

PARTIAL BASES AND HOMOLOGICAL STABILITY OF $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ REVISITED

CALISTA BERNARD, JEREMY MILLER, AND ROBIN J. SROKA

ABSTRACT. Let R be a unital ring satisfying the invariant basis number property, that every stably free R -module is free, and that the complex of partial bases of every finite rank free module is Cohen–Macaulay. This class of rings includes every ring of stable rank 1 (e.g. any local, semi-local or Artinian ring), every Euclidean domain, and every Dedekind domain \mathcal{O}_S of arithmetic type where $|S| > 1$ and S contains at least one non-complex place. Extending recent work of Galatius–Kupers–Randal-Williams and Kupers–Miller–Patz, we prove that the sequence of general linear groups $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ satisfies slope-1 homological stability with $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ -coefficients.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Assumptions on R	5
3. (Relative) Steinberg modules	9
4. Generating sets for (relative) Steinberg modules	11
5. Slope-1 homological stability	23
Appendix A. Additional details	24
References	37

1. INTRODUCTION

Let R be a unital ring. Charney [Cha80], Maazen [Maa79] and van der Kallen [Kal80] proved generic slope-1/2 homological stability results that apply to large classes of rings R , including all Euclidean and Dedekind domains. The most general version, due to van der Kallen [Kal80], shows that if the Bass stable rank of R is finite, $\mathrm{sr}(R) < \infty$, then the inclusion induced map

$$H_i(\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(R); \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\cong} H_i(\mathrm{GL}_n(R); \mathbb{Z})$$

is an isomorphism in the slope-1/2 range given by $i \leq n/2 + c$, where $c \in \mathbb{Q}$ is a constant depending on $\mathrm{sr}(R)$. To establish this, and in the process resolving a conjecture of Quillen (cf. [Wag76, Section 1]), van der Kallen proved that certain complexes of unimodular vectors in R^n are highly connected for every $n \geq 0$.

The goal of this work is to show that in many cases of interest, e.g. if R is a local, semi-local or Artinian ring; a Euclidean domain; or a Dedekind domain $R = \mathcal{O}_S$ of arithmetic

CB and RJS were supported by the Swedish Research Council under grant no. 2016-06596 while in residence at Institut Mittag-Leffler in Djursholm, Sweden during the semester *Higher algebraic structures in algebra, topology and geometry*. JM was supported by NSF grant DMS-2202943. RJS was supported by NSERC Discovery Grant A4000 in connection with a Postdoctoral Fellowship at McMaster University, by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) – Project-ID 427320536 – SFB 1442, as well as by Germany’s Excellence Strategy EXC 2044 – 390685587, Mathematics Münster: Dynamics–Geometry–Structure.

type where $|S| > 1$ and S contains at least one non-complex place, the slope-1/2 ranges established in [Cha80; Maa79; Kal80] can be improved to slope-1 ranges if one is willing to invert 2 in the coefficient module.

1.1. Statement of main result. Our argument requires that the ring R satisfy three properties. To state these, we recall the definition of a well-studied simplicial complex [Qui74; Wag76; Maa79; Kal80; CFP19], which is closely related to the aforementioned complexes of unimodular vectors (see Section 2).

Definition 1.1. A *partial basis* of R^n is a subset of a basis. The n -th *complex of partial bases* of R , denoted by $B_n(R)$, is the simplicial complex in which a k -simplex is a partial basis of R^n of size $k + 1$.

Recall that a simplicial complex X is called *d-spherical* if X is of finite dimension $\dim(X) = d < \infty$ and $(d - 1)$ -connected. Following Quillen [Qui78, Section 8], we say that X is *Cohen–Macaulay* if it is of finite dimension $\dim(X) = d < \infty$, d -spherical and the link of every p -simplex in X is $(d - p - 1)$ -spherical. Using this topological notion and well-known ring-theoretic properties, we can now state our assumptions.

Assumption 1.2. Let R be a unital ring such that

- (1) R has the invariant basis number property;
- (2) R is Hermite (i.e. every stably free R -module is free);
- (3) for all $n \geq 0$ the complex of partial bases $B_n(R)$ is Cohen–Macaulay.

Our main result then takes the following form.

Theorem 1.3. Let R be a unital ring satisfying Assumption 1.2 and let \mathbb{k} be a commutative ring in which $2 \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ is a unit. Then

$$H_i(\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(R); \mathbb{k}) \rightarrow H_i(\mathrm{GL}_n(R); \mathbb{k})$$

is an isomorphism for $i \leq n - 2$ and a surjection for $i \leq n - 1$.

Previously, such slope-1 homological stability results were known to hold for general linear groups over fields and connected semi-local rings with infinite residue fields with $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{Z}$ [Qui74; Sus84; NS89; Gui89; GKRW18; GKRW20; SW20]; the integers, the Gaussian integers, and the Eisenstein integers with $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ [KMP22]; and any ring of integers of a number field with $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{Q}$ [LS19].

Our theorem recovers almost all of these results with $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$; the only exception is the case of totally imaginary, non-Euclidean number rings [LS19]. Moreover, it extends the class of rings whose general linear groups satisfy slope-1 homological stability with $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ -coefficients to include:

- (1) *Every ring of stable rank 1* (e.g. all fields; all local, semi-local or Artinian rings [Bas64, (6.5); Vas84, Example 1.1]; the ring of all algebraic integers [Vas84, Example 1.2]): Item 1 is an elementary consequence of having finite stable rank, see e.g. [RWW17, Remark 5.8]. Item 2 follows from the fact that the stable rank is equal to one, see [Faj+20, Corollary 11.1.5]. Item 3 holds because Item 1 and Item 2 imply (compare Section 2) that $B_n(R)$ agrees with the complex of unimodular sequences investigated by van der Kallen in [Kal80], who proved that these complexes are Cohen–Macaulay [Kal80, §2. An Acyclicity Theorem].
- (2) *Every Euclidean domain* (e.g. Dedekind domains with finitely many prime ideals, Euclidean number rings, the ring of polynomials over any field):

[Item 1](#) holds for every commutative ring, see e.g. [[Coh66](#), Theorem 2.6]. [Item 2](#) follows from the fact that Euclidean domains are principal ideal domains. [Item 3](#) is a result of Maazen [[Maa79](#)], which inspired van der Kallen’s work [[Kal80](#)].

- (3) *Every Dedekind domain $R = \mathcal{O}_S$ of arithmetic type, where $|S| > 1$ and S contains at least one non-complex place* (e.g. number rings $R \neq \mathbb{Z}$ with a real embedding or rings of S -integers of global fields with infinitely many units in which some prime is invertible [[CFP19](#), p.1380]):

[Item 1](#) holds for every commutative ring, see e.g. [[Coh66](#), Theorem 2.6]. [Item 2](#) follows from the Steinitz-Chevalley structure theory for Dedekind domains, see e.g. [[Lam06](#), Examples 4.7 (4)]. [Item 3](#) is a result of Church–Farb–Putman [[CFP19](#), Theorem E].

In the last item and following [[CFP19](#), Definition 1.3], by a Dedekind domain of arithmetic type R we mean the ring of S -integers $\mathcal{O}_S := \{x \in K : \mathrm{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}(x) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \mathfrak{p} \in S\}$ of a global field K (i.e. a number field K/\mathbb{Q} or a function field in one variable over a finite field $K/\mathbb{F}_q(T)$), where S is a finite nonempty set of places of K (containing all infinite places if K is a number field). This includes all number rings and certain localizations thereof. As explained in [[CFP19](#)], the assumption that $|S| > 1$ is equivalent to R having infinitely many units. In particular, the third class of rings above does not include Dedekind domains such as the Euclidean number rings \mathbb{Z} and $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ (which are covered by the second class). More generally, the third class does not include rings of integers of totally imaginary number fields and those \mathcal{O}_S with finitely many units in the function field case (e.g. $\mathbb{F}_p[T]$).

Our theorem improves the generic slope-2/3 stability result with $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ -coefficients for general linear groups over Euclidean domains obtained by Kupers–Miller–Patz [\[KMP22, Theorem B\]](#). For Dedekind domains of class number 1 and if one is willing to invert 2 in the coefficients, it often improves a generic slope-2/3 stability result due to Galatius–Kupers–Randal-Williams [\[GKRW21, Section 18.2\]](#).

At this level of generality, the slope-1 range in [Theorem 1.3](#) cannot be improved: Results of Suslin [\[Sus84\]](#), Nesterenko–Suslin [\[NS89\]](#) and Guin [\[Gui89\]](#) show e.g. that for infinite fields F it holds that $H_n(\mathrm{GL}_n(F), \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(F); \mathbb{Z})$ is isomorphic to the n -th Milnor K -theory group $K_n^M(F)$. Since these are often nonzero for all n , slope-1 stability is often sharp.

We furthermore remark that it is necessary to use coefficients where 2 is invertible in [Theorem 1.3](#), because e.g. $H_1(\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_2), \mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{F}_2); \mathbb{Z}) \neq 0$.

1.2. Outline and main technical achievement. The proof of [Theorem 1.3](#) builds on ideas due to Charney [\[Cha80\]](#), Galatius–Kupers–Randal-Williams [\[GKRW18\]](#) and Kupers–Miller–Patz [\[KMP22\]](#). Indeed, our general strategy of proof builds on that used by Kupers–Miller–Patz in [\[KMP22\]](#) to prove slope-1 stability with $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ -coefficients for the general linear groups over the integers, the Gaussian integers and the Eisenstein integers. [\[KMP22\]](#) use ideas developed in [\[GKRW18; Cha80\]](#) to reduce the question of whether slope-1 stability with $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ -coefficients holds to the question of whether the co-invariants of certain modules associated to $\{\mathrm{GL}_n(R)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are trivial (after tensoring with $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$). The relevant modules are the Steinberg module, denoted by $\mathrm{St}_n(R)$, and certain *relative* Steinberg modules, denoted by $\mathrm{St}_n^m(R)$.

Steinberg modules $\mathrm{St}_n(R)$ play an important role in representation theory (e.g. [\[Ste51\]](#)), the study of the cohomology of arithmetic groups (e.g. [\[BS73\]](#)) and the algebraic K -theory of R (e.g. [\[Qui73\]](#)). If [Assumption 1.2](#) holds, an argument due to Church–Farb–Putman [\[CFP19, Proof of Theorem A\]](#) shows that the complex of partial bases $B_n(R)$ can be used to construct a generating set of the Steinberg module $\mathrm{St}_n(R)$ and that this generating set can

be used to check that its co-invariants vanish,

$$(\mathrm{St}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{Z}[1/2])_{\mathrm{GL}_n(R)} = 0, \text{ if } n \geq 2.$$

This was carried out by Scalumandre [Sca23] in the generality that we require in this work.

Our main technical result uses a new induction procedure to show that [Assumption 1.2](#) also suffices to construct generating sets for the *relative* Steinberg modules $\mathrm{St}_n^m(R)$, which can be used to check that their co-invariants also have the desired vanishing property,

$$(\mathrm{St}_n^m(R) \otimes \mathbb{Z}[1/2])_{\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)} = 0, \text{ if } m \geq 1 \text{ and } n \geq 1.$$

Previously, it was only known how to construct such a generating set for *relative* Steinberg modules under significantly stronger connectivity assumptions: Kupers–Miller–Patz’s approach in [KMP22] requires that certain complexes of augmented partial frames $\mathrm{BA}_n(R)$, introduced by Church–Putman [CP17], are Cohen–Macaulay. Here $\mathrm{BA}_n(R)$ is a simplicial complex of dimension n , while the complexes of partial bases $B_n(R)$ appearing in [Assumption 1.2](#) are only $(n - 1)$ -dimensional. To satisfy the Cohen–Macaulay property, the complex of augmented frames $\mathrm{BA}_n(R)$ ought therefore to be $(n - 1)$ -connected, while [Item 3](#) in [Assumption 1.2](#) only requires $B_n(R)$ to be $(n - 2)$ -connected. To date, the complexes of augmented partial frames are only known to have the desired connectivity properties if R is a field or one of three rings: the integers [CP17], the Gaussian and Eisenstein integers [Kup+22]. In fact, it is known that for many Euclidean rings the complexes of augmented partial frames $\mathrm{BA}_n(R)$ do *not* satisfy the connectivity assumption needed to run the argument of Kupers–Miller–Patz, see [Kup+22, Proof of Theorem C].

The main innovation of this work is hence to bypass the need for high connectivity of the complexes of augmented partial frames $\mathrm{BA}_n(R)$ in [KMP22]: We use the *same* simplicial complexes $B_n(R)$ as Maazen [Maa79] and van der Kallen [Kal80], yet are still able to double the slope of the stable range.

Our homological stability argument is powered by the connection to E_k -cells introduced in [KM18, Theorem 4.2], and the relation between E_k -cells and splitting complexes developed by Galatius–Kupers–Randal-Williams in [GKRW21] and [GKRW18]. As in [GKRW18], the two vanishing results for the co-invariants of Steinberg and relative Steinberg modules lead to a vanishing result for the co-invariants of the *Charney modules* $\mathrm{Ch}_n(R)$ after tensoring with $\mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ (see [Definition 5.2](#) and [Proposition 5.4](#)),

$$(\mathrm{Ch}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{Z}[1/2])_{\mathrm{GL}_n(R)} = 0 \text{ if } n \geq 2.$$

The $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ -modules $\mathrm{Ch}_n(R)$ arise as the top-degree homology groups of spherical splitting complexes, which were first studied in Charney’s work on homological stability of general linear groups [Cha80]. More recently, Galatius–Kupers–Randal-Williams proved that the homology of the groups $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ with coefficients in the Charney modules measures the E_1 -André–Quillen homology of the E_∞ -algebra $\mathrm{BGL}(R) = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathrm{BGL}_n(R)$ (compare [Remark 5.3](#)). Proving a vanishing result for $H_0(\mathrm{GL}_n(R); \mathrm{Ch}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{Z}[1/2])$, i.e. the co-invariants above, is the required input for deducing the slope-1 stability result using the theory of E_k -cells (see [KMP22, Proposition 5.1]).

1.3. Outline. In [Section 2](#), we elaborate on the ring-theoretic meaning of [Assumption 1.2](#) and give an equivalent set of assumptions. We show that R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#) if and only if R^{op} does. This left-right duality is a key technical ingredient in our stability argument. In [Section 3](#), we introduce the Steinberg and relative Steinberg modules. In [Section 4](#), we prove the desired vanishing results for the co-invariants of the relative Steinberg modules. This is the main technical innovation of this work. In [Section 5](#), we deduce

our main theorem. We show the vanishing result for the co-invariants of the Charney modules and deduce slope-1 homological stability using the theory of E_k -cells. In [Appendix A](#), we collect all technical arguments that need to be carried out but that are similar to arguments contained in the literature. Its function is to keep the article focused on the novel contributions.

1.4. Acknowledgements. It is a pleasure to thank Jian-Shu Li, Binyong Sun and Oscar Randal-Williams for helpful correspondence about the relation of this article and [\[LS19\]](#), and Alexander Kupers for helpful conversations.

1.5. Notation and conventions. R denotes a unital (not necessarily commutative) ring, and all R -modules are taken to be left R -modules. We denote by $\langle S \rangle$ the R -span of a subset S of an R -module. If M is a left R -module, we denote by $\text{End}_R(M)$ its ring of left R -module endomorphisms, where the addition is defined point-wise and we use the convention that the product $(f \cdot g)$ is given by composition in the opposite order $(g \circ f)$. With this convention M is an $(R, \text{End}_R(M))$ -bimodule, and if M is a free R -module of rank n , there are ring isomorphisms $\text{End}_R(RR) \cong R$ and, picking an R -module basis, $\text{End}_R(M) \cong \text{Mat}_{n \times n}(R)$. We will henceforth write morphisms and matrices acting on left modules on the right (and vice versa). We use blackboard bold to denote posets \mathbb{P} . If $x \in \mathbb{P}$, we write $\mathbb{P}_{<x} := \{z \in \mathbb{P} : z < x\}$ and similarly define $\mathbb{P}_{\leq x}$, $\mathbb{P}_{>x}$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\geq x}$. If $x < y$ in \mathbb{P} , we write $\mathbb{P}_{(x,y)} := \{z \in \mathbb{P} : x < z < y\}$.

2. ASSUMPTIONS ON R

In this section, we describe a set of assumptions on R that is equivalent to [Assumption 1.2](#), but expressed in terms of the spaces of unimodular sequences appearing in [\[Qui78; Wag76; Maa79; Ka180\]](#). We use this to discuss our assumptions on R in greater detail, and to elaborate their ring-theoretic meaning. Combined with an argument carried out in [Appendix A.2](#), we prove that R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#) if and only if its opposite ring R^{op} does (see [Theorem 2.11](#)). This left-right duality is an important ingredient in the proof of the key [Proposition 5.4](#); it allows to apply a dualizing trick due to Charney [\[Cha80\]](#) on which the strategy of [\[KMP22\]](#) relies. This is the only section in this work in which we do not assume that [Assumption 1.2](#) holds.

Definition 2.1. Let M be a free R -module. A vector $\vec{v} \in M$ is called *unimodular* if it is the basis of a free direct summand of rank-1 in M . The *complex of unimodular vectors* $U(M)$ is the simplicial complex whose vertices are unimodular vectors in M , and where a collection of vectors forms a simplex if and only if they are a basis for a free direct summand of M . Let $U_n(R)$ denote $U(R^n)$. We write $\mathbb{U}_n(R)$ for the simplex poset of $U(R)$, and call it the poset of unimodular vectors.

Note that the poset of unimodular vectors $\mathbb{U}_n(R)$ in [Definition 2.1](#) a priori differs from the poset of partial bases $\mathbb{B}_n(R)$, i.e. the simplex poset of the complex $B_n(R)$ in [Definition 1.1](#), since e.g. in general a set of n unimodular (i.e. linearly independent) vectors in R^n need not be a basis, and complements of free summands need not be free.

However, we will show that [Assumption 1.2](#) is equivalent to the following set of assumptions, and that under these assumptions it holds that $\mathbb{B}_n(R) = \mathbb{U}_n(R)$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Assumption 2.2. R is a unital ring such that

- (1) R is weakly finite (i.e. if $n \geq 0$ and $R^n \cong R^n \oplus C$, then $C = 0$);
- (2) for all $n \geq 0$ the complexes of unimodular vectors $U_n(R)$ is Cohen–Macaulay.

In the next two subsections, we establish and discuss the following result.

Proposition 2.3. *Let R be a unital ring. Then [Assumption 1.2](#) holds if and only if [Assumption 2.2](#) holds, and in either case $\mathbb{B}_n(R) = \mathbb{U}_n(R)$ for all $n \geq 0$.*

2.1. Invariant basis number property and other rank conditions. The following three properties are common assumptions on a unital ring R in algebra and topology [[Coh66](#)]:

- (I) For all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $R^m \cong R^n$ implies $m = n$.
- (II) For all $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $R^m \cong R^n \oplus C$ implies $m \geq n$.
- (III) For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $R^n \cong R^n \oplus C$ implies $C = 0$.

[Property I](#) is called the *invariant basis number property* (i.e. this is [Item 1](#) of [Assumption 1.2](#)), and [Property III](#) is called *weakly or stable finiteness* in the literature [[Coh06](#), Chapter 0.1] (i.e. this is [Item 1](#) of [Assumption 2.2](#)). We remark that [Property III](#) is equivalent to saying that a set of n linearly independent vectors in R^n (i.e. an $(n-1)$ -simplex in the complex of unimodular vectors $\mathbb{U}_n(R)$) is a basis of R^n . It is an exercise to see that [Property III](#) implies [Property II](#), and that [Property II](#) implies [Property I](#). The reverse implications are false in general [[Coh66](#)]. Nevertheless, [Property I](#), [Property II](#) and [Property III](#) are equivalent if every stably free R -module is free [[Coh66](#), Theorem 2.7]. Our discussion yields the following.

Corollary 2.4. *If R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#) or [Assumption 2.2](#), then R satisfies [Property I](#), [Property II](#) and [Property III](#). In particular, $\mathbb{B}_n(R)$ and $\mathbb{U}_n(R)$ are $(n-1)$ -dimensional.*

2.2. Hermite rings and completing unimodular sequences. A ring is called *Hermite* if every stably free module is free [[Lam06](#)]. While the rank conditions discussed in the previous subsection are satisfied by most rings that one commonly encounters, the assumption that our ring R is Hermite, i.e. [Item 2](#) in [Assumption 1.2](#), is more restrictive (see e.g. [[Coh06](#), Chapter 0.4]). It has the following equivalent characterization: If R satisfies [Property I](#), [Property II](#) or [Property III](#), then R is Hermite if and only if $R^m \oplus C = R^n$ implies that $m \leq n$ and $C \cong R^{n-m}$ [[Coh06](#), Corollary 0.4.2]. In terms of unimodular vectors, this can be phrased as follows.

Lemma 2.5. *Let R be a unital ring satisfying [Property III](#). Then R is Hermite if and only if the link of every k -simplex in $\mathbb{U}_n(R)$ is nonempty for $k \leq n-2$. In this case, it holds that $\mathbb{B}_n(R) = \mathbb{U}_n(R)$ and that this complex is pure of dimension $(n-1)$ (i.e. every simplex is contained in a maximal $(n-1)$ -simplex).*

Proof. Let $\Delta = \{\vec{v}_0, \dots, \vec{v}_k\}$ be a k -simplex in $\mathbb{U}_n(R)$ for $k \leq n-2$, let V be the free rank- $(k+1)$ summand it spans in R^n and let C be a complement of V in $R^n = V \oplus C$.

Assume that R is Hermite. Then [[Coh06](#), Corollary 0.4.2] (stated above) implies C is a free module of rank- $(n-k-1)$. Picking any basis $\{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_{n-k-1}\}$ of C , it follows that $\{\vec{v}_0, \dots, \vec{v}_k\} \sqcup \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_{n-k-1}\}$ is a basis of R^n . In particular, $\mathbb{B}_n(R) = \mathbb{U}_n(R)$, the link of Δ in $\mathbb{U}_n(R)$ is nonempty (since $n-k-1 \geq 1$) and Δ is contained in an $(n-1)$ -simplex.

If the link of Δ in $\mathbb{U}_n(R)$ is nonempty, then there exists a $\vec{c}_1 \in R^n$ such that $\Delta' = \{\vec{v}_0, \dots, \vec{v}_k\} \sqcup \{\vec{c}_1\}$ is a $(k+1)$ -simplex in $\mathbb{U}_n(R)$. Repeating this argument $(n-k-1)$ -many times, we obtain a maximal $(n-1)$ -simplex $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_{k+1}\} \sqcup \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_{n-k-1}\}$, which is a basis of R^n by [Property III](#). Hence, $\mathbb{B}_n(R) = \mathbb{U}_n(R)$, Δ is contained in an $(n-1)$ -simplex and $V = \langle \Delta \rangle$ has a free complement in R^n . To see that R is Hermite, let C' be any stably free R -module. If C' is not finitely generated, then C' has to be free [[Lam06](#), Proposition 4.2]. If C' is finitely generated, then C' is the complement $V \oplus C' = R^n$ for some free summand $V = \langle \Delta \rangle$, spanned by some Δ and in some R^n . Since all complements of V are isomorphic (to the quotient R^n/V) and V has a free complement, C' is free as well. \square

This also completes the proof of [Proposition 2.3](#), since [Item 2](#) of [Assumption 2.2](#) implies that the link of every k -simplex in $U_n(R)$ is non-empty for $k \leq n - 2$. To finish, we record the following observation about our assumptions.

Corollary 2.6. *If R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#) or [Assumption 2.2](#), then R is Hermite, $\mathbb{B}_n(R) = \mathbb{U}_n(R)$, and this complex is pure of dimension $(n - 1)$.*

2.3. Linear algebra over Hermite rings. In this section we collect basic facts about modules over Hermite rings (i.e. stably free R -modules are free) that we will frequently use in this work, similar to [\[CP17, Section 2.2\]](#).

Lemma 2.7. *Let R be a Hermite ring, M be a free R -module and V be a free summand of M . Then every complement C of V in $M = V \oplus C$ is also a free summand of M . Equivalently, $C \cong M/V$ is free. If R additionally satisfies [Property I](#), [Property II](#) or [Property III](#) and $\text{rank}(M), \text{rank}(V) < \infty$, then $\text{rank}(C) = \text{rank}(M) - \text{rank}(V)$.*

Proof. This follows from the definition, the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/V \rightarrow 0$ and [\[Coh06, Corollary 0.4.2\]](#). \square

We use this to check the following analogue of [\[CP17, Lemma 2.6\]](#) for Hermite rings.

Lemma 2.8. *Let R be a Hermite ring. If V and V' are free summands of R^n such that $V \subseteq V'$, then V is a free summand in V' .*

Proof. Let $R^n = V \oplus C$ and $R^n = V' \oplus C'$. [Lemma 2.7](#) implies that $C \cong R^n/V$ and $C' \cong R^n/V'$ are free. This means that $0 \rightarrow V'/V \rightarrow R^n/V \rightarrow R^n/V' \rightarrow 0$ is split. Hence V'/V is stably free and therefore free, because R is Hermite. It therefore follows that $0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow V' \rightarrow V'/V \rightarrow 0$ is split and this yields the claim. \square

Lemma 2.9. *Let R be Hermite and have the invariant basis number property. Consider two direct sum decompositions $R^n = V \oplus W = V' \oplus W'$ into free modules V, W, V', W' such that $V \subseteq V'$ and $W' \subseteq W$. Then $V' \cap W$ is a free R -module of rank $(\text{rank}(V') - \text{rank}(V)) = (\text{rank}(W) - \text{rank}(W'))$ and*

$$R^n = V \oplus (V' \cap W) \oplus W', \quad V' = V \oplus (V' \cap W), \quad W = (V' \cap W) \oplus W'.$$

Proof. It suffices to check that $V' = V \oplus (V' \cap W)$ and $W = (V' \cap W) \oplus W'$, for then the claim follows from [Lemma 2.7](#). If $v' \in V' \subseteq R^n$, then there is a unique way of writing $v' = v + w$ for $v \in V$ and $w \in W$. Since $w = v' - v$, it holds that $w \in V' \cap W$. The first claim follows. The second claim can be checked similarly: If $w \in W \subseteq R^n$, then there is a unique way of writing $w = v' + w'$ for $v' \in V'$ and $w' \in W'$. Since $v' = w - w'$ it holds that $v' \in V' \cap W$. \square

2.4. The opposite ring and left-right duality. Since we do not assume that R is commutative or that R admits an anti-automorphism, the rings R and R^{op} are a priori different and can not be identified with one another. Nevertheless, the following shows that if either satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#) then both do.

For the first two items in [Assumption 1.2](#), this is well-known.

Lemma 2.10. *R satisfies [Item 1](#) and [Item 2](#) of [Assumption 1.2](#) if and only if R^{op} does.*

Proof. Assuming that R satisfies [Item 1](#) and [Item 2](#) of [Assumption 1.2](#), we check that R^{op} also does. This suffices because $(R^{op})^{op} = R$. By [\[Coh66, Theorem 2.7\]](#), R satisfies [Property III](#). It follows from [\[Coh66, Proposition 2.2\]](#) that R^{op} also satisfies [Property III](#), and hence also [Property II](#) and [Property I](#), i.e. [Item 1](#). It follows from [\[Coh06, Theorem](#)

0.4.1] that R satisfies [Item 2](#) if and only if R^{op} does (using that [Item 1](#) and [Item 2](#) together means n -Hermite for all $n \geq 1$ in the sense of [[Coh06](#)]). \square

In [Appendix A.2](#), we show that [Item 3](#) of [Assumption 1.2](#) also holds for R^{op} if R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#). This is surprising, because there does not seem to be a straightforward way to relate the partial bases complexes of R^n and $(R^{op})^n$ if $R \not\cong R^{op}$. As a consequence our argument is rather technical; it follows ideas developed by Sadofsch Costa in [[SC20](#)], and leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 2.11. *R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#) if and only if R^{op} does.*

Proof. This follows from [Lemma 2.10](#) and the results contained in [Appendix A.2](#). \square

This left-right duality result, i.e. [Theorem 2.11](#), is first and foremost a theoretical insight. It is important, because some of arguments in this work actually require that *both* R and R^{op} satisfy [Assumption 1.2](#): In the proofs of [Proposition A.17](#) and [Proposition A.19](#) discussed in [Appendix A.4](#), we carry out the analogue of an argument of Kupers–Miller–Patz [\[KMP22\]](#) in our setting, and use [Theorem 2.11](#) to pass from R -modules M to R^{op} -modules $M^\vee = \text{Hom}_R(M, R)$. The key dualizing trick used in these proofs (compare with [Lemma A.16](#)) is due to Charney [\[Cha80\]](#). Left-right duality allows us to apply it without assuming that $R \cong R^{op}$ and without additional assumptions on R^{op} .

In practice, [Theorem 2.11](#) was known to hold for all examples that the authors are aware of: If R is a commutative ring (e.g. an Euclidean or Dedekind domain) or a ring with anti-automorphism, then $R \cong R^{op}$. If R is a ring of stable rank one, a result of Vaserstein [\[Vas71, Theorem 2\]](#) shows that the stable ranks of R and R^{op} are equal, $\text{sr}(R) = \text{sr}(R^{op})$. Therefore, van der Kallen’s theorem [\[Kal80, §2. An Acyclicity Theorem\]](#) applies to both R and R^{op} to show that $B_n(R)$ and $B_n(R^{op})$ are Cohen–Macaulay. It is natural to ask if this is a coincidence, and [Theorem 2.11](#) shows that it is not.

We close this section by recording an elementary observation related to left-right duality, which is also used in [Appendix A.2](#) and [Appendix A.4](#).

Lemma 2.12. *Let R be a unital ring and C denote a free R -module C of rank n . Then $C^\vee = \text{Hom}_R(C, R)$ is a free R^{op} -module of rank n , and taking the inverse-transpose yields a group isomorphism*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GL}(C) &\xrightarrow{\cong} \text{GL}(C^\vee) \\ \phi &\mapsto (\phi^{-1})^*, \end{aligned}$$

where $(\phi^{-1})^*$ is the automorphism that acts on a function in C^\vee by precomposing with ϕ^{-1} .

Proof. Picking an R -module basis of C leads to an isomorphism of rings $\text{End}_R(C) \cong \text{Mat}_{n \times n}(R)$, and hence an isomorphism of the groups of units $\text{GL}(C) \cong \text{GL}_n(R)$. Similarly, the associated dual basis for C^\vee shows that it is a free R^{op} -module of rank n , provides a ring isomorphism $\text{End}_{R^{op}}(C^\vee) \cong \text{Mat}_{n \times n}(R^{op})$, and an isomorphism of groups of units $\text{GL}(C^\vee) \cong \text{GL}_n(R^{op})$. Taking inverses $\phi \mapsto \phi^{-1}$ defines an isomorphism between the group of units of $\text{End}_R(C)$ and $\text{End}_R(C)^{op}$, $\text{GL}(C)$ and $\text{GL}(C)^{op}$. Acting by precomposition yields a ring isomorphism $\text{End}_R(C)^{op} \rightarrow \text{End}_{R^{op}}(C^\vee) : \psi \mapsto \psi^*$, where $\psi^*(f) = f \circ \psi$ for $f \in \text{End}_{R^{op}}(C^\vee)$. Hence, the map in the claim is an isomorphism $\text{GL}(C) \rightarrow \text{GL}(C^\vee)$. Coordinate isomorphisms identify this isomorphism with the inverse-transpose isomorphism $\text{GL}_n(R) \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(R^{op}) : M \mapsto (M^{-1})^T$, hence the name. \square

3. (RELATIVE) STEINBERG MODULES

We introduce the Steinberg modules $\mathrm{St}_n(R)$ and the relative Steinberg modules $\mathrm{St}_n^m(R)$ following [KMP22, Section 4.2]. To do this we associate certain (relative) Tits complexes to R . The content of this section is closely related to recent work of Scalumandre [Sca23].

Definition 3.1. Let M be a free R -module, and let $\mathbb{T}(M)$ be the poset of nonzero proper free summands of M , ordered by inclusion. Let $T(M)$ denote the geometric realization of $\mathbb{T}(M)$. We will write $\mathbb{T}_n(R)$ for $\mathbb{T}(R^n)$ and $T_n(R)$ for its geometric realization, and refer to $\mathbb{T}_n(R)$ as the *Tits complex*.

The next lemma shows that, under [Assumption 1.2](#) and assuming that R is commutative, the Tits complexes above agree with those recently defined and studied by Scalumandre [Sca23]. This is the reason why we named them exactly as in [Sca23].

Lemma 3.2. *Under [Assumption 1.2](#), the Tits complex in [Definition 3.1](#) agrees with the one defined by Scalumandre [Sca23, Definition 3.12] (dropping the commutativity assumption).*

Proof. Dropping the commutativity assumption, the Tits complex $\mathbb{T}_n^S(R)$ in [Sca23, Definition 3.12] is the poset of nonzero proper summands V of R^n such that V and R^n/V are free R -modules, where $V \leq_S V'$ if $V' = V \oplus C$ with C a free R -module. [Lemma 2.7](#) implies that for every free summand $V \in T_n(R)$ the quotient R^n/V is also free. Hence, $\mathbb{T}_n^S(R)$ and $\mathbb{T}_n(R)$ have the same underlying set. If $V, V' \in T_n(R)$ such that $V \subseteq V'$, then [Lemma 2.8](#) implies that $V = V' \oplus C$ for some C and another application of [Lemma 2.7](#) shows that C is free. Hence, it holds that $V \leq_S V'$. \square

The proof of [Sca23, Proposition 2.6] yields the following description of the k -simplices of $T_n(R)$ in our setting if one refers to [Lemma 2.7](#) instead of [Sca23, Lemma 2.5].

Lemma 3.3. *Under [Assumption 1.2](#), the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $V_0 \leq \dots \leq V_k$ is a k -simplex in $T_n(R)$;
- (2) $V_0 \leq \dots \leq V_k$ is a face of a $(n-2)$ -simplex in $T_n(R)$;
- (3) There exist partial bases $\emptyset \neq \sigma_0 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \sigma_k$ of R^n such that $V_i = \langle \sigma_i \rangle_R$;
- (4) $V_0 \neq 0$, V_i and V_{i+1}/V_i are free for every $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, V_k and R^n/V_k are free.

In particular, $T_n(R)$ is a pure simplicial complex of dimension $(n-2)$.

Remark 3.4. In general [Sca23, Lemma 2.5] does not hold for non-commutative rings, see e.g. [Lam06, Theorem 4.11] and [Lam06, page 36, 2nd paragraph].

Remark 3.5. For rings that are not PIDs, [Definition 3.1](#) differs from the usual definition of the Tits building as we require that the submodules are free. In particular, $T_n(R)$ is in general not a building in the sense of Br uhatt–Tits. This is another reason why we chose to follow the naming convention in [Sca23], compare [Sca23, Remark 1.4].

We will also be interested in the following relative versions of the Tits complex.

Definition 3.6. For N a free summand of a free R -module M , let $\mathbb{T}(M, N)$ be the subposet of $\mathbb{T}(M)$ of summands of complements of N . We write $\mathbb{T}_n^m(R)$ for the *relative Tits complex* $\mathbb{T}(R^{m+n}, R^m)$, where here R^m is viewed as a summand of R^{m+n} via the standard decomposition $R^{m+n} = R^m \oplus R^n$. Let $T(M, N)$ and $T_n^m(R)$ denote the respective geometric realizations.

Note that under [Assumption 1.2](#) and if $m > 0$, the relative Tits complex $T_n^m(R)$ is $(n-1)$ -dimensional as a consequence of [Lemma 3.3](#). Next, we relate the (relative) Tits complexes to the partial bases complexes introduced in [Definition 1.1](#).

Definition 3.7. Let M be a free R -module. The complex of partial bases $B(M)$ is the simplicial complex where a collection of vectors $\{\vec{v}_0, \dots, \vec{v}_k\}$ in M spans a k -simplex if it is a subset of a basis of M . Let $B_n(R)$ denote $B(R^n)$, and let $B_n^m(R)$ denote $\text{Link}_{B(R^{n+m})}(\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m\})$, where \vec{e}_i is the i -th standard unit vector in R^{m+n} . We write $\mathbb{B}(M)$, $\mathbb{B}_n(R)$ and $\mathbb{B}_n^m(R)$ for the simplex posets of these simplicial complexes.

There is an interesting map of posets between the simplex posets of (relative) partial bases and the (relative) Tits building, given by taking spans.

Definition 3.8. If $m = 0$, let $\mathbb{B}_n(R)^{(n-2)}$ denote the $(n-2)$ -skeleton of $\mathbb{B}_n(R)$. Then there is a poset map $\text{span} : \mathbb{B}_n(R)^{(n-2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n(R)$ defined by sending a partial basis σ to the R -linear summand $\langle \sigma \rangle$ of R^n it spans. If $m > 0$, there is a similarly defined poset map $\text{span} : \mathbb{B}_n^m(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n^m(R)$ sending a partial basis σ of a complement of R^m in R^{m+n} to the R -linear summand $\langle \sigma \rangle$ it spans.

The following is a consequence of [Lemma 3.3](#) and is the analogue of [[Sca23](#), Lemma 3.14] in our setting.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $m > 0$. Under [Assumption 1.2](#), $\text{span} : \mathbb{B}_n(R)^{(n-2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n(R)$ and $\text{span} : \mathbb{B}_n^m(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n^m(R)$ are surjective poset maps.*

Using standard poset arguments together with the high connectivity of $\mathbb{B}_n^m(R)$, i.e. [Item 3](#) of [Assumption 1.2](#), we can deduce that $\mathbb{T}_n^m(R)$ is highly connected as well. This observation has been used by Kupers–Miller–Patz in [[KMP22](#), Lemma 4.6], and the proof of the following lemma is completely analogous to their argument.

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose [Assumption 1.2](#) holds and let $m > 0$. Then*

- (1) *the spanning map $\text{span} : \mathbb{B}_n(R)^{(n-2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n(R)$ is $(n-2)$ -connected;*
- (2) *the spanning map $\text{span} : \mathbb{B}_n^m(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n^m(R)$ is $(n-1)$ -connected.*

Thus, $T_n(R)$ is Cohen–Macaulay and, if $m > 0$, then $T_n^m(R)$ is $(n-1)$ -spherical.

The fact that the Tits complex $\mathbb{T}_n(R)$ is Cohen–Macaulay was previously proved by Scalumandre under slightly different assumptions, see [[Sca23](#), Theorem 4.2, Case $m = n-1$]. Scalumandre’s result generalizes a classical theorem due to Solomon–Tits [[Sol69](#)] for fields R as well as unpublished work of Rognes [[Rog91](#)] for $R = \mathbb{Z}/p^n$. The following includes an alternative proof in our setting, based on a connectivity theorem due to van der Kallen–Looijenga [[KL11](#), Corollary 2.2] and an argument contained in the proof of [[KMP22](#), Lemma 4.6].

Proof. As in the proof of [[KMP22](#), Lemma 4.6], we argue by induction on n using [Assumption 1.2](#) and [[KMP22](#), Proposition 4.1] (this is [[KL11](#), Corollary 2.2]). Recall that we already established that span is a surjective poset map.

For [Item 1](#): We start by noting that $\mathbb{B}_n(R)^{(n-2)}$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(n-2)$ by [Assumption 1.2](#) and e.g. the discussion on [[HV17](#), page 1887]. If $n = 0$ or $n = 1$ the claim is void. For $n = 2$, both complexes are discrete sets and $\mathbb{T}_n(R)$ is the set of free rank-1 summands L in R^2 that have a free complement. Since the span map is surjective, it is surjective on π_0 if $n = 2$, i.e. span is 0-connected. Assume that $n > 2$ and let $V \in \mathbb{T}_n(R)$. Then $\text{span}_{\leq V} = \mathbb{B}(V)$, and $\mathbb{T}_n(R)_{>V} \cong \mathbb{T}_{n-\text{rank}(V)}(R)$ by [Lemma A.1](#). $\mathbb{B}(V)$ is $(\text{rank}(V) - 2)$ -connected by [Assumption 1.2](#), and the induction hypothesis implies that $\mathbb{T}_{n-\text{rank}(V)}(R)$ is $(n - \text{rank}(V) - 3)$ -connected since $n - \text{rank}(V) < n$. It follows that the assumptions [[KMP22](#), Proposition 4.1, Part 2] for proving that span is $(n-2)$ -connected are satisfied if we set $t(V) := \text{rank}(V) - 1$ for $V \in \mathbb{T}_n(R)$. This finishes the proof of

Item 1, and shows that $T_n(R)$ is $(n-3)$ -connected. The Cohen–Macaulay property for $T_n(R)$ follows from this, [Qui78, Proposition 8.6] and [Lemma A.1](#) exactly as in the last paragraph of [Sca23, page 25, Proof of Theorem A].

For **Item 2**, the argument is similar: If $n = 0$ the claim is void. If $n = 1$ the domain and codomain are discrete posets, and the claim follows by direct inspection and the surjectivity of the poset map span exactly as in the first case. If $n > 1$, we consider $V \in \mathbb{T}_n^m(R)$, again set $t(V) := \mathrm{rank}(V) - 1$, and observe that $\mathrm{span}_{\leq V} = \mathbb{B}(V)$ and $\mathbb{T}_n^m(R)_{>V} \cong \mathbb{T}_{n-\mathrm{rank}(V)}^m(R)$ by [Lemma A.2](#). The assumptions of [KMP22, Proposition 4.1, Part 2] for proving that span is $(n-1)$ -connected again follow from the induction hypothesis and [Assumption 1.2](#). \square

Given a free summand N of an R -module M , we denote by $\mathrm{GL}(M, N) \leq \mathrm{GL}(M)$ the subgroup that fixes N pointwise. If $M = R^{m+n}$ and $N = R^n$, we write $\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R) = \mathrm{GL}(R^{m+n}, R^n)$. We note that $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ acts (from the right) on $T_n(R)$ simplicially, and similarly $\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)$ acts on $T_n^m(R)$. As a consequence of [Lemma 3.10](#), $T_n(R) \simeq \vee S^{n-2}$ and $T_n^m(R) \simeq \vee S^{n-1}$ for $m > 0$ and if R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#). In particular, the complexes have a single (possibly) nontrivial reduced homology group in degree $(n-2)$ and $(n-1)$. This leads us to the following definition.

Definition 3.11. Let R be a ring such that $T_n(R)$ is $(n-2)$ -spherical. Then the *Steinberg module* of R , denoted by $\mathrm{St}_n(R)$, is the right $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ -module $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(T_n(R); \mathbb{Z})$. If $m > 0$ and $T_n^m(R)$ is $(n-1)$ -spherical, then the *relative Steinberg module* $\mathrm{St}_n^m(R)$ is the right $\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)$ -module $\tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R); \mathbb{Z})$.

4. GENERATING SETS FOR (RELATIVE) STEINBERG MODULES

To obtain our stability result following [KMP22], we need to prove a vanishing result for certain co-invariants of the (relative) Steinberg modules introduced in [Definition 3.11](#).

For the non-relative Steinberg modules $\mathrm{St}_n(R)$, [Assumption 1.2](#) allows one to run an argument due to Church–Farb–Putman [CFP19] to obtain a generating set for $\mathrm{St}_n(R)$, which can be used to show that $(\mathrm{St}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{Z}[1/2])_{\mathrm{GL}_n(R)} = 0$ if $n \geq 2$. Recently, Scalman-dre [Sca23] carried out this argument in the generality that we require in this work. For Euclidean domains the construction of this generating set is due to Ash–Rudolph [AR79, Theorem 4.1] and the vanishing result is due to Lee–Szczarba [LS76, Theorem 1.3].

The main technical innovation of this article is to show that, if $m > 0$, [Assumption 1.2](#) also suffices to construct a generating set for the relative Steinberg modules $\mathrm{St}_n^m(R)$, which can be used to check that $(\mathrm{St}_n^m(R) \otimes \mathbb{Z}[1/2])_{\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)} = 0$ if $n \geq 1$. Compared to our [Item 3](#) in [Assumption 1.2](#), the arguments in [KMP22, Theorem 3.15 and Lemma 4.6] require much more complicated connectivity assumptions, which to date are only known to hold for fields, the integers [CP17], the Gaussian and the Eisenstein integers [Kup+22]. In contrast, [Assumption 1.2](#) is known to hold for all local, semi-local or Artinian rings, Euclidean domains as well as certain non-euclidean Dedekind domains (compare [Section 1](#)). To prove our result, we introduce a modified partial basis complex, which is the key ingredient in a new induction procedure that we use to construct a generating set for $\mathrm{St}_n^m(R)$ with $m > 0$.

4.1. Apartment classes and the Steinberg module. Let [Assumption 1.2](#) hold and $\partial\Delta_{n-1}$ be the boundary of the standard $(n-1)$ -simplex. Its poset of simplices can be identified with the poset $\mathbb{T}(\llbracket n \rrbracket)$ of nonempty proper subsets of $\llbracket n \rrbracket := \{1, \dots, n\}$. For any given matrix $M \in \mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ with column vectors $\vec{M} = [\vec{M}_1 \dots \vec{M}_n]$, we obtain a poset embedding

$$M : \mathbb{T}(\llbracket n \rrbracket) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{T}_n(R) : S \mapsto \langle \vec{M}_i : i \in S \rangle.$$

Fixing a generator $\eta_{n-2} \in \tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{T}(\llbracket n \rrbracket))$ once and for all, we obtain a unique class $[M] := M_*(\eta_{n-2}) \in \tilde{H}(\mathbb{T}_n(R); \mathbb{Z}) = \text{St}_n(R)$, which is called the *apartment class* of $M \in \text{GL}_n(R)$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let R be a ring such that [Assumption 1.2](#) holds. Then the map*

$$\mathbb{Z}[\text{GL}_n(R)] \rightarrow \text{St}_n(R) : M \mapsto [M]$$

is a $\text{GL}_n(R)$ -equivariant surjection. In particular, $\text{St}_n(R)$ is generated as an abelian group by the set apartment classes $\{[M] : M \in \text{GL}_n(R)\}$.

Proof. This follows from an argument due to Church–Farb–Putman [[CFP19](#), Proof of Theorem A]. It was carried out by Scalamanire in the required generality in [[Sca23](#), Theorem 5.1], which we can apply to prove the claim using [Assumption 1.2](#) and [Lemma 3.10](#). \square

Corollary 4.2. *Let R be a ring such that [Assumption 1.2](#) holds and let \mathbb{k} be a commutative ring in which $2 \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ is a unit. If $n \geq 2$, then the $\text{GL}_n(R)$ -coinvariants of $\text{St}(R) \otimes \mathbb{k}$ vanish. In symbols,*

$$(\text{St}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\text{GL}_n(R)} = 0.$$

Proof. We can apply a trick due to Church–Farb–Putman [[CFP19](#), Proof of Theorem C]: Let $n \geq 2$ and let $[M] \in \text{St}_n(R)$ be an apartment class where $M = [\vec{M}_1 \dots \vec{M}_n]$. By virtue of [Theorem 4.1](#), we only need to show that $[M] \otimes 1 = 0$ in $(\text{St}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\text{GL}_n(R)}$. To see this, consider the element $\phi \in \text{GL}_n(R)$ that maps $\vec{M}_1 \mapsto \vec{M}_2$, $\vec{M}_2 \mapsto \vec{M}_1$ and $\vec{M}_i \mapsto \vec{M}_i$ for $i > 2$. The element ϕ acts by reversing the orientation of $[M]$, i.e. $[M] \cdot \phi = -[M]$, and therefore in the coinvariants it holds that $[M] \otimes 1 = -[M] \otimes 1$ and, since 2 is a unit in \mathbb{k} and $2 \cdot ([M] \otimes 1) = 0$, we must have that $[M] \otimes 1 = 0$. \square

4.2. Relative apartment classes and relative Steinberg modules. Now we define the set that will parametrize generators of the relative Steinberg module, as well as modified versions of this set that will be needed in the proof.

Definition 4.3. Let $m, n \geq 1$.

- (1) When $0 \leq j \leq n$, we write $S_n^m(j)$ for the set of formal symbols

$$[\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_1 + r_1 \vec{e}_{\beta(1)}] * \dots * [\vec{v}_j, \vec{v}_j + r_j \vec{e}_{\beta(j)}]$$

obtained from a choice of ordered simplex $[\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_j]$ of $B_n^m(R)$, a choice of coefficients $r_i \in R - \{0\}$, and a choice of vectors $\vec{e}_{\beta(i)} \in \{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m, \vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_{i-1}\}$. We use the conventions that $S_n^m(0)$ contains a single element (thought of as an empty simplex in $B_n^m(R)$), and when $j = n$, we write S_n^m for $S_n^m(n)$.

- (2) We define $\mathbb{Z}\{S_n^m\}$ to be the right $\text{GL}_n^m(R)$ -module with underlying \mathbb{Z} -module

$$\mathbb{Z}\{S_n^m\} := \bigoplus_{S_n^m} \mathbb{Z},$$

and whose $\text{GL}_n^m(R)$ -action on the basis elements S_n^m is defined by

$$([\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_1 + \alpha_1 \vec{e}_{\beta(1)}] * \dots * [\vec{v}_n, \vec{v}_n + \alpha_n \vec{e}_{\beta(n)}]) \cdot \phi = [\phi(\vec{v}_1), \phi(\vec{v}_1) + \alpha_1 \phi(\vec{e}_{\beta(1)})] * \dots * [\phi(\vec{v}_n), \phi(\vec{v}_n) + \alpha_n \phi(\vec{e}_{\beta(n)})]$$

for $\phi \in \text{GL}_n^m(R)$.

Let R be a ring such that [Assumption 1.2](#) is satisfied and $m, n \geq 1$. We will prove that there exists a $\text{GL}_n^m(R)$ -equivariant surjection

$$F : \mathbb{Z}\{S_n^m\} \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_n^m; \mathbb{Z}) = \text{St}_n^m(R).$$

This map is constructed as follows. Consider a symbol

$$\Theta = [\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_1 + \alpha_1 \vec{e}_{\beta(1)}] * \cdots * [\vec{v}_n, \vec{v}_n + \alpha_n \vec{e}_{\beta(n)}] \in S_n^m.$$

Let $1_\Theta \in \mathbb{Z}$ denote 1 in the summand of the domain of F indexed by Θ . Let

$$S^{n-1} = S^0 * \cdots * S^0$$

be the simplicial $(n-1)$ -sphere obtained as a join of n copies of S^0 , and denote its poset of simplices by S^{n-1} . Each symbol $\Theta \in S_n^m$ gives rise to a poset embedding

$$\Theta : S^{n-1} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{T}_n^m(R)$$

by mapping the two vertices of the i -th copy of S^0 in the join $S^{n-1} = S^0 * \cdots * S^0$ to $\{\langle \vec{v}_i \rangle, \langle \vec{v}_i + \alpha_i \vec{e}_{\beta(i)} \rangle\}$. Passing to homology we obtain a map

$$\Theta_* : \tilde{H}_{n-1}(S^{n-1}; \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_n^m(R); \mathbb{Z}) = \mathrm{St}_n^m(R).$$

Fix a generator $\eta_{n-1} \in \tilde{H}_{n-1}(S^{n-1}; \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}$. This choice determines generators $\eta_{n-1} \in \tilde{H}_{n-1}(S^{n-1}; \mathbb{Z})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ using the suspension isomorphisms coming from the identifications $S^0 * S^{n-2} \cong S^{n-1}$. The map F is then defined by the formula

$$F(1_\Theta) = \Theta_*(\eta_{n-1}) =: [\Theta].$$

The class $[\Theta] \in \tilde{H}_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_n^m(R); \mathbb{Z}) = \mathrm{St}_n^m(R)$ is called the *relative apartment class* associated to the symbol $\Theta \in S_n^m$. Our main technical result is the following theorem.

Theorem 4.4. *Let R be a ring such that [Assumption 1.2](#) holds and $m, n \geq 1$. Then*

$$F : \mathbb{Z}\{S_n^m\} \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{St}_n^m(R) : \Theta \mapsto [\Theta]$$

is a $\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)$ -equivariant surjection. In particular, the set of relative apartment classes $\{[\Theta] : \Theta \in S_n^m\}$ generates $\mathrm{St}_n^m(R)$ as an abelian group.

This generating set allows us to obtain the following vanishing result, which is the key input for the homological stability theorems proved in the next section.

Corollary 4.5. *Let R be a ring such that [Assumption 1.2](#) holds, and let \mathbb{k} be a commutative ring in which 2 is a unit. If $n, m \geq 1$, then the $\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)$ -coinvariants of $\mathrm{St}_n^m(R) \otimes \mathbb{k}$ vanish. In symbols,*

$$(\mathrm{St}_n^m(R) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)} = 0 \text{ if } m, n \geq 1.$$

Proof of Corollary 4.5. This argument is inspired by a trick used in [\[KMP22, Theorem 3.15, Case 2, and Proposition 3.16.\]](#). By [Theorem 4.4](#) it suffices to show every generator $[\Theta] \otimes 1 \in (\mathrm{St}_n^m(R) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)}$ is equal to zero if 2 is a unit in \mathbb{k} . Let

$$\Theta = [\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_1 + \alpha_1 \vec{e}_{\beta(1)}] * \cdots * [\vec{v}_n, \vec{v}_n + \alpha_n \vec{e}_{\beta(n)}] \in S_n^m.$$

Then $\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m, \vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_n\}$ is a basis of R^{m+n} and $\vec{e}_{\beta(n)} \in \{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m, \vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_{n-1}\}$. Consider the element ϕ of $\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)$ that sends \vec{v}_n to $-\vec{v}_n - \alpha_n \vec{e}_{\beta(n)}$ and is the identity on \vec{e}_i and \vec{v}_j when $j \neq n$. It follows that

$$\Theta \cdot \phi = [\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_1 + \alpha_1 \vec{e}_{\beta(1)}] * \cdots * [\vec{v}_{n-1}, \vec{v}_{n-1} + \alpha_{n-1} \vec{e}_{\beta(n-1)}] * [-(\vec{v}_n + \alpha_n \vec{e}_{\beta(n)}), -\vec{v}_n].$$

Observe that this implies $[\Theta] = -[\Theta \cdot \phi] = -[\Theta] \cdot \phi \in \mathrm{St}_n^m(R)$. Therefore, in the coinvariants it holds that

$$[\Theta] \otimes 1 = -([\Theta] \cdot \phi \otimes 1) = -([\Theta] \cdot \phi \otimes 1 \cdot \phi) = -([\Theta] \otimes 1)$$

and it follows that $2 \cdot ([\Theta] \otimes 1) = 0$ in $(\mathrm{St}_n^m(R) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)}$. Since 2 is a unit in \mathbb{k} , this implies that $[\Theta] \otimes 1 = 0$ in $(\mathrm{St}_n^m(R) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\mathrm{GL}_n^m(R)}$ as claimed. \square

Before proving [Theorem 4.4](#), we will introduce and study the connectivity properties of several simplicial complexes and posets.

4.2.1. *Complex of externally augmented partial bases.* The following new complex will play an important role in our arguments.

Definition 4.6. Fix a ring R and an integer $m \geq 1$, and let γ be either a simplex in $B_n^m(R)$ or the empty set. Let $BX_n^{m,\gamma}(R)$ denote the simplicial complex whose vertices are vectors \vec{v} in R^{m+n} with the property that $\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m\} \sqcup \gamma \sqcup \{\vec{v}\}$ is a partial basis of R^{m+n} (i.e. a simplex in $B_{m+n}(R)$). The simplicial complex $BX_n^{m,\gamma}(R)$ has two different types of simplices:

- (1) *standard* k -simplices $\sigma = \{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_{k+1}\}$ defined by the property that $\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m\} \sqcup \gamma \sqcup \{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_{k+1}\}$ is a partial basis of size $m + |\gamma| + (k + 1)$ of R^{m+n} ;
- (2) *externally additive* k -simplices $\sigma = \{\vec{v}_1 = \vec{v}_2 + r\vec{e}_{\beta(2)}, \vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}_{k+1}\}$ defined by the property that $\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m\} \sqcup \gamma \sqcup \{\vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}_{k+1}\}$ is a partial basis of size $m + |\gamma| + k$ of R^{m+n} and that \vec{v}_1 is a sum of the form $\vec{v}_2 + r\vec{e}_{\beta(2)}$ for $e_{\beta(2)} \in \{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m\} \sqcup \gamma$ and $r \in R \setminus \{0\}$.

We will refer to the simplicial complex $BX_n^{m,\gamma}(R)$ as the *complex of externally augmented partial bases*. If $\gamma = \emptyset$, we write $BX_n^m(R)$ for $BX_n^{m,\gamma}(R)$.

We highlight that $BX_n^{m,\gamma}(R)$ is exactly $\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\gamma)$ with extra externally additive simplices, as in [Item 2](#), glued on. In particular, $\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\gamma)$ is a subcomplex of $BX_n^{m,\gamma}(R)$ and, if $\gamma = \emptyset$, $B_n^m(R)$ is a subcomplex of $BX_n^m(R)$.

Remark 4.7. The definition of the simplicial complexes $BX_n^{m,\gamma}(R)$ is inspired by work of Church–Putman [\[CP17\]](#). In their work on the rational codimension-one cohomology of $\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$, a closely related simplicial complex $BA_n^m(\mathbb{Z})$ of augmented partial frames plays a key role. The complex $BA_n^m(\mathbb{Z})$ is constructed using externally additive augmentations for which the e_i -coefficient satisfies $r = 1$, as well as internally additive augmentations, which do not occur in our setting. Similar complexes of augmented frames, $BA_n^m(\mathbb{Z}[i])$ and $BA_n^m(\mathbb{Z}[\rho])$, for the Gaussian integers and the Eisenstein integers have been studied in Kupers–Miller–Patz–Wilson’s work [\[Kup+22\]](#) on the rational codimension-one cohomology of $\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z}[i])$ and $\text{SL}_n(\mathbb{Z}[\rho])$. These three spherical complexes of augmented partial frames, $BA_n^m(\mathbb{Z})$, $BA_n^m(\mathbb{Z}[i])$, and $BA_n^m(\mathbb{Z}[\rho])$, have also been used by Kupers–Miller–Patz [\[KMP22\]](#) to construct generating sets for the relative Steinberg modules $\text{St}_n^m(\mathbb{Z})$, $\text{St}_n^m(\mathbb{Z}[i])$ and $\text{St}_n^m(\mathbb{Z}[\rho])$. The complexes $BX_n^{m,\gamma}(R)$ of externally augmented partial bases occurring in this work are, in general, not spherical (see [Remark 4.10](#)). One way to think about the complexes $BX_n^{m,\gamma}(R)$ is that they are similar to the complexes $BA_n^m(R)$ except they do not have simplices corresponding to the Bykovskii-relations in Steinberg modules [\[Byk03\]](#). These simplices turn out not to be relevant for slope-1 homological stability, and ignoring them allows us to prove our results for rings where the Bykovskii-relations do not hold.

4.2.2. *Key observation.* The next lemma will be key for establishing a relation between the span map $\text{span} : B_n^m(R) \rightarrow T_n^m(R)$ in [Definition 3.8](#) and the relative apartment class map $F : \mathbb{Z}\{S_n^m\} \twoheadrightarrow \text{St}_n^m(R)$ occurring in [Theorem 4.4](#). It studies a collection of Θ -dependent span maps for each symbol $\Theta \in S_n^m(j)$. For $j = 0$ and $\Theta \in S_n^m(0)$ the empty symbol, the associated collection contains exactly one spanning map, which is $\text{span} : B_n^m(R) \rightarrow T_n^m(R)$.

First we must construct these maps. Suppose [Assumption 1.2](#) holds and $m, n \geq 1$. Let $0 \leq j < n$ and consider a symbol

$$\Theta = [\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_1 + \alpha_1 \vec{e}_{\beta(1)}] * \dots * [\vec{v}_j, \vec{v}_j + \alpha_j \vec{e}_{\beta(j)}] \in S_n^m(j).$$

Associated with Θ , we find a simplex $\sigma = \sigma(\Theta) = \{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_j\} \in B_n^m(R)$. By restricting the spanning map

$$\text{span} : B_n^m(R) \rightarrow T_n^m(R)$$

to the simplex poset of $\text{Link}_{B_n^m}(\sigma)$, we obtain a map

$$\mathbb{L}\text{ink}_{B_n^m}(\sigma) \rightarrow T_n^m(R).$$

Let $S^{j-1} = S^0 * \dots * S^0$ be a join of j copies of S^0 . Using the symbol Θ we can define an embedding

$$\Theta : S^{j-1} \hookrightarrow T_n^m(R),$$

whose value on the two vertices of the i -th S^0 in S^{j-1} is given by $\{\langle \vec{v}_i \rangle, \langle \vec{v}_i + \alpha_i \vec{e}_{\beta(i)} \rangle\}$. The two maps are compatible and yield the Θ -dependent span map

$$\text{span}_\Theta : S^{j-1} * \mathbb{L}\text{ink}_{B_n^m}(\sigma) \rightarrow T_n^m(R).$$

Consider any decomposition $R^{m+n} = R^m \oplus \langle \sigma \rangle \oplus C_\sigma$. Then C_σ is free by Lemma 2.7. Viewing $B(C_\sigma)$ as a subcomplex of $\text{Link}_{B_n^m}(\sigma)$ via the inclusion

$$C_\sigma \hookrightarrow R^{m+n} = R^m \oplus \langle \sigma \rangle \oplus C_\sigma$$

yields a map

$$\text{incl}_{(\theta, C_\sigma)} : S^{j-1} * B(C_\sigma) \rightarrow S^{j-1} * \mathbb{L}\text{ink}_{B_n^m}(\sigma).$$

The first key observation is that the composition of this map with span_Θ is nullhomotopic.

Lemma 4.8. *If Assumption 1.2 holds, $m, n \geq 1$ and $0 \leq j < n$, then the composition*

$$\text{span}_\Theta \circ \text{incl}_{(\theta, C_\sigma)} : S^{j-1} * B(C_\sigma) \rightarrow S^{j-1} * \mathbb{L}\text{ink}_{B_n^m}(\sigma) \rightarrow T_n^m(R)$$

is nullhomotopic for every choice of C_σ .

Proof. Recall that $C_\sigma \neq 0$ is a nonzero free summand of the complement $\langle \sigma \rangle \oplus C_\sigma$ of R^m by Lemma 2.7 and therefore defines an element

$$C_\sigma \in T_n^m(R).$$

Since we view $B(C_\sigma)$ as a subposet of $\mathbb{L}\text{ink}_{B_n^m}(\sigma)$ via the inclusion $C_\sigma \hookrightarrow R^{m+n} = R^m \oplus \langle \sigma \rangle \oplus C_\sigma$, it follows that for any partial basis $\tau \in B(C_\sigma)$ it holds that

$$\langle \tau \rangle \subseteq C_\sigma \text{ in } T_n^m(R).$$

Hence, the image of $\text{span}_\Theta \circ \text{incl}_{(\theta, C_\sigma)}$ is contained in subspace $\Theta(S^{j-1}) * T_n^m(R)_{\leq C_\sigma}$, where $T_n^m(R)_{\leq C_\sigma}$ is the subposet of elements that are bounded above by C_σ . Since $T_n^m(R)_{\leq C_\sigma}$ has a cone point C_σ , it follows that the image of $\text{span}_\Theta \circ \text{incl}_{(\theta, C_\sigma)}$ is contained in a contractible subspace. Therefore, $\text{span}_\Theta \circ \text{incl}_{(\theta, C_\sigma)}$ is nullhomotopic. \square

4.2.3. Relative connectivity results. In the next two steps, we investigate the connectivity of the complex $BX_n^m(R)$, first relative to $B_n^m(R)$ and then relative to $B_n(R)$.

Lemma 4.9. *Suppose Assumption 1.2 holds. If $m \geq 1$, then $\pi_k(BX_n^m(R), B_n^m(R))$ and $H_k(BX_n^m(R), B_n^m(R))$ are trivial for all $k < n$.*

Proof. If $n = 0$, both $B_n^m(R)$ and $BX_n^m(R)$ are empty spaces, so there is nothing to prove. If $n = 1$, then $B_1^m(R)$ is a discrete set, and we need to check that $H_0(BX_1^m(R), B_1^m(R)) = 0$. Since $BX_1^m(R)$ and $B_1^m(R)$ have the same vertex set, it holds that $\tilde{H}_0(B_1^m(R)) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_0(BX_1^m(R))$ is a surjection and this follows from the long exact homology sequence.

For $n \geq 2$, we know that $B_n^m(R)$ is $(n-2)$ -connected and $n-2 \geq 0$. Therefore, $B_n^m(R)$ is path-connected, and since $B_n^m(R)$ is a subcomplex of $BX_n^m(R)$ containing all vertices of $BX_n^m(R)$, it follows that $BX_n^m(R)$ is path-connected as well. We will prove that $\pi_k(BX_n^m(R), B_n^m(R)) = 0$ for $0 < k < n$. Since $B_n^m(R)$ and $BX_n^m(R)$ are path-connected, the relative Hurewicz theorem will then imply that $H_k(BX_n^m(R), B_n^m(R)) = 0$ for $k < n$.

Let $\phi : (D^k, S^{k-1}) \rightarrow (BX_n^m(R), B_n^m(R))$ be a simplicial map, where D^k is a disc of dimension $0 < k < n$ equipped with some combinatorial simplicial structure (see e.g. [Put09, Definition 6.3 and Lemma 6.4]). Let $\Delta \in D^k$ be a simplex of maximal dimension with the property that $\phi(\Delta) = \{\vec{v}_1 = \vec{v}_2 + r\vec{e}_i, \vec{v}_2\}$ is an externally additive edge in $BX_n^m(R)$. Since D^k is a combinatorial disc, it holds that $\text{Link}_{D^k}(\Delta) \cong S^{k-\dim \Delta - 1}$. The maximality assumption on Δ implies that $\phi(\text{Link}_{D^k}(\Delta)) \subset \text{Link}_{BX_n^m(R)}(\phi(\Delta))$. We observe that $\text{Link}_{BX_n^m(R)}(\phi(\Delta)) \cong \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\{\vec{v}_2\}) \cong B_{n-1}^{m+1}(R)$ is $(n-2)$ -spherical. Since $k < n$ and $\dim \Delta \geq \dim \phi(\Delta) = 1$, it follows that $k - \dim \Delta - 1 < n - 2$. Therefore, we see that the restriction

$$\phi|_{\text{Link}} : \text{Link}_{D^k}(\Delta) \rightarrow \text{Link}_{BX_n^m(R)}(\phi(\Delta))$$

is nullhomotopic via a map

$$\psi : D(\Delta) \rightarrow \text{Link}_{BX_n^m(R)}(\phi(\Delta)),$$

where $D(\Delta)$ is a combinatorial $(k - \dim \Delta)$ -disc (using e.g. [Put09, Lemma 6.4]). We obtain a map

$$\phi|_{\Delta} * \psi : \Delta * D(\Delta) \rightarrow \text{Star}_{BX_n^m(R)}(\phi(\Delta)) = \phi(\Delta) * \text{Link}_{BX_n^m(R)}(\phi(\Delta)),$$

whose codomain is a contractible complex. Hence, the two maps

$$\phi|_{\partial \Delta} * \psi : \partial \Delta * D(\Delta) \rightarrow \text{Star}_{BX_n^m(R)}(\phi(\Delta))$$

and

$$\phi|_{\text{Star}} = \phi|_{\Delta} * \phi|_{\text{Link}} : \text{Star}_{D^k}(\Delta) = \Delta * \text{Link}_{D^k}(\Delta) \rightarrow \text{Star}_{BX_n^m(R)}(\phi(\Delta))$$

are homotopic relative to their restriction to the boundary $\partial \Delta * \text{Link}_{D^k}(\Delta)$ of their domains. Using this homotopy we obtain a map ϕ' that is homotopic to ϕ and with the following description: The domain of ϕ' is a combinatorial disc $(D^k)'$ (using e.g. [BPS23, Lemma 5.7]) that is obtained from D^k by cutting out the combinatorial k -disc $\text{Star}_{D^k}(\Delta) = \Delta * \text{Link}_{D^k}(\Delta)$ and gluing in the combinatorial k -disc $\partial \Delta * D(\Delta)$ along the $(k-1)$ -sphere $\partial(\partial \Delta * D(\Delta)) = \partial \Delta * \text{Link}_{D^k}(\Delta)$. On $(\partial \Delta * D(\Delta), \partial \Delta * \text{Link}_{D^k}(\Delta))$, the map ϕ' is defined by $(\phi|_{\partial \Delta} * \psi, \phi|_{\partial \Delta} * \phi|_{\text{Link}})$. Notice that the only simplices in $\partial \Delta * D(\Delta)$ that $\phi|_{\Delta} * \psi$ can map to an externally additive edge are contained in $\partial \Delta$. Therefore, ϕ' maps one fewer simplex of dimension $\dim \Delta$ to an external edge than ϕ does. Recall that any simplex contained in the boundary sphere of the domain of ϕ is mapped to $B_n^m(R)$. Any such simplex would therefore have to be contained in the boundary sphere of $\text{Star}_{D^k}(\Delta) = \partial \Delta * \text{Link}_{D^k}(\Delta)$. In particular, the two maps ϕ and ϕ' agree on these simplices. Therefore, ϕ and ϕ' are homotopic relative to their boundary spheres. Iterating this procedure, we can homotope ϕ to a map ϕ^\dagger whose image does not contain any externally additive simplices. The image of such a map has to be contained in $B_n^m(R)$, and therefore $[\phi] = 0 \in \pi_k(BX_n^m(R), B_n^m(R))$. \square

Remark 4.10. Let $m \geq 1$. Note that $BX_n^m(R)$ is *not* $(n-1)$ -connected in general: If $n = 2$, then the loop given by the three edges $\{\vec{e}_{m+1}, \vec{e}_{m+2}\}$, $\{\vec{e}_{m+2}, \vec{e}_{m+1} + \vec{e}_{m+2}\}$ and $\{\vec{e}_{m+1} + \vec{e}_{m+2}, \vec{e}_{m+1}\}$ is not nullhomotopic in $BX_2^m(R)$. This can be seen as follows. Projecting onto R^2 gives a splitting of the inclusion $B_2(R) \rightarrow BX_2^m(R)$. Thus $\pi_1(B_2(R)) \rightarrow \pi_1(BX_2^m(R))$

is injective. The above loop is clearly nonzero in $\pi_1(B_2(R))$ since $B_2(R)$ is a graph, and hence it is nontrivial in $\pi_1(BX_2^m(R))$ as well.

Lemma 4.11. *Suppose that [Assumption 1.2](#) holds, and let $m \geq 1$. If we view $B_n(R)$ as a subcomplex of $BX_n^m(R)$ via the standard inclusion*

$$R^n \hookrightarrow R^{m+n} = R^m \oplus R^n,$$

then $\pi_k(BX_n^m(R), B_n(R))$ and $H_k(BX_n^m(R), B_n(R))$ are zero for all $k < n$.

Proof. If $n = 0$, both $B_n(R)$ and $BX_n^m(R)$ are empty spaces, and hence the claim holds. If $n = 1$, then $B_1(R)$ is a discrete set, and a proper subset of the vertex set of $BX_1^m(R)$. We need to see that $H_0(BX_1^m(R), B_1(R)) = 0$. Let $\vec{v} = r_1\vec{e}_1 + \dots + r_m\vec{e}_m + r_{m+1}\vec{e}_{m+1}$ be a vertex in $BX_1^m(R)$. Then $\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m, \vec{v}\}$ is a basis of R^{m+1} , and therefore $\vec{v}_i = r_i\vec{e}_i + \dots + r_{m+1}\vec{e}_{m+1}$ is a vertex in $BX_1^m(R)$ for every $1 \leq i \leq m+1$ because $\{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m, \vec{v}_i\}$ is also a basis of R^{m+1} . Note that $\vec{v}_1 = \vec{v}$, and observe that $\vec{v}_{m+1} = r_{m+1}\vec{e}_{m+1}$ has to be a vertex in $B_1(R)$. It follows that every vertex $\vec{v} \in BX_1^m(R)$ can be connected to a vertex of $B_1(R)$ by an edge path consisting of at most m externally additive edges $\{\vec{v}_i, \vec{v}_{i+1}\}$ in $BX_1^m(R)$. Therefore, $\tilde{H}_0(B_1(R)) \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{H}_0(BX_1^m(R))$ is a surjection, and the claim follows from the long exact sequence in homology.

For $n \geq 2$, we know that $B_n(R)$ is path-connected because it is $(n-2)$ -connected and $(n-2) \geq 0$. Furthermore, $BX_n^m(R)$ is path-connected as argued in [Lemma 4.9](#). We will prove that $\pi_k(BX_n^m(R), B_n(R)) = 0$ for $0 < k < n$. Since $B_n(R)$ and $BX_n^m(R)$ are both path-connected, we can then apply the relative Hurewicz theorem to conclude that $H_k(BX_n^m(R), B_n(R)) = 0$ for $k < n$.

Let $0 < k < n$ and consider a simplicial map $\phi : (D^k, S^{k-1}) \rightarrow (BX_n^m(R), B_n(R))$, where D^k is a combinatorial disc (see e.g. [\[Put09, Definition 6.3 and Lemma 6.4\]](#)). By [Lemma 4.9](#), we can assume that $\phi : (D^k, S^{k-1}) \rightarrow (B_n^m(R), B_n(R))$. Since $B_n^m(R)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(n-1)$, it is locally weakly Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(n-1)$ in the sense of [\[GRW18, §2.1\]](#); that is, the link of a p -simplex is isomorphic to $B_{n-(p+1)}^{m+p+1}(R)$ and hence $((n-1) - p - 2)$ -connected. Applying [\[GRW18, Theorem 2.4\]](#) to ϕ , we can assume that every vertex w in the interior of D^k , i.e. $w \notin S^{k-1}$, satisfies

$$\phi(\text{Link}_{D^k}(w)) \subseteq \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\phi(w)).$$

Let $1 \leq i \leq m$. Pick any vertex $w \in D^k$ with $\phi(w) = \vec{z}$ and such that the \vec{e}_i -coordinate r_i of \vec{z} is nonzero. Then \vec{z} is not contained in $B_n(R)$, so w has to be contained in the interior of D^k since ϕ maps the boundary sphere S^{k-1} to $B_n(R)$. We will explain how one can homotope ϕ inside $BX_n^m(R)$ to a simplicial map

$$\phi' : (D^k, S^{k-1}) \rightarrow (B_n^m(R), B_n(R))$$

such that

- the simplicial structure of the domain of ϕ and ϕ' are exactly the same,
- $\phi(v) = \phi'(v)$ for all vertices of D^k except the vertex w ,
- and $\phi'(w) = \vec{z} - r_i\vec{e}_i$. Note that the \vec{e}_i -coordinate of $\vec{z} - r_i\vec{e}_i$ is zero and no other coordinates have been changed.

We start by observing that $\{\vec{z}, \vec{z} - r_i\vec{e}_i\}$ is an externally additive edge in $BX_n^m(R)$. Since the image $\phi(D^k) \subset B_n^m(R)$ of ϕ cannot contain externally additive edges, it follows that $\vec{z} - r_i\vec{e}_i$ is not contained in $\phi(\text{Link}_{D^k}(w))$. Since w is contained in the interior of D^k , the

previous paragraph implies that $\phi(\text{Link}_{D^k}(w)) \subseteq \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\vec{z})$. In particular, $\phi(x) \neq \vec{z}$ if $x \in \text{Link}_{D^k}(w)$. Hence, the following holds for every simplex τ of $\text{Link}_{D^k}(w)$.

- The disjoint union $\phi(\tau) \sqcup \{\vec{z}, \vec{z} - r_i \vec{e}_i\}$ is an externally additive simplex in $\text{BX}_n^m(R)$,
- $\phi(\tau) \sqcup \{\vec{z}\} = \phi(\tau * w)$,
- and $\phi(\tau) \sqcup \{\vec{z} - r_i \vec{e}_i\}$ is a simplex of $B_n^m(R)$.

Since every simplex in $\text{Star}_{D^k}(w) = \text{Link}_{D^k}(w) * w$ is of the form $\tau * w$ for some simplex $\tau \in \text{Link}_{D^k}(w)$, this implies that there exists a simplicial map

$$h : D^k \cup_{\text{Star}_{D^k}(w)} (\text{Star}_{D^k}(w) * w') \rightarrow \text{BX}_n^m(R),$$

where w' is a new vertex, $h(w') = \vec{z} - r_i \vec{e}_i$ and $h|_{D^k} = \phi$. This is the homotopy between ϕ and ϕ' .

Iterating this construction, we see that ϕ is homotopic (relative to the boundary sphere S^k) to a map ϕ^\dagger whose image does not contain vertices \vec{z} with nonzero \vec{e}_i -coordinate. Applying this procedure for every $1 \leq i \leq m$ implies that ϕ is homotopic (relative to the boundary sphere S^k) to a map ϕ^\dagger satisfying $\phi^\dagger(D^k) \subset B_n(R)$. This completes the proof. \square

4.2.4. Surjectivity of the relative apartment class map. Now we are ready to prove [Theorem 4.4](#).

Proof of Theorem 4.4. All homology in this proof is taken with \mathbb{Z} coefficients, but we frequently omit the \mathbb{Z} from the notation for readability. Let $0 \leq j \leq n$ and consider a symbol

$$\Theta = [\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_1 + \alpha_1 \vec{e}_{\beta(1)}] * \cdots * [\vec{v}_j, \vec{v}_j + \alpha_j \vec{e}_{\beta(j)}] \in S_n^m(j).$$

Associated with Θ , we find a simplex $\sigma(\Theta) = \{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_j\} \in B_n^m(R)$ and a Θ -dependent spanning map

$$\text{span}_\Theta : \mathbb{S}^{j-1} * \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n^m(R).$$

Passing to reduced homology and applying the suspension isomorphism j times, we obtain a map

$$f_\Theta : \tilde{H}_{n-1-j}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_n^m(R)).$$

We will prove by induction on j that the map

$$F_j = \oplus_{f_\Theta} : \bigoplus_{S_n^m(j)} \tilde{H}_{n-1-j}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_n^m(R))$$

is a $\text{GL}_n^m(R)$ -equivariant surjection for any $0 \leq j \leq n$. Here, the right $\text{GL}_n^m(R)$ -action on the left-hand-side is described as follows. An element $\phi \in \text{GL}_n^m(R)$ maps a class

$$[c] \in \tilde{H}_{n-1-j}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)))$$

in the summand indexed by $\Theta \in S_n^m(j)$ to the class

$$[c \cdot \phi] \in \tilde{H}_{n-1-j}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta \cdot \phi)))$$

in the summand indexed by $(\Theta \cdot \phi) \in S_n^m(j)$.

For $j = n$, we note that $S_n^m(n) = S_n^m$ and that $\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)) = \emptyset$ for every $\Theta \in S_n^m$. In this case, $\tilde{H}_{-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ for every $\Theta \in S_n^m$ and

$$F = F_n : \mathbb{Z}\{S_n^m\} = \bigoplus_{S_n^m} \mathbb{Z} \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_n^m) = \text{St}_n^m(R)$$

is the map in the statement of the theorem. We will now explain the induction argument.

For the base case, we consider $j = 0$. In this case, $S_n^m(0)$ contains a unique element, the empty symbol Θ , and the Θ -dependent spanning map

$$\text{span}_\Theta : \emptyset * \mathbb{L}\text{ink}_{B_n^m(R)}(\emptyset) = B_n^m(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n^m$$

agrees with the spanning map studied in [Lemma 4.8](#). Therefore, [Lemma 4.8](#) implies that F_0 is an $GL_n^m(R)$ -equivariant surjection.

Suppose the statement holds for $j \geq 0$. If $j \leq n-1$, we will prove the statement for $j+1$.

Consider a symbol $\Theta \in S_n^m(j)$ and consider any decomposition $R^{m+n} = R^m \oplus \langle \sigma(\Theta) \rangle \oplus C_{\sigma(\Theta)}$. Since $j \neq n$, it holds that $C_{\sigma(\Theta)} \neq 0$. By [Assumption 1.2](#), $\tilde{H}_*(B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) \cong \tilde{H}_*(B_{n-j}(R)) = 0$ unless $*$ = $n-j-1$ and $\tilde{H}_*(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \cong \tilde{H}_*(B_{n-j}^{m+j}(R)) = 0$ unless $*$ = $n-j-1$. It follows that the long exact sequence for the pair $(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)}))$ becomes a short exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1-j}(B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) &\rightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1-j}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \\ &\rightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1-j}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, the map

$$\ell_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} : \tilde{H}_{n-1-j}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1-j}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)}))$$

is a surjection.

By [Lemma 4.8](#), it follows that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \\ \Sigma^j \downarrow \cong & & \Sigma^j \downarrow \cong \\ \tilde{H}_{n-1}(\mathbb{S}^{j-1} * B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) & \xrightarrow{\text{incl}_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)}} & \tilde{H}_{n-1}(\mathbb{S}^{j-1} * \mathbb{L}\text{ink}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \\ & \searrow 0 & \downarrow \text{span}_\Theta \\ & & \tilde{H}_{n-1}(\mathbb{T}_n^m(R)). \end{array}$$

Notice that the map f_Θ is the composition of the two rightmost vertical maps in the diagram above. We conclude that for any pair (Θ, C_Θ) the map f_Θ factors over $\tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)}))$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) & \xrightarrow{\ell_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)}} & \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) \\ \downarrow f_\Theta & \swarrow \text{span}_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} & \\ \tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R)) & & \end{array}$$

By [Lemma 4.11](#), we know that

$$\tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(BX_n^{m, \sigma(\Theta)}(R), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) \cong \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(BX_{n-j}^{m+j}(R), B_{n-j}(R)) = 0.$$

Therefore, the long exact sequence of the triple $(BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R), \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)}))$ contains a surjection

$$\partial_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} : \tilde{H}_{n-j}(BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R), \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \twoheadrightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})).$$

Composing $\partial_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)}$ with the map above, we obtain a map

$$g_\Theta = \text{span}_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} \circ \partial_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} : \tilde{H}_{n-j}(BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R), \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R)).$$

We remark that g_Θ agrees with the map

$$\tilde{H}_{n-j}(BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R), \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \xrightarrow{\partial} \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \xrightarrow{f_\Theta} \tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R)),$$

since by definition $\partial_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} = \ell_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} \circ \partial$ where ∂ is the boundary map for the pair $(BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R), \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)))$. In particular, g_Θ does not depend on the choice of complement $C_{\sigma(\Theta)}$; we only introduced this factorization to check surjectivity in the next step.

If we perform the above construction for every $\Theta \in S_n^m(j)$, we arrive at a map

$$G_{j+1} = \oplus g_\Theta : \bigoplus_{S_n^m(j)} \tilde{H}_{n-j}(BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R), \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R)).$$

We will show that G_{j+1} is surjective. Then we will relate this map to F_{j+1} and use its surjectivity to show that F_{j+1} is surjective as well.

Let us first verify that G_{j+1} is surjective. By the definition of G_{j+1} , there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus_{S_n^m(j)} \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) & \xrightarrow{\oplus \ell_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)}} & \bigoplus_{S_n^m(j)} \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) \\ \downarrow F_j = \oplus f_\Theta & \swarrow \oplus \text{span}_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} & \\ \tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R)) & & \end{array}$$

By the induction hypothesis, the leftmost arrow in this diagram, F_j , is surjective. Therefore, the map

$$\oplus \text{span}_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} : \bigoplus_{S_n^m(j)} \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R))$$

is surjective. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \oplus \partial_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} : \bigoplus_{S_n^m(j)} \tilde{H}_{n-j}(BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R), \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) &\twoheadrightarrow \\ &\bigoplus_{S_n^m(j)} \tilde{H}_{n-1-j}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) \end{aligned}$$

is surjective as well because each of the functions $\partial_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)}$ is surjective. It follows that

$$G_{j+1} = \oplus g_\Theta = \oplus (\text{span}_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} \circ \partial_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)}) = (\oplus \text{span}_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)}) \circ (\oplus \partial_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)})$$

is surjective as a composition of two surjections.

We will now explain how G_{j+1} can be related to F_{j+1} . For this we will decompose the domain of G_{j+1} . The definition of $BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{H}_{n-j}(BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R), \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \\ &= \bigoplus_{\substack{\tau=\{\vec{v}, \vec{v}+r\vec{e}\}, \\ \vec{v} \in \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)) \text{ and } r \neq 0, \\ \vec{e} \in \{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m\} \cup \sigma(\Theta)}} \tilde{H}_{n-j}(\text{Star}_{BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)}(\tau), \text{Star}_{BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)}(\tau) \cap \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have the following four identifications

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{H}_{n-j}(\text{Star}_{BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)}(\tau), \text{Star}_{BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)}(\tau) \cap \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \\ (1) \quad & \cong \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Star}_{BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)}(\tau) \cap \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \\ (2) \quad & \cong \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\partial(\tau) * \text{Link}_{BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)}(\tau)) \\ (3) \quad & \cong \tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\text{Link}_{BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)}(\tau)) \\ (4) \quad & \cong \tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)) * \{\vec{v}\}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{H}_{n-j}(BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R), \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \\ & \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{\tau=\{\vec{v}, \vec{v}+r\vec{e}\}, \\ \vec{v} \in \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)) \text{ and } r \neq 0, \\ \vec{e} \in \{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m\} \cup \sigma(\Theta)}} \tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)) * \{\vec{v}\}) \end{aligned}$$

if $n-j-1 \geq 0$. Hence, G_{j+1} can be identified with a surjection

$$\bigoplus_{S_n^m(j)} \bigoplus_{\substack{\tau=\{\vec{v}, \vec{v}+r\vec{e}\}, \\ \vec{v} \in \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)) \text{ and } r \neq 0, \\ \vec{e} \in \{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m\} \cup \sigma(\Theta)}} \tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)) * \{\vec{v}\}) \rightarrow \tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R)).$$

Consider the following symbol $\Theta^\dagger \in S_n^m(j+1)$,

$$\Theta^\dagger = [\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_1 + r_1 \vec{e}_{\beta(1)}] * \dots * [\vec{v}_j, \vec{v}_j + r_j \vec{e}_{\beta(j)}] * [\vec{v}_{j+1}, \vec{v}_{j+1} + r_{j+1} \vec{e}_{\beta(j+1)}].$$

Forgetting the last pair $[\vec{v}_{j+1}, \vec{v}_{j+1} + r_{j+1} \vec{e}_{\beta(j+1)}]$ in Θ^\dagger , we obtain a symbol

$$\Theta = [\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_1 + r_1 \vec{e}_{\beta(1)}] * \dots * [\vec{v}_j, \vec{v}_j + r_j \vec{e}_{\beta(j)}] \in S_n^m(j).$$

Forgetting the order of the pair $[\vec{v}_{j+1}, \vec{v}_{j+1} + r_{j+1} \vec{e}_{\beta(j+1)}]$, we obtain an externally additive edge $\tau = \{\vec{v}_{j+1}, \vec{v}_{j+1} + r_{j+1} \vec{e}_{\beta(j+1)}\}$ in $BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)$. Noting that $\sigma(\Theta^\dagger) = \sigma(\Theta) * \{\vec{v}_{j+1}\}$, we obtain a forgetful surjection

$$\begin{aligned} U_{j+1} : \bigoplus_{S_n^m(j+1)} \tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta^\dagger))) & \rightarrow \\ & \bigoplus_{S_n^m(j)} \bigoplus_{\substack{\tau=\{\vec{v}, \vec{v}+r\vec{e}\}, \\ \vec{v} \in \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)) \text{ and } r \neq 0, \\ \vec{e} \in \{\vec{e}_1, \dots, \vec{e}_m\} \cup \sigma(\Theta)}} \tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)) * \{\vec{v}\}). \end{aligned}$$

We claim that

$$G_{j+1} \circ U_{j+1} = F_{j+1}.$$

Once this is checked, the induction step and the proof of the theorem are complete.

To see that this equality holds, we consider the summand $\tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta^\dagger)))$ indexed by $\Theta^\dagger \in S_n^m(j+1)$ of the domain of F_{j+1} and verify that the restriction of $G_{j+1} \circ U_{j+1}$ to it is equal to the function f_{Θ^\dagger} . Since $F_{j+1} = \bigoplus_{\Theta^\dagger \in S_n^m(j+1)} f_{\Theta^\dagger}$, the claim then follows.

Applying the definition of U_{j+1} , we forget the last pair in the symbol Θ^\dagger to obtain the symbol $\Theta \in S_n^m(j)$ and the externally additive edge $\tau = \{\vec{v}_{j+1}, \vec{v}_{j+1} + r_{j+1}\vec{e}_{\beta(j+1)}\}$ in $BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)$. The map f_{Θ^\dagger} was obtained from the Θ^\dagger -dependent spanning map

$$\text{span}_{\Theta^\dagger} : \mathbb{S}^j * \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta^\dagger)) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n^m(R)$$

and $(j+1)$ -many suspension isomorphisms. The last one of the 0-spheres in the join $\mathbb{S}^j = \mathbb{S}^0 * \dots * \mathbb{S}^0$ is mapped to the pair $\{\langle \vec{v}_{j+1} \rangle, \langle \vec{v}_{j+1} + r_{j+1}\vec{e}_{\beta(j+1)} \rangle\}$ in $\mathbb{T}_n^m(R)$. Hence, we can relate f_{Θ^\dagger} to f_Θ by writing f_{Θ^\dagger} as the following composition:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta^\dagger))) & & \\ \cong \downarrow \Sigma_{\partial\tau} & \searrow f_{\Theta^\dagger} & \\ \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\partial(\tau) * \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta^\dagger))) & & \\ \downarrow \text{inclusion} & & \\ \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) & \xrightarrow{f_\Theta} & \tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R)) \end{array}$$

Using the identifications in [Equations \(1 – 4\)](#), that $\sigma(\Theta^\dagger) = \sigma(\Theta) \cup \{\vec{v}_{j+1}\}$ and abbreviating $\text{Star}_{BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)}(\tau)$ as $\text{Star}(\tau)$, we also find at the following commutative diagram which contains the above factorization of f_{Θ^\dagger} as the left vertical composition.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta^\dagger))) & \xlongequal{U_{j+1}} & \tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta) \cup \{\vec{v}_{j+1}\})) \\ \cong \downarrow \Sigma_{\partial\tau} & & \cong \downarrow \text{Equations (3) and (4)} \\ \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\partial(\tau) * \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta^\dagger))) & \xrightarrow[\text{Equation (4)}]{\cong} & \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\partial(\tau) * \text{Link}_{BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R)}(\tau)) \\ \downarrow \text{inclusion} & & \downarrow \text{inclusion, } \cong \text{Equation (2)} \\ \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) & \xleftarrow[\text{inclusion}]{} & \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Star}(\tau) \cap \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) \\ & \searrow \text{connecting map, } \cong \text{Equation (1)} & \\ & \tilde{H}_{n-j}(\text{Star}(\tau), \text{Star}(\tau) \cap \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) & \\ & \downarrow \text{inclusion} & \\ & \tilde{H}_{n-j}(BX_n^{m,\sigma(\Theta)}(R), \text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta))) & \\ & \downarrow \partial_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} & \\ & \tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)})) & \\ & \downarrow \text{span}_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)} & \\ & \tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R)) & \end{array}$$

Additional maps in the diagram include:

- A curved arrow from $\tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)))$ to $\tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R))$ labeled f_Θ .
- A curved arrow from $\tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)))$ to $\tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)}))$ labeled $\ell_{(\Theta, C_\Theta)}$.
- A curved arrow from $\tilde{H}_{n-j-1}(\text{Link}_{B_n^m(R)}(\sigma(\Theta)), B(C_{\sigma(\Theta)}))$ to $\tilde{H}_{n-1}(T_n^m(R))$ labeled g_Θ .

Note that on the right vertical composition of this diagram is exactly the definition of $G_{j+1} \circ U_{j+1}$ on the summand $\tilde{H}_{n-j-2}(\mathrm{Link}_{\mathrm{BGL}_n(R)}(\sigma(\Theta^\dagger)))$. Hence the claim follows. \square

5. SLOPE-1 HOMOLOGICAL STABILITY

In this section, we describe how the slope-1 homological stability result, [Theorem 1.3](#), follows from [Corollary 4.2](#) and [Corollary 4.5](#). This section of the paper is very similar to parts of [\[GKRW18\]](#), relies on the E_k -cellular approach to homological stability develop in [\[GKRW21\]](#) and is almost identical to parts of [\[KMP22\]](#). Because we do not assume that R is a principle ideal domain as in the setting of [\[KMP22\]](#), we include the details of technical arguments in the [Appendix A](#) to show how their work carries over to our setting (i.e. using [Assumption 1.2](#) only). We refer the reader to [\[KM18; GKRW21; GKRW18; GKRW19; GKRW20; KMP22\]](#) for the required background on E_k -cells.

5.1. E_1 -homology and the Charney module. Suppose that R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#). Let $\mathrm{GL}(R)$ denote the groupoid with set of objects given by the natural numbers \mathbb{N} and automorphisms of n given by $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$. The block sum operation \oplus and the swap automorphisms $R^m \oplus R^n \rightarrow R^n \oplus R^m$ yield a symmetric monoidal structure $(\mathrm{GL}(R), \oplus, 0)$, with the property that $r : \mathrm{GL}(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{N} : n \mapsto n$ is a symmetric monoidal functor and $r^{-1}(0) = 0$. We are hence exactly in the setting of [\[GKRW21, Section 17.1\]](#). Furthermore, $\mathrm{GL}_0(R)$ is the trivial group and the block sum map $-\oplus- : \mathrm{GL}_m(R) \times \mathrm{GL}_n(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_{m+n}(R)$ is injective, so [\[GKRW21, Assumption 17.1 and 17.2\]](#) hold. It follows from [\[GKRW21, Corollary 17.5, Lemma 17.10 and Remark 17.11\]](#) and [Lemma A.13](#) that the E_1 -homology of the E_∞ -algebra $\mathrm{BGL}(R) = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathrm{BGL}_n(R)$ can be interpreted in terms of the equivariant homology of the following version of a splitting complex first studied by Charney [\[Cha80\]](#).

Definition 5.1. Let $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ denote the poset whose elements are pairs of nonzero free submodules (P, Q) with $P \oplus Q = R^n$, where $(P, Q) \leq (P', Q')$ if $P \subseteq P'$ and $Q' \subseteq Q$. Let $S_n^{E_1}(R)$ denote the geometric realization of $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$.

Charney considered a slight variant of this complex for general Dedekind domains, where the assumption that P and Q are free is not included, and proved that these complexes are spherical [\[Cha80, Theorem 1.1\]](#). In this case, their equivariant homology measures the E_1 -homology of an E_∞ -algebra built out of automorphisms of (not necessarily free) projective modules.

Note that $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ is $(n-2)$ -dimensional if [Assumption 1.2](#) holds, and that for principal ideal domains R the complex in [Definition 5.1](#) agrees with Charney's [\[Cha80\]](#). This leads us to the following definition.

Definition 5.2. Let R be a ring such that $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ is $(n-2)$ -spherical. Then the *Charney module* of R^n is the right $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ -module $\mathrm{Ch}_n(R) := \tilde{H}_{n-2}(S_n^{E_1}(R); \mathbb{Z})$.

Remark 5.3. The Charney module in [Definition 5.2](#) is an example of an E_1 -Steinberg module as introduced in [\[GKRW21, Definition 17.6\]](#), compare with [Lemma A.13](#). For this reason, it is frequently referred to as the E_1 -Steinberg module or split Steinberg module of the E_∞ -algebra $\mathrm{BGL}(R)$ in the literature [\[GKRW21; GKRW18; GKRW20; KMP22\]](#).

The first part of the next proposition extends Charney's connectivity theorem [\[Cha80, Theorem 1.1\]](#) to our setting. The second part is a vanishing result for the coinvariants of the Charney modules and is obtained using [Corollary 4.2](#) and [Corollary 4.5](#). These two results constitute the computational input required by the E_k -cellular approach to homological stability to prove our slope-1 homological stability theorem.

Proposition 5.4. *If R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#), then $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ is $(n - 2)$ -spherical for all $n \geq 0$. Moreover, if $n \geq 2$, then $(\text{Ch}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\text{GL}_n(R)} \cong 0$ for every commutative ring \mathbb{k} in which $2 \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ is a unit.*

Proof. [\[KMP22, Theorem 4.8\]](#) proves this claim if R is Euclidean and under different connectivity assumptions. However, their argument remains valid if R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#). This uses the fact that R^{op} also satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#) by the virtue of [Theorem 2.11](#), as well as the results established in [Lemma 3.10](#), [Corollary 4.2](#) and [Corollary 4.5](#). To make this article self-contained, we explain how one can adapt their argument to our setting in [Appendix A.4](#). \square

5.2. Proof of the stability theorem. We are now ready to prove [Theorem 1.3](#).

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Let $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ denote the positive integers. The framework of [\[GKRW21, Section 17.1\]](#) and the discussion in [\[GKRW21, Section 18.1\]](#) gives a functorially defined $\mathbb{N}_{>0}$ -graded non-unital E_∞ -algebra $\mathbf{R}_\mathbb{k}$ in the category of simplicial \mathbb{k} -modules with $H_{n,i}(\mathbf{R}_\mathbb{k}) = H_i(\text{GL}_n(R); \mathbb{k})$. Here $H_{n,i}$ means homology in homological degree i and grading n . Using that $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ is $(n - 2)$ -spherical by the first part of [Proposition 5.4](#), it follows from [\[GKRW21, Lemma 18.2, Corollary 17.5, Lemma 17.10, and Remark 17.11\]](#) and [Lemma A.13](#) that the derived E_1 -indecomposables of $\mathbf{R}_\mathbb{k}$ can be identified with the homology of the general linear groups with coefficients in the Charney modules (see also [\[KMP22, Proposition 2.3\]](#)),

$$H_{n,i}^{E_1}(\mathbf{R}_\mathbb{k}) \cong H_{i-n+1}(\text{GL}_n(R); \text{Ch}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{k}).$$

In particular, $H_{n,i}^{E_1}(\mathbf{R}_\mathbb{k}) \cong 0$ for $i \leq n - 2$ for degree reasons. Invoking the second part of [Proposition 5.4](#) and using the assumption that $2 \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ is a unit, it follows that $H_0(\text{GL}_n(R); \text{Ch}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{k}) \cong 0$ if $n \geq 2$. Thus, $H_{n,n-1}^{E_1}(\mathbf{R}_\mathbb{k}) \cong 0$ for $n \geq 2$. Therefore [\[KMP22, Proposition 5.1\]](#) implies [Theorem 1.3](#): the conclusion of [\[KMP22, Proposition 5.1\]](#) concerns the vanishing of the homology of a simplicial \mathbb{k} -module $\overline{\mathbf{R}}_\mathbb{k}/\sigma$ and, by definition, $H_{n,i}(\overline{\mathbf{R}}_\mathbb{k}/\sigma) = H_i(\text{GL}_n(R), \text{GL}_{n-1}(R); \mathbb{k})$. The vanishing of these relative homology groups is equivalent to the homological stability result claimed in [Theorem 1.3](#). \square

APPENDIX A. ADDITIONAL DETAILS

A.1. (Relative) Tits complexes. In this section we verify the identifications used in arguments involving the Tits complexes associated to R , [Definition 3.1](#). These are simple adaptations of well-known results to our setting.

Lemma A.1. *Let R satisfy [Assumption 1.2](#) and $V, V' \in \mathbb{T}_n(R)$ such that $V \subsetneq V'$. Then*

- (1) $\mathbb{T}_n(R)_{>V} \cong \mathbb{T}(R^n/V) \cong \mathbb{T}_{n-\text{rank}(V)}(R)$;
- (2) $\mathbb{T}_n(R)_{<V} = \mathbb{T}(V) \cong \mathbb{T}_{\text{rank}(V)}(R)$;
- (3) $\mathbb{T}_n(R)_{(V,V')} = \mathbb{T}(V')_{>V} \cong \mathbb{T}_{\text{rank}(V')-\text{rank}(V)}(R)$.

Proof. For [Item 1](#), we will check that $\mathbb{T}_n(R)_{>V} \cong \mathbb{T}(R^n/V)$. Then [Lemma 2.7](#) implies that R^n/V is free of rank $(n - \text{rank}(V))$ and hence it follows that $\mathbb{T}(R^n/V) \cong \mathbb{T}_{n-\text{rank}(V)}(R)$. We claim that

$$\mathbb{T}_n(R)_{>V} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(R^n/V) : U \mapsto U/V \text{ and } \mathbb{T}(R^n/V) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n(R)_{>V} : W \mapsto q_V^{-1}(W)$$

are inverse poset maps, where $q_V : R^n \rightarrow R^n/V$ denotes the projection map. The first map is well-defined: If $R^n = U \oplus C'$, then $R^n/V \cong (C' \oplus U)/V \cong C' \oplus U/V$, and it follows from [Lemma 2.7](#) that U/V is a free summand of R^n/V . The first map is order-preserving:

If $U \subseteq U'$, then $U/V \subseteq U'/V$. The second map is well-defined: If $R^n/V = W \oplus D$, then Lemma 2.7 implies that $0 \rightarrow q_V^{-1}(W) \rightarrow R^n \rightarrow D \rightarrow 0$ is split and that $q_V^{-1}(W)$ is a free summand of R^n . The second map is order-preserving: If $W \subseteq W'$, then $q_V^{-1}(W) \subseteq q_V^{-1}(W')$. It's easy to check that these two maps are inverses of each other. The first equality in Item 2 follows from Lemma 2.8, the second identification is immediate. Item 3 follows from Item 1 and Item 2. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let R satisfy Assumption 1.2, $m > 0$ and $V \in \mathbb{T}_n^m(R)$. Then*

- (1) $\mathbb{T}_n^m(R)_{>V} \cong \mathbb{T}(R^{n+m}/V, R^m) \cong \mathbb{T}_{n-\mathrm{rank}(V)}^m(R)$;
- (2) $\mathbb{T}_n^m(R)_{<V} = \mathbb{T}(V) \cong \mathbb{T}_{\mathrm{rank}(V)}(R)$.

Proof. The first identification in Item 1, $\mathbb{T}_n^m(R)_{>V} \cong \mathbb{T}(R^{n+m}/V, R^m)$, is obtained by restriction from the poset isomorphism $\mathbb{T}_{m+n}(R)_{>V} \cong \mathbb{T}(R^{m+n}/V)$ constructed for Item 1 of Lemma A.1. For the second isomorphism we consider a complement L of R^m in R^{m+n} such that $V \subseteq L$. Then L is free by Lemma 2.7, $L = V \oplus C$ by Lemma 2.8 and we obtain a decomposition $V \oplus C \oplus R^m = R^{m+n}$, where C is free of rank $(n - \mathrm{rank}(V))$ by Lemma 2.7. Hence, $R^{m+n}/V = (V \oplus C \oplus R^m)/V \cong V/V \oplus C \oplus R^m \cong C \oplus R^m$ is free of rank $(n - \mathrm{rank}(V) + m)$ and therefore $\mathbb{T}(R^{n+m}/V, R^m) \cong \mathbb{T}_{n-\mathrm{rank}(V)}^m(R)$. The first equality in Item 2 follows from Lemma 2.8, and the second identification is immediate.

For Item 2, the equality $\mathbb{T}_n^m(R)_{<V} = \mathbb{T}(V)$, and hence the claim, follows by restriction from the equality $\mathbb{T}_{m+n}(R)_{<V} = \mathbb{T}(V)$ proved in Item 2 of Lemma A.1. \square

A.2. The complex of partial bases of the opposite ring. In this part of the appendix, we complete the proof of Theorem 2.11 claiming that R^{op} satisfies Assumption 1.2 if R does. For the first two items of Assumption 1.2 this is contained in the literature, as explained in Lemma 2.10. Our contribution is to show that R^{op} also satisfies Item 3 of Assumption 1.2, i.e. that $B_n(R^{op})$ is Cohen–Macaulay. To see this, we will adapt an argument due to Sadofschì Costa [SC20] to our setting.

We start with several preliminary observations; the first one shows how the Tits complexes and Steinberg modules of R and R^{op} are related.

Lemma A.3. *Let R be a ring satisfying Assumption 1.2 and let M be a free R -module of rank n . Let $M^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, R)$ be its dual R^{op} -module, which is free of rank n . There is an isomorphism of posets of Tits complexes*

$$\mathbb{T}(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)^{op} : V \mapsto V^\circ$$

mapping a summand V to the summand $V^\circ = \{f \in M^\vee : f|_V = 0\}$. This isomorphism is compatible with the action of $\mathrm{GL}(M)$ and $\mathrm{GL}(M^\vee)$ on the domain and codomain if these two groups are identified using the inverse-transpose isomorphism in Lemma 2.12.

Proof. We first check that the map $\mathbb{T}(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)^{op} : V \mapsto V^\circ$ is well-defined: Let $V \in \mathbb{T}(M)$. Then restricting R -linear functions to the summand V yields a surjection $M^\vee \twoheadrightarrow V^\vee$, whose kernel is V° . Since V^\vee is a free R^{op} -module of rank $\mathrm{rank}(V)$ and since R^{op} is Hermite by Lemma 2.10, it follows that V° is a free summand of rank $(n - \mathrm{rank}(V))$. If $V_1 \subseteq V_2$, then it obviously holds $V_2^\circ \subseteq V_1^\circ$. The map is hence a well-defined poset map.

The canonical isomorphism $M \cong (M^\vee)^\vee$ (see e.g. [Bly90, Theorem 9.2]) induces a poset isomorphism $\mathbb{T}(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}((M^\vee)^\vee)$ identifying V and $(V^\circ)^\circ$. Since this isomorphism factors through $\mathbb{T}(M^\vee)^{op}$, the poset map $V \mapsto V^\circ$ is injective. Using the canonical isomorphism $M^\vee \cong ((M^\vee)^\vee)^\vee$ one can similarly check that the poset map is surjective. To conclude that the map is an isomorphism of posets, we are left with checking that $V_1 \subseteq V_2$

if $V_2^\circ \subseteq V_1^\circ$: Let $\vec{v} \in V_1$. Then $f(\vec{v}) = 0$ for all $f \in V_2^\circ \subseteq V_1^\circ$. Hence $\text{ev}_{\vec{v}}(f) = 0$ for all $f \in V_2^\circ$, which means that $\text{ev}_{\vec{v}} \in (V_2^\circ)^\circ$. Now the canonical isomorphism implies that $\vec{v} \in V_2$. It follows that the map is a poset isomorphism as claimed.

Finally, we check the compatibility with the group actions, i.e. $(V \cdot \phi)^\circ = (V^\circ) \cdot (\phi^{-1})^*$ for $V \in \mathbb{T}(M)$ and $\phi \in \text{GL}(M)$. To see this, we note that $f_0 \in (V^\circ) \cdot (\phi^{-1})^*$ if and only if $f_0 = f_1 \circ \phi^{-1}$ for $f_1 \in V^\circ$; if and only if $f_0 \circ \phi \in V^\circ$; if and only if $f_0(\phi(\vec{v})) = 0$ for $\vec{v} \in V$; if and only if $f_0 \in (V \cdot \phi)^\circ$. \square

Corollary A.4. *Let R be a ring satisfying [Assumption 1.2](#), let M be a finite rank R -module and consider its dual R^{op} -module M^\vee . Then $T(M^\vee)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(n - 2)$ and the apartment class map $[-] : \mathbb{Z}[\text{GL}(M^\vee)] \rightarrow \text{St}(M^\vee)$ is an equivariant surjection.*

Proof. The claim follows from [Lemma 2.12](#), [Lemma 3.10](#), [Theorem 4.1](#), [Lemma A.3](#) and the resulting commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{Z}[\text{GL}(M)] & \xrightarrow[\cong]{((-1)^{-1})^*} & \mathbb{Z}[\text{GL}(M^\vee)] \\ \downarrow [-] & & \downarrow [-] \\ \text{St}(M) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{(-)_*^\circ} & \text{St}(M^\vee) \end{array}$$

\square

We now start working towards establishing a relation between the complexes of partial bases of R and R^{op} . [Lemma A.3](#) shows that we can compare summands of a free R -module M to summands of the R^{op} -module M^\vee , even though it is not clear how unimodular vectors in the former can be related to unimodular vectors in the latter. The idea is therefore to pass to certain simplicial complexes, which are built out of summands but “remember” the homotopy type of the complex of partial bases. This is the role of the following two complexes.

Definition A.5. Let M be a free R -module of finite rank n . A *frame* in M is a set $\{L_1, \dots, L_n\}$ of rank-1 summands in M such that there exists a basis $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_n\}$ of M with $L_i = \langle \vec{v}_i \rangle$. We denote by $F(M)$ the complex of partial frames, whose k -simplices are size- $(k + 1)$ subsets of frames. We write $F_n(R)$ for $F(R^n)$. A *co-frame* in M is a set $\{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$ of rank- $(n - 1)$ summands in M with the property that there exists a basis $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ of M such $C_i = \langle \vec{v}_j : j \neq i \rangle$. We denote by $\text{coF}(M)$ the complex of partial co-frames, whose k -simplices are size- $(k + 1)$ subsets of co-frames. We write $\text{coF}_n(R) = \text{coF}(R^n)$.

Complexes of frames related to those in [Definition A.5](#) have previously been considered, see e.g. [\[CFP19\]](#) and [\[KMP22\]](#). The complex of co-frames $\text{coF}_n(R)$ can be seen as an analogue of the simplicial complex Y_H defined and studied by Hatcher–Vogtmann in the context of free groups, see [\[HV98, Remark after Corollary 3.4 and Theorem 2.4\]](#). Hatcher–Vogtmann’s complex plays a key role in Sadofschi Costa’s work [\[SC20\]](#).

In the next few lemmas, we make precise in which sense these complexes “remember” the homotopy type of the complex of partial bases. An important tool for this is Hatcher–Wahl’s notion of a complete join complex, see [\[HW10, Definition 3.2 and Example 3.3\]](#).

Lemma A.6. *Let Y be a complete join complex over a simplicial complex X of dimension d . Then Y is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension d if and only if X is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension d .*

Proof. Hatcher–Wahl show that Y is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension d if X is, see [HW10, Proposition 3.5]. Assume that Y is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension d and consider the natural “forgetting labels” map $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$. Since Y is a complete join complex over X , we must have $\dim(X) = d$. Picking a preimage $s(x) \in \pi^{-1}(x)$ for every vertex x of X yields a simplicial map $s : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $\pi \circ s = \mathrm{id}_X$, i.e. it exhibits X as a retract of Y . It follows that X is $(d-1)$ -connected. Let Δ be any simplex in X and let Δ' be a simplex of Y of dimension $\dim(\Delta)$ such that $\pi(\Delta') = \Delta$ (for example, $\Delta' = s(\Delta)$). Then $\mathrm{Link}_Y(\Delta')$ is a complete join complex over $\mathrm{Link}_X(\Delta)$, see e.g. the last paragraph of the proof of [HW10, Proposition 3.5]. In particular, $\mathrm{Link}_X(\Delta)$ is of dimension $(d - \dim(\Delta) - 1)$. By assumption $\mathrm{Link}_Y(\Delta')$ is $(d - \dim(\Delta') - 2)$ -connected, and since $\mathrm{Link}_X(\Delta)$ is a retract of this space it has to be $(d - \dim(\Delta) - 2)$ -connected. \square

Corollary A.7. *If R satisfies Item 1 and Item 2 of Assumption 1.2, then $B_n(R)$ is a complete join complex over $F_n(R)$. In particular, R satisfies Item 3 of Assumption 1.2 if and only if for all $n \geq 0$ the complex of frames $F_n(R)$ is Cohen–Macaulay.*

Proof. The map $B_n(R) \rightarrow F_n(R)$ that sends a partial basis $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_k\}$ to the partial frame $\{\langle \vec{v}_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \vec{v}_k \rangle\}$ exhibits $B_n(R)$ as a complete join complex on $F_n(R)$. Indeed, in the language of [HW10, Example 3.3], the set of labels of a vertex $L \in F_n(R)$ is exactly the set of unimodular vectors contained in L . The claim then follows from Lemma A.6. \square

We also record the following simple observation, which is frequently used in subsequent induction arguments.

Corollary A.8. *Let $m \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$ and view R^n as a summand in $R^{m+n} = R^m \oplus R^n$. If R satisfies Item 1 and Item 2 of Assumption 1.2, then $B_n^m(R)$ is a complete join complex over $B_n(R)$. In particular, $B_n^m(R)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(n-1)$ for all $m \geq 0$ if and only if $B_n(R)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(n-1)$.*

Proof. If $\vec{v} \in R^{m+n}$, we denote by $\vec{v}' = \vec{v} - (\sum_{i=1}^m a_i \vec{e}_i)$ the vector obtained by setting the first m coordinates (a_1, \dots, a_m) of \vec{v} to zero. The map $B_n^m(R) \rightarrow B_n(R)$ that sends a partial basis $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_k\}$ to the partial basis $\{\vec{v}'_1, \dots, \vec{v}'_k\}$ exhibits $B_n^m(R)$ as a complete join complex on $B_n(R)$. Indeed, in the language of [HW10, Example 3.3], the set of labels of a vertex $\vec{v}' \in B_n(R)$ is exactly the set of vectors $\{\vec{v}' + (\sum_{i=1}^m a_i \vec{e}_i) : a_i \in R\}$ whose last n coordinates agree with those of \vec{v}' . The claim then follows from Lemma A.6. \square

In the next step, we relate the frame complexes of R to the co-frame complexes of R^{op} .

Lemma A.9. *Let R be a ring satisfying Assumption 1.2 and let M be a free R -module of rank n . Let $M^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, R)$ be its dual R^{op} -module, which is free of rank n . The following map is a simplicial isomorphism:*

$$(-)^\circ : F(M) \rightarrow \mathrm{coF}(M^\vee) : \{L_1, \dots, L_k\} \mapsto \{L_1^\circ, \dots, L_k^\circ\},$$

where L_i° is the R^{op} -module of R -linear functions $f : M \rightarrow R$ with $f|_{L_i} = 0$. In particular, $\mathrm{coF}(M^\vee)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(n-1)$.

Proof. The map is well-defined: If $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_k\}$ is a partial basis such that $L_i = \langle \vec{v}_i \rangle$, we can extend it to a basis $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_n\}$ and can consider the dual basis $\{\vec{v}_1^*, \dots, \vec{v}_n^*\}$ of M^\vee . It then holds that $\vec{v}_j^* \in L_i^\circ$ if and only if $j \neq i$. Since $\mathrm{rank} L_i^\circ = n-1$ and R^{op} satisfies Property III, it follows that $L_i^\circ = \langle \vec{v}_j^* : j \neq i \rangle$ and hence that $\{L_1^\circ, \dots, L_k^\circ\}$ is indeed a simplex in $\mathrm{coF}(M^\vee)$. The canonical isomorphism $M \cong (M^\vee)^\vee$ (see e.g. [Bly90, Theorem 9.2]) identifies $L_i \cong (L_i^\circ)^\circ$ and induces a simplicial isomorphism $F(M) \cong F((M^\vee)^\vee)$. Since

this isomorphism factors through $\text{coF}(M^\vee)$, it follows that the map is injective. Similarly, one can use the canonical isomorphism $M^\vee \cong ((M^\vee)^\vee)^\vee$ to check that the map is surjective. To conclude that the map is a simplicial isomorphism, we need to see that $\{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ is a simplex in $\text{F}(M)$ if $\{L_1^\circ, \dots, L_k^\circ\}$ is a simplex in $\text{coF}(M^\vee)$. This holds because any basis witnessing that $\{L_1^\circ, \dots, L_k^\circ\}$ is a simplex in $\text{coF}(M^\vee)$ is the dual basis $\{\vec{v}_1^*, \dots, \vec{v}_n^*\}$ of some basis $\{\vec{v}_1, \dots, \vec{v}_n\}$ of M (see e.g. [Lemma 2.12](#)). If $L_i^\circ = \langle \vec{v}_j^* : j \neq i \rangle$, then it holds that $f(\vec{v}_i) = 0$ for every $f \in L_i^\circ$. Therefore $\vec{v}_i \in L_i$, hence $L_i = \langle \vec{v}_i \rangle$ and $\{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ is a simplex in $\text{F}(M)$. This completes the proof. \square

Let R be a ring satisfying [Assumption 1.2](#) and M be a free R -module of rank n . We note that there are two interesting poset maps: The first one is a spanning map for frames,

$$\text{span} : \mathbb{F}(M)^{(n-2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(M) : \{L_1, \dots, L_k\} \mapsto \bigoplus_1^k L_i,$$

which is $(n-2)$ -connected by exactly the same argument as in [Lemma 3.10](#) using [Corollary A.7](#). The second one is a co-spanning map for co-frames,

$$\text{cospan} : \text{coF}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)^{op} : \{C_1, \dots, C_k\} \mapsto \bigcap_1^k C_i.$$

Note that this map is well-defined: If $\{\vec{v}_1^*, \dots, \vec{v}_n^*\}$ is a basis of M^\vee such that $C_i = \langle \vec{v}_j^* : j \neq i \rangle$, then it holds that $\bigcap_1^k C_i = \langle \vec{v}_j^* : j \notin \{1, \dots, k\} \rangle$ is a free summand of rank $n-k$ with complement $\langle \vec{v}_j^* : 1 \leq j \leq k \rangle$. The next lemma relates these two maps.

Lemma A.10. *Let R be a ring satisfying [Assumption 1.2](#) and let M be a free R module of rank n . Then the spanning and co-spanning map fit into a commutative diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{F}(M)^{(n-2)} & \xrightarrow[\cong]{(-)^\circ} & \text{coF}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)} \\ \downarrow \text{span} & & \downarrow \text{cospan} \\ \mathbb{T}(M) & \xrightarrow[\cong]{(-)^\circ} & \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)^{op} \end{array}$$

In particular, the map cospan is $(n-2)$ -connected.

Proof. We only need to check that the diagram commutes. Consider a simplex $\{L_i\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}}$ in $\mathbb{F}(M)^{(n-2)}$. There is a basis $\{\vec{v}_i\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ of M such that $L_i = \langle \vec{v}_i \rangle$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and we write $\{\vec{v}_i^*\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}}$ for its dual basis of M^\vee . It follows that $\text{span}(\{L_i\}) = \langle \vec{v}_i : 1 \leq i \leq k \rangle$, and therefore that $\text{span}(\{L_i\})^\circ = \langle \vec{v}_i^* : i \notin \{1, \dots, k\} \rangle$. On the other hand, $(\{L_i\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}})^\circ = \{L_i^\circ\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}}$ with $L_i^\circ = \langle \vec{v}_j^* : j \neq i \rangle$, hence $\text{cospan}(\{L_i^\circ\}_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}}) = \bigcap_{i \in \{1, \dots, k\}} L_i^\circ = \langle \vec{v}_i^* : i \notin \{1, \dots, k\} \rangle$ as well. Since the diagram commutes, and claim about cospan follows from [Lemma A.3](#) and [Lemma A.9](#). \square

Following [\[SC20\]](#), we will now use the co-spanning map to study the connectivity of $B(M^\vee)$ if M^\vee has small rank. These base cases require extra care, and are used in a subsequent induction argument to establish 1-connectedness. They are discussed in the next lemma, the proof of which is analogous to the argument for [\[SC20, Proposition 5.9\]](#).

Lemma A.11. *Let R be a ring satisfying [Assumption 1.2](#), let M be a free R -module of rank n and consider its dual R^{op} -module M^\vee . Then $B(M^\vee)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(n-1)$ if $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.*

Proof. For the first part: $B(M^\vee)$ is nonempty, i.e. (-1) -connected, if $n = 1$ since any basis $\{\vec{v}_1^*\} \subseteq M^\vee$ is a vertex.

For the second part: If $n = 2$, then [Lemma A.9](#) implies that $\text{coF}(M^\vee)$ is 0-connected. But $\text{coF}(M^\vee) = \text{F}(M^\vee)$ if $n = 2$, and therefore $\text{F}(M^\vee)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension

1 as well. By Lemma 2.10 and Corollary A.7, it follows that $B(M^\vee)$ is a complete join complex over $F(M^\vee)$ and therefore Lemma A.6 implies that $B(M^\vee)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension 1 as well.

For the third part, the argument is similar to [SC20, Proposition 5.9]: We start with several preliminary observations to establish the analogue of [SC20, Proposition 5.8] in our setting. If $n = 3$, then Lemma A.9 implies that $\text{coF}(M^\vee)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension 2, i.e. this complex is, in particular, 1-connected. Hence the set of boundaries of barycentric subdivisions of 2-simplices in $\text{coF}(M^\vee)$ yield a set $\{\partial\Delta_i^2\}$ of 1-loops (in the sense of [SC20, Definition 5.1]) with the π_1 -spanning property (in the sense of [SC20, Definition 5.2]) for the barycentric subdivision of the 1-skeleton $\text{coF}(M^\vee)^{(1)}$. By Lemma A.10, the co-spanning map $\text{cospan} : \text{coF}(M^\vee)^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)^{op}$ is 1-connected and therefore induces a surjection between the fundamental groups. It follows that the image of the set of 1-loops $\{\partial\Delta_i^2\}$ in $\text{coF}(M^\vee)^{(1)}$ gives a set of 1-loops with the π_1 -spanning property for $T(M^\vee)^{op}$. For each 2-simplex $\Delta = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$ in $\text{coF}(M^\vee)$, there exists by definition a basis $\{\vec{v}_1^*, \vec{v}_2^*, \vec{v}_3^*\}$ of M^\vee such that $C_i = \langle \vec{v}_j^* : j \neq i \rangle$. Notice that $\Delta' = \{\vec{v}_1^*, \vec{v}_2^*, \vec{v}_3^*\}$ is a 2-simplex in $B(M^\vee)$, and that the 1-loop obtained by applying the spanning map $\text{span} : \mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)$ to the boundary of its barycentric subdivision is equal to that associated to the boundary of $\Delta = \{C_1, C_2, C_3\}$ using the co-spanning map, using that the geometric realizations satisfy $T(M^\vee) = T(M^\vee)^{op}$. This shows that the set $\{\gamma_i\}$ of 1-loops in $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(1)}$ obtained from the boundaries of barycentric subdivisions of 2-simplices of $B(M^\vee)$ has the property that applying the spanning map $\{\text{span}(\gamma_i)\}$ yields a set of 1-loops that has the π_1 -spanning property for $\mathbb{T}(M^\vee)$.

Now, we consider the spanning map $\text{span} : \mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)$. It follows from the previous two parts that the lower fibers $\text{span}_{\leq V^\circ} = \mathbb{B}(V^\circ)$ of this map are $(\text{rank } V^\circ - 2)$ -connected and the codomain is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension 1 by Lemma A.3. Therefore the map is 1-spherical in the sense of [SC20, Definition 2.4], and by the first part of [SC20, Theorem 5.7] it follows that its domain is 1-spherical and, in particular, 0-connected. But this means that $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$ is also 0-connected, and we are left with checking that it is simply connected. To see this, we apply the second part of [SC20, Theorem 5.7] to construct a set $\{\gamma_i\} \cup \{\alpha_i\} \cup \{\eta_{i,j}\}$ of 1-loops with the π_1 -spanning property for $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(1)}$ such that each 1-loop is null-homotopic in $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$. For this, let $V^\circ \in \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)$.

We already constructed the 1-loops $\{\gamma_i\}$, and we note that these 1-loops are null-homotopic in $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$ as boundaries of 2-simplices.

If $\text{rank } V^\circ = 2$, we consider an arbitrary set $\{\alpha_i\}$ of 1-loops in the graph $\mathbb{B}(V^\circ)$ with the π_1 -spanning property. Since V° is a summand of rank 2 in M^\vee , there exists some unimodular vector \vec{w}^* such that $V^\circ \oplus \langle \vec{w}^* \rangle = M^\vee$. It follows that each 1-loop α_i is null-homotopic in $B(M^\vee)$ because it is contained in the contractible subcomplex $\{\vec{w}^*\} * B(V^\circ)$.

If $\text{rank } V^\circ = 1$, we consider some arbitrary set $\{\alpha_i\}$ of 0-loops in the discrete set $\mathbb{B}(V^\circ)$ with the π_0 -spanning property (in the sense of [SC20, Definition 5.1 and Definition 5.2]), and an arbitrary set $\{\beta_j\}$ of 0-loops in the discrete set $\mathbb{T}(M^\vee)_{>V^\circ}$ with the π_0 -spanning property. We now describe how to choose the 1-loop $\eta_{i,j}$ in $\mathbb{B}_3(M^\vee)$ for each pair of indices (i, j) : If $\alpha_i = \{\vec{x}_1^*, \vec{x}_2^*\}$ and $\beta_j = \{H_1, H_2\}$, there exist unimodular vectors \vec{z}_1^* and \vec{z}_2^* in M^\vee such that $H_1 = V^\circ \oplus \langle \vec{z}_1^* \rangle$ and $H_2 = V^\circ \oplus \langle \vec{z}_2^* \rangle$. We then define $\eta_{i,j}$ to be the 1-loop in $B(M^\vee)$ corresponding to the edge path $\vec{x}_1^* \rightsquigarrow \vec{z}_1^* \rightsquigarrow \vec{x}_2^* \rightsquigarrow \vec{z}_2^* \rightsquigarrow \vec{x}_1^*$. To see that $\eta_{i,j}$ is null-homotopic one observes that \vec{z}_1^* and \vec{z}_2^* are both vertices in $\text{Link}_{B(M^\vee)}(\vec{x}_1^*) = \text{Link}_{B(M^\vee)}(\vec{x}_2^*)$. The complex $\text{Link}_{B(M^\vee)}(\vec{x}_1^*) = \text{Link}_{B(M^\vee)}(\vec{x}_2^*)$ is isomorphic to the complex $B_2^1(R^{op})$ and hence, by virtue of Corollary A.8, it is a complete join complex over a complex isomorphic

to $B_2(R^{op})$. Since $B_2(R^{op})$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension 1 by the second part of this lemma (proved above), [Corollary A.8](#) implies that $\text{Link}_{B(M^\vee)}(\vec{x}_1^*) = \text{Link}_{B(M^\vee)}(\vec{x}_2^*)$ is also Cohen–Macaulay of dimension 1 and, in particular, 0-connected. It follows that the 1-loop $\eta_{i,j}$ is null-homotopic in $B(M^\vee)$.

Now, by [\[SC20, Theorem 5.7\]](#) we have a set of 1-loops in $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(1)}$ with the π_1 -spanning property such that each 1-loop is null-homotopic in $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$. Hence, $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$ is 1-connected. The connectivity property for links of simplices in $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$ follows from [Corollary A.8](#) and the first two parts of this lemma (proved above). \square

We are now ready to prove the result in full generality. The proof of the next theorem is analogous to the proof of [\[SC20, Theorem 6.2\]](#).

Theorem A.12. *Let R be a ring satisfying [Assumption 1.2](#), let M be free module of rank n and consider its dual R^{op} -module M^\vee . Then $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $n - 1$.*

Proof. We argue by induction on n . The base cases $n \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ have already been established in [Lemma A.11](#). For the induction step $n \geq 4$ we consider the spanning map $\text{span} : \mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)$. The codomain of this map is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(n - 2)$ by [Lemma A.3](#), and by the induction hypothesis $\text{span}_{\leq V^\circ} = \mathbb{B}(V^\circ)$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(\text{rank}(V^\circ) - 1)$ for every $V^\circ \in \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)$. Therefore, it follows from the first part of [\[SC20, Theorem 3.1\]](#), see also [\[Qui78, Theorem 9.1\]](#), that $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)}$ is $(n-2)$ -spherical. This means that $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$ is $(n-3)$ -connected, and in particular 1-connected since $n \geq 4$. Hence, we only need to check that $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)) = 0$. To see this, we want to apply the second part of [\[SC20, Theorem 3.1\]](#) to construct a basis $\{\gamma_i\} \cup \{\alpha_i * \beta_j\}$ of $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)}) = \ker(\partial_{n-2})$ such that each basis element is a boundary in $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$ and therefore $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)) = \ker(\partial_{n-2}) / \text{im}(\partial_{n-1}) \cong 0$.

We first check that the three conditions stated in [\[SC20, Theorem 3.1\]](#) are satisfied: The first condition states that $\langle \sigma_1 \rangle \subseteq \langle \sigma_2 \rangle$ implies that $\text{Link}_{\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)}}(\sigma_2) \subseteq \text{Link}_{\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)}}(\sigma_1)$. This holds because [Lemma 2.10](#), [Lemma 2.8](#) and the assumption imply that $\langle \sigma_2 \rangle = \langle \sigma_1 \rangle \oplus C$ for some free R^{op} -module C and if $\tau \in \text{Link}_{\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)}}(\sigma_2)$, then $\langle \tau \rangle \oplus \langle \sigma_2 \rangle = \langle \tau \rangle \oplus \langle \sigma_1 \rangle \oplus C$ is a free summand of M^\vee , so $\langle \tau \rangle \oplus \langle \sigma_1 \rangle$ is a free summand of M^\vee (with free complement) and therefore $\tau \in \text{Link}_{\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)}}(\sigma_1)$. The second condition states that if $\langle \sigma_1 \rangle \subseteq \langle \sigma_2 \rangle$ and $\langle \tau_1 \rangle \subseteq \langle \tau_2 \rangle$, then $\langle \sigma_1 \cup \tau_1 \rangle \subseteq \langle \sigma_2 \cup \tau_2 \rangle$ assuming $\sigma_1 \cup \tau_1$ and $\sigma_2 \cup \tau_2$ are simplices in $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)}$. This is obviously true. The third condition states that for every $V^\circ \in \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)}$ with $\langle \sigma \rangle = V^\circ$, it holds that the map obtained by restriction $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)}_{>\sigma} \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)_{>V^\circ}$ is a surjection on the top homology. It follows from [Lemma A.3](#) and the fact that $\mathbb{T}(M^\vee)_{>V^\circ} \cong \mathbb{T}(M^\vee/V^\circ)$, see [Item 1](#) of [Lemma A.1](#), that the codomain is Cohen–Macaulay. The induction hypothesis and [Corollary A.8](#) imply that $\text{span}_{\leq W^\circ} \cong \mathbb{B}_{\text{rank}(W^\circ) - \text{rank}(V^\circ)}^{\text{rank}(V^\circ)}(R^{op})$ is also Cohen–Macaulay. Therefore, the first part of [\[SC20, Theorem 3.1\]](#) shows that the third condition does indeed hold. We may hence apply the second part of [\[SC20, Theorem 3.1\]](#) to construct a basis for $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)})$.

We now apply the second part of [\[SC20, Theorem 3.1\]](#) to construct a basis for $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)})$, and check that each of the elements in this basis is trivial in $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{B}(M^\vee))$: By [Lemma A.3](#), we can choose the classes $\{\gamma_i\}$ in $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)})$ to be a collection of boundaries of barycentric subdivisions of top-dimensional simplices in $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$ with the property that $\{\text{span}(\gamma_i)\}$ is a basis of $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{T}(M^\vee)) = \text{St}(M^\vee)$ consisting of apartment classes. In particular, γ_i is a boundary in $\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)$ and hence it holds that $\gamma_i = 0 \in \tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{B}(M^\vee))$. Now let $V^\circ \in \mathbb{T}(M^\vee)$ and $\sigma \in \mathbb{B}(M^\vee)^{(n-2)}$ with

$V^\circ = \langle \sigma \rangle$ be arbitrary. Let $\{\alpha_i\}$ be a basis of $\tilde{H}_{\mathrm{rank}(V^\circ)-1}(\mathrm{span}_{\leq V^\circ})$ and let $\{\beta_j\}$ be a collection of classes in $\tilde{H}_{(n-2)-(\mathrm{rank}(V^\circ)-1)-1}(\mathrm{Link}_{\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)(n-2)}(\sigma))$ such that $\{\mathrm{span}(\beta_j) \oplus V^\circ\}$ is a basis of $\tilde{H}_{(n-2)-(\mathrm{rank}(V^\circ)-1)-1}(\mathbb{T}(M^\vee)_{>V^\circ})$. We need to see that the classes $\{\alpha_i * \beta_j\}$ in $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathrm{span}_{\leq V^\circ} * \mathrm{Link}_{\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)(n-2)}(\sigma))$ are trivial in $\tilde{H}_{n-2}(\mathbb{B}(M^\vee))$. By the induction hypothesis and [Corollary A.8](#), it holds that $\mathrm{Link}_{\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)}(\sigma) \cong \mathbb{B}_{n-\mathrm{rank}(V^\circ)}^{\mathrm{rank}(V^\circ)}(R^{op})$ is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension $(n - \mathrm{rank}(V^\circ) - 1)$. Therefore, the classes β_j are trivial in $\tilde{H}_{(n-2)-(\mathrm{rank}(V^\circ)-1)-1}(\mathrm{Link}_{\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)}(\sigma))$. Hence, there exists a chain ω_j in $C_{n-\mathrm{rank}(V^\circ)-1}(\mathrm{Link}_{\mathbb{B}(M^\vee)}(\sigma))$ such that $\partial_{n-\mathrm{rank}(V^\circ)-1}(\omega_j) = (-1)^{|\alpha_i|} \beta_j$ and it follows that $\alpha_i * \beta_j$ is a boundary: $\partial_{n-1}(\alpha_i * \omega_j) = \alpha_i * \beta_j$. This completes the proof. \square

A.3. Relating Charney’s splitting complex to the E_1 -splitting complex. In this part of the appendix, we spell out the relation between the splitting complex $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ introduced in [Definition 5.1](#) and the E_1 -splitting complex introduced in [\[GKRW21, Definition 17.9\]](#) to make this work self-contained. Similar complexes and this relation have been studied by Hepworth in [\[Hep20\]](#) for principle ideal domains. All of the arguments presented here are easy adaptations of results proved in [\[Hep20\]](#), and we do not claim any novelty.

Lemma A.13. *Let R be a ring satisfying [Assumption 1.2](#). For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ Charney’s splitting complex $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ is $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ -equivariantly isomorphic to the n -th E_1 -splitting complex associated to the E_∞ -algebra $\mathrm{BGL}(R)$ by [\[GKRW21, Definition 17.9\]](#).*

Proof. As explained in [\[Hep20, Example 2.4\]](#), the family $\{\mathrm{GL}_n(R)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a family of groups with multiplication in the sense of [\[Hep20, Definition 2.1\]](#) by virtue of the symmetric monoidal structure $(\mathrm{GL}(R), \oplus, 0)$ introduced in [Section 5.1](#). Replacing the PID assumption in [\[Hep20, Proposition 3.4\]](#) by [Item 1](#) and [Item 2](#) of [Assumption 1.2](#) and the poset $S_R(R^n)$ introduced in the paragraph before [\[Hep20, Proposition 3.4\]](#) by $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ as in [Definition 5.1](#), the proof of [\[Hep20, Proposition 3.4\]](#) applies to show that the splitting poset SP_n associated to the family $\{\mathrm{GL}_n(R)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, see [\[Hep20, Definition 3.1\]](#), is isomorphic to $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$: the first time [\[Hep20\]](#) uses that R is a PID the claim holds in our setting by [Definition 5.1](#), and the second time [\[Hep20\]](#) uses that R is a PID the claim follows from [Lemma 2.9](#) in our setting. By [\[Hep20, Proposition 6.4\]](#), the semi-simplicial nerve of splitting poset SP_n agrees with the E_1 -splitting complex of [\[GKRW21, Definition 17.9\]](#) using [\[GKRW21, Remark 17.11\]](#), compare with [\[Hep20, Section 1.2\]](#). \square

A.4. Standard connectivity estimate and coinvariants of the Charney module. In this part of the appendix, we spell out the details of the proof of [Proposition 5.4](#) to make this work self-contained. The argument we present and the notions defined in this context are adaptations of the proof of [\[KMP22, Theorem 4.8\]](#) and the definitions in [\[KMP22, Section 4.3\]](#) to our setting.

Definition A.14. Let V and W be nonzero free summands of a free R -module M . Then $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | M)$ is the subposet of $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(M)$ of splittings (U, T) such that $U \subseteq V$ and $W \subseteq T$. We write $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot | M)$ when $V = M$ and $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, \cdot | M)$ when $W = \{0\}$.

We show that these E_1 -splitting complexes are spherical using a technique due to Charney [\[Cha80\]](#) called *cutting down*. This is encapsulated in the following analogue of [\[KMP22, Lemma 4.10\]](#).

Lemma A.15. *Let R be a ring satisfying [Assumption 1.2](#), and let M be a free R -module. If V, W are free summands of M such that $V \cap W = \{0\}$ and $V \oplus W \subsetneq M$ is a proper*

summand, then for any complement C of W in M containing V , we have an isomorphism

$$\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | M) \cong \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, \cdot | C).$$

Moreover, this isomorphism is equivariant with respect to the subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}(M)$ that preserves C and V and fixes W pointwise.

Proof. We start by noting that C is necessarily free by [Lemma 2.7](#), and that the containment $V \subsetneq C$ is necessarily proper (otherwise it would hold that $V \oplus W = M$, a contradiction). We claim that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | M) &\leftrightarrow \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, \cdot | C) \\ (U, T) &\mapsto (U, T \cap C) \\ (U', T' \oplus W) &\mapsto (U', T') \end{aligned}$$

still defines a pair of *well-defined* mutually inverse functors in our setting (exactly as in [\[KMP22, Lemma 4.10\]](#)): Firstly, observe that if $(U, T) \in \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | M)$, then $U \subseteq V \subsetneq C$ and $W \subseteq T$. Hence it follows from [Lemma 2.9](#) that $U \oplus (T \cap C) = C$ and that $T \cap C$ is free and nonzero of rank $\mathrm{rank}(C) - \mathrm{rank}(U) > 0$, because V is a proper summand of M . Secondly, the inverse to this functor sends a splitting (U', T') of C to $(U', T' \oplus W)$, which is a free splitting of M since $C \oplus W \cong M$ and U', T', W are all free.

If $\phi \in \mathrm{GL}(M)$ preserves C , we must have that $C \cdot \phi = C$ (since $M = C \oplus W$, $M = (C \cdot \phi) \oplus (W \cdot \phi)$ and $C \cdot \phi \subseteq C$, [Lemma 2.8](#) implies that $C = (C \cdot \phi) \oplus K$, and $K = 0$ because [Property III](#) holds by [Assumption 1.2](#) and $\mathrm{rank}(C) = \mathrm{rank}(C \cdot \phi)$). Thus, ϕ may be restricted to an element of $\mathrm{GL}(C)$. Therefore, we have an action of the subgroup $\mathrm{GL}(M, \mathrm{pres } C, \mathrm{pres } V, \mathrm{fix } W)$ of $\mathrm{GL}(M)$, consisting of maps that preserve C and V and fix W pointwise, on both complexes. The fact that the isomorphism defined above is equivariant to this action follows from the fact that if $\phi \in \mathrm{GL}(M, \mathrm{pres } C, \mathrm{pres } V, \mathrm{fix } W)$, then $(C \cdot \phi) = C$ and $(W \cdot \phi) = W$, so $(T \cap C) \cdot \phi = (T \cdot \phi) \cap C$ for any summand T of M , and $(T' \oplus W) \cdot \phi = (T' \cdot \phi) \oplus W$ for any summand T' of C . \square

Since we did not assume that R is commutative, we additionally need the following technical lemma relating certain relative splitting complexes associated to R and R^{op} .

Lemma A.16. *Let R be a ring satisfying [Assumption 1.2](#), let C be a free R -module of finite rank and let V be a free summand of C . Consider the associated free R^{op} -module $C^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}_R(C, R)$, which has the same rank as C , and its submodule V° of R -linear functions vanishing on V . Mapping a splitting (U, T) to (T°, U°) yields an isomorphism*

$$\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, \cdot | C) \cong \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, V^\circ \subseteq \cdot | C^\vee),$$

which is compatible with the action of the subgroup $\mathrm{GL}(C, \mathrm{pres } V, \mathrm{fix } C/V) \leq \mathrm{GL}(C)$ on the left side and the action of the subgroup $\mathrm{GL}(C^\vee, \mathrm{fix } V^\circ) \leq \mathrm{GL}(C^\vee)$ on the right side under their identification obtained by restricting the inverse-transpose group isomorphism $\mathrm{GL}(C) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V^\vee) : \phi \mapsto (\phi^{-1})^$ (compare [Lemma 2.12](#)).*

Proof. We first show that the mapping $(U, T) \mapsto (T^\circ, U^\circ)$ is well-defined: That $T^\circ \cap U^\circ = \{0\}$ follows immediately from the fact that $C = U \oplus T$, since any map vanishing on both U and T must then vanish on all of C . Furthermore, restricting $f : C = U \oplus T \rightarrow R$ to $f|_T : T \rightarrow R$ leads to an exact sequence of R^{op} -modules $0 \rightarrow T^\circ \rightarrow C^\vee \rightarrow T^\vee \rightarrow 0$. This sequence is split, since T^\vee is a free R^{op} -module and of the same rank as T (see [Lemma 2.12](#)). Because C^\vee is also free of the same rank as C , it follows that T° is a free R^{op} -module of the same rank as U . Similarly, U° is a free R^{op} -module of the same rank as

T . Hence, (T°, U°) is a splitting of C^\vee into nonzero free summands. Furthermore, $U \subseteq V$ implies $V^\circ \subseteq U^\circ$ and, similarly, $(U_1, T_1) \leq (U_2, T_2)$ implies $(T_1^\circ, U_1^\circ) \leq (T_2^\circ, U_2^\circ)$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{D}: \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, \cdot | C) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, V^\circ \subseteq \cdot | C^\vee)$$

is indeed a well-defined map of posets.

We check that \mathcal{D} is a poset isomorphism: Firstly, we show that \mathcal{D} is bijective. We note that the canonical isomorphism $C \cong (C^\vee)^\vee$ (see e.g. [Bly90, Theorem 9.2]) identifies U and $(U^\circ)^\circ$ and induces an isomorphism of posets $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(V \subseteq \cdot, \cdot | C) \cong \mathbb{S}^{E_1}((V^\circ)^\circ \subseteq \cdot, \cdot | (C^\vee)^\vee)$, which factors through \mathcal{D} . This implies that \mathcal{D} is injective. Similarly, we see that \mathcal{D} is surjective using $C^\vee \cong ((C^\vee)^\vee)^\vee$. Secondly, we show that \mathcal{D} is an order embedding, i.e. that $(U_1, T_1) \leq (U_2, T_2)$ if and only if $(T_1^\circ, U_1^\circ) \leq (T_2^\circ, U_2^\circ)$. It remains to see that $(T_1^\circ, U_1^\circ) \leq (T_2^\circ, U_2^\circ)$ implies $(U_1, T_1) \leq (U_2, T_2)$. This follows from the argument in Lemma A.3, which shows that for any free summands V_1, V_2 , if $V_2^\circ \subseteq V_1^\circ$, then $V_1 \subseteq V_2$. Thus, \mathcal{D} is a poset isomorphism.

Finally, we check that the isomorphism \mathcal{D} is compatible with suitable group actions: First note that if $\phi \in \mathrm{GL}(C, \mathrm{pres} V, \mathrm{fix} C/V)$, then $f \cdot (\phi^{-1})^* = f \circ \phi^{-1} = f$ for all $f \in V^\circ$. We can see this, for example, by choosing a complement W of V . Then we can write any $c \in C$ as $c = v + w$ for $v \in V$ and $w \in W$, and $f(c) = f(w)$. Since ϕ fixes C/V and preserves V , we have that $\phi^{-1}(v + w) = v' + w$, for some $v' \in V$. Thus, $f(\phi^{-1}(v + w)) = f(v' + w) = f(w) = f(c)$. Therefore, the isomorphism $\mathrm{GL}(C) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(C^\vee)$ restricts to a map from the subgroup $\mathrm{GL}(C, \mathrm{pres} V, \mathrm{fix} C/V)$ to the subgroup $\mathrm{GL}(C^\vee, \mathrm{fix} V^\circ)$. We claim that this is an isomorphism, i.e. that this restriction is surjective: Every $(\phi^{-1})^* \in \mathrm{GL}(C^\vee, \mathrm{fix} V^\circ)$ satisfies $f = f \circ \phi$ for all $f \in V^\circ$. For $\vec{v} \in V$, it therefore holds that $\mathrm{ev}_{\phi(\vec{v})} \in (V^\circ)^\circ$ because $\mathrm{ev}_{\phi(\vec{v})}(f) = f(\phi(\vec{v})) = 0$ for all $f \in V^\circ$. The canonical isomorphism $C \cong (C^\vee)^\vee$ identifies V with $(V^\circ)^\circ$, and hence implies that $\phi(v) \in V$, i.e. that ϕ preserves V . We next observe that for every $\vec{c} \in C$ it holds that $\mathrm{ev}_{\vec{c} - \phi(\vec{c})}(f) = 0$ for all $f \in V^\circ$ and therefore $\mathrm{ev}_{\vec{c} - \phi(\vec{c})} \in (V^\circ)^\circ$. The canonical isomorphism $V \cong (V^\vee)^\vee$ hence implies that $\vec{c} - \phi(\vec{c}) \in V$, i.e. that ϕ fixes C/V .

Suppose $\phi \in \mathrm{GL}(C)$ takes (U_1, T_1) to (U_2, T_2) . Then ϕ^{-1} maps (U_2, T_2) to (U_1, T_1) . In particular, the preimage of U_1 under ϕ^{-1} is U_2 , and $\phi^{-1}(U_2) = U_1$, so $f \in U_1^\circ$ if and only if $f \cdot (\phi^{-1})^* = f \circ \phi^{-1} \in U_2^\circ$. Similarly, $f \in T_1^\circ$ if and only if $f \cdot (\phi^{-1})^* = f \circ \phi^{-1} \in T_2^\circ$. Thus, $(\phi^{-1})^*$ takes (T_1°, U_1°) to (T_2°, U_2°) . This establishes the compatibility of our isomorphism with the group action. \square

The next proposition is the analogue of the first part of [KMP22, Theorem 4.8] and shows that Charney's connectivity result [Cha80, Theorem 1.1] extends to our setting. It relies on a map-of-posets argument which is analogous to that used to prove [GKRW18, Theorem 4.3] and [KMP22, Theorem 4.8].

Proposition A.17. *Assume that R satisfies Assumption 1.2. Then $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ is $(n - 2)$ -spherical for all n , and if $W \in \mathbb{T}_n(R)$ is a proper nonzero free summand of R^n , then $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)$ is $(n - \mathrm{rank} W - 1)$ -spherical.*

Proof. This argument exploits that R^{op} also satisfies Assumption 1.2 by the virtue of Theorem 2.11. All steps in this proof are carried out for R and R^{op} simultaneously, even though we only write out the details for R .

We first establish the second part. If $\mathrm{rank} W = n - 1$, then Property III (established in Corollary 2.4) implies that there is no summand W' of R^n satisfying $W \subsetneq W' \subsetneq R^n$, and hence $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot) \cong \mathbb{T}(R^n, W) \cong \mathbb{T}_{n - \mathrm{rank} W}^{\mathrm{rank} W}(R)$, which is $(n - \mathrm{rank} W - 1)$ -spherical by

Lemma 3.10. Thus, it suffices to prove the result for $1 \leq \text{rank } W \leq n - 2$. We do this by induction on n with base case $n = 2$.

If $n = 2$, then $\text{rank } W = n - 1$ is the only possibility, so there is nothing left to prove. For the induction step, we consider the map of posets

$$f : \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}(R^n, W)$$

sending a splitting (V, U) to V , exactly as in the proof of [GKRW18, Theorem 4.8] and [KMP22, Theorem 4.8]. Note that this map is well-defined in our setting: If $V \oplus U = R^n$, $L \oplus W = R^n$ and $W \subseteq U$, then Lemma 2.8 ensures that $U = L' \oplus W$ for some free L' . It follows that W admits a complement C in R^n that contains V as a summand, namely $C = L' \oplus V$. Therefore it does indeed hold that $V \in \mathbb{T}(R^n, W)$, and that the map is well-defined. The following claims about this poset map hold:

- (1) The target is $(n - \text{rank } W - 1)$ -spherical, since $\mathbb{T}(R^n, W) \cong \mathbb{T}_{n-\text{rank } W}^{\text{rank } W}(R)$ and invoking Lemma 3.10;
- (2) $\mathbb{T}(R^n, W)_{>V}$ is $(n - \text{rank } W - \text{rank } V - 1)$ -spherical if $V \in \mathbb{T}(R^n, W)$, since $\mathbb{T}(R^n, W)_{>V} \cong \mathbb{T}_{n-\text{rank } W-\text{rank } V}^{\text{rank } W}(R)$ by Lemma A.2 and invoking Lemma 3.10;
- (3) $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)_{f \leq V}$ is $(\text{rank } V - 1)$ -spherical for every $V \in \mathbb{T}(R^n, W)$, as we shall see now.

To show Claim 3, we let $V \in \mathbb{T}(R^n, W)$ and consider two cases. If $V \oplus W = R^n$, then (V, W) is a terminal object in $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)_{f \leq V}$ and the complex is contractible. If $V \oplus W \neq R^n$, we apply cutting down: By the definition of $\mathbb{T}(R^n, W)$, it holds that V is a summand of a complement C of W . In particular, $V \oplus W \subsetneq R^n$ is a proper summand of R^n in this second case. Using that $V \subseteq C$, Lemma A.15 therefore yields an isomorphism

$$\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n) \cong \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, \cdot | C).$$

Consider the free R^{op} -module $C^\vee = \text{Hom}_R(C, R)$, which is of the same rank as C (see Lemma 2.12) and its submodule V° of R -linear functions that vanish on V . Lemma A.16 yields a poset isomorphism $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, \cdot | C) \cong \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, V^\circ \subseteq \cdot | C^\vee)$. Since C^\vee is a free R^{op} -module of rank $n - \text{rank } W$ (which is strictly less than n), and $\text{rank } V^\circ = \text{rank } C - \text{rank } V$, it follows from the induction hypothesis for R^{op} that $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, V^\circ \subseteq \cdot | C^\vee)$ is $(\text{rank } C - (\text{rank } C - \text{rank } V) - 1) = (\text{rank } V - 1)$ -spherical. This finishes the proof of Claim 3.

Claim 1, Claim 2 and Claim 3 show that we can apply [GKRW18, Theorem 4.1] with $t(V) = n - \text{rank } W - \text{rank } V$ to conclude that the source $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)$ is indeed $(n - \text{rank } W - 1)$ -spherical.

Now we prove the statement about connectivity of $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ and consider the map of posets

$$f : \mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R) \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_n(R)^{op}$$

sending a splitting (V, W) to W , exactly as in the proof of [GKRW18, Theorem 4.8] and [KMP22, Theorem 4.8]. Note that this map is also well-defined in our setting, since W is indeed a nontrivial proper summand of R^n . The following claims hold:

- (1) The target $\mathbb{T}_n(R)^{op}$ is $(n - 2)$ -spherical by Lemma 3.10;
- (2) $\mathbb{T}_n(R)^{op}_{>W}$ is $(\text{rank } W - 2)$ -spherical if $W \in \mathbb{T}_n(R)$, since $\mathbb{T}_n(R)^{op}_{>W} = \mathbb{T}_n(R)_{<W} \cong \mathbb{T}_{\text{rank } W}(R)$ by Lemma A.1 and invoking Lemma 3.10;
- (3) $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)_{f \leq W} \cong \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)$ is $(n - \text{rank } W - 1)$ -spherical as we have argued above.

Claim 1, Claim 2 and Claim 3 show that we can apply [GKRW18, Theorem 4.1] with $t(W) = \text{rank } W - 1$ to conclude that the source $\mathbb{S}_n^{E_1}(R)$ is indeed $(n - 2)$ -spherical. \square

In light of [Proposition A.17](#), it makes sense to define relative versions of the Charney module $\mathrm{Ch}_n(R)$, see [Definition 5.2](#), if R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#).

Definition A.18. Let R be a ring such that $S^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)$ is $(n - \mathrm{rank} W - 1)$ -spherical for $W \in \mathbb{T}_n(R)$. We define the *relative Charney module* to be the right $\mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W)$ -module

$$\mathrm{Ch}(R^n, W) := \tilde{H}_{n-\mathrm{rank} W-1}(S^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n); \mathbb{Z}).$$

The last proposition in this appendix is the analogue of the second part of [[KMP22](#), Theorem 4.8] and shows that their vanishing theorem for the coinvariants of Charney modules also holds to our setting. This builds on the map-of-posets arguments carried out in the proof of the previous proposition.

Proposition A.19. Assume that R satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#), and let \mathbb{k} be a commutative ring such that $2 \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ is a unit and $W \in \mathbb{T}_n(R)$. If $n \geq 2$, then

$$(\mathrm{Ch}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\mathrm{GL}_n(R)} = 0, \text{ and } (\mathrm{Ch}(R^n, W) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W)} = 0.$$

Proof. This argument runs parallel to the proof of [Proposition A.17](#) and uses facts established there. Again, we use that R^{op} also satisfies [Assumption 1.2](#) by virtue of [Theorem 2.11](#). And again, all steps in this proof are carried out for R and R^{op} simultaneously, even though we only write out the details for R .

We start by establishing the second part of the claim. If the rank of W is $n - 1$, then $\mathrm{Ch}(R^n, W)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{St}(R^n, W)$ by the proof of [Proposition A.17](#) (the isomorphism $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, W \subseteq \cdot) \cong \mathbb{T}(R^n, W)$ is $\mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W)$ -equivariant). In this case, the result has therefore already been shown in [Corollary 4.5](#). Thus, it suffices to prove the result for $1 \leq \mathrm{rank} W \leq n - 2$. We do this by induction on n with base case $n = 2$.

If $n = 2$, then $\mathrm{rank} W = n - 1$ is the only possibility, so there is nothing left to prove. For the induction step, the first map-of-posets argument in the proof of [Proposition A.17](#) yields, by the second part of [[GKRW18](#), Theorem 4.1], a filtration of $\mathbb{k}[\mathrm{GL}(R^n, W)]$ -modules $0 = F_{n-\mathrm{rank} W} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq F_{-1} = \mathrm{Ch}(R^n, W) \otimes \mathbb{k}$ such that

$$F_{-1}/F_0 \cong \mathrm{St}(R^n, W) \otimes \mathbb{k},$$

and if $q \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} F_q/F_{q+1} &\cong \bigoplus_{\substack{V \in \mathbb{T}(R^n, W) \\ \mathrm{rank} V = q+1}} \mathrm{St}(R^n/V, W) \otimes \tilde{H}_q(\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)) \otimes \mathbb{k} \\ &\cong \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W, \mathrm{pres} V)}^{\mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W)} \mathrm{St}(R^n/V, W) \otimes \tilde{H}_q(\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)) \otimes \mathbb{k}, \end{aligned}$$

where V is a choice of rank $q + 1$ summand in $\mathbb{T}(R^n, W)$, and $\mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W, \mathrm{pres} V)$ denotes the subgroup of $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$ that fixes W pointwise and maps V to V . It then suffices to show that the $\mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W)$ -coinvariants of F_q/F_{q+1} vanish for all q .

When $q = -1$, we have that

$$(\mathrm{St}(R^n, W) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W)} = 0$$

by [Corollary 4.5](#). If $q \geq 0$, then Shapiro's Lemma says that the $\mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W)$ -coinvariants of F_q/F_{q+1} are isomorphic to the $\mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W, \mathrm{pres} V)$ -coinvariants of

$$\mathrm{St}(R^n/V, W) \otimes \tilde{H}_q(\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)) \otimes \mathbb{k}$$

for some choice of V . To show that these coinvariants vanish, we restrict to the subgroup K defined by the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(R^n, \mathrm{fix} W, \mathrm{pres} V) \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}(R^n/V, \mathrm{fix} W) \rightarrow 0.$$

In particular, every element of K acts trivially on R^n/V , so K acts trivially on $\text{St}(R^n/V, W)$. Thus, it suffices to show that the K -coinvariants of

$$\tilde{H}_q(\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)) \otimes \mathbb{k}$$

vanish. If $V \oplus W = R^n$, then $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)$ is contractible (as in the proof of [Proposition A.17](#)), so there is nothing to prove. On the other hand, if $V \oplus W$ is a proper summand of R^n , we can choose a complement C of W that contains V and apply cutting down, exactly as in the proof of [Proposition A.17](#). That is,

$$\tilde{H}_q(\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, W \subseteq \cdot | R^n)) \otimes \mathbb{k} \cong \tilde{H}_q(\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, \cdot | C)) \otimes \mathbb{k}.$$

Notice that every element of K must preserve C (since any $\phi \in K$ determines the identity map on R^n/V , it must be the case that $\phi(c) - c \in V$ for any $c \in C$; hence $\phi(c) \in C$) in addition to preserving V and fixing W , so this isomorphism is K -equivariant. Moreover, restriction to C gives an isomorphism from K to $\text{GL}(C, \text{pres } V, \text{fix } C/V)$, so it suffices to show vanishing of the $\text{GL}(C, \text{pres } V, \text{fix } C/V)$ -coinvariants of $\tilde{H}_q(\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, \cdot | C)) \otimes \mathbb{k}$. As in the proof of [Proposition A.17](#), [Lemma A.16](#) yields a poset isomorphism $\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot \subseteq V, \cdot | C) \cong \mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, V^\circ \subseteq \cdot | C^\vee)$ that is compatible with the group action of $\text{GL}(C, \text{pres } V, \text{fix } C/V)$ on the left side and the group action of $\text{GL}(C^\vee, \text{fix } V^\circ)$ on the right side. It therefore suffices to show vanishing of the $\text{GL}(C^\vee, \text{fix } V^\circ)$ -coinvariants of $\tilde{H}_q(\mathbb{S}^{E_1}(\cdot, V^\circ \subseteq \cdot | C^\vee)) \otimes \mathbb{k}$. But this is precisely the $\text{GL}(C^\vee, \text{fix } V^\circ)$ -coinvariants of $\text{Ch}(C^\vee, V^\circ) \otimes \mathbb{k}$, and the rank of the free R^{op} -module C^\vee is strictly less than n (since W is nontrivial) and at least 2 (since we have already dealt with the case where W has rank $n-1$), so these coinvariants vanish by the induction hypothesis for R^{op} . This finishes the proof of the second part.

Now we prove the first part, the statement about $(\text{Ch}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\text{GL}_n(R)}$. The second map-of-posets argument from [Proposition A.17](#) and the second part of [\[GKRW18, Theorem 4.1\]](#) yield a filtration $0 = F_{n-1} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq F_{-1} = \text{St}_n^{E_1}(R) \otimes \mathbb{k}$ of $\mathbb{k}[\text{GL}_n(R)]$ -modules such that

$$F_{-1}/F_0 \cong \text{St}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{k},$$

and if $q \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} F_q/F_{q+1} &\cong \bigoplus_{\substack{U \in \mathbb{T}_n(R) \\ \text{rank } U = n-q-1}} \text{St}(U) \otimes \text{Ch}(R^n, U) \otimes \mathbb{k} \\ &\cong \text{Ind}_{\text{GL}(R^n, \text{pres } R^{n-q-1})}^{\text{GL}_n(R)} \text{St}(R^{n-q-1}) \otimes \text{Ch}(R^n, R^{n-q-1}) \otimes \mathbb{k}, \end{aligned}$$

where $R^{n-q-1} \subseteq R^n$ denotes the submodule spanned by the first $n-q-1$ standard basis vectors. As before, it suffices to show that the coinvariants of each quotient F_q/F_{q+1} vanish.

When $q = -1$, the fact that the $\text{GL}_n(R)$ -coinvariants of $\text{St}_n(R) \otimes \mathbb{k}$ vanish follows from [Corollary 4.2](#). If $q \geq 0$, then Shapiro's lemma says that the $\text{GL}_n(R)$ -coinvariants of F_q/F_{q+1} are isomorphic to the $\text{GL}(R^n, \text{pres } R^{n-q-1})$ -coinvariants of

$$\text{St}(R^{n-q-1}) \otimes \text{Ch}(R^n, R^{n-q-1}) \otimes \mathbb{k}.$$

It is therefore sufficient to show that the $\text{GL}(R^n, \text{fix } R^{n-q-1})$ -coinvariants vanish, which is true because $\text{GL}(R^n, \text{fix } R^{n-q-1})$ acts trivially on $\text{St}(R^{n-q-1})$, and we have already shown that $(\text{Ch}(R^n, R^{n-q-1}) \otimes \mathbb{k})_{\text{GL}(R^n, \text{fix } R^{n-q-1})} = 0$ in the first part of this proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [AR79] Avner Ash and Lee Rudolph. “The modular symbol and continued fractions in higher dimensions”. In: *Invent. Math.* 55.3 (1979), pp. 241–250. ISSN: 0020-9910. DOI: [10.1007/BF01406842](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01406842) (cit. on p. 11).
- [Bas64] H. Bass. “ K -theory and stable algebra”. In: *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* 22 (1964), pp. 5–60. ISSN: 0073-8301. DOI: [10.1007/BF02684689](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02684689) (cit. on p. 2).
- [Bly90] T. S. Blyth. *Module theory*. Second. Oxford Science Publications. An approach to linear algebra. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1990, pp. viii+360. ISBN: 0-19-853389-6 (cit. on pp. 25, 27, 33).
- [BS73] A. Borel and J.-P. Serre. “Corners and arithmetic groups”. In: *Comment. Math. Helv.* 48 (1973), pp. 436–491. ISSN: 0010-2571. DOI: [10.1007/BF02566134](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02566134) (cit. on p. 3).
- [BPS23] Benjamin Brück, Peter Patzt, and Robin J. Sroka. *A presentation of symplectic Steinberg modules and cohomology of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{Z})$* . 2023. arXiv: [2306.03180](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.03180) [[math.AT](#)] (cit. on p. 16).
- [Byk03] V. A. Bykovskii. “Generating elements of the annihilating ideal for modular symbols”. In: *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* 37.4 (2003), pp. 27–38, 95. ISSN: 0374-1990. DOI: [10.1023/B:FAIA.0000015577.42722.21](https://doi.org/10.1023/B:FAIA.0000015577.42722.21) (cit. on p. 14).
- [Cha80] Ruth M. Charney. “Homology stability for GL_n of a Dedekind domain”. In: *Invent. Math.* 56.1 (1980), pp. 1–17. ISSN: 0020-9910. DOI: [10.1007/BF01403153](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01403153) (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 23, 31, 33).
- [CFP19] Thomas Church, Benson Farb, and Andrew Putman. “Integrality in the Steinberg module and the top-dimensional cohomology of $\mathrm{SL}_n \mathcal{O}_K$ ”. In: *Amer. J. Math.* 141.5 (2019), pp. 1375–1419. ISSN: 0002-9327. DOI: [10.1353/ajm.2019.0036](https://doi.org/10.1353/ajm.2019.0036) (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 11, 12, 26).
- [CP17] Thomas Church and Andrew Putman. “The codimension-one cohomology of $\mathrm{SL}_n \mathbb{Z}$ ”. In: *Geom. Topol.* 21.2 (2017), pp. 999–1032. ISSN: 1465-3060. DOI: [10.2140/gt.2017.21.999](https://doi.org/10.2140/gt.2017.21.999) (cit. on pp. 4, 7, 11, 14).
- [Coh66] P. M. Cohn. “Some remarks on the invariant basis property”. In: *Topology* 5 (1966), pp. 215–228. ISSN: 0040-9383. DOI: [10.1016/0040-9383\(66\)90006-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-9383(66)90006-1) (cit. on pp. 3, 6, 7).
- [Coh06] P. M. Cohn. *Free ideal rings and localization in general rings*. Vol. 3. New Mathematical Monographs. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006, pp. xxii+572. ISBN: 978-0-521-85337-8; 0-521-85337-0. DOI: [10.1017/CB09780511542794](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511542794) (cit. on pp. 6, 7, 8).
- [Faj+20] William Fajardo, Claudia Gallego, Oswaldo Lezama, Armando Reyes, Héctor Suárez, and Helbert Venegas. *Skew PBW extensions—ring and module-theoretic properties, matrix and Gröbner methods, and applications*. Vol. 28. Algebra and Applications. Springer, Cham, [2020] ©2020, pp. xv+584. ISBN: 978-3-030-53377-9; 978-3-030-53378-6. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-030-53378-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53378-6) (cit. on p. 2).
- [GKRW18] Søren Galatius, Alexander Kupers, and Oscar Randal-Williams. *E_∞ -cells and general linear groups of finite fields*. 2018. arXiv: [1810.11931](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.11931) [[math.AT](#)] (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 4, 23, 33, 34, 35, 36).
- [GKRW19] Søren Galatius, Alexander Kupers, and Oscar Randal-Williams. “ E_2 -cells and mapping class groups”. In: *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* 130 (2019), pp. 1–61. ISSN: 0073-8301. DOI: [10.1007/s10240-019-00107-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10240-019-00107-8) (cit. on p. 23).
- [GKRW20] Søren Galatius, Alexander Kupers, and Oscar Randal-Williams. *E_∞ -cells and general linear groups of infinite fields*. 2020. arXiv: [2005.05620](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.05620) [[math.AT](#)] (cit. on pp. 2, 23).
- [GKRW21] Søren Galatius, Alexander Kupers, and Oscar Randal-Williams. *Cellular E_k -algebras*. 2021. arXiv: [1805.07184](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.07184) [[math.AT](#)] (cit. on pp. 3, 4, 23, 24, 31).

- [GRW18] Søren Galatius and Oscar Randal-Williams. “Homological stability for moduli spaces of high dimensional manifolds. I”. In: *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 31.1 (2018), pp. 215–264. ISSN: 0894-0347. DOI: [10.1090/jams/884](https://doi.org/10.1090/jams/884) (cit. on p. 17).
- [Gui89] Daniel Guin. “Homologie du groupe linéaire et K -théorie de Milnor des anneaux”. In: *J. Algebra* 123.1 (1989), pp. 27–59. ISSN: 0021-8693. DOI: [10.1016/0021-8693\(89\)90033-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-8693(89)90033-1) (cit. on pp. 2, 3).
- [HV98] Allen Hatcher and Karen Vogtmann. “The complex of free factors of a free group”. In: *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)* 49.196 (1998), pp. 459–468. ISSN: 0033-5606. DOI: [10.1093/qjmath/49.196.459](https://doi.org/10.1093/qjmath/49.196.459) (cit. on p. 26).
- [HV17] Allen Hatcher and Karen Vogtmann. “Tethers and homology stability for surfaces”. In: *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 17.3 (2017), pp. 1871–1916. ISSN: 1472-2747. DOI: [10.2140/agt.2017.17.1871](https://doi.org/10.2140/agt.2017.17.1871) (cit. on p. 10).
- [HW10] Allen Hatcher and Nathalie Wahl. “Stabilization for mapping class groups of 3-manifolds”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 155.2 (2010), pp. 205–269. ISSN: 0012-7094. DOI: [10.1215/00127094-2010-055](https://doi.org/10.1215/00127094-2010-055) (cit. on pp. 26, 27).
- [Hep20] Richard Hepworth. “On the edge of the stable range”. In: *Math. Ann.* 377.1-2 (2020), pp. 123–181. ISSN: 0025-5831. DOI: [10.1007/s00208-020-01955-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-020-01955-0) (cit. on p. 31).
- [Kal80] Wilberd van der Kallen. “Homology stability for linear groups”. In: *Invent. Math.* 60.3 (1980), pp. 269–295. ISSN: 0020-9910. DOI: [10.1007/BF01390018](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01390018) (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8).
- [KL11] Wilberd van der Kallen and Eduard Looijenga. “Spherical complexes attached to symplectic lattices”. In: *Geom. Dedicata* 152 (2011), pp. 197–211. ISSN: 0046-5755. DOI: [10.1007/s10711-010-9553-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10711-010-9553-0) (cit. on p. 10).
- [KM18] Alexander Kupers and Jeremy Miller. “ E_n -cell attachments and a local-to-global principle for homological stability”. In: *Math. Ann.* 370.1-2 (2018), pp. 209–269. ISSN: 0025-5831. DOI: [10.1007/s00208-017-1533-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-017-1533-3) (cit. on pp. 4, 23).
- [KMP22] Alexander Kupers, Jeremy Miller, and Peter Patzt. “Improved homological stability for certain general linear groups”. In: *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* 125.3 (2022), pp. 511–542. ISSN: 0024-6115. DOI: [10.1112/plms.12463](https://doi.org/10.1112/plms.12463) (cit. on pp. 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 23, 24, 26, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35).
- [Kup+22] Alexander Kupers, Jeremy Miller, Peter Patzt, and Jennifer C. H. Wilson. “On the generalized Bykovskii presentation of Steinberg modules”. In: *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 13 (2022), pp. 10347–10401. ISSN: 1073-7928. DOI: [10.1093/imrn/rnab028](https://doi.org/10.1093/imrn/rnab028) (cit. on pp. 4, 11, 14).
- [Lam06] T. Y. Lam. *Serre’s problem on projective modules*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006, pp. xxii+401. ISBN: 978-3-540-23317-6; 3-540-23317-2. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-540-34575-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-34575-6) (cit. on pp. 3, 6, 9).
- [LS76] Ronnie Lee and R. H. Szczarba. “On the homology and cohomology of congruence subgroups”. In: *Invent. Math.* 33.1 (1976), pp. 15–53. ISSN: 0020-9910. DOI: [10.1007/BF01425503](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01425503) (cit. on p. 11).
- [LS19] Jian-Shu Li and Binyong Sun. “Low degree cohomologies of congruence groups”. In: *Sci. China Math.* 62.11 (2019), pp. 2287–2308. ISSN: 1674-7283. DOI: [10.1007/s11425-018-9476-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11425-018-9476-8) (cit. on pp. 2, 5).
- [Maa79] Hendrik Maazen. *Homology stability for the general linear group*. PhD thesis. Utrecht University, 1979. URL: <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/237657> (visited on 05/14/2024) (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5).
- [NS89] Yu. P. Nesterenko and A. A. Suslin. “Homology of the general linear group over a local ring, and Milnor’s K -theory”. In: *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* 53.1 (1989), pp. 121–146. ISSN: 0373-2436. DOI: [10.1070/IM1990v034n01ABEH000610](https://doi.org/10.1070/IM1990v034n01ABEH000610) (cit. on pp. 2, 3).
- [Put09] Andrew Putman. “An infinite presentation of the Torelli group”. In: *Geom. Funct. Anal.* 19.2 (2009), pp. 591–643. ISSN: 1016-443X. DOI: [10.1007/s00039-009-0006-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-009-0006-6) (cit. on pp. 16, 17).

- [Qui73] Daniel Quillen. “Finite generation of the groups K_i of rings of algebraic integers”. In: *Algebraic K-theory, I: Higher K-theories (Proc. Conf., Battelle Memorial Inst., Seattle, Wash., 1972)*. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 341. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1973, pp. 179–198. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0067056](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0067056) (cit. on p. 3).
- [Qui74] Daniel Quillen. *Notebook 1974, 1-3*. 1974. URL: <https://www.claymath.org/online-resources/quillen-notebooks/> (visited on 05/14/2024) (cit. on p. 2).
- [Qui78] Daniel Quillen. “Homotopy properties of the poset of nontrivial p -subgroups of a group”. In: *Adv. in Math.* 28.2 (1978), pp. 101–128. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: [10.1016/0001-8708\(78\)90058-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8708(78)90058-0) (cit. on pp. 2, 5, 11, 30).
- [RWW17] Oscar Randal-Williams and Nathalie Wahl. “Homological stability for automorphism groups”. In: *Adv. Math.* 318 (2017), pp. 534–626. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: [10.1016/j.aim.2017.07.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2017.07.022) (cit. on p. 2).
- [Rog91] John Rognes. *The Tits Buildings for \mathbb{Z}/p^n* . Apr. 1991. URL: <https://www.mn.uio.no/math/personer/vit/rognes/papers/Tits.pdf> (visited on 03/04/2024) (cit. on p. 10).
- [SC20] Iván Sadofschi Costa. “The complex of partial bases of a free group”. In: *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* 52.1 (2020), pp. 109–120. ISSN: 0024-6093. DOI: [10.1112/blms.12311](https://doi.org/10.1112/blms.12311) (cit. on pp. 8, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30).
- [Sca23] Matthew Scalamanire. *A Solomon-Tits theorem for rings*. 2023. arXiv: [2310.07175](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.07175) [math.AT] (cit. on pp. 4, 9, 10, 11, 12).
- [Sol69] Louis Solomon. “The Steinberg character of a finite group with BN -pair”. In: *Theory of Finite Groups (Symposium, Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass., 1968)*. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York-Amsterdam, 1969, pp. 213–221 (cit. on p. 10).
- [SW20] David Sprehn and Nathalie Wahl. “Homological stability for classical groups”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 373.7 (2020), pp. 4807–4861. ISSN: 0002-9947. DOI: [10.1090/tran/8030](https://doi.org/10.1090/tran/8030) (cit. on p. 2).
- [Ste51] R. Steinberg. “A geometric approach to the representations of the full linear group over a Galois field”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 71 (1951), pp. 274–282. ISSN: 0002-9947. DOI: [10.2307/1990691](https://doi.org/10.2307/1990691) (cit. on p. 3).
- [Sus84] A. A. Suslin. “Homology of GL_n , characteristic classes and Milnor K -theory”. In: *Algebraic K-theory, number theory, geometry and analysis (Bielefeld, 1982)*. Vol. 1046. Lecture Notes in Math. Springer, Berlin, 1984, pp. 357–375. DOI: [10.1007/BFb0072031](https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0072031) (cit. on pp. 2, 3).
- [Vas84] L. N. Vaserstein. “Bass’s first stable range condition”. In: *Proceedings of the Luminy conference on algebraic K-theory (Luminy, 1983)*. Vol. 34. 2-3. 1984, pp. 319–330. DOI: [10.1016/0022-4049\(84\)90044-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4049(84)90044-6) (cit. on p. 2).
- [Vas71] L. N. Vaseršteĭn. “The stable range of rings and the dimension of topological spaces”. In: *Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen.* 5.2 (1971), pp. 17–27. ISSN: 0374-1990. DOI: [10.1007/BF01076414](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01076414) (cit. on p. 8).
- [Wag76] J. B. Wagoner. “Stability for homology of the general linear group of a local ring”. In: *Topology* 15.4 (1976), pp. 417–423. ISSN: 0040-9383. DOI: [10.1016/0040-9383\(76\)90035-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0040-9383(76)90035-5) (cit. on pp. 1, 2, 5).

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, USA
 Email address: berna249@umn.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, USA
 Email address: jeremykmiller@purdue.edu

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT MÜNSTER, GERMANY
 Email address: robinjsroka@uni-muenster.de