

## A NEW DEFORMATION OF MULTIPLE ZETA VALUE

YOSHIHIRO TAKEYAMA

ABSTRACT. We introduce a new deformation of multiple zeta value (MZV). It has one parameter  $\omega$  satisfying  $0 < \omega < 2$  and recovers MZV in the limit as  $\omega \rightarrow +0$ . It is defined in the same algebraic framework as a  $q$ -analogue of multiple zeta value ( $q$ MZV) by using a multiple integral. We prove that our deformed multiple zeta value satisfies the double shuffle relations which are satisfied by  $q$ MZVs. We also prove the extended double Ohno relations, which are proved for  $(q)$ MZVs by Hirose, Sato and Seki, by using a multiple integral whose integrand contains the hyperbolic gamma function due to Ruijsenaars.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We call a (non-empty) tuple of positive integers an *index*. An index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$  is said to be *admissible* if  $k_r \geq 2$ . For an admissible index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ , the *multiple zeta value*  $\zeta(\mathbf{k})$  (MZV for short) is defined by

$$\zeta(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{0 < m_1 < \dots < m_r} \frac{1}{m_1^{k_1} \dots m_r^{k_r}}.$$

Recently, a  $q$ -analogue of MZV ( $q$ MZV), which is a one-parameter deformation of MZV, is studied. For example, the so-called Bradley-Zhao model of it is defined by

$$\zeta_q(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{0 < m_1 < \dots < m_r} \frac{q^{(k_1-1)m_1 + \dots + (k_r-1)m_r}}{[m_1]^{k_1} \dots [m_r]^{k_r}},$$

where  $q$  is a deformation parameter satisfying  $0 < q < 1$  and  $[n] = (1 - q^n)/(1 - q)$  is the  $q$ -integer. In the limit as  $q \rightarrow 1$ , it recovers the MZV  $\zeta(\mathbf{k})$ . It is known that  $q$ MZVs satisfy many of the same linear relations of MZVs.

In this paper we introduce a new deformation of MZV, which we call an  $\omega$ -deformed multiple zeta value, and show that it satisfies the double shuffle relations and the extended double Ohno relations which are satisfied by  $q$ MZVs.

We recall briefly the definition of  $q$ MZVs and the above-mentioned two relations. Let  $\mathfrak{H} = \mathcal{C}\langle a, b \rangle$  be the non-commutative polynomial ring of two variables  $a$  and  $b$  whose coefficient ring is  $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{Q}[\hbar]$ . Set  $\mathcal{A} = \{\hbar b\} \cup \{ba^k \mid k \geq 1\}$ . We denote by  $\widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$  the  $\mathcal{C}$ -submodule of  $\mathfrak{H}$  spanned by 1 and the words in  $\mathcal{A}$  whose rightmost letter is not  $\hbar b$ . We endow  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathcal{C}$ -module structure such that  $\hbar$  acts as multiplication by  $1 - q$ . Then the  $q$ MZV is defined as an image of a  $\mathcal{C}$ -linear map  $Z_q : \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (see Section 2.2 for details). For example, the Bradley-Zhao model  $\zeta_q(\mathbf{k})$  is equal to  $Z_q(e_{k_1} \dots e_{k_r})$ , where  $e_k = b(a + \hbar)a^{k-1}$  for  $k \geq 1$ .

The double shuffle relations of  $q$ MZVs are described as follows (see, e.g., [14]). On the domain  $\widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$  of the map  $Z_q$ , two associative and commutative binary operations called the shuffle product  $\mathfrak{M}_{\hbar}$  and the harmonic product  $*_{\hbar}$  are defined. Then the map  $Z_q$  is a homomorphism with respect to both of the two products, and hence we have  $Z_q(w \mathfrak{M}_{\hbar} w' - w *_{\hbar} w') = 0$  for any  $w, w' \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ . This equality gives linear relations among  $q$ MZVs whose coefficients belong to  $\mathbb{Q}[1 - q]$ , which are called the *double shuffle relations*.

---

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 22K03243.

In [10, Corollary 3.22], Satoh proves that the shuffle product and the harmonic product are related to each other via an anti-involution  $\sigma$  defined on the scalar extension  $\mathbb{Q}[\hbar, \hbar^{-1}] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathfrak{H}$ . This result implies that the double shuffle relations follow from the shuffle product relations  $Z_q(w \mathfrak{M}_{\hbar} w') = Z_q(w)Z_q(w')$  and the resummation duality  $Z_q(\sigma(w)) = Z_q(w)$  proved in [12, Theorem 4].

The extended double Ohno relations of  $q$ MZVs are obtained by Hirose, Sato and Seki [5]. For an admissible index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$  and non-negative integers  $m$  and  $n$ , we define the *double Ohno sum*  $O_{m,n}(\mathbf{k})$  by

$$O_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\substack{m_1, \dots, m_r, n_1, \dots, n_r \geq 0 \\ m_1 + \dots + m_r = m \\ n_1 + \dots + n_r = n}} \zeta_q(k_1 + m_1 + n_1, \dots, k_r + m_r + n_r).$$

The extended double Ohno relations are  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear relations of the double Ohno sums, which also give the same relations for MZVs in the limit as  $q \rightarrow 1$ .

Although we do not write down an explicit form of the extended double Ohno relations here, we state two corollaries (see [5] for details). For this purpose, we recall the definition of the dual index  $\mathbf{k}^\dagger$  of an admissible index  $\mathbf{k}$ . Write an admissible index  $\mathbf{k}$  in the form

$$\mathbf{k} = (\{1\}^{b_1-1}, a_1 + 1, \dots, \{1\}^{b_r-1}, a_r + 1)$$

with positive integers  $a_1, \dots, a_r$  and  $b_1, \dots, b_r$ . Then its dual  $\mathbf{k}^\dagger$  is defined by

$$\mathbf{k}^\dagger = (\{1\}^{a_r-1}, b_r + 1, \dots, \{1\}^{a_1-1}, b_1 + 1).$$

For example,  $(1, 3, 1, 1, 2)^\dagger = (4, 1, 3)$ . For an admissible index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$  and non-negative integer  $m$ , the *Ohno sum*  $O_m(\mathbf{k})$  is defined by

$$O_m(\mathbf{k}) = O_{m,0}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\substack{m_1, \dots, m_r \geq 0 \\ m_1 + \dots + m_r = m}} \zeta_q(k_1 + m_1, \dots, k_r + m_r).$$

The first corollary is the Ohno relations:

$$O_m(\mathbf{k}) = O_m(\mathbf{k}^\dagger)$$

for any admissible index  $\mathbf{k}$  and non-negative integer  $m$ . Originally they are proved by Ohno [7] for MZVs, and Bradley proved them for  $q$ MZVs in [2]. The second corollary is the double Ohno relations:

$$O_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}) = O_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}^\dagger)$$

for any non-negative integers  $m, n$  and any admissible index  $\mathbf{k}$  of the form

$$\mathbf{k} = (\{2\}^{n_0}, 1, \{2\}^{n_1}, 3, \dots, \{2\}^{n_{2d-2}}, 1, \{2\}^{n_{2d-1}}, 3, \{2\}^{2d})$$

with some non-negative integers  $d, n_0, \dots, n_{2d}$ , which is called a *BBBL-type* index after [1, Section 7]. In [4] it is proved that the double Ohno relations follow from the Ohno relations. The extended double Ohno relations, which contain the Ohno relations and their double version, are proved by using the technique called the connected sum method due to Seki and Yamamoto [11].

The  $\omega$ -deformed multiple zeta value, which we newly introduce in this paper, is defined as follows. A deformation parameter which we denote by  $\omega$  is assumed to satisfy  $0 < \omega < 2$ . We endow the complex number field  $\mathbb{C}$  with  $\mathcal{C}$ -module structure such that  $\hbar$  acts as multiplication by  $2\pi i\omega$ . Then we will define, by abuse of notation, a  $\mathcal{C}$ -linear map  $Z_\omega : \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  and call the value

$Z_\omega(w)$  with  $w \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$  an  $\omega$ -deformed multiple zeta value ( $\omega$ MZV for short). For example, the  $\omega$ MZV corresponding to the Bradley-Zhao model of  $q$ MZV is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_\omega(\mathbf{k}) &= Z_\omega(e_{k_1} \cdots e_{k_r}) \\ &= (2\pi i \omega)^{|\mathbf{k}|} \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega (k_a - 1)(t_1 + \cdots + t_a)}}{(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (t_1 + \cdots + t_a)})^{k_a}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $|\mathbf{k}| = \sum_{a=1}^r k_a$  is the *weight* of  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$  and  $0 < \epsilon < \min(1, 1/r\omega)$ . The above integral is absolutely convergent if  $k_r \geq 2$  and does not depend on  $\epsilon$ . In the limit as  $\omega \rightarrow +0$ , it recovers the MZV  $\zeta(\mathbf{k})$ . Similar deformation is introduced by Kato and the author for multiple  $L$ -values except MZVs in [6].

The main results of this paper are as follows. First,  $\omega$ MZVs satisfy the shuffle product relations  $Z_\omega(w \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w') = Z_\omega(w)Z_\omega(w')$  and the duality  $Z_\omega(\sigma(w)) = Z_\omega(w)$  for any  $w, w' \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ . Hence  $\omega$ MZVs satisfy the same double shuffle relations as  $q$ MZVs, where  $\hbar$  acts as multiplication by  $2\pi i \omega$ . Second, the above-mentioned  $\omega$ MZVs  $\zeta_\omega(\mathbf{k})$  satisfy the extended double Ohno relations in the same form as ( $q$ )MZVs. In the proof we make use of a multiple integral which corresponds to the connected sum given in [5], whose integrand contains the hyperbolic gamma function defined by Ruijsenaars [8].

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives some preliminaries on  $q$ MZVs and their relations. In Section 3 we define the  $\omega$ MZVs, and prove the double shuffle relations in Section 4. In Section 5 we prove the extended double Ohno relations of  $\omega$ MZVs. Appendix A and Appendix B provide technical proofs of propositions in this paper.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. Shuffle product and Harmonic product.** Let  $\hbar$  be a formal variable. We set  $\mathcal{C} = \mathbb{Q}[\hbar]$  and denote the non-commutative polynomial ring of two variables  $a$  and  $b$  over  $\mathcal{C}$  by  $\mathfrak{H} = \mathcal{C}\langle a, b \rangle$ . For  $k \geq 1$  we set

$$g_k = ba^k, \quad e_k = b(a + \hbar)a^{k-1}.$$

Then the set

$$\mathcal{A} = \{\hbar b\} \cup \{ba^k \mid k \geq 1\} = \{e_1 - g_1\} \cup \{g_k \mid k \geq 1\}.$$

is algebraically independent. We denote by  $\mathcal{M}$  the set consisting of 1 and monomials in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and by  $\mathcal{M}_0$  the subset of  $\mathcal{M}$  consisting of the monomials whose rightmost letter is not  $e_1 - g_1$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{M}_0$  is the set of elements of the form

$$(2.1) \quad (e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_1} g_{\beta_1+1} \cdots (e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_r} g_{\beta_r+1}$$

with  $r \geq 0$  and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \geq 0$ . We denote by  $\widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$  (resp.  $\widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^1$ ) the  $\mathcal{C}$ -submodule of  $\mathfrak{H}$  spanned by  $\mathcal{M}_0$  (resp.  $\mathcal{M}$ ).

The shuffle product  $\mathfrak{M}_\hbar$  on  $\mathfrak{H}$  is the  $\mathcal{C}$ -bilinear binary operation uniquely defined by the following properties:

- (i) For any  $w \in \mathfrak{H}$ , it holds that  $w \mathfrak{M}_\hbar 1 = w$  and  $1 \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w = w$ .
- (ii) For any  $w, w' \in \mathfrak{H}$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} wa \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w' a &= (wa \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w' + w \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w' a + \hbar w \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w') a, \\ wb \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w' &= w \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w' b = (w \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w') b. \end{aligned}$$

The shuffle product  $\mathfrak{M}_\hbar$  is commutative and associative. Since  $e_1 - g_1 = \hbar b$ , we have

$$(2.2) \quad (w(e_1 - g_1)) \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w' = w \mathfrak{M}_\hbar (w'(e_1 - g_1)) = (w \mathfrak{M}_\hbar w')(e_1 - g_1)$$

for any  $w, w' \in \mathfrak{H}$ . Consider the formal power series  $H(X)$  in  $X$  given by

$$(2.3) \quad H(X) = \sum_{k \geq 1} g_k X^{k-1} = g_1 \frac{1}{1 - aX}.$$

Then it holds that

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} wH(X) \mathfrak{H}_\hbar w' H(Y) \\ = \{(1 + \hbar X)(wH(X) \mathfrak{H}_\hbar w') + (1 + \hbar Y)(w \mathfrak{H}_\hbar w' H(Y)) + (w \mathfrak{H}_\hbar w')(e_1 - g_1)\} \\ \times H(X + Y + \hbar XY) \end{aligned}$$

for any  $w, w' \in \mathfrak{H}$  as a formal power series in  $X$  and  $Y$  (see [13, Lemma 3.10]). Therefore, the  $\mathcal{C}$ -module  $\widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$  is closed under the shuffle product.

We denote by  $\mathfrak{z}$  the  $\mathcal{C}$ -module spanned by  $\mathcal{A}$ , and define the symmetric  $\mathcal{C}$ -bilinear map  $\circ_\hbar : \mathfrak{z} \times \mathfrak{z} \rightarrow \mathfrak{z}$  by

$$(e_1 - g_1) \circ_\hbar (e_1 - g_1) = \hbar(e_1 - g_1), \quad (e_1 - g_1) \circ_\hbar g_k = \hbar g_k, \quad g_k \circ_\hbar g_l = g_{k+l}$$

for  $k, l \geq 1$ . The harmonic product  $*_\hbar$  is the  $\mathcal{C}$ -bilinear binary operation on  $\widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^1$  uniquely defined by the following properties:

- (i) For any  $w \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^1$ , it holds that  $w *_\hbar 1 = w$  and  $1 *_\hbar w = w$ .
- (ii) For any  $w, w' \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^1$  and  $u, v \in \mathcal{A}$ , it holds that  $(wu) *_\hbar (w'v) = (w *_\hbar w'v)u + (wu *_\hbar w')v + (w *_\hbar w')(u \circ_\hbar v)$ .

The harmonic product  $*_\hbar$  is commutative and associative, and the  $\mathcal{C}$ -module  $\widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$  is closed under it.

We define the anti-involution  $\sigma$  on the scalar extension  $\mathbb{Q}[\hbar, \hbar^{-1}] \otimes_{\mathcal{C}} \mathfrak{H}$  by

$$\sigma(a) = \hbar b, \quad \sigma(b) = \hbar^{-1} a$$

and  $\mathbb{Q}[\hbar, \hbar^{-1}]$ -linearity. Then it holds that

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \sigma((e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_1} g_{\beta_1+1} \cdots (e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_r} g_{\beta_r+1}) \\ = (e_1 - g_1)^{\beta_r} g_{\alpha_r+1} \cdots (e_1 - g_1)^{\beta_1} g_{\alpha_1+1} \end{aligned}$$

for non-negative integers  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$  and  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r$ . Hence the map  $\sigma$  restricted to  $\widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$  is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -linear isomorphism.

**Proposition 2.1** ([10], Corollary 3.22). *For any  $w, w' \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ , we have  $w *_\hbar w' = \sigma(\sigma(w) \mathfrak{H}_\hbar \sigma(w'))$ .*

**2.2. A  $q$ -analogue of multiple zeta values.** Let  $q$  be a real parameter satisfying  $0 < q < 1$ . We endow the real number field  $\mathbb{R}$  with  $\mathcal{C}$ -module structure such that  $\hbar$  acts as multiplication by  $1 - q$ . For a positive integer  $m$ , we define the  $\mathcal{C}$ -linear map  $F_q(\cdot | m) : \mathfrak{z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by

$$F_q(e_1 - g_1 | m) = 1 - q, \quad F_q(g_k | m) = \left( \frac{q^m}{[m]} \right)^k$$

for  $k \geq 1$ , where  $[m] = (1 - q^m)/(1 - q)$  is the  $q$ -integer. From  $e_1 = (e_1 - g_1) + g_1$  and  $e_{k+1} = g_{k+1} + \hbar g_k$ , we see that

$$F_q(e_k | m) = \frac{q^{(k-1)m}}{[m]^k}$$

for  $k \geq 1$ .

We define the  $\mathcal{C}$ -linear map  $Z_q : \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  by  $Z_q(1) = 1$  and

$$(2.6) \quad Z_q(u_1 \cdots u_r) = \sum_{0 < m_1 < \cdots < m_r} \prod_{a=1}^r F_q(u_a | m_a)$$

for  $u_a \in \mathcal{A}$  ( $1 \leq a \leq r$ ) such that  $u_r \neq e_1 - g_1$ . We call the value  $Z_q(w)$  with  $w \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$  a  $q$ -analogue of  $MZV$  ( $qMZV$ ).

For an admissible index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ , we set

$$\zeta_q(\mathbf{k}) = Z_q(e_{k_1} \cdots e_{k_r}) = \sum_{0 < m_1 < \cdots < m_r} \frac{q^{(k_1-1)m_1 + \cdots + (k_r-1)m_r}}{[m_1]^{k_1} \cdots [m_r]^{k_r}}.$$

It is called the *Bradley-Zhao model* of  $qMZV$ . In the limit as  $q \rightarrow 1 - 0$ , it turns into the multiple zeta value, that is, we have

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1-0} \zeta_q(\mathbf{k}) = \zeta(\mathbf{k})$$

for any admissible index  $\mathbf{k}$ .

**2.3. Double shuffle relations.**  $qMZVs$  satisfy the following relations (see, e.g., [14]):

**Proposition 2.2.** *For any  $w, w' \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ , the following equalities hold.*

- (i)  $Z_q(w *_{\hbar} w') = Z_q(w)Z_q(w')$  (*harmonic product relation*)
- (ii)  $Z_q(w \mathfrak{H}_{\hbar} w') = Z_q(w)Z_q(w')$  (*shuffle product relation*)
- (iii)  $Z_q(\sigma(w)) = Z_q(w)$  (*duality*)

The above relations (i) and (ii) imply the following relations:

**Corollary 2.3** (Double shuffle relations of  $qMZVs$ ). *For any  $w, w' \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ , it holds that*

$$Z_{\omega}(w \mathfrak{H}_{\hbar} w' - w *_{\hbar} w') = 0.$$

**Remark 2.4.** By using Proposition 2.1, we see that the relation (i) in Proposition 2.2 can be derived from (ii), (iii) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_q(w *_{\hbar} w') &= Z_q(\sigma(\sigma(w) \mathfrak{H}_{\hbar} \sigma(w'))) = Z_q(\sigma(w) \mathfrak{H}_{\hbar} \sigma(w')) \\ &= Z_q(\sigma(w))Z_{\omega}(\sigma(w')) = Z_q(w)Z_{\omega}(w'). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the double shuffle relations follow also from (ii) and (iii) in Proposition 2.2.

**2.4. Extended double Ohno relations.** For an admissible index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$  and non-negative integers  $m$  and  $n$ , we define the *double Ohno sum*  $O_{m,n}(\mathbf{k})$  by

$$O_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\substack{m_1, \dots, m_r, n_1, \dots, n_r \geq 0 \\ m_1 + \cdots + m_r = m \\ n_1 + \cdots + n_r = n}} \zeta_q(k_1 + m_1 + n_1, \dots, k_r + m_r + n_r).$$

Then the infinite sum

$$O(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{m,n \geq 0} O_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}) \xi^m \eta^n$$

absolutely converges in a neighborhood of  $(\xi, \eta) = (0, 0)$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{Q}\langle x, y \rangle$  be the non-commutative polynomial ring of two variables  $x$  and  $y$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Set  $z_k = yx^{k-1}$  for  $k \geq 1$  and  $z_{\mathbf{k}} = z_{k_1} \cdots z_{k_r}$  for an index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ . The  $\mathbb{Q}$ -subalgebra  $y\mathfrak{h}x$  of  $\mathfrak{h}$  is freely generated by the set  $\{z_{\mathbf{k}} \mid \mathbf{k} \text{ is an admissible index}\}$ . We fix  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ , and define the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear map  $O : y\mathfrak{h}x \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by  $O(z_{k_1} \cdots z_{k_r}) = O(\mathbf{k})$  for any admissible index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ , and extend it to the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear map  $O : (y\mathfrak{h}x)[[X]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by

$$O\left(\sum_{j \geq 0} w_j X^j\right) = \sum_{j \geq 0} O(w_j) \xi^j \eta^j$$

for  $w_j \in y\mathfrak{h}x$  ( $j \geq 0$ ).

Denote by  $\mathfrak{a}$  the subring of  $\mathfrak{h}[[X]]$  generated by  $x, y, X$  and  $(1 + yxX)^{-1}$ . Define the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -anti-automorphism  $\tau$  by  $\tau(X) = X$  and

$$\tau(x) = (1 + yxX)^{-1}y = y(1 + xyX)^{-1}, \quad \tau(y) = x(1 + yxX) = (1 + xyX)x.$$

**Theorem 2.5** (Extended double Ohno relations [5]). *For any  $w \in \mathfrak{a}$ , the infinite sum  $O(ywx)$  is absolutely convergent in a neighborhood of  $(\xi, \eta) = (0, 0)$  and it holds that  $O(ywx) = O(y\tau(w)x)$ .*

**Remark 2.6.** The equality  $O(ywx) = O(y\tau(w)x)$  holds as a power series in  $\xi$  and  $\eta$ . By taking each coefficient of the both hand sides, we obtain finite linear relations among the double Ohno sums. We will prove the same equality for a new deformation of MZV, then the infinite sum  $O(ywx)$  is defined as a formal power series in  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  to avoid consideration of convergence.

### 3. $\omega$ -DEFORMED MULTIPLE ZETA VALUE

**3.1. Analytic preliminaries.** Hereafter we assume that

$$0 < \omega < 2.$$

Let  $M(\mathbb{C})$  be the field of meromorphic functions on  $\mathbb{C}$ . We endow  $M(\mathbb{C})$  with  $\mathcal{C}$ -module structure such that  $\hbar$  acts as multiplication by  $2\pi i\omega$ , that is,  $(\hbar f)(t) = 2\pi i\omega f(t)$  for  $f \in M(\mathbb{C})$ . Then we define the  $\mathcal{C}$ -linear map  $I_\omega : \mathfrak{z} \rightarrow M(\mathbb{C})$  by

$$I_\omega(e_1 - g_1 | t) = 2\pi i\omega, \quad I_\omega(g_k | t) = \left( \frac{2\pi i\omega e^{2\pi i\omega t}}{1 - e^{2\pi i\omega t}} \right)^k = \left( \frac{2\pi i\omega}{e^{-2\pi i\omega t} - 1} \right)^k$$

for  $k \geq 1$ . It holds that

$$I_\omega(e_k | t) = (2\pi i\omega)^k \frac{e^{2\pi i\omega(k-1)t}}{(1 - e^{2\pi i\omega t})^k}$$

for  $k \geq 1$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $(w_1, w_2, w_3)$  be a triple of monomials in  $\mathcal{A}$  which belongs to the set*

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{T} = (\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \times (\mathcal{M}_0 \setminus \{1\})) \cup (\mathcal{M}_0 \times \mathcal{M}_0 \times \{1\}).$$

*Set  $w_j = v_{j,1} \cdots v_{j,r_j}$ , where  $v_{j,a}$  ( $1 \leq j \leq 3, 1 \leq a \leq r_j$ ) is an element of  $\mathcal{A}$ . If  $w_j = 1$ , set  $r_j = 0$ . Suppose that  $\epsilon$  is a constant satisfying  $0 < \epsilon < \min(1, \omega/(r_1 + r_2 + r_3))$ . Then the multiple integral*

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{F}(w_1, w_2, w_3) = \prod_{j=1}^3 \prod_{a=1}^{r_j} \int_{-\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_{j,a}}{e^{2\pi i t_{j,a}} - 1} \prod_{j=1}^2 \prod_{a=1}^{r_j} I_\omega(v_{j,a} | t_{j,1} + \cdots + t_{j,a}) \\ \times \prod_{a=1}^{r_3} I_\omega(v_{3,a} | [t_1] + [t_2] + t_{3,1} + \cdots + t_{3,a}),$$

*is absolutely convergent and does not depend on  $\epsilon$ , where  $[t_j] = \sum_{a=1}^{r_j} t_{j,a}$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ).*

To prove Proposition 3.1, we should estimate the integrand of  $\mathcal{F}(w_1, w_2, w_3)$ . For this purpose, we show a basic inequality.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Set*

$$(3.3) \quad c(y) = \begin{cases} |\sin y| & (\text{if } \cos y \geq 0) \\ 1 & (\text{if } \cos y \leq 0) \end{cases}$$

*Then*

$$|e^{x+iy} - 1| \geq c(y)e^{\frac{1}{2}(x+|x|)}.$$

*for any  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

*Proof.* We see that  $|e^{x+iy} - 1|^2 = (e^x - \cos y)^2 + \sin^2 y$ . If  $x \leq 0$ , then  $0 < e^x \leq 1$ , and hence  $|e^{x+iy} - 1|^2 \geq c(y)^2$ . Since  $|e^{x+iy} - 1| = e^x |e^{-(x+iy)} - 1|$  and  $c(-y) = c(y)$ , it holds that  $|e^{x+iy} - 1| \geq e^x c(y)$  for  $x \geq 0$ .  $\square$

From Lemma 3.2, we obtain the following estimate.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Suppose that  $0 < \rho < \min(1, 1/\omega)$  and set  $t = -\rho + iu$  with  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, it holds that*

$$\left| \frac{1}{e^{2\pi it} - 1} \right| \leq \frac{e^{\pi(u-|u|)}}{c(-2\pi\rho)}, \quad |I_\omega(e_1 - g_1 | t)| = 2\pi\omega,$$

$$|I_\omega(g_k | t)| \leq \left( \frac{2\pi\omega}{c(2\pi\omega\rho)} \right)^k e^{-k\pi\omega(u+|u|)} \quad (k \geq 1),$$

where  $c(y)$  is defined by (3.3). Hence the function  $I_\omega(v | t)$  with  $v \in \mathcal{A}$  is bounded on the line  $-\rho + i\mathbb{R}$ .

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 3.1.

*Proof of Proposition 3.1.* Here we prove the proposition in the case where  $(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \times (\mathcal{M}_0 \setminus \{1\})$ . The proof for the case where  $(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathcal{M}_0 \times \mathcal{M}_0 \times \{1\}$  is similar.

Denote by  $F(t)$  the integrand of (3.2). Since  $w_3 \in \mathcal{M}_0 \setminus \{1\}$ , we can set  $v_{3,r_3} = g_k$  with some  $k \geq 1$ . Using Proposition 3.3, we see that there exists a positive constant  $C = C(\omega, r, \epsilon)$  such that

$$(3.4) \quad |F(t)| \leq C \left( \prod_{j=1}^3 \prod_{a=1}^{r_j} \frac{1}{|e^{2\pi it_{j,a}} - 1|} \right) |I_\omega(g_k | [t_1] + [t_2] + [t_3])|,$$

on the integral region, where  $[t_3] = \sum_{a=1}^{r_3} t_{3,a}$ . Set  $u_{j,a} = \text{Im } t_{j,a}$ . Using Proposition 3.3 again, we see that the right hand side of (3.4) is estimated from above by  $C' \exp(\pi S(u))$ , where  $C'$  is a positive constant and

$$S(u) = \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^{r_j} (u_{j,a} - |u_{j,a}|) - k\omega \left( \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^{r_j} u_{j,a} + \left| \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^{r_j} u_{j,a} \right| \right).$$

Since  $k \geq 1$  and  $x + |x| \geq 0$  for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} S(u) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^{r_j} (u_{j,a} - |u_{j,a}|) - \omega \left( \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^{r_j} u_{j,a} + \left| \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^{r_j} u_{j,a} \right| \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^{r_j} (u_{j,a} - |u_{j,a}|) - \omega \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^{r_j} u_{j,a} \leq (|1 - \omega| - 1) \sum_{j=1}^3 \sum_{a=1}^{r_j} |u_{j,a}|. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $0 < \omega < 2$ , we have  $|1 - \omega| - 1 < 0$ . Therefore, the integral (3.2) is absolutely convergent and independent of  $\epsilon$ .  $\square$

### 3.2. Definition of $\omega$ -deformed multiple zeta value.

**Definition 3.4.** We endow the complex number field  $\mathbb{C}$  with  $\mathcal{C}$ -module structure such that  $\hbar$  acts as multiplication by  $2\pi i\omega$ . We define the  $\mathcal{C}$ -linear map  $Z_\omega : \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by  $Z_\omega(1) = 1$  and

$$Z_\omega(u_1 \cdots u_r) = \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi it_a} - 1} \prod_{a=1}^r I_\omega(u_a | t_1 + \cdots + t_a)$$

for  $u_1, \dots, u_r \in \mathcal{A}$  such that  $u_r \neq e_1 - g_1$ , where  $\epsilon$  is a constant satisfying  $0 < \epsilon < \min(1, 1/r\omega)$ . Proposition 3.1 with  $w_2 = w_3 = 1$  implies that the above integral is absolutely convergent and

does not depend on  $\epsilon$ . We call the value  $Z_\omega(w)$  with  $w \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$  an  $\omega$ -deformed multiple zeta value ( $\omega$ MZV).

We give a more explicit formula of  $\omega$ MZV for the monomial (2.1).

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $r$  be a positive integer and suppose that  $0 < \epsilon < \min(1, 1/r\omega)$ . For any non-negative integers  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$  and  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r$ , it holds that*

$$(3.5) \quad Z_\omega((e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_1} g_{\beta_1+1} \cdots (e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_r} g_{\beta_r+1}) \\ = \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \prod_{a=1}^r \left\{ (-2\pi i \omega)^{\alpha_a} \binom{t_a + \alpha_a}{\alpha_a} \left( \frac{2\pi i \omega}{1 - e^{-2\pi i \omega(t_1 + \cdots + t_a)}} \right)^{\beta_a+1} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* From the definition of  $Z_\omega$ , we have

$$Z_\omega((e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_1} g_{\beta_1+1} \cdots (e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_r} g_{\beta_r+1}) \\ = (2\pi i \omega)^{\sum_{a=1}^r \alpha_a} \prod_{a=1}^r \prod_{j=1}^{\alpha_a+1} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds_{a,j}}{e^{2\pi i s_{a,j}} - 1} \prod_{a=1}^r I_\omega(g_{\beta_a+1} | [s_1] + \cdots + [s_a]),$$

where  $[s_a] = \sum_{j=1}^{\alpha_a+1} s_{a,j}$  for  $1 \leq a \leq r$ . Change the integration variable  $s_{a,\alpha_a+1}$  to  $t_a = [s_a]$  for  $1 \leq a \leq r$ . Then the above integral becomes

$$\prod_{a=1}^r \left( \int_{-(\alpha_a+1)\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} dt_a I_\omega(g_{\beta_a+1} | t_1 + \cdots + t_a) \left( \prod_{j=1}^{\alpha_a} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds_j}{e^{2\pi i s_j} - 1} \right) \frac{1}{e^{2\pi i(t_a - s_1 - \cdots - s_{\alpha_a})} - 1} \right).$$

Now the desired equality follows from Lemma 3.6 below.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\alpha$  be a positive integer. Suppose that  $0 < \epsilon < 1/(\alpha + 1)$  and  $\text{Re } t = -(\alpha + 1)\epsilon$ . Then it holds that*

$$\left( \prod_{j=1}^{\alpha} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds_j}{e^{2\pi i s_j} - 1} \right) \frac{1}{e^{2\pi i(t - s_1 - \cdots - s_\alpha)} - 1} = (-1)^\alpha \binom{t + \alpha}{\alpha} \frac{1}{e^{2\pi i t} - 1}.$$

*Proof.* We use induction on  $\alpha$ . First, in the case of  $\alpha = 1$ , the left hand side is equal to

$$\int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds}{e^{2\pi i s} - 1} \frac{(t - s + 1) - (t - s)}{e^{2\pi i(t-s)} - 1} = \left( \int_{-\epsilon-1+i\mathbb{R}} - \int_{-\epsilon+\mathbb{R}} \right) \frac{ds}{e^{2\pi i s} - 1} \frac{t - s}{e^{2\pi i(t-s)} - 1} \\ = -2\pi i \text{Res}_{s=-1} \frac{ds}{e^{2\pi i s} - 1} \frac{t - s}{e^{2\pi i(t-s)} - 1} = -\frac{t + 1}{e^{2\pi i t} - 1}.$$

Next, suppose that  $\alpha \geq 2$  and  $\text{Re } t = -(\alpha + 1)\epsilon$ . Since  $\text{Re}(t - s_1) = -\alpha\epsilon$  for  $s_1 \in -\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}$ , the induction hypothesis implies that

$$\left( \prod_{j=1}^{\alpha} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds_j}{e^{2\pi i s_j} - 1} \right) \frac{1}{e^{2\pi i(t - s_1 - \cdots - s_\alpha)} - 1} \\ = (-1)^{\alpha-1} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds_1}{e^{2\pi i s_1} - 1} \binom{t - s_1 + \alpha - 1}{\alpha - 1} \frac{1}{e^{2\pi i(t - s_1)} - 1} \\ = (-1)^{\alpha-1} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds_1}{e^{2\pi i s_1} - 1} \left( \binom{t - s_1 + \alpha}{\alpha} - \binom{t - s_1 + \alpha - 1}{\alpha} \right) \frac{1}{e^{2\pi i(t - s_1)} - 1} \\ = (-1)^{\alpha-1} \left( \int_{-\epsilon-1+i\mathbb{R}} - \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \right) \frac{ds_1}{e^{2\pi i s_1} - 1} \binom{t - s_1 + \alpha - 1}{\alpha} \frac{1}{e^{2\pi i(t - s_1)} - 1}.$$

Since  $(t^{-s_1+\alpha-1})_\alpha$  is zero at  $s_1 = t$ , it is equal to

$$(-1)^\alpha 2\pi i \operatorname{Res}_{s_1=-1} \frac{ds_1}{e^{2\pi i s_1} - 1} \binom{t-s_1+\alpha-1}{\alpha} \frac{1}{e^{2\pi i(t-s_1)} - 1} = (-1)^\alpha \binom{t+\alpha}{\alpha} \frac{1}{e^{2\pi i t} - 1}.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 3.7.** Suppose that  $\epsilon > 0$  is small enough. Then, using Proposition 3.5, we see that the infinite sum

$$\begin{aligned} R_\omega \left( \begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_r \\ y_1, \dots, y_r \end{matrix} \right) &= \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \geq 0 \\ \beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \geq 0}} Z_\omega((e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_1} g_{\beta_1+1} \cdots (e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_r} g_{\beta_r+1}) \\ &\quad \times \prod_{a=1}^r \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega y_a} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \right)^{\alpha_a} \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega x_a} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \right)^{\beta_a} \end{aligned}$$

converges absolutely and defines a holomorphic function of  $x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_r$  in a neighborhood of the origin of  $\mathbb{C}^{2r}$ . From Proposition 3.5, we see that

$$(3.6) \quad R_\omega \left( \begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_r \\ y_1, \dots, y_r \end{matrix} \right) = (2\pi i \omega)^r e^{-2\pi i \omega \sum_{a=1}^r y_a} \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega(t_1+\cdots+t_a-y_a t_a)}}{1 - e^{2\pi i \omega(x_a+t_1+\cdots+t_a)}}.$$

The contour  $-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}$  of the integration variable  $t_a$  in (3.6) separates the poles of the integrand at  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $-x_k - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} t_j + (1/\omega)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  ( $k \geq a$ ) from those at  $\mathbb{Z}_{< 0}$  and  $-x_k - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} t_j + (1/\omega)\mathbb{Z}_{< 0}$  ( $k \geq a$ ).

Any function  $f(x_1, \dots, x_r, y_1, \dots, y_r)$  which is holomorphic in a neighborhood of the origin of  $\mathbb{C}^{2r}$  is uniquely expanded into a power series of  $(e^{2\pi i \omega x_a} - 1)/2\pi i \omega$  and  $(e^{2\pi i \omega y_a} - 1)/2\pi i \omega$  ( $1 \leq a \leq r$ ) since their derivatives do not vanish at  $x_a = 0$  or  $y_a = 0$ . Therefore,  $R_\omega$  is a generating function of  $\omega$ MZVs.

In the case of  $\omega = 1$ , the generating function  $R_1$  is uniquely determined from the initial formula

$$R_1 \left( \begin{matrix} x_1 \\ y_1 \end{matrix} \right) = 2\pi i \frac{1 - e^{2\pi i x_1 y_1}}{(1 - e^{2\pi i x_1})(1 - e^{2\pi i y_1})}$$

and the recurrence relation

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 \left( \begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_r \\ y_1, \dots, y_r \end{matrix} \right) &= \frac{2\pi i}{1 - e^{2\pi i y_r}} \frac{1}{e^{2\pi i x_{r-1}} - e^{2\pi i x_r}} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ R_1 \left( \begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_{r-2}, x_{r-1} \\ y_1, \dots, y_{r-2}, y_{r-1} \end{matrix} \right) - R_1 \left( \begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_{r-2}, x_r \\ y_1, \dots, y_{r-2}, y_{r-1} \end{matrix} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - e^{2\pi i x_r y_r} \left( R_1 \left( \begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_{r-2}, x_{r-1} \\ y_1 - y_r, \dots, y_{r-2} - y_r, y_{r-1} - y_r \end{matrix} \right) - R_1 \left( \begin{matrix} x_1, \dots, x_{r-2}, x_r \\ y_1 - y_r, \dots, y_{r-2} - y_r, y_{r-1} - y_r \end{matrix} \right) \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

for  $r \geq 2$ , which are derived from the formula (3.6) though we omit the details. Therefore, any  $\omega$ MZV with  $\omega = 1$  is a polynomial in  $2\pi i$  with rational coefficients.

**3.3. Limit as  $\omega \rightarrow +0$ .** Here we summarize some results about the limit of  $\omega$ MZVs as  $\omega \rightarrow +0$ . The following two propositions are proved in Appendix A.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $v$  be the monomial (2.1) with  $r \geq 1$  and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \geq 0$ .*

- (i) *As  $\omega \rightarrow +0$ , it holds that  $Z_\omega(v) = O((-\log \omega)^r)$ . Hence  $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow +0} Z_\omega(\hbar \omega) = 0$  for any  $w \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ .*
- (ii) *If there exist  $s$  and  $t$  such that  $1 \leq s \leq t \leq r$ ,  $\alpha_s \geq 1$  and  $\beta_t \geq 1$ , then  $\lim_{\omega \rightarrow +0} Z_\omega(v) = 0$ .*

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $(k_1, \dots, k_r)$  be an admissible index. Then it holds that*

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow +0} Z_\omega(g_{k_1} \cdots g_{k_r}) = \zeta(k_1, \dots, k_r).$$

**Remark 3.10.** The  $q$ MZV defined by (2.6) has similar properties. See [13, Proposition 3.4].

**Corollary 3.11.** *Let  $(k_1, \dots, k_r)$  be an admissible index. Then it holds that*

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow +0} Z_\omega(e_{k_1} \cdots e_{k_r}) = \zeta(k_1, \dots, k_r).$$

*Proof.* It holds that  $e_k = g_k + \hbar g_{k-1}$  for  $k \geq 2$  and  $e_1 = (e_1 - g_1) + g_1$ . Since  $k_r \geq 2$ , we see that  $e_{k_1} \cdots e_{k_{r-1}} e_{k_r} - e_{k_1} \cdots e_{k_{r-1}} g_{k_r}$  belongs to  $\hbar \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ . Moreover,  $e_{k_1} \cdots e_{k_{r-1}} g_{k_r} - g_{k_1} \cdots g_{k_{r-1}} g_{k_r}$  is a  $\mathcal{C}$ -linear combination of monomials (2.1) with  $\alpha_s \geq 1$  for some  $1 \leq s \leq r$  and  $\beta_r = k_r - 1 \geq 1$  modulo  $\hbar \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ . Hence, from Proposition 3.8 and Proposition 3.9, we see that

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow +0} Z_\omega(e_{k_1} \cdots e_{k_r}) = \lim_{\omega \rightarrow +0} Z_\omega(g_{k_1} \cdots g_{k_r}) = \zeta(k_1, \dots, k_r).$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

For an admissible index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ , we set

$$(3.7) \quad \zeta_\omega(\mathbf{k}) = Z_\omega(e_{k_1} \cdots e_{k_r}) = (2\pi i \omega)^{|\mathbf{k}|} \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega (k_a - 1)(t_1 + \cdots + t_a)}}{(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (t_1 + \cdots + t_a)})^{k_a}},$$

where  $|\mathbf{k}| = \sum_{a=1}^r k_a$  is the weight of  $\mathbf{k}$ . Corollary 3.11 shows that  $\zeta_\omega(\mathbf{k}) \rightarrow \zeta(\mathbf{k})$  as  $\omega \rightarrow +0$ .

## 4. DOUBLE SHUFFLE RELATIONS

### 4.1. Shuffle product relations.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{G}$  be the  $\mathcal{C}$ -submodule of the tensor product  $\mathfrak{H}^{\otimes 3}$  spanned by the set  $\{w_1 \otimes w_2 \otimes w_3 \mid (w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathcal{T}\}$ , where  $\mathcal{T}$  is the set defined by (3.1). Define the  $\mathcal{C}$ -linear map  $\mathcal{F}_\omega : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by (3.2) and  $\mathcal{C}$ -linearity. We also define the  $\mathcal{C}$ -linear map  $\mathcal{S} : \mathfrak{G} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$  by  $\mathcal{S}(w_1 \otimes w_2 \otimes w_3) = (w_1 \mathfrak{H}_\hbar w_2) w_3$  for  $(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathcal{T}$ . Then it holds that  $Z_\omega(\mathcal{S}(w)) = \mathcal{F}_\omega(w)$  for any  $w \in \mathfrak{G}$ .*

*Proof.* It is enough to show the proposition in the case of  $w = w_1 \otimes w_2 \otimes w_3$  with  $(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathcal{T}$ . Set  $w_j = v_{j,1} \cdots v_{j,r_j}$  ( $1 \leq j \leq 3$ ), where  $v_{j,k} \in \mathcal{A}$ . We prove  $Z_\omega(\mathcal{S}(w)) = \mathcal{F}_\omega(w)$  by induction on  $r_1 + r_2$ . If  $r_1 = 0$  or  $r_2 = 0$ , it follows from the definition of  $\mathcal{F}_\omega$ . Suppose that  $r_1 \geq 1$  and  $r_2 \geq 1$ . If  $v_{1,r_1}$  or  $v_{2,r_2}$  is equal to  $e_1 - g_1$ , then the desired equality is trivial since  $I_\omega(e_1 - g_1 \mid t)$  does not depend on  $t$ . Suppose that  $v_{1,r_1}$  and  $v_{2,r_2}$  belong to the set  $\{g_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ . Set

$$H(t, X) = \sum_{k \geq 1} I_\omega(g_k \mid t) X^{k-1}.$$

If  $|X|$  is sufficiently small, it holds that

$$H(t, X) = \frac{2\pi i \omega}{e^{-2\pi i \omega t} - 1 - 2\pi i \omega X}.$$

Using this expression we see that

$$\begin{aligned} H(t, X)H(s, Y) &= ((1 + 2\pi i \omega X)H(t, X) + (1 + 2\pi i \omega Y)H(s, Y) + 2\pi i \omega) \\ &\quad \times H(t + s, X + Y + 2\pi i \omega XY). \end{aligned}$$

Comparing it with (2.4), we see that the desired equality follows from the induction hypothesis.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.2** (Shuffle product relations of  $\omega$ MZVs). *For any  $w, w' \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ , it holds that*

$$Z_\omega(w \mathfrak{H}_\hbar w') = Z_\omega(w)Z_\omega(w').$$

*Proof.* Since  $w \otimes w' \otimes 1 \in \mathfrak{G}$ , Proposition 4.1 and the definition of  $\mathcal{F}_\omega$  imply that

$$Z_\omega(w \boxtimes w') = Z_\omega(\mathcal{S}(w \otimes w' \otimes 1)) = \mathcal{F}_\omega(w \otimes w' \otimes 1) = Z_\omega(w)Z_\omega(w').$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

#### 4.2. Duality and double shuffle relations.

**Theorem 4.3** (Duality of  $\omega$ MZVs). *For any  $w \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ , it holds that*

$$Z_\omega(\sigma(w)) = Z_\omega(w).$$

In the proof of Theorem 4.3 we use the following equality.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Suppose that  $0 < \epsilon < 1$  and  $0 < \text{Im } \alpha < 2\pi$ . Then we have*

$$\int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} dt \frac{e^{\alpha t}}{e^{2\pi i t} - 1} = \frac{1}{e^\alpha - 1}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $0 < \text{Im } \alpha < 2\pi$ , the integral in the left hand side is absolutely convergent. The desired formula is derived as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} dt \frac{e^{\alpha t}}{e^{2\pi i t} - 1} &= \frac{1}{e^\alpha - 1} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} dt \frac{e^{\alpha(t+1)} - e^{\alpha t}}{e^{2\pi i t} - 1} \\ &= \frac{1}{e^\alpha - 1} \left( \int_{-\epsilon+1+i\mathbb{R}} - \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \right) dt \frac{e^{\alpha t}}{e^{2\pi i t} - 1} \\ &= \frac{2\pi i}{e^\alpha - 1} \text{Res}_{t=0} \frac{e^{\alpha t}}{e^{2\pi i t} - 1} dt = \frac{1}{e^\alpha - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.3.* It is enough to prove the equality  $Z_\omega(w) = Z_\omega(\sigma(w))$  in the case where  $w$  is the monomial (2.1) with  $r \geq 1$  and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_r \geq 0$ . Note that  $\sigma(w)$  is given by (2.5). From the definition we have

$$Z_\omega(w) = (2\pi i \omega)^{\sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_j} \prod_{j=1}^r \prod_{a=1}^{\alpha_j+1} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_{j,a}}{e^{2\pi i t_{j,a}} - 1} \prod_{j=1}^r I_\omega(g_{\beta_j+1} | [t_1] + \dots + [t_j]),$$

where  $[t_j] = \sum_{a=1}^{\alpha_a+1} t_{j,a}$  ( $1 \leq j \leq r$ ). Using Lemma 4.4 we see that

$$I_\omega(g_{\beta+1} | t) = (2\pi i \omega)^{\beta+1} \left( \prod_{b=1}^{\beta+1} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds_b}{e^{2\pi i s_b} - 1} \right) e^{-2\pi i \omega t[s]}$$

for  $\beta \geq 0$ , where  $[s] = \sum_{b=1}^{\beta+1} s_b$ . Hence it holds that

$$(4.1) \quad Z_\omega(w) = (2\pi i \omega)^{\sum_{j=1}^r (\alpha_j + \beta_j + 1)} \prod_{j=1}^r \left( \prod_{a=1}^{\alpha_j+1} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_{j,a}}{e^{2\pi i t_{j,a}} - 1} \prod_{b=1}^{\beta_j+1} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds_{j,b}}{e^{2\pi i s_{j,b}} - 1} \right) \\ \times e^{-2\pi i \omega \sum_{1 \leq a \leq b \leq r} [t_a][s_b]},$$

where  $[s_b] = \sum_{j=1}^{\beta_b+1} s_{j,b}$ . Now change the integration variables  $t_{j,a} \rightarrow s_{r+1-j,a}$  and  $s_{j,b} \rightarrow t_{r+1-j,b}$ , and we obtain the integral (4.1) with  $\alpha_j$  and  $\beta_j$  replaced by  $\beta_{r+1-j}$  and  $\alpha_{r+1-j}$ , respectively. Thus we see that  $Z_\omega(w) = Z_\omega(\sigma(w))$ .  $\square$

As discussed in Remark 2.4, we obtain the harmonic product relations and the double shuffle relations for  $\omega$ MZVs from Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.3:

**Theorem 4.5** (Harmonic product relations of  $\omega$ MZVs). *For any  $w, w' \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ , it holds that*

$$Z_\omega(w *_{\hbar} w') = Z_\omega(w)Z_\omega(w').$$

**Theorem 4.6** (Double shuffle relations of  $\omega$ MZVs). *For any  $w, w' \in \widehat{\mathfrak{H}}^0$ , it holds that*

$$Z_\omega(w \text{III}_{\hbar} w' - w *_{\hbar} w') = 0.$$

## 5. EXTENDED DOUBLE OHNO RELATIONS

**5.1. Algebraic formulation.** For an admissible index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$  and non-negative integers  $m$  and  $n$ , we define the double Ohno sum of  $\omega$ MZVs by

$$O_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\substack{m_1, \dots, m_r, n_1, \dots, n_r \geq 0 \\ m_1 + \dots + m_r = m \\ n_1 + \dots + n_r = n}} \zeta_\omega(k_1 + m_1 + n_1, \dots, k_r + m_r + n_r),$$

where  $\zeta_\omega(\mathbf{k})$  is given by (3.7). Recall that  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathbb{Q}\langle x, y \rangle$  is the non-commutative polynomial ring,  $z_k = yx^{k-1}$  for  $k \geq 1$  and  $z_{\mathbf{k}} = z_{k_1} \cdots z_{k_r}$  for an index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ . We define the formal power series  $\Omega(\mathbf{k} | \xi, \eta)$  in  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  by

$$(5.1) \quad \Omega(\mathbf{k} | \xi, \eta) = \sum_{m,n \geq 0} O_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}) \xi^m \eta^n,$$

and define the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear map  $\Omega(\cdot | \xi, \eta) : y\mathfrak{h}x \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[\xi, \eta]]$  by  $\Omega(z_{\mathbf{k}} | \xi, \eta) = \Omega(\mathbf{k} | \xi, \eta)$  for any admissible index  $\mathbf{k}$ .

For a non-negative integer  $n$ , we define the ideal  $I_n$  of  $\mathbb{C}[[\xi, \eta]]$  by  $I_n = \{\sum_{i+j \geq n} c_{ij} \xi^i \eta^j \mid c_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}\}$ . We endow the ring  $\mathbb{C}[[\xi, \eta]]$  with the topology such that the ideals  $\{I_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  form a fundamental system of neighborhoods of zero. Then we extend the map  $\Omega(\cdot | \xi, \eta)$  to the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear map on the formal power series ring  $(y\mathfrak{h}x)[[X]]$  by

$$\Omega(\sum_{j \geq 0} w_j X^j | \xi, \eta) = \sum_{j \geq 0} \Omega(w_j | \xi, \eta) \xi^j \eta^j,$$

where  $w_j \in y\mathfrak{h}x$  ( $j \geq 0$ ).

**Theorem 5.1** (Extended double Ohno relations of  $\omega$ MZVs). *For any  $w \in \mathfrak{a}$ , it holds that*

$$\Omega(ywx | \xi, \eta) = \Omega(y\tau(w)x | \xi, \eta)$$

(see Section 2.4 for the definition of  $\mathfrak{a}$  and  $\tau$ ).

We prove Theorem 5.1 in the rest of this section. For this purpose we consider a generating function of the double Ohno sums.

For  $k \geq 1$ , we set

$$(5.2) \quad J_k(t | \lambda, \mu) = \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega(k-1)t}}{(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega(\lambda+t)})(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega(\mu+t)})(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega t})^{k-2}}.$$

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$  be an admissible index. Suppose that  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2r\omega$ . Then the infinite sum*

$$O(\mathbf{k} | \lambda, \mu) = \sum_{m,n \geq 0} O_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}) \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega \lambda} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \right)^m \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega \mu} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \right)^n$$

defines a holomorphic function in the region

$$(5.3) \quad \{(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid |\lambda| < \epsilon/3\pi, |\mu| < \epsilon/3\pi\}$$

and it holds that

$$(5.4) \quad O(\mathbf{k} | \lambda, \mu) = (2\pi i \omega)^{|\mathbf{k}|} \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \prod_{a=1}^r J_{k_a}(t_1 + \cdots + t_a | \lambda, \mu).$$

See Appendix B for the proof of Proposition 5.2.

**5.2. Hyperbolic gamma function.** In the proof of Theorem 5.1, we use the hyperbolic gamma function due to Ruijsenaars [8]. Here we summarize some of its properties. See [9, Appendix A] for details.

The hyperbolic gamma function  $G(z | \omega_1, \omega_2)$  has two complex parameters  $\omega_1, \omega_2$  whose real parts are positive. In this paper we use it with  $(\omega_1, \omega_2) = (1, 1/\omega)$  and write  $G(z) = G(z | 1, 1/\omega)$  for simplicity. We set

$$\underline{\omega} = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\omega} \right).$$

The function  $G(z)$  is a meromorphic function on  $\mathbb{C}$  satisfying

$$(5.5) \quad G(z)G(-z) = 1$$

and

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{aligned} G(z+i) &= -2i \sinh(\pi\omega(z+i\underline{\omega}))G(z), \\ G(z+i/\omega) &= -2i \sinh(\pi(z+i\underline{\omega}))G(z). \end{aligned}$$

The poles of  $G(z)$  are at  $-i\underline{\omega} + i\mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0} + (i/\omega)\mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$  and the zeroes are at  $i\underline{\omega} + i\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} + (i/\omega)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . In the region  $|\operatorname{Im}z| < \underline{\omega}$ , it holds that

$$G(z) = \exp \left( i \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} \left( \frac{\sin 2\omega t z}{2 \sinh \omega t \sinh t} - \frac{z}{t} \right) \right).$$

Let  $K$  be a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Then we have

$$(5.7) \quad G(z) \exp \left( \frac{\pi i \omega}{2} z^2 + \frac{\pi i}{24} \left( \omega + \frac{1}{\omega} \right) \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (\operatorname{Im} z \in K, \operatorname{Re} z \rightarrow +\infty).$$

There exist positive constants  $M$  and  $M'$  which depend on  $\omega$  and  $K$  such that

$$(5.8) \quad |G(z)| \leq M \left| \exp \left( \mp \frac{\pi i \omega}{2} z^2 \right) \right|,$$

$$(5.9) \quad \left| \frac{G'(z)}{G(z)} \right| \leq M' (|z|^2 + 1)$$

if  $\pm \operatorname{Re}z > \max(1, 1/\omega)$  and  $\operatorname{Im}z \in K$ . Hence, if  $K$  is a closed interval contained in  $(-\underline{\omega}, \underline{\omega})$ , we can take a positive constant  $M$  so that

$$(5.10) \quad |G(z)| \leq M e^{\pi\omega |\operatorname{Re}z| |\operatorname{Im}z|}$$

in the strip  $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Im}z \in K\}$ .

**5.3. Connected integral.** For indices  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$  and  $\mathbf{l} = (l_1, \dots, l_s)$ , we set

$$(5.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} | \lambda, \mu) &= (2\pi i \omega)^{|\mathbf{k}|+|\mathbf{l}|} \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \prod_{b=1}^s \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{du_b}{e^{2\pi i u_b} - 1} \\ &\times \prod_{a=1}^{r-1} J_{k_a}(t_1 + \cdots + t_a | \lambda, \mu) \prod_{b=1}^{s-1} J_{l_b}(u_1 + \cdots + u_b | \lambda, \mu) \\ &\times \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega [t]}}{1 - e^{2\pi i \omega [t]}} \right)^{k_r-1} \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega [u]}}{1 - e^{2\pi i \omega [u]}} \right)^{l_s-1} \Theta([t], [u], \lambda, \mu), \end{aligned}$$

where  $J_k(t | \lambda, \mu)$  is defined by (5.2),  $[t] = \sum_{a=1}^r t_a$ ,  $[u] = \sum_{b=1}^s u_b$ , and the function  $\Theta(t, u, \lambda, \mu)$  is defined by

$$\Theta(t, u, \lambda, \mu) = \frac{e^{-\pi i \omega t u}}{1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (t+u+\lambda+\mu)}} \times \frac{G(i(\underline{\omega} + t))G(i(\underline{\omega} + u))G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + u + \lambda + \mu))}{G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + \lambda))G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + \mu))G(i(\underline{\omega} + u + \lambda))G(i(\underline{\omega} + u + \mu))}.$$

Note that  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} | \lambda, \mu) = \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{k} | \lambda, \mu)$  for any indices  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $\mathbf{l}$  since  $\Theta(t, u, \lambda, \mu)$  is symmetric in  $t$  and  $u$ .

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r), \mathbf{l} = (l_1, \dots, l_s)$  be indices and suppose that  $0 < (r+s+2)\epsilon < \min(1, 1/\omega)$ . Then the integral  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} | \lambda, \mu)$  is absolutely convergent and defines a holomorphic function on the region  $B = \{(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid |\lambda| < \epsilon, |\mu| < \epsilon\}$ .*

See Appendix B for the proof of Proposition 5.3.

For an index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ , we set

$$\mathbf{k}_\uparrow = (k_1, \dots, k_{r-1}, k_r + 1).$$

Note that  $\mathbf{k}_\uparrow$  is admissible for any index  $\mathbf{k}$ . The integral  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} | \lambda, \mu)$  is related to the generating function  $O(\mathbf{k} | \lambda, \mu)$  of the double Ohno sums as follows.

**Theorem 5.4.** *For any index  $\mathbf{k}$ , it holds that*

$$\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \{1\} | \lambda, \mu) = d(\lambda, \mu)O(\mathbf{k}_\uparrow | \lambda, \mu),$$

where

$$(5.12) \quad d(\lambda, \eta) = \frac{i}{\sqrt{\omega}} e^{\pi i \omega (\lambda + \mu - \lambda \mu)} G(i(\underline{\omega} - \lambda - 1/\omega))G(i(\underline{\omega} - \mu - 1/\omega)).$$

To prove Theorem 5.4, we use the following identity.

**Proposition 5.5.** *For generic  $(u_1, u_2, u_4, u_5) \in \mathbb{C}^4$ , it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_C du \exp((4i\underline{\omega} - u_1 - u_2 - u_4 - u_5)\pi i \omega u) \frac{G(u - u_4)G(u - u_5)}{G(u + u_1)G(u + u_2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega}} \exp((u_1 u_2 - u_4 u_5 - i\underline{\omega}(u_4 + u_5 - u_1 - u_2))\pi i \omega) \\ & \quad \times G(-3i\underline{\omega} + u_1 + u_2 + u_4 + u_5) \prod_{j=1}^2 \prod_{k=4}^5 G(i\underline{\omega} - u_j - u_k), \end{aligned}$$

where  $C$  is a deformation of the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  separating the poles at  $-u_j + i\underline{\omega} + i\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} + (i/\omega)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) from the poles at  $u_k - i\underline{\omega} - i\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} - (i/\omega)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  ( $k = 4, 5$ ).

*Proof.* By using (5.8) and (5.9), we see that the both hand sides of the desired equality are holomorphic at generic  $(u_1, u_2, u_4, u_5)$ . Therefore it is enough to prove it under the assumption  $\text{Im}(u_1 + u_2 + u_4 + u_5) > 4\underline{\omega}$ .

We start from a hyperbolic analogue of non-terminating Saalschütz formula [3, Corollary 4.6]:

$$(5.13) \quad \int_{C_0} du \frac{\prod_{k=4}^6 G(u - u_k)}{\prod_{j=1}^3 G(u + u_j)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega}} \prod_{j=1}^3 \prod_{k=4}^6 G(i\underline{\omega} - u_j - u_k).$$

This equality holds for generic  $(u_1, \dots, u_6) \in \mathbb{C}^6$  satisfying  $\sum_{j=1}^6 u_j = 4i\underline{\omega}$ . The contour  $C_0$  is a deformation of the real line  $\mathbb{R}$  separating the poles at  $-u_j + i\underline{\omega} + i\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} + (i/\omega)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ) from the poles at  $u_k - i\underline{\omega} - i\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} - (i/\omega)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  ( $k = 4, 5, 6$ ).

Take  $u_3$  and  $u_6$  satisfying  $\sum_{j=1}^6 u_j = 4i\underline{\omega}$ ,  $\text{Im}(u_3 + u_6) < 0$  and  $\text{Im}(i\underline{\omega} - u_j) > 0$  ( $j = 3, 6$ ). Suppose that  $\eta > 0$  and set

$$\psi(u_3, u_6, \eta) = -\pi i \omega (u_3 + u_6) \left( \eta + \frac{u_3 - u_6}{2} \right).$$

From (5.13) we see that

$$(5.14) \quad \int_{C_0} du \frac{\prod_{k=4,5} G(u - u_k)}{\prod_{j=1,2} G(u + u_j)} e^{\psi(u_3, u_6, \eta)} \frac{G(u - u_6 + \eta)}{G(u + u_3 + \eta)} \\ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega}} e^{\psi(u_3, u_6, \eta)} \prod_{j=1,2} G(i\underline{\omega} - u_j - u_6 + \eta) \prod_{k=4,5} G(i\underline{\omega} - u_3 - u_k - \eta) \\ \times G(-3i\underline{\omega} + u_1 + u_2 + u_4 + u_5) \prod_{j=1,2} \prod_{k=4,5} G(i\underline{\omega} - u_j - u_k).$$

Note that, for large enough  $\eta$ , the contour  $C_0$  is independent of  $\eta$ . Denote by  $F(u)$  the integrand in the left hand side. Using (5.8) and  $\text{Im}(u_3 + u_6) < 0$ , we see that there exists a constant  $\widetilde{M}$  which is independent of  $\eta$  such that

$$|F(u)| \leq \widetilde{M} \exp(\mp 2\pi(1 + \omega) \text{Re } u) \quad (u \in C_0, \text{Re } u \geq A),$$

where  $A = \max(\text{Re } u_4, \text{Re } u_5, -\text{Re } u_1, -\text{Re } u_2) + \max(1, 1/\omega)$ . Therefore, we can apply the dominated convergence theorem to the integral (5.14) and take the limit as  $\eta \rightarrow +\infty$ . Then we get the desired equality by using (5.5) and (5.7).  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 5.4.* By using (5.6), we see that

$$(5.15) \quad \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \{1\} | \lambda, \mu) \\ = (2\pi i \omega)^{|\mathbf{k}|+1} \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \prod_{a=1}^{r-1} J_{k_a}(t_1 + \cdots + t_a | \lambda, \mu) \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega [t]}}{1 - e^{2\pi i \omega [t]}} \right)^{k_r-1} \\ \times \frac{G(i(\underline{\omega} + [t]))}{G(i(\underline{\omega} + [t] + \lambda))G(i(\underline{\omega} + [t] + \mu))} e^{-\pi i \omega ([t] + \lambda + \mu)} H([t] | \lambda, \mu),$$

where

$$H(t | \lambda, \mu) = \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} du e^{-\pi i(1+\omega+t)u} \frac{G(i(\underline{\omega} + u - 1/\omega))G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + u + \lambda + \mu - 1))}{G(i(\underline{\omega} + u + \lambda))G(i(\underline{\omega} + u + \mu))}.$$

Proposition 5.5 implies that

$$H(t | \lambda, \mu) = d(\lambda, \mu) \frac{e^{\pi i \omega (2(\lambda + \mu) + 3t)}}{(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (\lambda + t)})(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (\mu + t)})} \frac{G(i(\underline{\omega} + \lambda + t))G(i(\underline{\omega} + \mu + t))}{G(i(\underline{\omega} + t))}.$$

Substituting it into (5.15), we obtain the desired equality from Proposition 5.2.  $\square$

**5.4. Transport relation.** We show an important property of the connected integral  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} | \lambda, \mu)$ . For an index  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ , we set

$$\mathbf{k}_{\rightarrow} = (k_1, \dots, k_r, 1), \quad \mathbf{k}_{\rightarrow\uparrow} = (\mathbf{k}_{\rightarrow})_{\uparrow} = (k_1, \dots, k_r, 2).$$

**Theorem 5.6** (Transport relations). *For any index  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $\mathbf{l}$ , it holds that*

$$(5.16) \quad \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}_{\rightarrow}, \mathbf{l} | \lambda, \mu) = \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}_{\uparrow} | \lambda, \mu) + \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega \lambda} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega \mu} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}_{\rightarrow\uparrow}, \mathbf{l}_{\uparrow} | \lambda, \mu),$$

$$(5.17) \quad \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}_{\uparrow}, \mathbf{l} | \lambda, \mu) = \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}_{\rightarrow} | \lambda, \mu) - \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega \lambda} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega \mu} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}_{\uparrow}, \mathbf{l}_{\rightarrow\uparrow} | \lambda, \mu)$$

in a neighborhood of  $(\lambda, \mu) = (0, 0)$ .

*Proof.* It is enough to prove (5.16) since the symmetry  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} \mid \lambda, \mu) = \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{l}, \mathbf{k} \mid \lambda, \mu)$  implies (5.17).

Set  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$  and  $\mathbf{l} = (l_1, \dots, l_s)$ . We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.18) \quad & \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}_{\rightarrow}, \mathbf{l} \mid \lambda, \mu) - \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega \lambda} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega \mu} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}_{\rightarrow \uparrow}, \mathbf{l}_{\uparrow} \mid \lambda, \mu) \\
&= (2\pi i \omega)^{|\mathbf{k}| + |\mathbf{l}| + 1} \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \prod_{b=1}^s \int_{-\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}} \frac{du_b}{e^{2\pi i u_b} - 1} \\
&\quad \times \prod_{a=1}^r J_{k_a}(t_1 + \dots + t_a \mid \lambda, \mu) \prod_{b=1}^s J_{l_b}(u_1 + \dots + u_b \mid \lambda, \mu) \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega [u]}}{1 - e^{2\pi i \omega [u]}} \right)^{l_s - 1} \\
&\quad \times \frac{e^{-\pi i \omega [t][u]}}{1 - e^{2\pi i \omega [u]}} \frac{G(i(\underline{\omega} + [u]))}{G(i(\underline{\omega} + [u] + \lambda))G(i(\underline{\omega} + [u] + \mu))} V([t], [u], \lambda, \mu),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $[t] = \sum_{a=1}^r t_a$ ,  $[u] = \sum_{b=1}^s u_b$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
V(t, u, \lambda, \mu) &= \int_{-\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds}{e^{2\pi i s} - 1} \left\{ 1 - e^{2\pi i \omega u} \frac{(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (t + \lambda + s)})(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (t + \mu + s)})}{(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (t + s)})(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (t + u + \lambda + \mu + s)})} \right\} \\
&\quad \times \Xi(s \mid t, u, \lambda, \mu), \\
\Xi(s \mid t, u, \lambda, \mu) &= e^{-\pi i \omega u s} \frac{G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + s))G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + u + \lambda + \mu + s))}{G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + \lambda + s))G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + \mu + s))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (5.6), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
V(t, u, \lambda, \mu) &= \int_{-\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}} \frac{ds}{e^{2\pi i s} - 1} (\Xi(s \mid t, u, \lambda, \mu) - \Xi(s - 1 \mid t, u, \lambda, \mu)) \\
&= \left( \int_{-\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}} - \int_{-\epsilon - 1 + i\mathbb{R}} \right) \frac{ds}{e^{2\pi i s} - 1} \Xi(s \mid t, u, \lambda, \mu) \\
&= 2\pi i \operatorname{Res}_{s=-1} \frac{ds}{e^{2\pi i s} - 1} \Xi(s \mid t, u, \lambda, \mu) \\
&= e^{2\pi i \omega u} \frac{(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (t + \lambda)})(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (t + \mu)})}{(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega t})(1 - e^{2\pi i \omega (t + u + \lambda + \mu)})} \frac{G(i(\underline{\omega} + t))G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + u + \lambda + \mu))}{G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + \lambda))G(i(\underline{\omega} + t + \mu))}.
\end{aligned}$$

From this formula we see that the right hand side of (5.18) is equal to  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}_{\uparrow} \mid \lambda, \mu)$ .  $\square$

**5.5. Proof of extended double Ohno relations.** Now we can prove Theorem 5.1 in a similar way to the proof given in [5].

Recall the definition (5.12) of  $d(\lambda, \mu)$ . We see that  $1/d(\lambda, \mu)$  is holomorphic in a neighborhood of  $(\lambda, \mu) = (0, 0)$ . Hence we can define the value  $Z_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l})$  for indices  $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}$  and  $m, n \geq 0$  by the expansion

$$\frac{\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} \mid \lambda, \mu)}{d(\lambda, \mu)} = \sum_{m,n \geq 0} Z_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}) \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega \lambda} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \right)^m \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i \omega \mu} - 1}{2\pi i \omega} \right)^n.$$

We define the symmetric  $\mathbb{Q}$ -bilinear map  $\Phi(\cdot, \cdot \mid \xi, \eta) : y\mathfrak{h} \times y\mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[\xi, \eta]]$  by

$$\Phi(z_{\mathbf{k}}, z_{\mathbf{l}} \mid \xi, \eta) = \sum_{m,n \geq 0} Z_{m,n}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l}) \xi^m \eta^n$$

for any index  $\mathbf{k}$  and  $\mathbf{l}$ , and extend it to the  $\mathbb{Q}$ -bilinear map  $\Phi(\cdot, \cdot \mid \xi, \eta) : y\mathfrak{h}[[X]] \times y\mathfrak{h}[[X]] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[[\xi, \eta]]$  by

$$\Phi(\sum_{i \geq 0} w_i X^i, \sum_{j \geq 0} w'_j X^j \mid \xi, \eta) = \sum_{i,j \geq 0} \Phi(w_i, w'_j \mid \xi, \eta) (\xi \eta)^{i+j},$$

where  $w_i, w'_j \in y\mathfrak{h}$ .

Theorem 5.6 implies that

$$(5.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \Phi(wy, w' | \xi, \eta) &= \Phi(w, w'x | \xi, \eta) + \xi\eta\Phi(wyx, w'x | \xi, \eta), \\ \Phi(wx, w' | \xi, \eta) &= \Phi(w, w'y | \xi, \eta) - \xi\eta\Phi(wx, w'yx | \xi, \eta) \end{aligned}$$

for  $w, w' \in y\mathfrak{h}[[X]]$ . These relations imply that  $\Phi(wyx, w' | \xi, \eta) = \Phi(w, w'yx | \xi, \eta)$ . Hence it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(wy, w' | \xi, \eta) &= \Phi(w, w'x | \xi, \eta) + \xi\eta\Phi(w, w'xyx | \xi, \eta) \\ &= \Phi(w, w'x(1 + yxX) | \xi, \eta) = \Phi(w, w'\tau(y) | \xi, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Using (5.19) repeatedly, we see that

$$\Phi(wx, w' | \xi, \eta) = \sum_{j=0}^N (-\xi\eta)^j \Phi(w, w'y(xy)^j | \xi, \eta) + (-\xi\eta)^{N+1} \Phi(wx, w'(yx)^{N+1} | \xi, \eta)$$

for all  $N \geq 1$ . Therefore, in the formal power series ring  $\mathbb{C}[[\xi, \eta]]$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(wx, w' | \xi, \eta) &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (-\xi\eta)^j \Phi(w, w'y(xy)^j | \xi, \eta) \\ &= \Phi(w, w'y(1 + xyX)^{-1} | \xi, \eta) = \Phi(w, w'\tau(x) | \xi, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain

$$(5.20) \quad \Phi(wv, w' | \xi, \eta) = \Phi(w, w'\tau(v) | \xi, \eta)$$

for  $w, w' \in y\mathfrak{h}[[X]]$  and  $v \in \{x, y\}$ .

Theorem 5.4 and the symmetry of  $\Phi$  show that

$$\Omega(ywx | \xi, \eta) = \Phi(yw, y | \xi, \eta), \quad \Omega(y\tau(w)x | \xi, \eta) = \Phi(y, y\tau(w) | \xi, \eta)$$

for  $w \in \mathfrak{h}$ . Using (5.20) repeatedly, we see that  $\Phi(yw, y | \xi, \eta) = \Phi(y, y\tau(w) | \xi, \eta)$ . Thus we obtain the desired equality  $\Omega(ywx | \xi, \eta) = \Omega(y\tau(w)x | \xi, \eta)$ .

#### APPENDIX A. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.8 AND PROPOSITION 3.9

We fix two constants  $\sigma$  and  $A$  satisfying  $0 < \sigma < 1$  and  $0 < A < \pi$ . Then there exists a positive constant  $M = M(\sigma, A)$  such that

$$\left| \frac{z}{\sinh z} \right| \leq M e^{-\sigma |\operatorname{Re} z|}$$

if  $|\operatorname{Im} z| \leq A$ . Hence, if  $-A/\pi\omega < \operatorname{Re} t < 0$ , it holds that

$$\left| \frac{2\pi i\omega e^{2\pi i\omega t}}{1 - e^{2\pi i\omega t}} \right| = \left| \frac{\pi i\omega t}{\sinh(\pi i\omega t)} \frac{e^{\pi i\omega t}}{t} \right| \leq M \frac{e^{-\pi\omega(\sigma|\operatorname{Im} t| + \operatorname{Im} t)}}{|t|}.$$

For  $\alpha \geq 1$ , there exists a positive constant  $B_\alpha$  such that

$$\left| \binom{t + \alpha}{\alpha} \right| \leq \binom{|t| + \alpha}{\alpha} \leq B_\alpha (|t| + 1)^\alpha$$

for any  $t \in \mathbb{C}$ .

Now assume that  $0 < \epsilon < \min(1, 1/r\omega, A/\pi r\omega)$ . Denote by  $E(t_1, \dots, t_r)$  the integrand of the right hand side of (3.5). The above inequalities imply that

$$(A.1) \quad |E(t_1, \dots, t_r)| \leq C_1 \omega^{\sum_{a=1}^r \alpha_a} \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{1}{|e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1|} \frac{(|t_a| + 1)^{\alpha_a}}{|t_1 + \dots + t_a|^{\beta_a + 1}} \\ \times \exp(-\pi\omega \sum_{a=1}^r (\beta_a + 1)(\sigma |\operatorname{Im}(t_1 + \dots + t_a)| + \operatorname{Im}(t_1 + \dots + t_a)))$$

on the integral region, where  $C_1$  is a constant independent of  $\omega$ . Now set  $t_a = -\epsilon + i\epsilon x_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq r$ . It holds that

$$|t_a| + 1 \leq \epsilon(1 + |x_a|) + 1 \leq (\epsilon + 1)(|x_a| + 1)$$

and

$$|t_1 + \dots + t_a| = \epsilon \sqrt{a^2 + (x_1 + \dots + x_a)^2} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{2}}(1 + |x_1 + \dots + x_a|)$$

for  $1 \leq a \leq r$ . Hence, using Proposition 3.3, we see that the right hand side of (A.1) is estimated from above by

$$C_2 \omega^{\sum_{a=1}^r \alpha_a} \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{(|x_a| + 1)^{\alpha_a}}{(|x_1 + \dots + x_a| + 1)^{\beta_a + 1}} \exp(\pi\epsilon S(x_1, \dots, x_r)),$$

where  $C_2$  is a constant independent of  $\omega$  and

$$S(x_1, \dots, x_r) = \sum_{a=1}^r (x_a - |x_a|) - \omega \sum_{a=1}^r (\beta_a + 1)(\sigma |x_1 + \dots + x_a| + x_1 + \dots + x_a).$$

It holds that

$$S(x_1, \dots, x_r) \\ = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^r (x_a - |x_a|) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^r \left\{ (1 - 2\omega \sum_{j=a}^r (\beta_j + 1))x_a - |x_a| \right\} - \omega\sigma \sum_{a=1}^r (\beta_a + 1)|x_1 + \dots + x_a| \\ \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^r (x_a - |x_a|) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^r \left| 1 - 2\omega \sum_{j=a}^r (\beta_j + 1) \right| |x_a| - \omega\sigma \sum_{a=1}^r |x_1 + \dots + x_a|.$$

Now assume that

$$0 < \omega < (2 \sum_{j=1}^r (\beta_j + 1))^{-1}.$$

Then it holds that

$$S(x_1, \dots, x_r) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^r (x_a - |x_a|) - \omega \sum_{a=1}^r \sum_{j=a}^r (\beta_j + 1) |x_a| - \omega\sigma \sum_{a=1}^r |x_1 + \dots + x_a| \\ \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^r (x_a - |x_a|) - \omega\sigma \sum_{a=1}^r |x_1 + \dots + x_a|.$$

As a result we obtain the estimate

$$(A.2) \quad |E(t_1, \dots, t_r)| \leq C_2 \omega^{\sum_{a=1}^r \alpha_a} \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{(|x_a| + 1)^{\alpha_a}}{(|x_1 + \dots + x_a| + 1)^{\beta_a + 1}} \\ \times \exp\left(\pi\epsilon \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=1}^r (x_a - |x_a|) - \omega\sigma \sum_{a=1}^r |x_1 + \dots + x_a|\right)\right)$$

for sufficiently small  $\omega > 0$ , where  $t_a = -\epsilon + i\epsilon x_a$  ( $1 \leq a \leq r$ ).

*Proof of Proposition 3.8 (i).* From (A.2) we see that

$$|Z_\omega((e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_1} g_{\beta_1+1} \cdots (e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_r} g_{\beta_r+1})| \\ \leq C_3 \omega^{\sum_{a=1}^r \alpha_a} \left( \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx_a \right) \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{(|x_a| + 1)^{\alpha_a}}{|x_1 + \dots + x_a| + 1} e^{-\pi\epsilon\sigma\omega \sum_{a=1}^r |x_1 + \dots + x_a|},$$

for sufficiently small  $\omega > 0$ , where  $C_3$  is a constant independent of  $\omega$ . Now we change the integration variable to  $y_a = x_1 + \dots + x_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq r$ . We have

$$\prod_{a=1}^r (|x_a| + 1)^{\alpha_a} = (|y_1| + 1)^{\alpha_1} \prod_{a=2}^r (|y_a - y_{a-1}| + 1)^{\alpha_a} \\ \leq (|y_1| + 1)^{\alpha_1} \prod_{a=2}^r ((|y_a| + 1) + (|y_{a-1}| + 1))^{\alpha_a} \\ = \sum_{\substack{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r \geq 0 \\ \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_r = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_r}} d_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r} \prod_{a=1}^r (|y_a| + 1)^{\gamma_a},$$

where  $d_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r}$  is a non-negative integer. Hence

$$|Z_\omega((e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_1} g_{\beta_1+1} \cdots (e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_r} g_{\beta_r+1})| \\ \leq C_3 \sum_{\substack{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r \geq 0 \\ \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_r = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_r}} d_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r}^{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r} \prod_{a=1}^r \left( \omega^{\gamma_a} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dy (|y| + 1)^{\gamma_a - 1} e^{-\pi\epsilon\sigma\omega|y|} \right).$$

By using Lemma A.1 below, we see that the right hand side above is  $O((-\log \omega)^r)$  as  $\omega \rightarrow +0$ .  $\square$

**Lemma A.1.** For a non-negative integer  $\gamma$ , we set

$$F_\gamma(\rho) = \rho^\gamma \int_0^\infty dy (y + 1)^{\gamma-1} e^{-\rho y} \quad (\rho > 0).$$

Then it holds that  $F_0(\rho) = O(-\log \rho)$  and  $F_\gamma(\rho) = O(1)$  for  $\gamma \geq 1$  as  $\rho \rightarrow +0$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\rho > 0$ , it holds that

$$F_\gamma(\rho) = \int_0^\infty dy (y + \rho)^{\gamma-1} e^{-y}.$$

Hence

$$0 \leq F_0(\rho) \leq \int_0^1 \frac{dy}{y + \rho} + \int_1^\infty dy \frac{e^{-y}}{y} = \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{\rho}\right) + \int_1^\infty dy \frac{e^{-y}}{y} = O(-\log \rho)$$

and

$$0 \leq F_\gamma(\rho) \leq \int_0^\infty (y + 1)^{\gamma-1} e^{-y} < +\infty$$

for  $\gamma \geq 1$  and  $\rho \leq 1$ .  $\square$

Next we prove Proposition 3.8 (ii). We use the following inequality.

**Lemma A.2.** *Suppose that  $\eta > 0$  and  $1 \leq s \leq t \leq r$ . Then the function*

$$\Psi(x_1, \dots, x_r) = e^{\eta \sum_{j=1}^r (x_j - |x_j|)} \frac{|x_s| + 1}{|x_1 + \dots + x_t| + 1}.$$

satisfies

$$0 \leq \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_r) \leq (\max(1, 1/2\eta))^2$$

for all  $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* Set  $x = x_s$  and  $y = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq t, j \neq s} x_j$ . Since  $\eta(x_j - |x_j|) \leq 0$  for  $t < j \leq r$  and  $|x| + |y| \leq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq t} |x_j|$ , we see that

$$0 \leq \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_r) \leq e^{\eta \sum_{j=1}^t (x_j - |x_j|)} \frac{|x| + 1}{|x + y| + 1} \leq e^{\eta(x - |x| + y - |y|)} \frac{|x| + 1}{|x + y| + 1}.$$

Set  $C = \max(1, 1/2\eta)$  and

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & (x \geq 0), \\ (1 + |x|)^{-1} & (x \leq 0). \end{cases}$$

Using  $0 \leq 1 + t \leq e^t$  for  $t \geq 0$ , we see that

$$e^{\eta(x - |x|)} \leq C\psi(x)$$

for any  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, it holds that

$$0 \leq \Psi(x_1, \dots, x_r) \leq C^2 \psi(x) \psi(y) \frac{|x| + 1}{|x + y| + 1}.$$

We see that

$$0 \leq \psi(x) \psi(y) \frac{|x| + 1}{|x + y| + 1} \leq 1$$

by case checking, and this completes the proof.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.8 (ii).* Suppose that  $\alpha_s, \beta_t \geq 1$  with  $1 \leq s \leq t \leq r$ . From (A.2) and Lemma A.2 with  $\eta = \pi\epsilon/2$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & |Z_\omega((e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_1} g_{\beta_1+1} \cdots (e_1 - g_1)^{\alpha_r} g_{\beta_r+1})| \\ & \leq C_4 \omega^{\sum_{a=1}^r \alpha_a} \left( \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx_a \right) \frac{(|x_s| + 1)^{\alpha_s - 1} \prod_{a=1, a \neq s}^r (|x_a| + 1)^{\alpha_a}}{\prod_{a=1}^r (|x_1 + \dots + x_a| + 1)} e^{-\pi\epsilon\sigma\omega \sum_{a=1}^r |x_1 + \dots + x_a|}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_4$  is a constant independent of  $\omega$ . As shown in the proof of Proposition 3.8 (i), the right hand side is  $O(\omega(-\log \omega)^r)$ , which goes to zero in the limit as  $\omega \rightarrow +0$ .  $\square$

We show the two lemmas below in order to prove Proposition 3.9.

**Lemma A.3.** *Suppose that  $\eta > 0$ . For a non-negative integer  $m$ , we set*

$$I_m(s) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} dy \frac{(\log(|y| + 1))^m}{|y| + 1} e^{-\eta(|y| + |s - y|)}.$$

*Then there exists a positive constant  $B = B(m, \eta)$  such that*

$$0 \leq I_m(s) \leq e^{-\eta|s|} \left( \frac{(\log(|s| + 1))^{m+1}}{m + 1} + B \right)$$

for any  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Proof.* We see that  $I_m(-s) = I_m(s) \geq 0$  from the definition. Hence it is enough to consider the case where  $s \geq 0$ .

For simplicity we set

$$f_m(y) = \frac{(\log(|y| + 1))^m}{|y| + 1}.$$

Note that  $f_m(y) = f_m(-y)$  and  $C_m = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}} |f_m(y)|$  is finite. We have

$$\int_0^s dy f_m(y) = \frac{(\log(s+1))^{m+1}}{m+1}$$

for  $s \geq 0$ . Hence it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} I_m(s) &= \left( \int_{-\infty}^0 + \int_0^s + \int_s^\infty \right) dy f_m(y) e^{-\eta(|y|+|s-y|)} \\ &= e^{-\eta s} \int_0^\infty dy f_m(-y) e^{-2\eta y} + e^{-\eta s} \int_0^s dy f_m(y) + e^{-\eta s} \int_0^\infty dy f_m(y+s) e^{-2\eta y} \\ &\leq e^{-\eta s} \frac{C_m}{\eta} + e^{-\eta s} \frac{(\log(s+1))^{m+1}}{m+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma A.4.** *Suppose that  $r$  and  $k$  are positive integers,  $\eta > 0$  and  $A \geq 1$ . Then the function*

$$(A.3) \quad K_{\eta,A}(x_1, \dots, x_r) = \left( \prod_{a=1}^{r-1} \frac{1}{|x_1 + \dots + x_a| + 1} \right) \frac{e^{\eta \sum_{a=1}^r (x_a - |x_a|)}}{(|x_1 + \dots + x_r| + A)^{k+1}}$$

is integrable on  $\mathbb{R}^r$  and it holds that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^r} K_{\eta,A}(x_1, \dots, x_r) dx_1 \cdots dx_r = O(A^{-k} (\log A)^{r-1}) \quad (A \rightarrow +\infty).$$

*Proof.* Change the integration variables to  $y_a = x_1 + \dots + x_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq r$ , and we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^r} K_{\eta,A}(x_1, \dots, x_r) dx_1 \cdots dx_r = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dy_r}{(|y_r| + A)^{k+1}} e^{\eta y_r} \left( \prod_{a=1}^{r-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dy_a}{|y_a| + 1} e^{-\eta \sum_{a=1}^r |y_a - y_{a-1}|} \right),$$

where  $y_0 = 0$ . Using Lemma A.3 repeatedly, we see that there exists a polynomial  $P_{r-1}(x)$  of degree  $(r-1)$  such that

$$0 \leq \prod_{a=1}^{r-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dy_a}{|y_a| + 1} e^{-\eta \sum_{a=1}^r |y_a - y_{a-1}|} \leq e^{-\eta |y_r|} P_{r-1}(\log(|y_r| + 1))$$

for any  $y_r \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^r} K_{\eta,A}(x_1, \dots, x_r) dx_1 \cdots dx_r \\ &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} dy \frac{P_{r-1}(\log(|y| + 1))}{(|y| + A)^{k+1}} e^{\eta(y-|y|)} \leq 2 \int_0^\infty dy \frac{P_{r-1}(\log(y+1))}{(y+A)^{k+1}} < +\infty \end{aligned}$$

since  $k \geq 1$ . Let  $m$  be a positive integer. Setting  $y = At$ , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_0^\infty dy \frac{(\log(y+1))^m}{(y+A)^{k+1}} = A^{-k} \int_0^\infty dt \frac{(\log A + \log(1/A+t))^m}{(t+1)^{k+1}} \\ &\leq A^{-k} \int_0^\infty dt \frac{(\log A + \log(1+t))^m}{(t+1)^{k+1}} = O(A^{-k} (\log A)^m) \end{aligned}$$

as  $A \rightarrow +\infty$ . Since the degree of  $P_{r-1}(x)$  is equal to  $r-1$ , we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 3.9.* Suppose that  $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$  is admissible. From the definition we have

$$(A.4) \quad Z_\omega(g_{k_1} \cdots g_{k_r}) = \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \prod_{a=1}^r \left( \frac{2\pi i \omega}{e^{-2\pi i \omega(t_1 + \cdots + t_a)} - 1} \right)^{k_a}.$$

We denote by  $E(t_1, \dots, t_r)$  the above integrand. Set  $t_a = -\epsilon + i\epsilon x_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq r$  and  $\eta = \pi\epsilon/2$ . Then we have (A.2) with  $\alpha_a = 0$  and  $\beta_a + 1 = k_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq r$ . Furthermore, since  $k_r \geq 2$ , it holds that  $|E(t_1, \dots, t_r)| \leq C_2 K(x_1, \dots, x_r)$ , where  $K(x_1, \dots, x_r)$  is the function (A.3) with  $A = 1$  and  $k = 1$ , and it is integrable because of Lemma A.4. Hence we can apply the dominated convergence theorem in the limit as  $\omega \rightarrow +0$ , and we see that

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow +0} Z_\omega(g_{k_1} \cdots g_{k_r}) = (-1)^{|\mathbf{k}|} \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{1}{(t_1 + \cdots + t_a)^{k_a}}.$$

Let  $M$  be a positive integer and shift the integral contour of  $t_r, t_{r-1}, \dots, t_1$  to  $-\epsilon - M + i\mathbb{R}$  in order by taking the residues at  $t_a = -l_a \in \{-1, -2, \dots, -M\}$ . Then the right hand side above becomes

$$(A.5) \quad \sum_{l_1, \dots, l_r=1}^M \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{1}{(l_1 + \cdots + l_a)^{k_a}} + (-1)^{|\mathbf{k}|} \sum_{b=1}^r \sum_{l_{b+1}, \dots, l_r=1}^M S_b(l_{b+1}, \dots, l_r | M),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_b(l_{b+1}, \dots, l_r | M) &= \left( \prod_{a=1}^{b-1} \int_{-\epsilon+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_a}{e^{2\pi i t_a} - 1} \right) \int_{-\epsilon-M+i\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt_b}{e^{2\pi i t_b} - 1} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{a=1}^b \frac{1}{(t_1 + \cdots + t_a)^{k_a}} \prod_{a=b+1}^r \frac{1}{(t_1 + \cdots + t_b - l_{b+1} - \cdots - l_r)^{k_a}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the first term of (A.5) converges to the MZV  $\zeta(k_1, \dots, k_r)$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , it suffices to show that the second term vanishes in the limit. Set  $t_a = -\epsilon + i\epsilon x_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq b-1$  and  $t_b = -\epsilon - M + i\epsilon x_b$ . Then, using Lemma 3.2, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &|S_b(l_{b+1}, \dots, l_r | M)| \\ &\leq C_5 \prod_{a=1}^b \int_{\mathbb{R}} dx_a \left( \prod_{a=1}^{b-1} \frac{1}{|x_1 + \cdots + x_a| + 1} \right) \frac{e^{\pi\epsilon \sum_{a=1}^b (x_a - |x_a|)}}{(|x_1 + \cdots + x_b| + A)^{k_b + k_{b+1} + \cdots + k_r}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_5$  is a constant independent of  $M$  and  $A = b + M/\epsilon$ . Note that the right hand side above does not depend on  $l_{b+1}, \dots, l_r$  and behaves as  $O(M^{-(k_b + \cdots + k_r - 1)} (\log M)^{b-1})$  as  $M \rightarrow \infty$  because of Lemma A.4 and  $k_r \geq 2$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l_{b+1}, \dots, l_r=1}^M S_b(l_{b+1}, \dots, l_r | M) &= M^{r-b} O(M^{-(k_b + \cdots + k_r - 1)} (\log M)^{b-1}) \\ &= O(M^{-1} (\log M)^{b-1}) \rightarrow 0 \quad (M \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## APPENDIX B. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5.2 AND PROPOSITION 5.3

Using Lemma 3.2, we obtain the following estimate of the function  $J_k(t | \lambda, \mu)$ .

**Lemma B.1.** *Suppose that*

$$0 < \rho < 1/\omega, \quad -1/\omega < \operatorname{Re} \lambda - \rho < 0, \quad -1/\omega < \operatorname{Re} \mu - \rho < 0,$$

and set  $t = -\rho + iu$  with  $u \in \mathbb{R}$ . For  $k \geq 1$ , set

$$A_k(\rho | \lambda, \mu) = \frac{2^{(2-k)_+} e^{2\pi\omega(|\operatorname{Im} \lambda| + |\operatorname{Im} \mu|)}}{c(2\pi\omega(\operatorname{Re} \lambda - \rho))c(2\pi\omega(\operatorname{Re} \mu - \rho))c(-2\pi\omega\rho)^{(k-2)_+}},$$

where  $c(y)$  is defined by (3.3) and  $(m)_+ = \max(m, 0)$ . Then it holds that

$$|J_1(t | \lambda, \mu)| \leq A_1(\rho | \lambda, \mu)$$

and

$$|J_k(t | \lambda, \mu)| \leq A_k(\rho | \lambda, \mu)e^{-2\pi\omega|u|} \leq A_k(\rho | \lambda, \mu)$$

for  $k \geq 2$ .

We will use the inequality below.

**Lemma B.2.** *If  $0 < \mu < 1/4\pi\omega$  and  $|z| < \mu$ , then  $|e^{2\pi i\omega z} - 1| < 6\pi\omega\mu$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $x = \operatorname{Re} z$  and  $y = \operatorname{Im} z$ . For  $0 \leq t < 1/2$ , it holds that  $1 - 2t < e^{-t} \leq e^t < 1 + 2t$ . From the assumption,  $|2\pi\omega y| < 2\pi\omega\mu < 1/2$ , and hence  $1 - 4\pi\omega\mu < e^{-2\pi\omega y} < 1 + 4\pi\omega\mu$ . Since  $1 \geq \cos(2\pi\omega x) \geq 1 - (2\pi\omega x)^2/2 \geq 1 - 2(\pi\omega\mu)^2$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} |e^{2\pi i\omega z} - 1|^2 &= (e^{-2\pi\omega y} - \cos(2\pi\omega x))^2 + \sin^2(2\pi\omega x) \\ &\leq (1 + 4\pi\omega\mu - \cos(2\pi\omega x))^2 + \sin^2(2\pi\omega x) \\ &= (1 + 4\pi\omega\mu)^2 - 2(1 + 4\pi\omega\mu)\cos(2\pi\omega x) + 1 \\ &\leq (1 + 4\pi\omega\mu)^2 - 2(1 + 4\pi\omega\mu)(1 - 2(\pi\omega\mu)^2) + 1 \\ &= 4(\pi\omega\mu)^2(5 + 4\pi\omega\mu) < (6\pi\omega\mu)^2 \end{aligned}$$

since  $\pi\omega\mu < 1/4$ . □

*Proof of Proposition 5.2.* It holds that

(B.1)

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\substack{0 \leq m_1, \dots, m_r \leq M \\ 0 \leq n_1, \dots, n_r \leq M}} \left| \zeta_\omega(k_1 + m_1 + n_1, \dots, k_r + m_r + n_r) \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i\omega\lambda} - 1}{2\pi i\omega} \right)^{\sum_{a=1}^r m_a} \left( \frac{e^{2\pi i\omega\mu} - 1}{2\pi i\omega} \right)^{\sum_{a=1}^r n_a} \right| \\ &\leq (2\pi\omega)^{|\mathbf{k}|} \left( \prod_{a=1}^r \int_{-\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}} |dt_a| \right) \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{|e^{2\pi i\omega(k_a-1)(t_1+\dots+t_a)}|}{|e^{2\pi i\omega t_a} - 1| |1 - e^{2\pi i\omega(t_1+\dots+t_a)}|^{k_a}} \\ &\quad \times \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m_1, \dots, m_r \leq M \\ 0 \leq n_1, \dots, n_r \leq M}} \prod_{a=1}^r \left| \frac{e^{2\pi i\omega\lambda} - 1}{e^{-2\pi i\omega(t_1+\dots+t_a)} - 1} \right|^{m_a} \left| \frac{e^{2\pi i\omega\mu} - 1}{e^{-2\pi i\omega(t_1+\dots+t_a)} - 1} \right|^{n_a}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $0 < \epsilon < 1/2\omega r$ , it holds that  $0 < \epsilon/3\pi < 1/4\pi\omega$  and  $0 < 2\omega\epsilon < 1$ . Hence, from Lemma B.2 and  $|\lambda| < \epsilon/3\pi$ , we see that

$$|e^{2\pi i\omega\lambda} - 1| < 2\omega\epsilon < \sin(\pi\omega\epsilon) = c(\pi\omega\epsilon).$$

Since  $0 < 2\pi\omega r\epsilon < \pi$ , Lemma 3.2 implies that

$$|e^{-2\pi i\omega(t_1+\dots+t_a)} - 1| \geq c(2\pi\omega a\epsilon) \geq c(2\pi\omega\epsilon)$$

for  $t_1, \dots, t_a \in -\epsilon + i\mathbb{R}$  and  $1 \leq a \leq r$ . Thus we see that

$$\left| \frac{e^{2\pi i\lambda} - 1}{e^{-2\pi i\omega(t_1+\dots+t_a)} - 1} \right| < \frac{c(\pi\omega\epsilon)}{c(2\pi\omega\epsilon)} < 1.$$

This inequality with  $\lambda$  replaced by  $\mu$  also holds.

Denote by  $E(t_1, \dots, t_r | \lambda, \mu)$  the integrand of (5.4). If  $|u| < c < 1$ , we have

$$\sum_{0 \leq m \leq M} |u|^m = \frac{1 - |u|^{M+1}}{1 - |u|} \leq \frac{1}{1 - |u|} \leq \frac{1 + c}{1 - c} \frac{1}{|1 - u|}.$$

By using it, we see that there exists a positive constant  $C(\omega, r, \epsilon)$  such that the integrand of the right hand side of (B.1) is estimated from above on the integral region by

$$C(\omega, r, \epsilon) |E(t_1, \dots, t_r | \lambda, \mu)|,$$

which does not depend on  $M$ . Set  $u_a = \text{Im } u_a$  for  $1 \leq a \leq r$ . From Lemma B.1 and  $k_r \geq 2$ , we see that

$$|E(t_1, \dots, t_r | \lambda, \mu)| \leq \left( \prod_{a=1}^r \frac{A_{k_a}(a\epsilon | \lambda, \mu)}{c(-2\pi\omega a\epsilon)} \right) \exp(\pi S(u_1, \dots, u_r)),$$

where

$$S(u_1, \dots, u_r) = \sum_{a=1}^r (u_a - |u_a|) - 2\omega |u_1 + \dots + u_r|.$$

It holds that

$$S(u_1, \dots, u_r) \leq \sum_{a=1}^r (u_a - |u_a|) - \omega (u_1 + \dots + u_r) \leq (|1 - \omega| - 1) \sum_{a=1}^r |u_a|.$$

Hence the function  $\exp(\pi S(u_1, \dots, u_r))$  is integrable on  $\mathbb{R}^r$ . Therefore, by using the dominated convergence theorem, we see that the infinite sum  $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k} | \lambda, \mu)$  is absolutely convergent and the equality (5.4) holds if  $(\lambda, \mu)$  belongs to the region (5.3).

For  $k \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq a \leq r$ , we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} J_k(t_1 + \dots + t_a | \lambda, \mu) = \frac{2\pi i \omega}{e^{-2\pi i \omega (\lambda + t_1 + \dots + t_a)} - 1} J_k(t_1 + \dots + t_a | \lambda, \mu)$$

and

$$(B.2) \quad \left| \frac{1}{e^{-2\pi i \omega (\lambda + t_1 + \dots + t_a)} - 1} \right| \leq \frac{1}{c(2\pi \omega (a\epsilon - \text{Re } \lambda))}$$

in the integral region. Therefore, the function  $\partial E / \partial \lambda$  is estimated from above by an integrable function which does not depend on  $\lambda$  or  $\mu$  in the region (5.3). We also have a similar estimate for  $\partial E / \partial \mu$ . Therefore the function  $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{k} | \lambda, \mu)$  is holomorphic in the region (5.3).  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 5.3.* First we estimate the function  $\Theta(t, u, \lambda, \mu)$ . Set  $t = -\epsilon + ix$  and  $u = -\rho + iy$  with  $\epsilon, \rho > 0$  and  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ . Suppose that all the real parts of  $t, u, t + \lambda, t + \mu, u + \lambda, u + \mu$  belong to the interval  $(-2\underline{\omega}, 0)$  and  $-1/\omega < \text{Re}(t + u + \lambda + \mu) < 0$ . By using Lemma 3.2, (5.6) and (5.10), we see that

$$(B.3) \quad |\Theta(t, u, \lambda, \mu)| \leq \frac{e^{P(\epsilon, \rho, |\lambda|, |\mu|, \omega)}}{c(2\pi \omega (\text{Re}(\lambda + \mu) - \epsilon - \rho))} \exp(-\pi \omega (\rho(x + |x|) + \epsilon(y + |y|))),$$

where  $P$  is some polynomial and  $c(y)$  is defined by (3.3).

We denote by  $E(t, u | \lambda, \mu)$  the integrand of (5.11). Set  $x_a = \text{Im } t_a$  ( $1 \leq a \leq r$ ) and  $y_b = \text{Im } u_b$  ( $1 \leq b \leq s$ ). Using (B.3), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |E(t, u | \lambda, \mu)| &\leq \frac{\prod_{a=1}^{r-1} A_{k_a}(-a\epsilon | \lambda, \mu) \prod_{b=1}^{s-1} A_{l_b}(-b\epsilon | \lambda, \mu)}{c(-2\pi\epsilon)^{r+s} c(2\pi\omega r\epsilon)^{k_r-1} c(2\pi\omega s\epsilon)^{l_s-1}} \\ &\quad \times \frac{e^{P(r\epsilon, s\epsilon, |\lambda|, |\mu|, \omega)}}{c(2\pi\omega (\text{Re}(\lambda + \mu) - (r + s)\epsilon))} \exp(\pi S(x, y)), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$S(x, y) = \sum_{a=1}^r (x_a - |x_a|) + \sum_{b=1}^s (y_b - |y_b|) - \omega\epsilon \left\{ s \left( \sum_{a=1}^r x_a + \left| \sum_{a=1}^r x_a \right| \right) + r \left( \sum_{b=1}^s y_b + \left| \sum_{b=1}^s y_b \right| \right) \right\}.$$

It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} S(x, y) &\leq \sum_{a=1}^r (x_a - |x_a|) + \sum_{b=1}^s (y_b - |y_b|) - \omega\epsilon \left( \sum_{a=1}^r x_a + \sum_{b=1}^s y_b \right) \\ &\leq (|1 - \omega\epsilon| - 1) \left( \sum_{a=1}^r |x_a| + \sum_{b=1}^s |y_b| \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $0 < \epsilon < 1/\omega$ , we have  $|1 - \omega\epsilon| - 1 < 0$ . Hence  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} | \lambda, \mu)$  is absolutely convergent. From (5.9), (B.2) and the above estimate of the integrand  $E(t, u | \lambda, \mu)$ , we see that the integral  $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l} | \lambda, \mu)$  defines a holomorphic function on  $B$ .  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Borwein, J. M., Bradley, D. M., Broadhurst, D. J. and Lisoněk, P., Combinatorial aspects of multiple zeta values, *Electron. J. Combin.* **5** (1998), Research Paper 38, 12 pp.
- [2] Bradley, D., Multiple  $q$ -zeta values, *J. Algebra* **283** (2005), no.2, 752–798.
- [3] van de Bult, F. J., Rains, E. M. and Stokman, J. V., Properties of generalized univariate hypergeometric functions, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **275** (2007), no.1, 37–95.
- [4] Hirose, M., Murahara, H., Onozuka, T. and Sato, N., Linear relations of Ohno sums of multiple zeta values, *Indag. Math. (N.S.)* **31** (2020), no.4, 556–567.
- [5] Hirose, M., Sato, N. and Seki, S., The connector for the double Ohno relation, *Acta Arith.* **201** (2021), no.2, 109–118.
- [6] Kato, M. and Takeyama, Y., A deformation of multiple  $L$ -values, *Ramanujan J.* **57** (2022), no.1, 93–118.
- [7] Ohno, Y., A generalization of the duality and sum formulas on the multiple zeta values, *J. Number Theory* **74** (1999), no.1, 39–43.
- [8] Ruijsenaars, S. N. M., First order analytic difference equations and integrable quantum systems, *J. Math. Phys.* **38** (1997), no.2, 1069–1146.
- [9] Ruijsenaars, S. N. M., A generalized hypergeometric function satisfying four analytic difference equations of Askey-Wilson type, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **206** (1999), no.3, 639–690.
- [10] Satoh, M., Generalized quasi-shuffle products, preprint, arXiv:2303.12386.
- [11] Seki, S. and Yamamoto, S., A new proof of the duality of multiple zeta values and its generalizations, *Int. J. Number Theory* **15** (2019), no.6, 1261–1265.
- [12] Takeyama, Y., The algebra of a  $q$ -analogue of multiple harmonic series, *SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl.* **9** (2013), Paper 061, 15 pp.
- [13] Takeyama, Y., A  $q$ -analogue of symmetric multiple zeta value, *Ramanujan J.* **63** (2024), no.1, 209–252.
- [14] Zhao, J., Multiple zeta functions, multiple polylogarithms and their special values, Ser. Number Theory Appl., **12**, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2016.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INSTITUTE OF PURE AND APPLIED SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF TSUKUBA, TSUKUBA, IBARAKI 305-8571, JAPAN

*Email address:* takeyama@math.tsukuba.ac.jp