions for $f^{(I,1,\delta)}(s)$ and $f^{(I,2,\delta)}(s)$ the inequality (2.49) gives us the obvious lower bound $2 - \delta > 1$ (for $s = 0$), hence

$$\begin{aligned}\left|f_{24}^{(I,1,\delta)}(s)\right| &\leq \delta(\ln(2) + |\ln(\delta)|) \stackrel{(1.35)}{\leq} 3\delta^{1/2}, \\ \left|f_{24}^{(I,2,\delta)}(s)\right| &\leq \delta(\ln(2) + |\ln(\delta)|) \stackrel{(1.35)}{\leq} 3\delta^{1/2},\end{aligned}$$

thanks to $\ln(2) \leq 1$ and $\delta \leq \delta^{1/2}$ for all $\delta \in [0, 1]$. By the criterion (2.48) the terms $\delta \mapsto H^{(I,1,\delta)}$ and $\delta \mapsto H^{(I,2,\delta)}$ in the factorization equation (2.47) are thus harmless group terms. The factorization equation (2.47) and (2.44) prove the first equation in (2.43) upon setting $H^{(I,\delta)} := H^{(I,2,\delta)}(H^{(I,1,\delta)})^{-1}$.

II: An elementary, but lengthy computation gives the following formula for $\Gamma^{(\tilde{c}_{(II,2,\delta)})}$ showing that it is of the form (2.46) with $\epsilon = \delta$, $B = A_{24} + A_{34}$, and $A = A_{12} + A_{13}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{(\tilde{c}_{(II,2,\delta)})} &= \ln(2\delta)(A_{24} + A_{34}) + \frac{-\ln(2\delta)}{2e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} - 1}(A_{12} + A_{13}) \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{\ln\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) - \delta^2 \ln(2\delta)e^{-\ln(2\hat{\delta})s}}{1 + \delta^2 e^{-\ln(2\hat{\delta})s}}}_{=:f_{24}^{(II,2,\delta)}(s)}A_{24} + \underbrace{\frac{\ln\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) + \delta^2 \ln(2\delta)e^{-\ln(2\hat{\delta})s}}{1 - \delta^2 e^{-\ln(2\hat{\delta})s}}}_{=:f_{34}^{(II,2,\delta)}(s)}A_{34} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{\ln\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) - \ln(2\hat{\delta})2e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} + \ln(2\delta)(2 - \delta^2)e^{-\ln(2\hat{\delta})s}}{\left((2 - \delta^2)e^{-\ln(2\hat{\delta})s} - 1\right)(2e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} - 1)}}_{=:f_{12}^{(II,2,\delta)}(s)}A_{12} \\ &+ \underbrace{\frac{\ln\left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) - \ln(2\hat{\delta})2e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} + \ln(2\delta)(2 + \delta^2)e^{-\ln(2\hat{\delta})s}}{\left((2 + \delta^2)e^{-\ln(2\hat{\delta})s} - 1\right)(2e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} - 1)}}_{=:f_{13}^{(II,2,\delta)}(s)}A_{13}\end{aligned}$$

We shall now prove the upper bound (2.48) for the four functions $f_{24}^{(II,2,\delta)}$, $f_{34}^{(II,2,\delta)}$, $f_{12}^{(II,2,\delta)}$,

and $f_{13}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$. Note first the following elementary inequality for all $0 < \delta \leq 1/4$

$$\left| \ln \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \right| = -\ln \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \leq \delta. \quad (2.50)$$

Indeed, for all $0 < x \leq 1$ we have $\frac{1}{x} \leq \frac{1}{x^2}$, hence

$$-\ln \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) = \int_{1-\frac{\delta}{2}}^1 \frac{1}{x} dx \leq \int_{1-\frac{\delta}{2}}^1 \frac{1}{x^2} dx = \frac{\delta}{2-\delta} \leq \delta.$$

For $f_{24}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$ and $f_{34}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$ we can bound both denominators by $1/2$ from below thanks to the lower bound 1 in (2.49). In the numerators the exponential function $e^{-\ln(2\delta)s}$ has an upper bound $\frac{1}{2\delta} = \frac{1}{2\delta(1-\frac{\delta}{2})} \leq \frac{1}{\delta}$ by (2.49). Hence, both functions have the following upper bounds (where we also use the inequality (2.50)): for all $s \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta \in]0, 1/4]$

$$\begin{cases} \left| f_{24}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}(s) \right| \\ \left| f_{34}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}(s) \right| \end{cases} \leq 2\delta + 2\ln(2\delta)\delta^2 \frac{1}{\delta} \stackrel{(1.35)}{\leq} 8\delta^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where the inequalities $\delta \leq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\ln(2) \leq 1$ have been used. It follows that the criterion (2.48) holds for $f_{24}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$ and $f_{34}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$.

For $f_{12}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$ and $f_{13}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$ note first that their numerators can be expressed in the following form where we have extracted a factor $\frac{1}{2}e^{-\ln(2\delta)s}$:

$$\frac{1}{2}e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} \left(-2\ln \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) (2 - e^{\ln(2\delta)s}) + 4\ln(2\delta) \left(e^{-\ln(1-\frac{\delta}{2})s} - 1 \right) - 2g\ln(2\delta)\delta^2 e^{-\ln(1-\frac{\delta}{2})s} \right).$$

with $g \in \{-1, 1\}$. On the other hand, in the denominators of $f_{12}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$ and $f_{13}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$ we can bound both left factors from below by $\frac{1}{2}$ thanks to the lower bound 1 in (2.49), and both right factors from below by $e^{-\ln(2\delta)s}$. It follows that for all $s \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta \in]0, 1/4]$

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{cases} \left| f_{12}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}(s) \right| \\ \left| f_{13}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}(s) \right| \end{cases} &\leq 2 \left| \ln \left(1 - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \right| (2 - e^{\ln(2\delta)s}) + 4|\ln(2\delta)| \left(e^{-\ln(1-\frac{\delta}{2})s} - 1 \right) \\ &\quad + 2|\ln(2\delta)|\delta^2 e^{-\ln(1-\frac{\delta}{2})s} \\ &\leq 4\delta + 4(\ln(2) + |\ln(\delta)|) \left(e^{-\ln(1-\frac{\delta}{2})s} - 1 \right) + 4(\ln(2) + |\ln(\delta)|)\delta^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the inequality (2.50), the fact that $e^{\ln(2\delta)s} \geq 2\delta$ and $e^{-\ln(1-\frac{\delta}{2})s} \leq 1/(1-\delta/2) \leq 2$ thanks to the upper bound in (2.49). Finally, we get, again by (2.49) for $\gamma = (1-\frac{\delta}{2})$,

$$e^{-\ln(1-\frac{\delta}{2})s} - 1 \leq \frac{1}{1-\frac{\delta}{2}} - 1 = \frac{\delta}{2-\delta} \leq \delta,$$

and again by the inequality (1.35) we get the final upper bound

$$\left| f_{12}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}(s) \right| \leq 24\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left| f_{13}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}(s) \right| \leq 24\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

since $\ln(2) \leq 1$ and $\delta \leq \delta^{\frac{1}{2}}$. It follows that the criterion (2.48) holds for $f_{12}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$ and $f_{13}^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$. These upper bounds show that the parallel transport along the path $\tilde{c}_{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$ factorizes according to (2.47):

$$W_{10}^{(c_{(\text{II},2,\delta)})} = e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{24}+A_{34})} \psi_{\delta}(A_{24} + A_{34}, A_{12} + A_{13}) H^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}, \quad (2.51)$$

where $\delta \mapsto H^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}$ is a harmless term. Using (2.40) and the second equation of (2.42) we can conclude that the parallel transport $W_{10}^{(\tilde{c}_{(\text{II},1,\delta)})}$ is given by formula (2.51) with the index change induced by the inversion permutation σ , see (2.40). Passing to the inverse of $W_{10}^{(\tilde{c}_{(\text{II},1,\delta)})}$ and using formula (2.44) we get the proof of the second equation of (2.43) upon setting $H^{(\text{II},\delta)} := H^{(\text{II},2,\delta)}(H^{(\text{II},1,\delta)})^{-1}$.

III: Due to the symmetry $c_{(\text{III},\delta)} = \Theta \circ c_{(\text{I},\delta)} \circ \iota$ we get the third formula of (2.43) by taking the first one, applying the inversion permutation σ , see (2.40), and passing to the inverse.

IV: An elementary computation gives the following formulas for $\Gamma^{(\tilde{c}_{(\text{IV},1,\delta)})}$ and $\Gamma^{(\tilde{c}_{(\text{IV},2,\delta)})}$ showing that they are of the form (2.46) with $\epsilon = \delta$, with $B = A_{13} + A_{23}$, $A = A_{34}$ for the first path, and with $\epsilon = \delta^2$ (!), $B = A_{34}$, $A = A_{13} + A_{23}$ for the second path:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{(\tilde{c}_{(\text{IV},1,\delta)})}(s) &= \ln(2\delta)(A_{13} + A_{23}) + \frac{-\ln(2\delta)}{2e^{-\ln(2\delta)s} - 1} A_{34} + \underbrace{\frac{2\ln(2\delta)\delta^2 e^{-\ln(2\delta)s}}{1 - 2\delta^2 e^{-\ln(2\delta)s}}}_{=: f_{23}^{(\text{IV},1,\delta)}(s)} A_{23}, \\ \Gamma^{(\tilde{c}_{(\text{IV},2,\delta)})}(s) &= \ln(2\delta^2)A_{34} + \frac{-\ln(2\delta^2)}{2e^{-\ln(2\delta^2)s} - 1} (A_{13} + A_{23}) \\ &\quad - \underbrace{\frac{2\ln(2\delta^2)\delta^2 e^{-\ln(2\delta^2)s}}{(2e^{-\ln(2\delta^2)s} - 1)(2(1 - \delta^2)e^{-\ln(2\delta^2)s} - 1)}}_{=: f_{23}^{(\text{IV},2,\delta)}(s)} A_{23}. \end{aligned}$$

The denominator of $\left| f_{23}^{(\text{IV},1,\delta)}(s) \right|$ can be bounded from below by $1/2$ upon using the upper bound in inequality (2.49) for $\gamma = 2\delta$. In the numerator we get the upper bound $\frac{1}{2\delta}$ for the exponential function, again thanks to (2.49), hence

$$\left| f_{23}^{(\text{IV},1,\delta)}(s) \right| \leq 2(\ln(2) + |\ln(\delta)|)\delta \stackrel{(1.35)}{\leq} 6\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (2.52)$$

hence the criterion (2.48) holds for $f_{23}^{(\text{IV},1,\delta)}(s)$.

Next, the right factor in the denominator of $\left| f_{23}^{(\text{IV},2,\delta)}(s) \right|$ can be bounded from below by

1/2 upon using the lower bound in inequality (2.49) for $\gamma = 2\delta^2$. We can bound the left factor in that denominator from below by $e^{-\ln(2\delta^2)s}$, hence

$$\left| f_{23}^{(\text{IV},2,\delta)}(s) \right| \leq 4(\ln(2) + 2|\ln(\delta)|)\delta^2 \stackrel{(1.35)}{\leq} 12\delta, \quad (2.53)$$

hence the criterion (2.48) holds for $f_{23}^{(\text{IV},2,\delta)}(s)$. Both upper bounds (2.52) and (2.53) prove that both parallel transports $W_{10}^{(\tilde{c}(\text{IV},1,\delta))}$ and $W_{10}^{(\tilde{c}(\text{IV},2,\delta))}$ factorize in the way described in (2.47) with harmless group terms $\delta \mapsto H^{(\text{IV},1,\delta)}$ and $\delta \mapsto H^{(\text{IV},2,\delta)}$, respectively. This proves the fourth parallel transport equation in (2.43) upon setting $H^{(\text{IV},\delta)} := H^{(\text{IV},2,\delta)}(H^{(\text{IV},1,\delta)})^{-1}$.

V: Due to the symmetry $c_{(\text{IV},\delta)} = \Theta \circ c_{(\text{I},\delta)} \circ \iota$ we get the fifth formula of (2.43) by taking the fourth one, applying the inversion permutation σ , see (2.40), and passing to the inverse. \square

By means of these informations we can prove the Pentagon Equation:

Theorem 24. *The Pentagon Equation (0.3) for the Drinfel'd associator holds.*

Proof. According to Corollary 14 we have the following equation of parallel transports along the paths (2.42) because U' is star-shaped around $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3})$, and the two composed paths $c_{(\text{V},\delta)} * c_{(\text{IV},\delta)}$ and $c_{(\text{III},\delta)} * (c_{(\text{II},\delta)} * c_{(\text{I},\delta)})$ are both continuous and piecewise smooth and have the same initial point (δ^2, δ) and final point $(1 - \delta, 1 - \delta^2)$:

$$W^{(c_{(\text{V},\delta)})} W^{(c_{(\text{IV},\delta)})} = W^{(c_{(\text{III},\delta)})} W^{(c_{(\text{II},\delta)})} W^{(c_{(\text{I},\delta)})}. \quad (2.54)$$

In view of the length of the formulas (2.43) of the preceding Lemma 23 we define the following abbreviations where ϵ, ϵ' are monomials in δ (in practice δ or δ^2), A, B are certain linear combinations of the elements $A_{ij} = A_{ji} \in \mathcal{A}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq 4$, and i is an element of $\{\text{I, II, III, IV, V}\}$:

$$\Phi_{\epsilon, \epsilon'}(A, B, H^{(i,\delta)}) := \psi_{\epsilon'}(B, A) H^{(i,\delta)} \psi_{\epsilon}(A, B)^{-1}. \quad (2.55)$$

We recall the relevant commutation relations for the elements A_{ij} coming from the conditions (2.1b) and (2.1c):

$$[A_{12}, A_{34}] = 0, \quad (2.56)$$

$$[A_{12}, A_{13} + A_{23}] = 0 = [A_{12}, A_{12} + A_{13} + A_{23}], \quad (2.57)$$

$$[A_{23}, A_{12} + A_{13}] = 0 = [A_{23}, A_{12} + A_{13} + A_{23}], \quad (2.58)$$

$$[A_{23}, A_{24} + A_{34}] = 0 = [A_{23}, A_{23} + A_{24} + A_{34}], \quad (2.59)$$

$$[A_{34}, A_{23} + A_{24}] = 0 = [A_{34}, A_{23} + A_{24} + A_{34}]. \quad (2.60)$$

Moreover, recall that if $A \in \mathcal{A}$ commutes with $B_1, \dots, B_N \in \mathcal{A}$ then the formal exponential $e^{\lambda\gamma A}$ ($\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$) commutes with any formal series whose coefficients consist of noncommutative polynomials in $B_1, \dots, B_N \in \mathcal{A}$, hence in particular

$$[A, B] = 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad e^{\lambda\gamma A} e^{\lambda\gamma' B} = e^{\lambda(\gamma A + \gamma' B)} = e^{\lambda\gamma' B} e^{\lambda\gamma A}. \quad (2.61)$$

As in the proof of the Hexagon Equation (2.27) we denote the conjugation $L_\delta H^{(i,\delta)} L_\delta^{-1}$ of a harmless term $\delta \mapsto H^{(i,\delta)}$ by an at most logarithmically divergent term $\delta \mapsto L_\delta$ (as elements in $(\text{Fun}([0, 1/4], \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A})[[\lambda]]$) by $\tilde{H}^{(i,\delta)}$. Note also that

$$L_\delta \Phi_{\epsilon,\epsilon'}(A, B, H^{(i,\delta)}) L_\delta^{-1} = \Phi_{\epsilon,\epsilon'}(L_\delta A L_\delta^{-1}, L_\delta B L_\delta^{-1}, \tilde{H}^{(i,\delta)}). \quad (2.62)$$

We compute the left hand side of (2.54) and try to ‘push’ the ‘singular terms’ of the form $e^{\lambda \ln(\epsilon)A}$ (with $\epsilon = \delta$ or $\epsilon = \delta^2$) to the left and to the right: here (2.61) will be used:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{10}^{(c(\text{V},\delta))} W_{10}^{(c(\text{IV},\delta))} &= e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{23}+A_{24})} \Phi_{\delta^2,\delta}(A_{12}, A_{23} + A_{24}, H^{(\text{V},\delta)}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta^2)A_{12}} \\ &\quad e^{\lambda \ln(\delta^2)A_{34}} \Phi_{\delta,\delta^2}(A_{13} + A_{23}, A_{34}, H^{(\text{IV},\delta)}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{13}+A_{23})} \\ &= e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{23}+A_{24})} \Phi_{\delta^2,\delta}(A_{12}, A_{23} + A_{24}, H^{(\text{V},\delta)}) e^{\lambda \ln(\delta^2)A_{34}} \\ &\quad e^{\lambda \ln(\delta^2)A_{34}} \Phi_{\delta,\delta^2}(A_{13} + A_{23}, A_{34}, H^{(\text{IV},\delta)}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{13}+A_{23})} \quad (2.63) \\ &= e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{23}+A_{24}+2A_{34})} \Phi_{\delta^2,\delta}(A_{12}, A_{23} + A_{24}, \tilde{H}^{(\text{V},\delta)}) \\ &\quad \Phi_{\delta,\delta^2}(A_{13} + A_{23}, A_{34}, \tilde{H}^{(\text{IV},\delta)}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)(2A_{12}+A_{13}+A_{23})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows by (2.43), the second by (2.56), and the third by (2.56),(2.60),(2.57), (2.62),(2.61). Next, we compute the right hand side of (2.54) in a similar way:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{10}^{(c(\text{III},\delta))} W_{10}^{(c(\text{II},\delta))} W_{10}^{(c(\text{I},\delta))} &\stackrel{(2.43)}{=} e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)A_{34}} \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(A_{23}, A_{34}, H^{(\text{III},\delta)}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)A_{23}} \\ &\quad e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{24}+A_{34})} \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(A_{12} + A_{13}, A_{24} + A_{34}, H^{(\text{II},\delta)}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{12}+A_{13})} \\ &\quad e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)A_{23}} \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(A_{12}, A_{23}, H^{(\text{I},\delta)}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)A_{12}} \\ &\stackrel{(2.59),(2.58)}{=} e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)A_{34}} \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(A_{23}, A_{34}, H^{(\text{III},\delta)}) e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{24}+A_{23}+A_{34})} \\ &\quad e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)2A_{23}} \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(A_{12} + A_{13}, A_{24} + A_{34}, H^{(\text{II},\delta)}) e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)2A_{23}} \\ &\quad e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{12}+A_{13}+A_{23})} \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(A_{12}, A_{23}, H^{(\text{I},\delta)}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)A_{12}} \\ &\stackrel{(2.59),(2.60),(2.57),(2.58)(2.62)}{=} e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{23}+A_{24}+2A_{34})} \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(A_{23}, A_{34}, \tilde{H}^{(\text{III},\delta)}) \\ &\quad \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(A_{12} + A_{13}, A_{24} + A_{34}, \tilde{H}^{(\text{II},\delta)}) \\ &\quad \Phi_{\delta,\delta}(A_{12}, A_{23}, \tilde{H}^{(\text{I},\delta)}) e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)(2A_{12}+A_{13}+A_{23})}. \quad (2.64) \end{aligned}$$

A comparison of the preceding equations (2.63) and (2.64) immediately shows that the singular terms $e^{\lambda \ln(\delta)(A_{23}+A_{24}+2A_{34})}$ and $e^{-\lambda \ln(\delta)(2A_{12}+A_{13}+A_{23})}$ cancel out in (2.54), leaving only products of terms of type (2.55) which tend to the desired product of Drinfel’d associators yielding the Pentagon Equation (0.3) in the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ thanks to the limit rules (1.28), the definition of the Drinfel’d associator (2.23), and the fact that harmless group terms tend to 1 for $\delta \rightarrow 0$ (see statement *v.*) of Proposition 4). \square

A Some Proofs of Theorems in Section 1.

A.1 Proof of Proposition 10

Proof. We compute using (1.52):

$$\begin{aligned}
(\check{\Theta}^*\check{\Gamma})(x', y') &= \sum_{j=1}^{N'} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\check{\Gamma}_i^{[1]}(\Theta^{(1)}(x', y'), \Theta^{(2)}(x', y')) \frac{\partial \Theta_i^{(1)}}{\partial x'_j}(x', y') dx'_j \right. \\
&\quad + \check{\Gamma}_i^{[1]}(\Theta^{(1)}(x', y'), \Theta^{(2)}(x', y')) \frac{\partial \Theta_i^{(1)}}{\partial y'_j}(x', y') dy'_j \\
&\quad + \check{\Gamma}_i^{[2]}(\Theta^{(1)}(x', y'), \Theta^{(2)}(x', y')) \frac{\partial \Theta_i^{(2)}}{\partial x'_j}(x', y') dx'_j \\
&\quad \left. + \check{\Gamma}_i^{[2]}(\Theta^{(1)}(x', y'), \Theta^{(2)}(x', y')) \frac{\partial \Theta_i^{(2)}}{\partial y'_j}(x', y') dy'_j \right),
\end{aligned}$$

hence with (1.52) and (1.53) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(\check{\Theta}^*\check{\Gamma})(x', y') &\stackrel{(1.49)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{N'} \sum_{i=1}^N \Gamma_i(\Theta(z')) \left(\frac{\partial \check{\Theta}_i}{\partial x'_j}(x', y') dx'_j + \frac{\partial \check{\Theta}_i}{\partial y'_j}(x', y') dy'_j \right) \\
&\stackrel{(1.50)}{=} \sum_{j=1}^{N'} \sum_{i=1}^N (\Gamma_i \circ \Theta)^\vee(x', y') \left(\frac{\partial \Theta_i}{\partial z'_j} \right)^\vee(x', y') dz'_j = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N'} (\Theta^*\Gamma)_j dz'_j \right)^\vee(x', y'),
\end{aligned}$$

which proves the Proposition. \square

A.2 Proof of Proposition 12

Proof. We get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \Gamma'_u}{\partial x'_v} - \frac{\partial \Gamma'_v}{\partial x'_u} + \lambda(\Gamma'_u \Gamma'_v - \Gamma'_v \Gamma'_u) &= \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\partial \left((\Gamma_i \circ \Theta) \frac{\partial \Theta_i}{\partial x'_u} \right)}{\partial x'_v} - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\partial \left((\Gamma_j \circ \Theta) \frac{\partial \Theta_j}{\partial x'_v} \right)}{\partial x'_u} \\
&\quad + \lambda \sum_{i,j=1}^N \left((\Gamma_i \circ \Theta)(\Gamma_j \circ \Theta) - (\Gamma_j \circ \Theta)(\Gamma_i \circ \Theta) \right) \frac{\partial \Theta_i}{\partial x'_u} \frac{\partial \Theta_j}{\partial x'_v} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{\partial^2 \Theta_i}{\partial x'_v \partial x'_u} - \frac{\partial^2 \Theta_i}{\partial x'_u \partial x'_v} \right) (\Gamma_i \circ \Theta) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i,j=1}^N \left(\left(\frac{\partial \Gamma_i}{\partial x_j} - \frac{\partial \Gamma_j}{\partial x_i} + \lambda(\Gamma_i \Gamma_j - \Gamma_j \Gamma_i) \right) \circ \Phi \right) \frac{\partial \Theta_i}{\partial x'_u} \frac{\partial \Theta_j}{\partial x'_v} \\
&= 0 + 0 = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

thanks to the chain rule, Schwartz's rule and to the flatness of Γ whence Γ' is flat. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 13

Proof. Consider the smooth map $\Gamma^{(F)} \in \left(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}\right)[[\lambda]]$ given by

$$\Gamma^{(F)}(s, t) := \sum_{i=1}^N \Gamma_i(F(s, t)) \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial s}(s, t). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Moreover, for each $(s, t) \in \mathcal{O}$ let $W_a^{(F)}(s, t)$ denote the parallel transport from p to $F(s, t)$ along the smooth path $s \rightarrow F(s, t)$, i.e. $W_a^{(F)}$ (we suppress the symbol Γ attached to W in this proof) satisfies the differential equation

$$\frac{\partial W_a^{(F)}}{\partial s} = \lambda \Gamma^{(F)} W_a^{(F)}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Since Γ and F are smooth, it follows that $(s, t) \mapsto W_a^{(F)}$ is smooth, and so it is an element of $(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A})[[\lambda]]$: indeed since $W_a^{(F)}$ is made out of iterated integrals (in the s -direction) the claim follows from the usual rule of differentiation of integrals depending on a parameter:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \int_a^s f(t, s') ds' = \int_a^s \frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(t, s') ds'.$$

Differentiating equation (A.2) with respect to t , and using equation (A.1), we get –upon using the Schwartz rule that all partial derivatives commute–

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2 W_a^{(F)}}{\partial t \partial s} &= \lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N (\Gamma_i \circ F) \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial s} W_a^{(F)} \right) \\ &= \lambda \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\frac{\partial \Gamma_i}{\partial x_j} \circ F \right) \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial t} \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial s} W_a^{(F)} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^N (\Gamma_i \circ F) \frac{\partial^2 F_i}{\partial t \partial s} W_a^{(F)} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^N (\Gamma_i \circ F) \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial s} \frac{\partial W_a^{(F)}}{\partial t} \\ &\stackrel{(1.55)}{=} \lambda \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\frac{\partial \Gamma_j}{\partial x_i} \circ F \right) \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial t} \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial s} W_a^{(F)} \\ &\quad - \lambda^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\Gamma_i \circ F) (\Gamma_j \circ F) \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial t} \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial s} W_a^{(F)} + \lambda^2 \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N (\Gamma_j \circ F) (\Gamma_i \circ F) \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial t} \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial s} W_a^{(F)} \\ &\quad + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^N (\Gamma_i \circ F) \frac{\partial^2 F_i}{\partial t \partial s} W_a^{(F)} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^N (\Gamma_i \circ F) \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial s} \frac{\partial W_a^{(F)}}{\partial t} \\ &\stackrel{(A.2)}{=} \lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N (\Gamma_i \circ F) \frac{\partial F_i}{\partial t} W_a^{(F)} \right) + \lambda \Gamma^{(F)} \left(\frac{\partial W_a^{(F)}}{\partial t} - \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N (\Gamma_j \circ F) \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial t} W_a^{(F)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, setting

$$H := \frac{\partial W_a^{(F)}}{\partial t} - \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N (\Gamma_j \circ F) \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial t} W_a^{(F)} \in \left(\mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathcal{A}\right)[[\lambda]],$$

the preceding equation gives us the formal linear ODE

$$\frac{\partial H}{\partial s} = \lambda \Gamma^{(F)} H \quad (\text{A.3})$$

with initial condition at $s = a$ for each $t \in \mathcal{O}''$ with $\mathcal{O}'' = \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid (a, t) \in \mathcal{O}\}$, note that $[0, 1] \subset \mathcal{O}''$:

$$H(a, t) = \frac{\partial W_{aa}^{(F)}(t)}{\partial t} - \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j(F(a, t)) \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial t}(a, t) W_{aa}^{(F)}(t) \stackrel{(1.57)}{=} \frac{\partial 1}{\partial t}(t) - \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j(p) \frac{\partial p}{\partial t}(t) = 0.$$

Hence the formal linear ODE (A.3) has the unique solution

$$H(s, t) = 0 \quad \forall (s, t) \in \mathcal{O} \supset [a, b] \times [0, 1].$$

It follows by the definition of H that there is the following formal linear ODE with respect to t :

$$\frac{W_a^{(F)}}{\partial t}(s, t) = \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j(F(s, t)) \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial t}(s, t) W_a^{(F)}(s, t),$$

and since there is no derivative with respect to s in this equation, we can set $s = b$ and get

$$\frac{W_{ba}^{(F)}}{\partial t}(t) = \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j(F(b, t)) \frac{\partial F_j}{\partial t}(b, t) W_{ba}^{(F)}(t) \stackrel{(1.57)}{=} \lambda \sum_{j=1}^N \Gamma_j(q) \frac{\partial q}{\partial t}(t) W_{ba}^{(F)}(t) = 0.$$

It follows that the parallel transport $W_{ba}^{(F)}$ does not depend on t , hence in particular

$$W_{ba}^{(c_0)} = W_{ba}^{(F)}(t = 0) = W_{ba}^{(F)}(t = 1) = W_{ba}^{(c_1)}.$$

□

A.4 Proof of Corollary 14

We first need the following well-known Smoothing Lemma which is a technical tool allowing for smoothing reparametrizations: it will only be needed in the proof of Corollary 14:

Lemma 25 (Smoothing Lemma). *Let $a < b$ be real numbers, $\{a, b\} \subset D \subset [a, b]$ a finite subset whose elements are given by $a_0 = a < a_1 < \dots < a_m < a_{m+1} = b$, and let $c : [a, b] \rightarrow U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be a continuous piecewise smooth path. Then there exists a smooth map $\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [a, b]$ such that its restriction to $[a, b]$ is strictly monotonous and surjective (hence has a continuous inverse on $[a, b]$), it induces the identity map on D , and whose higher derivatives all vanish at the points of D . Moreover, the composition $c \circ \theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [a, b]$ (in the sense of (1.5)) is an everywhere well-defined smooth map all of whose higher derivatives (for $r \geq 1$) vanish at all points of D . For all $s \leq a$ the map $c \circ \theta$ takes the constant value $c(a)$, and for all $s \geq b$ it takes the constant value $c(b)$. In particular, for every positive ϵ the restriction of $c \circ \theta$ to $[a - \epsilon, b + \epsilon]$ yields a reparametrized path which is smooth.*

Proof. Let $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the following function, well-known from analysis and differential geometry:

$$\rho(s) := \begin{cases} e^{-1/s} & \text{if } s > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } s \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

It is well-known and not hard to see that ρ is \mathcal{C}^∞ , has all of its higher derivatives equal to zero at 0 and only strictly positive values for $s > 0$. Define the function $\vartheta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\vartheta(s) := \sum_{i=0}^m (a_{i+1} - a_i) \frac{\rho(s - a_i) \rho(a_{i+1} - s)}{\int_{a_i}^{a_{i+1}} \rho(s' - a_i) \rho(a_{i+1} - s') ds'}$$

and $\theta : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the primitive of ϑ :

$$\theta(s) := a + \int_a^s \vartheta(s') ds'.$$

Then all the properties of θ follow from the fact that $a_{i+1} - a_i > 0$ and that the smooth function $s \mapsto \rho(s - a_i) \rho(a_{i+1} - s)$ is strictly positive on $]a_i, a_{i+1}[$ and zero outside $]a_i, a_{i+1}[$. Moreover, it is clear that the composition $c \circ \theta$ is smooth on $[a, b] \setminus D$ as a composition of smooth maps. By the iterated chain rule it follows that all the higher derivatives of $c \circ \theta$ tend to zero at the points of D since all the higher derivatives of θ go to zero at these points whereas all the higher left-side and right-side derivatives of c remain bounded. \square

Proof. (of Corollary 14):

Let $c : [0, 1] \rightarrow U' \subset U$ be the continuous piecewise smooth loop with $c(0) = c(1) = p$ defined by the composition $(c_2 \circ \iota) * c_1$ where $\iota : [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is the interval inversion $\iota(s) = 1 - s$. Furthermore, let $d : [0, 1] \rightarrow U'$ be the affine path joining ϖ with p , i.e. $d(s) = (1 - s)\varpi + sp$. Let $\check{c} : [0, 1] \rightarrow U'$ be the piecewise smooth path $\check{c} := (d \circ \iota) * (c * d)$ obtained by composition of piecewise smooth paths. Clearly, \check{c} is a continuous piecewise smooth loop based at ϖ . Choose a smooth reparametrization θ of the path \check{c} in the sense of the preceding Lemma 25. Recall that θ is a smooth map $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ with $\theta(s) = 0$ for all $s \leq 0$ and $\theta(s) = 1$ for all $s \geq b$. Thanks to (1.45) and to the fact that $\theta(0) = 0$, $\theta(1) = 1$ we have the following equality of parallel transports

$$\Gamma W_{10}^{(c \circ \theta)} = \Gamma W_{10}^{(\check{c})} = \Gamma W_{10}^{((d \circ \iota) * (c * d))} \stackrel{(1.47)}{=} \Gamma W_{10}^{(d)^{-1}} \Gamma W_{10}^{(c)} \Gamma W_{10}^{(d)}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Next, the map $\tilde{F} : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ defined by

$$\tilde{F}(s, t) = (1 - t)\check{c}(\theta(s)) + tq$$

is clearly smooth, hence in particular continuous, whence the inverse image $\mathcal{O} := \tilde{F}^{-1}(U')$ is an open subset of \mathbb{R}^2 which contains the rectangle $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ thanks to the hypothesis that U' is star-shaped around ϖ and that all the points of the loop c and hence of \check{c} are in U' . By compactness of $[0, 1]$ there is a strictly positive real number ϵ such that the open

rectangle $] -\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon[\times] -\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon[$ is still contained in \mathcal{O} thanks to the Heine-Borel Theorem. If you think that this is no longer undergraduate analysis there is the following first year argument: if for each non-negative integer n there was $t_n \in [0, 1]$ such that $(-\frac{1}{n+1}, t_n) \notin \mathcal{O}$ there would be subsequence $(t_{n_k})_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ converging to $\tau \in [0, 1]$ by the Bolzano-Weierstrass Theorem. However, the limit point $(0, \tau)$ in \mathbb{R}^2 is contained in the open subset \mathcal{O} , hence there is a strictly positive real number δ with $(0, \tau) \in [0, 0 - \delta[\times]\tau - \delta, \tau + \delta[\subset \mathcal{O}$. But then nearby elements of the subsequence $(-\frac{1}{n_k+1}, t_{n_k})$ would also be in \mathcal{O} contrary to the hypothesis. By a reasonable iteration of this argument the statement is proved. Let $F : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow U' \subset \mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ denote the restriction of \tilde{F} to \mathcal{O} . Then F clearly satisfies all the hypotheses of Theorem 13: for all $s \in] -\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon[$ we have $F(s, 0) = \check{c}(\theta(s)) =: c_{(0)}(s)$ and $F(s, 1) = \varpi =: c_{(1)}(s)$ (the constant loop at ϖ), and of course for all $t \in] -\epsilon, 1 + \epsilon[$ we get $F(0, t) = \varpi = F(1, t)$.

By Theorem 13 we get

$$\Gamma W_{10}^{(\check{c} \circ \theta)} = \Gamma W_{10}^{(c_{(1)})} = 1$$

since $c_{(1)}$ is the constant loop whence $\Gamma^{(c_{(1)})} = 0$. Thanks to equation (A.4) we get

$$1 = \Gamma W_{10}^{(c)} = \left(\Gamma W_{10}^{(c_2)} \right)^{-1} \Gamma W_{10}^{(c_1)}$$

which proves the statement. The case of a continuous piecewise smooth loop c_3 based at p is a particular case of the preceding statement upon choosing the constant loop c_4 at p as a second path. \square

References

- [1] Alekseev, A.Y., Enriquez, B., Torossian, C.: *Drinfeld associators, braid groups and explicit solutions of the Kashiwara-Vergne equations*. Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études **112** (2010), 143–189.
- [2] Arnaudiès, J.-M., Fraysse, H.: *Cours de mathématiques. 2.* (French) [Course in mathematics. 2] Analyse. [Analysis] Dunod Université: Ouvrages de Base. [Dunod University: Basic Works] Dunod, Paris, 1988.
- [3] Bar-Natan, D.: *On associators and the Grothendieck-Teichmüller group. I*. Sel. Math. **4** (1998), 183–212.
- [4] Chen, K.-T.: *Formal differential equations*. Ann. Math. **73** (1961), 110-133.
- [5] Coddington, E.A.; Levinson, N: *Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations*, 1955. Third edition, Tata McGraw Hill, New Delhi, 1972.
- [6] De Concini, C., Procesi, C.: *Hyperplane arrangements and holonomy equations*. Selecta Mathematica **1** (1995), 495–535.

- [7] Deligne, P.: *Equations Différentielles à Points Singuliers Réguliers*. LNM **163**, Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1970.
- [8] Drinfel'd, V.G.: *Quasi-Hopf algebras*. Leningrad Math. J. **1** (1990), 1419–1457.
- [9] Drinfel'd, V.G.: *On quasi-triangular quasi-Hopf algebras and a group closely connected with $\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q})$* . Leningrad Math. J. **2** (1991), 829–860.
- [10] Enriquez, B., Halbout, G.: *Quantization of quasi-Lie bialgebras*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. **23** (2010), 611–653.
- [11] Enriquez, B., Halbout, G.: *Quantization of coboundary Lie bialgebras*. Ann. of Math. **171** (2010), 1267–1345.
- [12] Etingof, P.I., Kazhdan, D.A.: *Quantization of Lie bialgebras. I*. Selecta Math. (N.S.) **2** (1996), 1–41.
- [13] Etingof, P.I., Schiffmann, O.: *Lectures on Quantum Groups*. 2nd edition. International Press, Somerville, MA, USA, 2002.
- [14] Fadell, E.R., Husseini, S.Y.: *Geometry and topology of configuration spaces*. Springer, Heidelberg, 2001.
- [15] Furusho, H.: *Pentagon and Hexagon Equations*. Ann. Maths. **171** (2010), 545–556.
- [16] Jacobson, N.: *Lie Algebras*. Dover, New York, 1979, reprint of the original version of 1962.
- [17] Jacobson, N.: *Basic Algebra II*, 1st ed., Freeman and Co., San Francisco, Ca, 1980.
- [18] Kassel, C.: *Quantum groups*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1995.
- [19] Knizhnik, V.G., Zamolodchikov, A.B.: *Current algebra and Wess-Zumino models in two dimensions*. Nuclear Phys. B **247** (1984), 83–103.
- [20] Kolář, I., Michor, P., Slovák, J.: *Natural Operations in Differential Geometry*. Springer, Berlin, 1993.
- [21] Kobayashi, S., Nomizu, K.: *Foundations of Differential Geometry*, Vol I, Interscience Publishers, Wiley and Sons, New York, 1963.
- [22] Kohno, T.: *Série de Poincaré-Koszul associée aux groupes de tresses pures*. Invent. math. **82** (1985), 57–75.
- [23] Kohno, T.: *Monodromy representations of braid groups and Yang-Baxter equations*. Annales de l'institut Fourier, **37** (1987), p. 139–160.
- [24] Kontsevich, M.L.: *Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds*. Lett. Math. Phys. **66** (2003), 157–216.

- [25] Lang, S.: *Undergraduate Analysis*. 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 1997.
- [26] Mac Lane, S.: *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 1998.
- [27] Quillen, D.: *Rational homotopy theory*, Ann. of Math. (2) **90** (1969), 205–295.
- [28] Reutenauer, C.: *Free Lie Algebras*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993.
- [29] Sakáloš, Š., Ševera, P.: *On quantization of quasi-Lie bialgebras*. Sel. Math. **21** (2015), 649–729.
- [30] Ševera, P.: *Quantization of Lie bialgebras revisited*. Sel. Math. **22** (2016), 1563–1581.
- [31] Sweedler, M.E.: *Hopf algebras*. Mathematics Lecture Note Series, W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1969.
- [32] Tamarkin, D.E.: *Operadic proof of M. Kontsevich’s formality theorem*. Ph.D. Thesis, The Pennsylvania State University. 1999. 51 pp. ISBN: 978-0599-42500-2.

(M. Bordemann) DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES, LABORATOIRE IRIMAS, UNIVERSITÉ DE HAUTE ALSACE, 18, RUE DES FRÈRES LUMIÈRE, 68093 MULHOUSE, FRANCE.

E-mail address: `Martin.Bordemann@uha.fr`,

(A. Rivezzi) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E APPLICAZIONI, UNIVERSITÀ DI MILANO-BICOCCA, VIA R.COZZI 55, 20125 MILANO, ITALY.

Current address: DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES, LABORATOIRE IRIMAS, UNIVERSITÉ DE HAUTE ALSACE, 18, RUE DES FRÈRES LUMIÈRE, 68093 MULHOUSE, FRANCE.

E-mail address: `a.rivezzi@campus.unimib.it`,

(Th. Weigel) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E APPLICAZIONI, UNIVERSITÀ DI MILANO-BICOCCA, VIA R.COZZI 55, 20125 MILANO, ITALY *E-mail address:* `thomas.weigel@unimib.it`.