

# On Growth Functions of Coxeter Groups

Sebastian *Bischof*\*

Mathematisches Institut, Arndtstraße 2, 35392 Gießen, Germany

May 28, 2024

## Abstract

Let  $(W, S)$  be a Coxeter system of rank  $n$  and let  $p_{(W, S)}(t)$  be its growth function. It is known that  $p_{(W, S)}(q^{-1}) < \infty$  holds for all  $n \leq q \in \mathbb{N}$ . In this paper we will show that this still holds for  $q = n - 1$ , if  $(W, S)$  is 2-spherical. Moreover, we will prove that  $p_{(W, S)}(q^{-1}) = \infty$  holds for  $q = n - 2$ , if the Coxeter diagram of  $(W, S)$  is the complete graph. These two results provide a complete characterization of the finiteness of the growth function in the case of 2-spherical Coxeter systems with complete Coxeter diagram.

**Keywords** Coxeter groups, Growth function, Poincaré series

**Mathematics Subject Classification** 20F55, 51F15

## 1 Introduction

One of the most central results in the theory of lattices is Margulis' Normal Subgroup Theorem for irreducible lattices in connected semi-simple Lie groups of real rank  $\geq 2$  with finite center and no non-trivial compact factor [14]. Among all the recent generalizations, let me mention that Bader and Shalom proved a version of the Normal Subgroup Theorem for irreducible cocompact lattices in a product of two locally compact, non-discrete, compactly generated groups [3]. Based on earlier results in [16], Caprace and Rémy applied the Normal Subgroup Theorem to show simplicity for Kac-Moody groups over finite fields of irreducible, non-spherical and non-affine type that are twin building lattices (cf. [9, Theorem 18]). Moreover, it can be used to prove virtual simplicity of certain twin tree lattices with non-trivial commutation relations (cf. [10]).

In [15] and [11], Rémy, and independently Carbone and Garland, proved that certain groups acting on (twin) buildings are lattices. To be more precise: Let  $(W, S)$  be a Coxeter system of finite rank and let  $\Phi := \Phi(W, S)$  be its associated set of roots (viewed as half-spaces). Let  $\mathcal{D} = (G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$  be an RGD-system of type  $(W, S)$ , i.e. a group  $G$  together with a family  $(U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi}$  of subgroups (which we call *root groups*) indexed by the set of roots  $\Phi$  satisfying some combinatorial axioms (for the precise definition we refer to [1, Ch. 7, 8]). Then there exists a *twin building*  $\Delta = (\Delta_+, \Delta_-, \delta_*)$  such that  $G$  acts on  $\Delta$ . It turns out that under some conditions,  $G^\dagger := \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi \rangle \leq \text{Aut}(\Delta_+) \times \text{Aut}(\Delta_-)$  and  $U_+ := \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi_+ \rangle \leq \text{Aut}(\Delta_-)$  are lattices (cf. [15], [11]) – and in this case  $G^\dagger$  is an example of a twin building lattice. Sufficient conditions are that every root group is finite,  $W$  is infinite and for  $q_{\min} := \min\{|U_\alpha| \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$  one has  $p_{(W, S)}\left(\frac{1}{q_{\min}}\right) < \infty$ , where  $p_{(W, S)}(t)$  denotes the *growth*

---

\*email: sebastian.bischof@math.uni-giessen.de

function of  $(W, S)$ . It is clear that this is finite if  $|S| \leq q_{\min}$ . It is particularly unsatisfying that this criterion does not apply to Coxeter systems of rank  $n \geq 3$  and  $q_{\min} = 2$ . However, there are examples of Coxeter systems  $(W, S)$  of rank  $n \geq 3$  with  $p_{(W,S)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) < \infty$ . Note that the growth function  $p_{(W,S)}(t)$  applied to  $q^{-1}$  with  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $q \geq 2$  is finite for spherical and affine Coxeter systems (cf. [6, Ch. VI, Exercices §4, 10]).

Suppose  $(W, S)$  is of type  $(4, 4, 4)$ , that is,  $(W, S)$  is of rank 3 and  $o(st) = 4$  for all  $s \neq t \in S$ . In [5] we constructed uncountably many new examples of RGD-systems of type  $(4, 4, 4)$  in which every root group has cardinality 2. As the known criterion does not apply to such RGD-systems, we first asked the question whether  $p_{(W,S)}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) < \infty$  holds. It turns out that this is indeed the case and the reason is the following more general result, which only depends on the rank of  $(W, S)$  and not on the type (cf. Theorem (4.3)):

**Theorem A:** Let  $(W, S)$  be a 2-spherical Coxeter system of rank  $n$ . Then  $p_{(W,S)}\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\right) < \infty$ .

After completion of this project I was informed by Corentin Bodart that a more general version of Theorem A can be deduced from [2, Theorem 1] (cf. also [12]). This implies that one can replace in Theorem A *2-spherical* by *non-universal*, i.e.  $m_{st} < \infty$  for some  $s \neq t \in S$ . Our methods of the proof are very different and most of the results proved in this paper are also used to prove Theorem C below. Our proofs are Coxeter group theoretic, while the proofs in [2] are for non-elementary word hyperbolic groups.

In view of the examples constructed in [5], Theorem A produces many new examples of lattices in (locally compact) automorphism groups of buildings and in a product of two automorphism groups of buildings. Combining Theorem A with [15, Théorème 1], we obtain that almost all RGD-systems of 2-spherical type and rank 3 are twin building lattices:

**Corollary B:** Let  $(W, S)$  a Coxeter system and let  $\mathcal{D} = (G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$  be an RGD-system of type  $(W, S)$ . Assume that the following are satisfied:

- $(W, S)$  is 2-spherical of rank 3 and  $W$  is infinite.
- $G = \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi \rangle$  and  $|U_\alpha| < \infty$  for all  $\alpha \in \Phi$ .

Then  $\mathcal{D}$  is a twin building lattice.

**Corollary B (Kac-Moody version):** Let  $(W, S)$  be a 2-spherical Coxeter system of rank 3 such that  $W$  is infinite, and let  $\mathbf{G}$  be the Kac-Moody group (in the sense of [19]) of type  $(W, S)$ . Then  $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{F}_q)$  is a twin building lattice, where  $\mathbb{F}_q$  denotes the finite field with  $q$  elements.

Now the question is whether the finiteness still holds for some  $q < n - 1$ . It turns out that in the class of Coxeter systems with complete Coxeter diagram this will not happen (cf. Theorem (4.5)):

**Theorem C:** Let  $(W, S)$  be a Coxeter system of rank  $n \geq 3$  such that the underlying Coxeter diagram is the complete graph. Then  $p_{(W,S)}\left(\frac{1}{n-2}\right) = \infty$ .

Suppose that the Coxeter diagram is 2-spherical, but the Coxeter diagram is not the complete graph. If the number of non-edges in the Coxeter diagram compared to the number of edges is *large*, then it is still possible that  $p_{(W,S)}\left(\frac{1}{n-2}\right) < \infty$  holds (cf. [17]). We also remark that Theorem C can be used to exclude certain subdiagrams for twin building lattices, as parabolic subgroups of twin building lattices are again twin building lattices:

**Corollary D:** Let  $(W, S)$  be a Coxeter system, let  $\mathcal{D}$  be an RGD-system of type  $(W, S)$  with finite root groups and let  $q_{\min} := \min\{|U_\alpha| \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$ . If  $\mathcal{D}$  is a twin building lattice, then there does not exist a subdiagram of  $(W, S)$  with at least  $q_{\min} + 2$  vertices, whose underlying Coxeter diagram is the complete graph.

## Acknowledgement

I am very grateful to Bernhard Mühlherr for stimulating discussions and interesting questions on the topic. I also thank Corentin Bodart and Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace for valuable remarks on an earlier draft. I thank Corentin Borart for pointing out the reference [2].

## 2 Preliminaries

### Growth of finitely generated groups

This subsection is based on [18].

Let  $G$  be a finitely generated group, and let  $X = X^{-1} \subseteq G \setminus \{1\}$  be a finite, symmetric set of generators. The *length* of  $g \in G$  with respect to  $X$  is the minimal  $n$  such that  $g = x_1 \cdots x_n$  with  $x_i \in X$ ; the *length function* will be denoted by  $\ell_{(G,X)} : G \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the *sphere* in  $\text{Cay}(G, X)$  centered around  $1_G$  with radius  $n$  will be denoted by

$$C_n^{(G,X)} := \{g \in G \mid \ell_{(G,X)}(g) = n\}.$$

The cardinalities are defined as  $c_n^{(G,X)} := |C_n^{(G,X)}|$ . The *growth function* of  $(G, X)$  is given by

$$p_{(G,X)}(t) := \sum_{n \geq 0} c_n^{(G,X)} t^n \in \mathbb{Z}[[t]].$$

### Coxeter systems

Let  $(W, S)$  be a Coxeter system and let  $\ell := \ell_{(W,S)}$  be the corresponding length function. For  $s, t \in S$  we denote the order of  $st$  in  $W$  by  $m_{st}$ . The *Coxeter diagram* corresponding to  $(W, S)$  is the labeled graph  $(S, E(S))$ , where  $E(S) = \{\{s, t\} \mid m_{st} > 2\}$  and where each edge  $\{s, t\}$  is labeled by  $m_{st}$  for all  $s, t \in S$ . The *rank* of the Coxeter system is the cardinality of the set  $S$ .

It is well-known that for each  $J \subseteq S$  the pair  $(\langle J \rangle, J)$  is a Coxeter system (cf. [6, Ch. IV, §1 Theorem 2]). A subset  $J \subseteq S$  is called *spherical* if  $\langle J \rangle$  is finite. The Coxeter system is called *2-spherical* if  $\langle J \rangle$  is finite for all  $J \subseteq S$  containing at most 2 elements (i.e.  $m_{st} < \infty$  for all  $s, t \in S$ ). Given a spherical subset  $J$  of  $S$ , there exists a unique element of maximal length in  $\langle J \rangle$ , which we denote by  $r_J$  (cf. [1, Corollary 2.19]).

For  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  we define

- $C_i := C_i^{(W,S)} = \{w \in W \mid \ell(w) = i\}$  and  $c_i := |C_i| = c_i^{(W,S)}$ ;
- $D_i := \{w \in C_i \mid \exists! s \in S : \ell(ws) < \ell(w)\}$  and  $d_i := |D_i|$ ;

### The chamber system $\Sigma(W, S)$

Let  $(W, S)$  be a Coxeter system. Defining  $w \sim_s w'$  if and only if  $w^{-1}w' \in \langle s \rangle$  we obtain a chamber system with chamber set  $W$  and equivalence relations  $\sim_s$  for  $s \in S$ , which we denote by  $\Sigma(W, S)$ . We call two chambers  $w, w'$  *s-adjacent* if  $w \sim_s w'$  and *adjacent* if they are *s-adjacent* for some  $s \in S$ . A *gallery of length  $n$*  from  $w_0$  to  $w_n$  is a sequence  $(w_0, \dots, w_n)$  of chambers where  $w_i$  and  $w_{i+1}$  are adjacent for each  $0 \leq i < n$ . A gallery  $(w_0, \dots, w_n)$  is called *minimal* if there exists no gallery from  $w_0$  to  $w_n$  of length  $k < n$  and we denote the length of a minimal gallery from  $w_0$  to  $w_n$  by  $\ell(w_0, w_n)$ . For  $J \subseteq S$  we define the *J-residue* of a chamber  $c \in W$  to be the set  $R_J(c) := c \langle J \rangle$ . A *residue  $R$*  is a *J-residue* for some  $J \subseteq S$ ; we call  $J$  the *type* of  $R$  and the cardinality of  $J$  is called the *rank* of  $R$ . A residue is called *spherical* if its type is a spherical subset of  $S$ . Let  $R$  be a spherical *J-residue*. Two chambers

$x, y \in R$  are called *opposite in  $R$*  if  $x^{-1}y = r_J$ . Two residues  $P, Q \subseteq R$  are called *opposite in  $R$*  if for each  $p \in P$  there exists  $q \in Q$  such that  $p, q$  are opposite in  $R$ . A *panel* is a residue of rank 1. It is a fact that for every chamber  $x \in W$  and every residue  $R$  there exists a unique chamber  $z \in R$  such that  $\ell(x, y) = \ell(x, z) + \ell(z, y)$  holds for each chamber  $y \in R$ . The chamber  $z$  is called the *projection* of  $x$  onto  $R$  and is denoted by  $z = \text{proj}_R x$ .

A subset  $\Sigma \subseteq W$  is called *convex* if for any two chambers  $c, d \in \Sigma$  and any minimal gallery  $(c_0 = c, \dots, c_k = d)$ , we have  $c_i \in \Sigma$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq k$ . Note that residues are convex by [1, Example 5.44(b)].

For two residues  $R$  and  $T$  we define  $\text{proj}_T R := \{\text{proj}_T r \mid r \in R\}$ . By [1, Lemma 5.36(2)]  $\text{proj}_T R$  is a residue contained in  $T$ . The residues  $R$  and  $T$  are called *parallel* if  $\text{proj}_T R = T$  and  $\text{proj}_R T = R$ .

## Roots and walls

Let  $(W, S)$  be a Coxeter system. A *reflection* is an element of  $W$  that is conjugate to an element of  $S$ . For  $s \in S$  we let  $\alpha_s := \{w \in W \mid \ell(sw) > \ell(w)\}$  be the *simple root* corresponding to  $s$ . A *root* is a subset  $\alpha \subseteq W$  such that  $\alpha = v\alpha_s$  for some  $v \in W$  and  $s \in S$ . We denote the set of all roots by  $\Phi(W, S)$ . The set  $\Phi(W, S)_+ := \{\alpha \in \Phi(W, S) \mid 1_W \in \alpha\}$  is the set of all *positive roots* and  $\Phi(W, S)_- := \{\alpha \in \Phi(W, S) \mid 1_W \notin \alpha\}$  is the set of all *negative roots*. For each root  $\alpha \in \Phi(W, S)$  we denote the *opposite root* by  $-\alpha$  and we denote the unique reflection which interchanges these two roots by  $r_\alpha$ . For  $\alpha \in \Phi(W, S)$  we denote by  $\partial\alpha$  (resp.  $\partial^2\alpha$ ) the set of all panels (resp. spherical residues of rank 2) stabilized by  $r_\alpha$ . Furthermore, we define  $\mathcal{C}(\partial\alpha) := \bigcup_{P \in \partial\alpha} P$  and  $\mathcal{C}(\partial^2\alpha) := \bigcup_{R \in \partial^2\alpha} R$ .

The set  $\partial\alpha$  is called the *wall* associated to  $\alpha$ . Let  $G = (c_0, \dots, c_k)$  be a gallery with  $c_{i-1} \neq c_i$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . We say that  $G$  *crosses the wall  $\partial\alpha$*  if there exists  $1 \leq i \leq k$  such that  $\{c_{i-1}, c_i\} \in \partial\alpha$ . It is a basic fact that a minimal gallery crosses a wall at most once (cf. [1, Lemma 3.69]). Moreover, a gallery which crosses each wall at most once is already minimal.

**(2.1) Convention.** For the rest of this paper we let  $(W, S)$  be a Coxeter system of finite rank and we let  $\Phi := \Phi(W, S)$  (resp.  $\Phi_+ := \Phi(W, S)_+$  and  $\Phi_- := \Phi(W, S)_-$ ).

A pair  $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subseteq \Phi$  of roots is called *prenilpotent*, if  $\alpha \cap \beta \neq \emptyset \neq (-\alpha) \cap (-\beta)$ . For a prenilpotent pair  $\{\alpha, \beta\}$  of roots we will write  $[\alpha, \beta] := \{\gamma \in \Phi \mid \alpha \cap \beta \subseteq \gamma \text{ and } (-\alpha) \cap (-\beta) \subseteq (-\gamma)\}$  and  $(\alpha, \beta) := [\alpha, \beta] \setminus \{\alpha, \beta\}$ . We note that roots are convex (cf. [1, Lemma 3.44]).

Let  $(c_0, \dots, c_k)$  and  $(d_0 = c_0, \dots, d_k = c_k)$  be two minimal galleries from  $c_0$  to  $c_k$  and let  $\alpha \in \Phi$ . Then  $\partial\alpha$  is crossed by the minimal gallery  $(c_0, \dots, c_k)$  if and only if it is crossed by the minimal gallery  $(d_0, \dots, d_k)$ .

**(2.2) Lemma.** *Let  $R$  be a spherical residue of  $\Sigma(W, S)$  of rank 2 and let  $\alpha \in \Phi$ . Then exactly one of the following hold:*

- (a)  $R \subseteq \alpha$ ;
- (b)  $R \subseteq (-\alpha)$ ;
- (c)  $R \in \partial^2\alpha$ ;

*Proof.* It is clear that the three cases are exclusive. Suppose that  $R \not\subseteq \alpha$  and  $R \not\subseteq (-\alpha)$ . Then there exist  $c \in R \cap (-\alpha)$  and  $d \in R \cap \alpha$ . Let  $(c_0 = c, \dots, c_k = d)$  be a minimal gallery. As residues are convex, we have  $c_i \in R$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq k$ . As  $c \in (-\alpha), d \in \alpha$ , there exists  $1 \leq i \leq k$  with  $c_{i-1} \in (-\alpha), c_i \in \alpha$ . In particular,  $\{c_{i-1}, c_i\} \in \partial\alpha$  and hence  $R \in \partial^2\alpha$ .  $\square$

**(2.3) Lemma.** *Let  $R, T$  be two spherical residues of  $\Sigma(W, S)$ . Then the following are equivalent*

- (i)  $R, T$  are parallel;
- (ii) a reflection of  $\Sigma(W, S)$  stabilizes  $R$  if and only if it stabilizes  $T$ ;
- (iii) there exist two sequences  $R_0 = R, \dots, R_n = T$  and  $T_1, \dots, T_n$  of residues of spherical type such that for each  $1 \leq i \leq n$  the rank of  $T_i$  is equal to  $1 + \text{rank}(R)$ , the residues  $R_{i-1}, R_i$  are contained and opposite in  $T_i$  and moreover, we have  $\text{proj}_{T_i} R = R_{i-1}$  and  $\text{proj}_{T_i} T = R_i$ .

*Proof.* This is [8, Proposition 2.7]. □

**(2.4) Lemma.** *Let  $\alpha \in \Phi$  be a root and let  $x, y \in \alpha \cap \mathcal{C}(\partial\alpha)$ . Then there exists a minimal gallery  $(c_0 = x, \dots, c_k = y)$  such that  $c_i \in \mathcal{C}(\partial^2\alpha)$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq k$ . Moreover, for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$  there exists  $L_i \in \partial^2\alpha$  with  $\{c_{i-1}, c_i\} \subseteq L_i$ .*

*Proof.* This is a consequence of [7, Lemma 2.3] and its proof. □

**(2.5) Lemma.** *Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi, \alpha \neq \pm\beta$  be two roots and let  $R, T \in \partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\beta$ .*

- (a) *The residues  $R$  and  $T$  are parallel.*
- (b) *If  $|\langle J \rangle| = \infty$  holds for all  $J \subseteq S$  containing three elements, then  $R = T$ .*

*Proof.* As  $R, T \in \partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\beta$ , there exist panels  $P_1, Q_1 \in \partial\alpha$  and  $P_2, Q_2 \in \partial\beta$  such that  $P_1, P_2 \subseteq R$  and  $Q_1, Q_2 \subseteq T$  (as in the proof of Lemma (2.2)). By Lemma (2.3) the panels  $P_i, Q_i$  are parallel for both  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . [13, Lemma 17] yields that  $P_i, \text{proj}_T P_i$  are parallel and hence  $\text{proj}_T P_1 \in \partial\alpha, \text{proj}_T P_2 \in \partial\beta$  by Lemma (2.3). As  $\alpha \neq \pm\beta$ , we deduce  $\text{proj}_T P_1 \neq \text{proj}_T P_2$  and hence  $\text{proj}_T R$  contains the two different panels  $\text{proj}_T P_1$  and  $\text{proj}_T P_2$ . In particular,  $\text{proj}_T R$  is not a panel. Since  $\text{proj}_T R$  is a residue contained in  $T$ , we deduce  $\text{proj}_T R = T$ . Using similar arguments, we obtain  $\text{proj}_R T = R$  and  $R, T$  are parallel. This proves (a). Moreover, Lemma (2.3) yields  $R = T$ , as there are no spherical residues of rank 3 by assumption. This finishes the proof. □

## Reflection and combinatorial triangles in $\Sigma(W, S)$

A *reflection triangle* is a set  $T$  of three reflections such that the order of  $tt'$  is finite for all  $t, t' \in T$  and such that  $\bigcap_{t \in T} \partial^2\beta_t = \emptyset$ , where  $\beta_t$  is one of the two roots associated with the reflection  $t$ . Note that  $\partial^2\beta_t = \partial^2(-\beta_t)$ . A set of three roots  $T$  is called *combinatorial triangle* (or simply *triangle*) if the following hold:

(CT1) The set  $\{r_\alpha \mid \alpha \in T\}$  is a reflection triangle.

(CT2) For each  $\alpha \in T$ , there exists  $\sigma \in \partial^2\beta \cap \partial^2\gamma$  such that  $\sigma \subseteq \alpha$ , where  $\{\beta, \gamma\} = T \setminus \{\alpha\}$ .

**(2.6) Lemma.** *Suppose that  $(W, S)$  is 2-spherical and the Coxeter diagram is the complete graph. If  $T$  is a triangle, then  $(-\alpha, \beta) = \emptyset$  holds for all  $\alpha \neq \beta \in T$ .*

*Proof.* This is [4, Proposition 2.3]. □

**(2.7) Proposition.** *Assume that  $(W, S)$  is 2-spherical and the Coxeter diagram is the complete graph. Let  $R \neq T$  be two residues of rank 2 such that  $P := R \cap T$  is a panel. If  $\ell(1_W, \text{proj}_R 1_W) < \ell(1_W, \text{proj}_T 1_W)$ , then  $\text{proj}_T 1_W = \text{proj}_P 1_W$ .*

*Proof.* We let  $\alpha \in \Phi_+$  be the root with  $P \in \partial\alpha$ . Let  $(c_0 = 1_W, \dots, c_{k'} = \text{proj}_P c_0)$  be a minimal gallery with  $c_k = \text{proj}_R c_0$  for some  $0 \leq k \leq k'$  and  $c_k, \dots, c_{k'} \in R$ .

We assume that  $\text{proj}_T c_0 \neq \text{proj}_P c_0$  holds. Then we have  $k' > \ell(1_W, \text{proj}_T 1_W) > \ell(1_W, \text{proj}_R 1_W) = k$ . Let  $(d_0 = 1_W, \dots, d_{m'} = \text{proj}_P d_0)$  be a minimal gallery with  $d_m = \text{proj}_T c_0$  for some  $0 \leq m \leq m'$  and  $d_m, \dots, d_{m'} \in T$ . We let  $\beta \in \Phi_+$  be the root with  $\{d_m, d_{m+1}\} \in \partial\beta$  and we let  $\gamma \in \Phi_+$  be the root with  $\{c_k, c_{k+1}\} \in \partial\gamma$ . We will show that  $\{\alpha, -\beta, -\gamma\}$  is a triangle. Thus we first show that  $\{r_\alpha, r_\beta, r_\gamma\}$  is a reflection triangle. We have  $T \in \partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\beta$  and, as a minimal gallery crosses a wall at most once, we deduce  $\alpha \neq \beta$ . Note that the wall  $\partial\beta$  is crossed by the minimal gallery  $(c_0, \dots, c_{k'})$ . Since  $\partial^2\alpha \ni R \neq T \in \partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\beta$  and  $\alpha \neq \pm\beta$ , Lemma (2.5)(b) implies  $R \notin \partial^2\beta$  and hence  $\partial\beta$  is crossed by  $(c_0, \dots, c_k)$ . As  $k < k'$ , we have  $\text{proj}_R 1_W \neq \text{proj}_P 1_W$  and hence  $\alpha \neq \gamma$ . As  $\alpha, \gamma \in \Phi_+$ , we have  $\alpha \neq \pm\gamma$ .

Assume that  $o(r_\beta r_\gamma) = \infty$ . We deduce  $\beta \subseteq \gamma$ . But  $\partial\gamma$  has to be crossed by the gallery  $(d_0, \dots, d_{m'})$ . Since  $\partial^2\alpha \ni T \neq R \in \partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\gamma$  and  $\alpha \neq \pm\gamma$ , we have  $T \notin \partial^2\gamma$  by Lemma (2.5)(b) as before. This implies that  $(d_0, \dots, d_m)$  crosses the wall  $\partial\beta$  and hence  $\gamma \subseteq \beta$ . This yields a contradiction and we have  $o(r_\beta r_\gamma) < \infty$ .

As  $R \in \partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\gamma$ , Lemma (2.5)(b) implies  $\partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\gamma = \{R\}$ . As  $R \notin \partial^2\beta$ , we deduce  $\partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\beta \cap \partial^2\gamma = \emptyset$  and hence  $\{r_\alpha, r_\beta, r_\gamma\}$  is a reflection triangle.

Now we have to verify (CT2). As  $\partial^2\gamma \not\ni T \in \partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\beta$  and  $P \subseteq T \cap (-\gamma)$ , we have  $T \subseteq (-\gamma)$  by Lemma (2.2). As  $\partial^2\beta \not\ni R \in \partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\gamma$  and  $P \subseteq R \cap (-\beta)$ , we have  $R \subseteq (-\beta)$ . Let  $1 \leq i \leq k$  be such that  $\{c_{i-1}, c_i\} \in \partial\beta$ . Note that  $\{d_m, d_{m+1}\} \in \partial\beta, d_{m+1} \in (-\beta) \cap T \subseteq (-\gamma)$  and  $c_i \in (-\beta) \cap \gamma$ . By Lemma (2.4) there exists a minimal gallery  $(e_0 = d_{m+1}, \dots, e_z = c_i)$  such that  $e_j \in \mathcal{C}(\partial^2\beta)$ . As  $d_{m+1} \in (-\gamma)$  and  $c_i \in \gamma$ , there exists  $1 \leq p \leq z$  such that  $e_{p-1} \in (-\gamma)$  and  $e_p \in \gamma$ . Again by Lemma (2.4) there exists  $L \in \partial^2\beta$  such that  $\{e_{p-1}, e_p\} \subseteq L$ , and hence  $L \in \partial^2\beta \cap \partial^2\gamma$ . As roots are convex and  $e_0 = d_{m+1}, e_z = c_i \in \alpha$ , we have  $e_p \in L \cap \alpha$ . As  $\{r_\alpha, r_\beta, r_\gamma\}$  is a reflection triangle (and hence  $L \notin \partial^2\alpha$ ), we obtain  $L \subseteq \alpha$  by Lemma (2.2). This implies that  $\{\alpha, -\beta, -\gamma\}$  is a triangle and hence  $(\alpha, \gamma) = \emptyset$  holds by Lemma (2.6). In particular,  $k+1 = k'$  and  $\ell(1_W, \text{proj}_R 1_W) = \ell(1_W, \text{proj}_P 1_W) - 1 \geq \ell(1_W, \text{proj}_T 1_W)$ . This is a contradiction to the assumption and we conclude  $\text{proj}_T 1_W = \text{proj}_P 1_W$ .  $\square$

**(2.8) Corollary.** *Assume that  $(W, S)$  is 2-spherical and that the underlying Coxeter diagram is the complete graph. Suppose  $w \in W$  and  $s \neq t \in S$  with  $\ell(ws) = \ell(w) + 1 = \ell(wt)$  and suppose  $w' \in \langle s, t \rangle$  with  $\ell(w') \geq 2$ . Then we have  $\ell(ww'r) = \ell(w) + \ell(w') + 1$  for each  $r \in S \setminus \{s, t\}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $r \in S \setminus \{s, t\}$  and assume that  $\ell(ww'r) = \ell(ww') - 1$  holds for some  $w' \in \langle s, t \rangle$  with  $\ell(w') \geq 2$ . Suppose  $w'$  starts with  $s$ , i.e.  $w' = sw''$  for some  $w'' \in \langle s, t \rangle$  with  $\ell(w'') = \ell(w') - 1$ . As  $\ell(ww'r) = \ell(ww') - 1$ , one easily sees that  $\ell(wstr) = \ell(wst) - 1$  and  $\ell(wsr) = \ell(ws) - 1$  hold, too. We define  $R := R_{\{r, t\}}(ws), T := R_{\{s, t\}}(w)$  and  $P := R \cap T = \mathcal{P}_t(ws)$ . Clearly,  $\text{proj}_T 1_W \neq \text{proj}_P 1_W$ . As  $m_{rt} \geq 3$ , we deduce  $\ell(1_W, \text{proj}_R 1_W) < \ell(1_W, \text{proj}_T 1_W)$  and Proposition (2.7) yields a contradiction.  $\square$

**(2.9) Lemma.** *Assume that  $(W, S)$  is 2-spherical and that  $m_{st} \geq 4$  holds for all  $s \neq t \in S$ . Suppose  $w \in W$  and  $s \neq t \in S$  with  $\ell(ws) = \ell(w) + 1 = \ell(wt)$ . Then we have  $\ell(w) + 2 \in \{\ell(wsr), \ell(wtr)\}$  for all  $r \in S \setminus \{s, t\}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\ell(wsr) = \ell(w) = \ell(wtr)$ . Then  $\ell(wr) = \ell(w) - 1$  and  $\ell(wrs) = \ell(w) - 2 = \ell(wrt)$ . Let  $R$  be the  $\{r, s\}$  residue containing  $w$ . As  $m_{rs} \geq 4$ , we deduce  $\ell(wrsr) = \ell(wrs) - 1$ . Let  $w' \in \langle s, t \rangle$  be such that  $wr = (\text{proj}_R 1_W)w'$ . Then  $\ell(w') \geq 2$  and the previous corollary implies  $\ell(wrt) = \ell(wr) + 1$ , which is a contradiction. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**(2.10) Remark.** Note that Lemma (2.9) is false without the assumption  $m_{st} \geq 4$ . To see this one can consider the Coxeter system of type  $\tilde{A}_2$ .

### 3 Some (in-)equalities

To show the two main results (Theorem (4.3) and (4.5)), we will apply the quotient criterion. In order to do so we need a few inequalities, which we establish in this and the next section. We recall that for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

- $C_i := \{w \in W \mid \ell(w) = i\}$  and  $c_i := |C_i|$ ;
- $D_i := \{w \in C_i \mid \exists! s \in S : \ell(ws) < \ell(w)\}$  and  $d_i := |D_i|$ ;

**(3.1) Convention.** In this section we assume that  $(W, S)$  is of rank  $n \geq 3$  and that there exists  $m \geq 3$  such that  $m_{st} = m$  holds for all  $s \neq t \in S$ . Moreover, we let  $i > m$ .

*(3.2) Remark.* Note that  $(W, S)$  is 2-spherical and that the underlying Coxeter diagram is the complete graph. In particular, we have  $|\langle J \rangle| = \infty$  for all  $J \subseteq S$  containing three elements. This implies that for each  $w \in W \setminus \{1_W\}$  there is either a unique element  $s_w \in S$  with  $\ell(ws_w) = \ell(w) - 1$ , or else there are exactly two elements  $s_w \neq t_w \in S$  with  $\ell(ws_w) = \ell(w) - 1 = \ell(wt_w)$ .

**(3.3) Lemma.**  $c_i - d_i = \binom{n-2}{2} c_{i-m} + (n-2)d_{i-m}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $v \in C_i \setminus D_i$  be an element. Then there exist unique  $s \neq t \in S$  with  $\ell(vs) = \ell(v) - 1 = \ell(vt)$ . We define  $R_v := R_{\{s,t\}}(v)$ . Then we consider the mapping

$$f : C_i \setminus D_i \rightarrow C_{i-m}, v \mapsto \text{proj}_{R_v} 1_W$$

Note that  $C_{i-m} = D_{i-m} \cup C_{i-m} \setminus D_{i-m}$ . If  $w \in C_{i-m} \setminus D_{i-m}$  is, there are exactly two elements in  $S$ , say  $s_w \neq t_w \in S$  which decrease the length of  $w$  (as  $i > m$ ). Any other element  $r \in S \setminus \{s_w, t_w\}$  increases the length of  $w$ . For  $n > 3$  and  $r_1 \neq r_2 \in S \setminus \{s_w, t_w\}$ , we have  $f(wr_{\{r_1, r_2\}}) = w$ . For  $n = 3$  we have  $f^{-1}(w) = \emptyset$ . In both cases  $w$  has  $\binom{n-2}{2}$  many preimages. If  $w \in D_{i-m}$  is, there exists a unique  $s_w \in S$  which decreases the length of  $w$  and (similarly as before)  $w$  has  $\binom{n-1}{2}$  many preimages. Note that  $\binom{n-1}{2} - \binom{n-2}{2} = n-2$ . We conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} c_i - d_i &= |C_i \setminus D_i| = \sum_{w \in C_{i-m}} |f^{-1}(w)| \\ &= \sum_{w \in C_{i-m} \setminus D_{i-m}} |f^{-1}(w)| + \sum_{w \in D_{i-m}} |f^{-1}(w)| \\ &= \binom{n-2}{2} (c_{i-m} - d_{i-m}) + \binom{n-1}{2} d_{i-m} \\ &= \binom{n-2}{2} c_{i-m} + (n-2)d_{i-m}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

**(3.4) Lemma.**  $2c_{i+1} - d_{i+1} = (n-2)c_i + d_i$ .

*Proof.* We put  $M_i := \{(w, s) \in C_i \times S \mid ws \in C_{i+1}\}$ . We prove the claim by showing that both sides of the equation are equal to  $|M_i|$ .

(a)  $2c_{i+1} - d_{i+1} = |M_i|$ : We consider the mapping

$$\pi : M_i \rightarrow C_{i+1}, (w, s) \mapsto ws.$$

Clearly,  $\pi$  is surjective. We define

$$C_{i+1}^1 := \{w \in C_{i+1} \mid |\pi^{-1}(w)| = 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad C_{i+1}^{>1} := \{w \in C_{i+1} \mid |\pi^{-1}(w)| > 1\}.$$

We show that  $C_{i+1}^{>1} = C_{i+1} \setminus D_{i+1}$ . Let  $\bar{w} \in C_{i+1}^{>1}$  be an element. Then there exist  $(w, s) \neq (w', s') \in \pi^{-1}(\bar{w})$ . It follows  $s \neq s'$  and hence  $\bar{w} \in C_{i+1} \setminus D_{i+1}$ . Now let  $w \in C_{i+1} \setminus D_{i+1}$ . Then there exist unique  $s_w \neq t_w \in S$  which decrease the length of  $w$ . This implies  $(ws_w, s_w) \neq (wt_w, t_w) \in \pi^{-1}(w)$ . As  $|\langle J \rangle| = \infty$  for all  $J \subseteq S$  containing three elements, we deduce for every  $1 \neq w \in W$  that

$$|\pi^{-1}(w)| \in \{1, 2\}.$$

We infer  $C_{i+1}^1 = C_{i+1} \setminus C_{i+1}^{>1} = C_{i+1} \setminus (C_{i+1} \setminus D_{i+1}) = D_{i+1}$  and compute:

$$\begin{aligned} |M_i| &= \sum_{w \in C_{i+1}} |\pi^{-1}(w)| = \sum_{w \in D_{i+1}} |\pi^{-1}(w)| + \sum_{w \in C_{i+1} \setminus D_{i+1}} |\pi^{-1}(w)| \\ &= d_{i+1} + 2(c_{i+1} - d_{i+1}) \\ &= 2c_{i+1} - d_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

(b)  $(n-2)c_i + d_i = |M_i|$ : For a subset  $T \subseteq C_i$ , we define

$$M_{i,T} := \{(w, s) \in M_i \mid w \in T\}.$$

For  $w \in D_i$  there are exactly  $n-1$  elements which increase the length of  $w$ . Thus we have  $|M_{i,D_i}| = (n-1)d_i$ . For  $w \in C_i \setminus D_i$  there are exactly  $n-2$  elements in  $S$  which increase the length of  $w$ . Thus we have  $|M_{i,C_i \setminus D_i}| = (n-2)(c_i - d_i)$ . We conclude:

$$|M_i| = |M_{i,C_i \setminus D_i}| + |M_{i,D_i}| = (n-2)(c_i - d_i) + (n-1)d_i = (n-2)c_i + d_i. \quad \square$$

**(3.5) Lemma.**  $c_{i+1} \leq (n-1)c_i - (n-2)d_{i-m+1} \leq (n-1)c_i$ .

*Proof.* The last inequality is obvious. Using Lemma (3.3) and (3.4), we deduce the following:

$$c_{i+1} + (n-2)d_{i-m+1} \leq 2c_{i+1} - d_{i+1} = (n-2)c_i + d_i \leq (n-1)c_i. \quad \square$$

**(3.6) Lemma.** *Suppose  $m > 3$ . Then the following hold:*

$$(a) \quad (n-2)c_i \leq c_{i+1};$$

$$(b) \quad (n-2)d_i \leq d_{i+1};$$

*Proof.* We define  $N_i := \{(w, s) \in C_i \times S \mid ws \in D_{i+1}\}$ . Then  $N_i \rightarrow D_{i+1}, (w, s) \mapsto ws$  is a bijection and hence  $|N_i| = d_{i+1}$ . As in the proof of Lemma (3.4) we define for a subset  $T \subseteq C_i$ :

$$N_{i,T} := \{(w, s) \in N_i \mid w \in T\}.$$

We see that  $c_{i+1} \geq d_{i+1} = |N_i| = |N_{i,D_i}| + |N_{i,C_i \setminus D_i}|$ . Let  $w \in C_i$ . We now count pairs  $(w, s) \in N_i$ . We distinguish the following two cases:

- (i)  $w \in D_i$ : Let  $s_w \in S$  be the unique element with  $\ell(ws_w) < \ell(w)$ . Let  $t \in S \setminus \{s_w\}$ . Then  $wt \in C_{i+1}$ . Suppose  $wt \notin D_{i+1}$ . Then there exists  $t \neq r \in S$  with  $\ell(wtr) < \ell(wt)$ . This implies  $\ell(wr) < \ell(w)$  and the uniqueness of  $s_w$  yields  $r = s_w$ . Now let  $r \in S \setminus \{s_w, t\}$ . Then  $wr \in C_{i+1}$ . Again, if  $wr \notin D_{i+1}$ , then  $s_w$  would decrease the length of  $wr$ . But this is a contradiction to Lemma (2.9). This implies  $(w, r) \in N_{i,D_i}$  for all  $r \in S \setminus \{s_w, t\}$ . This shows (b).



- (ii)  $w \in C_i \setminus D_i$ : Let  $s_w \neq t_w \in S$  be the two elements with  $\ell(ws_w) = \ell(wt_w) < \ell(w)$ . Now let  $r \in S \setminus \{s_w, t_w\}$ . Then  $wr \in C_{i+1}$ . We assume by contrary  $wr \notin D_{i+1}$ . Then there would exist  $u \in S \setminus \{r\}$  with  $\ell(wru) = \ell(w)$  and hence  $\ell(wu) < \ell(w)$ . By the uniqueness of  $s_w$  and  $t_w$  we obtain  $u \in \{s_w, t_w\}$ . But then we obtain a contradiction to Corollary (2.8). We conclude  $(w, r) \in N_{i, C_i \setminus D_i}$ .

We infer  $c_{i+1} \geq |N_{i, D_i}| + |N_{i, C_i \setminus D_i}| \geq (n-2)d_i + (n-2)(c_i - d_i) = (n-2)c_i$ .  $\square$

## 4 Main results

### Reduction step

Let  $(W, S)$  and  $(W', S')$  be two Coxeter systems. Following [18], we define  $(W, S) \preceq (W', S')$  if there exists an injective map  $\varphi : S \rightarrow S'$  satisfying  $m_{st} \leq m'_{\varphi(s)\varphi(t)}$  for all  $s, t \in S$ .

**(4.1) Theorem.** *Let  $(W, S)$  and  $(W', S')$  be two Coxeter systems and let  $a_n := a_n^{(W, S)}$  and  $a'_n := a_n^{(W', S')}$ . If  $(W, S) \preceq (W', S')$ , then  $a_n \leq a'_n$ .*

*Proof.* This is [18, Theorem A].  $\square$

### Convergence

**(4.2) Lemma.** *Let  $(W, S)$  be of rank  $n \geq 3$  and assume that there exists  $m \geq 4$  such that  $m_{st} = m$  holds for all  $s \neq t \in S$ . Then there exists  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\frac{d_i}{c_i} \geq k > 0$  holds for all  $i > m$ .*

*Proof.* Using Lemma (3.3), (3.6) and (3.6)(b), we compute:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \frac{c_i - d_i + d_i}{c_i} = \frac{1}{c_i} \left( \binom{n-2}{2} c_{i-m} + (n-2)d_{i-m} + d_i \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c_i} \left( \binom{n-2}{2} \frac{1}{(n-2)^m} c_i + \left( \frac{1}{(n-2)^{m-1}} + 1 \right) d_i \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{c_i} \left( \frac{(n-3)}{2(n-2)^{m-1}} c_i + \left( \frac{1}{(n-2)^{m-1}} + 1 \right) d_i \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2(n-2)^{m-2}} + \left( \frac{1}{(n-2)^{m-1}} + 1 \right) \frac{d_i}{c_i} \end{aligned}$$

We put

$$k := \left( 1 - \frac{1}{2(n-2)^{m-2}} \right) \cdot \left( \frac{1}{(n-2)^{m-1}} + 1 \right)^{-1}.$$

As  $n \geq 3$  and  $m \geq 4$ , we have  $k > 0$ . This proves the claim.  $\square$

**(4.3) Theorem.** *Let  $(W, S)$  be 2-spherical and of rank  $n \geq 3$ . Then  $p_{(W, S)} \left( \frac{1}{n-1} \right) < \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $m := \max\{4, m_{st} \mid s, t \in S\}$  and let  $(W', S')$  be the Coxeter system of rank  $n$  with  $m'_{st} = m$  for all  $s \neq t \in S'$ . Using Theorem (4.1) it suffices to show that

$$p_{(W', S')} \left( \frac{1}{n-1} \right) < \infty.$$

By Lemma (4.2) there exists  $k \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\frac{d_i}{c_i} \geq k > 0$  holds for all  $i > m$ . We apply the quotient criterion. We use Lemma (3.5) and compute for  $i > 2m-1$  and  $t = \frac{1}{n-1}$ :

$$\frac{c_{i+1} t^{i+1}}{c_i t^i} \leq \frac{(n-1)c_i - (n-2)d_{i-m+1}}{(n-1)c_i} \leq 1 - \frac{(n-2)d_{i-m+1}}{(n-1)^m c_{i-m+1}} \leq 1 - \frac{n-2}{(n-1)^m} k < 1. \quad \square$$

## Divergence

In this subsection we prove that the new lower bound  $\frac{1}{n-1}$  for the finiteness of the growth function is optimal for the class of 2-spherical Coxeter systems with complete Coxeter diagram.

**(4.4) Lemma.** *Let  $(W, S)$  be 2-spherical and of rank  $n \geq 4$  and assume that the underlying Coxeter diagram is the complete graph. Then  $(n-2)c_i \leq d_i + d_{i+1}$ .*

*Proof.* For  $i = 0$  we have  $c_0 = 1$ ,  $d_0 = 0$  and  $d_1 = n$  and the claim follows. Thus we can assume  $i > 0$ . As in Lemma (3.6) we define  $N_i := \{(w, s) \in C_i \times S \mid ws \in D_{i+1}\}$  as well as  $N_{i,T} := \{(w, s) \in N_i \mid w \in T\}$  for  $T \subseteq C_i$ . We consider the mapping

$$\pi : N_i \rightarrow D_{i+1}, (w, s) \mapsto ws.$$

As before,  $\pi$  is a bijection and we have  $|N_i| = d_{i+1}$ . Moreover, we have  $N_i = N_{i,D_i} \cup N_{i,C_i \setminus D_i}$  and this union is disjoint. We now count pairs  $(w, s)$  in  $N_i$ .

We fix  $w \in D_i$  and we let  $s_w \in S$  be the unique element with  $\ell(ws_w) = \ell(w) - 1$ . Assume that there are  $r, s, t \in S \setminus \{s_w\}$  pairwise distinct with  $wr, ws, wt \in C_{i+1} \setminus D_{i+1}$ . Similarly as in Lemma (3.6)(b) we deduce  $\ell(wzs_w) = \ell(w)$  for each  $z \in \{r, s, t\}$ . As  $m_{pq} \geq 3$  holds for all  $p \neq q \in S$ , we infer  $\ell(ws_w z) = \ell(ws_w) - 1$ . As  $\{r, s, t\}$  is not spherical, this is a contradiction and we have for a fixed  $w \in D_i$  at least  $n-3$  tuples  $(w, s)$  in  $N_i$ .

We fix  $w \in C_i \setminus D_i$  and we let  $s_w \neq t_w \in S$  be the unique elements with  $\ell(ws_w) = \ell(w) - 1 = \ell(wt_w)$ . Assume that there is  $s \in S \setminus \{s_w, t_w\}$  with  $ws \in C_{i+1} \setminus D_{i+1}$ . Then  $\ell(w) \in \{\ell(wss_w), \ell(wst_w)\}$ . W.l.o.g. we assume  $\ell(wss_w) = \ell(w)$ . But then Corollary (2.8) implies  $\ell(wt_w) = \ell(w) + 1$ , which is a contradiction. Thus we have for a fixed  $w \in C_i \setminus D_i$  exactly  $n-2$  tuples  $(w, s)$  in  $N_i$ . This implies that  $(n-2)c_i - d_i = (n-3)d_i + (n-2)(c_i - d_i) \leq d_{i+1}$ .  $\square$

**(4.5) Theorem.** *Let  $(W, S)$  be of rank  $n \geq 4$  and assume that the underlying Coxeter diagram is the complete graph. Then  $p_{(W,S)}\left(\frac{1}{n-2}\right) = \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $(W', S')$  be the Coxeter system of rank  $n$  with  $m'_{st} = 3$  for all  $s \neq t \in S'$ . Using Theorem (4.1) it suffices to show that

$$p_{(W',S')}\left(\frac{1}{n-2}\right) = \infty.$$

As before, we apply the quotient criterion. Using Lemma (3.4) and (4.4), we deduce the following for  $i > m = 3$  and  $t = \frac{1}{n-2}$ :

$$\frac{c_{i+1}t^{i+1}}{c_i t^i} = \frac{(n-2)c_i + d_i + d_{i+1}}{2(n-2)c_i} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{d_i + d_{i+1}}{2(n-2)c_i} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 1. \quad \square$$

## References

- [1] P. Abramenko and K. S. Brown. *Buildings*, volume 248 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2008. Theory and applications.
- [2] G. N. Arzhantseva and I. G. Lysenok. Growth tightness for word hyperbolic groups. *Math. Z.*, 241(3):597–611, 2002.
- [3] U. Bader and Y. Shalom. Factor and normal subgroup theorems for lattices in products of groups. *Invent. Math.*, 163(2):415–454, 2006.

- [4] S. Bischof. On commutator relations in 2-spherical RGD-systems. *Comm. Algebra*, 50(2):751–769, 2022.
- [5] S. Bischof. *Construction of RGD-systems of type (4, 4, 4) over  $\mathbb{F}_2$* . PhD thesis, Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen, 2023.
- [6] N. Bourbaki. *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 4–6*. Elements of Mathematics (Berlin). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002. Translated from the 1968 French original by Andrew Pressley.
- [7] P.-E. Caprace and B. Mühlherr. Reflection triangles in Coxeter groups and biautomaticity. *J. Group Theory*, 8(4):467–489, 2005.
- [8] P.-E. Caprace and B. Mühlherr. Isomorphisms of Kac-Moody groups which preserve bounded subgroups. *Adv. Math.*, 206(1):250–278, 2006.
- [9] P.-E. Caprace and B. Rémy. Simplicity and superrigidity of twin building lattices. *Invent. Math.*, 176(1):169–221, 2009.
- [10] P.-E. Caprace and B. Rémy. Simplicity of twin tree lattices with non-trivial communication relations. In *Topology and geometric group theory*, volume 184 of *Springer Proc. Math. Stat.*, pages 143–151. Springer, [Cham], 2016.
- [11] L. Carbone and H. Garland. Lattices in Kac-Moody groups. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 6(3-4):439–447, 1999.
- [12] P. de la Harpe. *Topics in geometric group theory*. Chicago Lectures in Mathematics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 2000.
- [13] A. Devillers, B. Mühlherr, and H. Van Maldeghem. Codistances of 3-spherical buildings. *Math. Ann.*, 354(1):297–329, 2012.
- [14] G. A. Margulis. *Discrete subgroups of semisimple Lie groups*, volume 17 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (3) [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas (3)]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
- [15] B. Rémy. Construction de réseaux en théorie de Kac-Moody. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.*, 329(6):475–478, 1999.
- [16] B. Rémy. Integrability of induction cocycles for Kac-Moody groups. *Math. Ann.*, 333(1):29–43, 2005.
- [17] T. Terragni. Data about hyperbolic coxeter systems, 2015.
- [18] T. Terragni. On the growth of a Coxeter group. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 10(2):601–618, 2016.
- [19] J. Tits. Uniqueness and presentation of Kac-Moody groups over fields. *J. Algebra*, 105(2):542–573, 1987.