

THE BOUNDNESS OF LUSZTIG'S \mathbf{a} -FUNCTION FOR COXETER GROUPS OF FINITE RANK

XIAOYU CHEN

ABSTRACT. We prove the Lusztig's \mathbf{a} -function is bounded for any Coxeter group of finite rank.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Hecke algebra, \mathbf{a} -function, and Tit's cone	2
1.1. Hecke algebras and \mathbf{a} -function	2
1.2. Geometric representation and Tit's cone	3
1.3. Results on the Bruhat order	4
2. First properties on intersection of hyperplanes	5
3. Proof of main theorem	9
3.1. Ideas of the proof	9
3.2. A key intersecting subset	10
3.2.1. Properties $\mathbf{I}(n), \mathbf{D}(n), \mathbf{O}(n), \mathbf{E}(n), \mathbf{L}(n)$	10
3.2.2. $\mathbf{I}(n-1), \mathbf{L}(n-1), \mathbf{D}(n-1) \Rightarrow \mathbf{O}(n), \mathbf{E}(n)$	11
3.2.3. $\mathbf{I}(n-1), \mathbf{D}(n-1), \mathbf{O}(n), \mathbf{E}(n) \Rightarrow \mathbf{I}(n), \mathbf{D}(n), \mathbf{L}(n)$	13
3.3. Intersection of hyperplanes and reflection subgroups	20
3.4. Hyperbolic Coxeter groups and Lobachevskian geometry	21
3.5. The boundness of the cardinality of intersecting subsets	22
3.6. The end of proof	29
4. Some remarks	29
4.1. Some examples	29
4.2. Remark on weighted version	30
References	31

INTRODUCTION

Lusztig defined the \mathbf{a} -function for a Coxeter group in [7], which is an important tool to study cells in Coxeter groups and some representation theoretic topics. In the same paper, Lusztig proved that the \mathbf{a} -function is

Date: Mar 9, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 20F55.

Key words and phrases. Coxeter group, Hecke algebra, \mathbf{a} -function, hyperbolic space, intersecting subset.

bounded for affine Weyl groups. The boundness of \mathbf{a} -function was conjectured by Xi for finite rank Coxeter groups in [14, 1.13(iv)], and by Lusztig for weighted Coxeter groups of finite rank and weighted Coxeter groups such that the length of longest elements of finite parabolic subgroups has a common upper bound in [10] and [8, Conjecture 13.4], respectively. The boundness conjecture of \mathbf{a} -function for finite rank Coxeter groups is one of the four open problems on Hecke algebras (cf. [10]), and is of great interest and still open in most cases.

Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system. Clearly, the conjecture holds if W is finite. For infinite W , the conjecture has been proved in following cases: (1) In [7], Lusztig proved the conjecture for affine Weyl groups, and same approach works for weighted affine case as pointed out in [8]. (2) In [13], Xi proved the conjecture for W with complete graph, i.e., for any $s, t \in S$, the order of st is > 2 or ∞ . (3) In [15], Zhou proved this conjecture in the case $|S| = 3$. (4). In [12], Shi and Yang proved the conjecture for weighted Coxeter groups with complete graph. (5) In [1], Belolipetsky proved the conjecture in the case that the order of st is either 2 or ∞ for any $s, t \in S$. (6) In [11], Shi and Li proved the conjecture for weighted Coxeter groups such that the order of st is not 3 for any $s, t \in S$.

In this paper, we prove that the \mathbf{a} -function is bounded for any Coxeter group of finite rank from a geometric point of view, and the same approach works for its weighted version.

This paper is organized as follows: In section 1, we recall some basic definitions and facts for Hecke algebras and \mathbf{a} -function, and geometries of Tits cone. In Section 2, we exploit some first properties on intersections of hyperplanes. In Section 3, we give a sketch of ideas of proof in Subsection 3.1, and turn to the detail of proof in from Subsection 4.2 to Subsection 4.5. In last Section, we give some examples to compare the upper bound of this paper and that conjectured by Lusztig, and indicate how the approach here works for the weighted version.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Professor Nanhua Xi for his helpful suggestions and comments in writing this paper. I thank Professor Jianpan Wang and Professor Naihong Hu for their valuable advices. I also thank Junbin Dong for enlightening discussion with him.

1. HECKE ALGEBRA, \mathbf{a} -FUNCTION, AND TIT'S CONE

1.1. Hecke algebras and \mathbf{a} -function. Let v be an indeterminate and $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$, the ring of Laurent polynomials in v with integer coefficients. Let W be a Coxeter group with set S of simple reflections. Let $\ell : W \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the usual length function on W . Define the Hecke algebra \mathcal{H} over \mathcal{A} as follows: \mathcal{H} is the free \mathcal{A} -module with basis T_w ($w \in W$), and the multiplication is defined by $T_w T_{w'} = T_{ww'}$ if $\ell(ww') = \ell(w) + \ell(w')$, and

$(T_s + 1)(T_s - v^2) = 0$ if $s \in S$. Let $\tilde{T}_w = v^{-\ell(w)}T_w$ and $\xi = v - v^{-1}$. Then

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{T}_w \tilde{T}_{w'} = \tilde{T}_{ww'} & \text{if } \ell(ww') = \ell(w) + \ell(w') \\ \tilde{T}_s^2 = 1 + \xi \tilde{T}_s & \text{if } s \in S \end{cases}.$$

For any $x, y \in W$, write

$$(1.2) \quad \tilde{T}_x \tilde{T}_y = \sum_{z \in W} f_{x,y,z} \tilde{T}_z, \quad f_{x,y,z} \in \mathcal{A}.$$

It is known from [7] and [13] that $f_{x,y,z}$ is a polynomial in ξ with nonnegative coefficients.

In [6], Kazhdan and Lusztig gave for each $w \in W$ the element $C_w \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$C_w = v^{-\ell(w)} \sum_{y \leq w} P_{y,w} T_y, \quad w \in W,$$

where $P_{y,w}$ are known as Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials. The elements C_w ($w \in W$) forms a \mathcal{A} -basis for \mathcal{H} . For any $x, y \in W$, write

$$C_x C_y = \sum_{z \in W} h_{x,y,z} C_z, \quad h_{x,y,z} \in \mathcal{A}.$$

It is known from [7] that $h_{x,y,z}$ is a polynomial in $\eta = v + v^{-1}$. Following [7], for any $z \in W$ we define

$$\mathbf{a}(z) = \max\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid i = \deg_v h_{x,y,z}, \quad x, y \in W\}.$$

Since $h_{x,y,z}$ is a polynomial in η , we have $\mathbf{a}(z) \geq 0$. It is known from [9] that

Theorem 1.1. *The \mathbf{a} -function is bounded by a constant c if and only if $\deg_\xi f_{x,y,z} \leq c$ for all $x, y, z \in W$.*

The main result of this paper is

Theorem 1.2. *If W is a Coxeter group of finite rank, then there is a constant c such that $\deg_\xi f_{x,y,z} \leq c$ for all $x, y, z \in W$. In particular, the \mathbf{a} -function of W is bounded by c .*

1.2. Geometric representation and Tit's cone. From here to the end of this paper, we always assume that $\text{rank } W$ is finite.

We recall basic facts in [5]. Let V be the \mathbb{R} -vector space spanned by the set $\Delta = \{\alpha_s \mid s \in S\}$ which is in one-to-one correspondence with S . For any $s, t \in S$, let $m_{st} \in \{1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{\infty\}$ be the order of st . There is a symmetric bilinear form $B(-, -)$ on V such that

$$B(\alpha_s, \alpha_t) = -\cos \frac{\pi}{m_{st}}.$$

For each $s \in S$ and $v \in V$, define

$$\sigma_{\alpha_s}(v) = v - 2B(\alpha_s, v)\alpha_s.$$

It is known that there is a unique group homomorphism $\rho: W \rightarrow GL(V)$ sending each $s \in S$ to σ_{α_s} , which is called geometric representation of W .

Moreover, ρ is faithful and B is $\rho(W)$ -invariant. We abbreviate $\rho(w)(v)$ ($w \in W, v \in V$) as wv . Let $\rho^*: W \rightarrow GL(V^*)$ be the contragredient representation of ρ . We abbreviate $\rho^*(w)(f)$ ($w \in W, f \in V^*$) as wf .

Let $\Phi = \{w\alpha_s \mid w \in W, s \in S\} \subset V$, the elements of which is called roots. It is clear that each $\alpha \in \Phi$ is of the form $\alpha = \sum_{s \in S} c_s \alpha_s$ ($c_s \in \mathbb{R}$). Call α is positive if $c_s \geq 0$ for all $s \in S$. Let Φ^+ be the set of positive roots. For $\alpha \in \Phi$, say, $\alpha = w\alpha_s \in \Phi$, then it is known that $ws w^{-1}v = v - 2B(v, \alpha)\alpha$. It follows that $ws w^{-1}$ depends only on α . Due to this, we denote $\sigma_\alpha = ws w^{-1}$ and call it a reflection in W .

Let $\langle -, - \rangle$ be the natural pair $V^* \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\langle f, v \rangle = f(v)$. For each $\alpha \in \Phi$ define the hyperplane

$$H_\alpha = \{f \in V^* \mid \langle f, \alpha \rangle = 0\},$$

and set $H_\alpha^+ = \{f \in V^* \mid \langle f, \alpha \rangle > 0\}$ and $H_\alpha^- = \{f \in V^* \mid \langle f, \alpha \rangle < 0\}$. We also call σ_α the reflection corresponding to hyperplane H_α .

It is clear that V^* has a basis f_s ($s \in S$) dual to the basis α_s ($s \in S$). Thus, one identifies V^* with \mathbb{R}^r ($r = |S|$, the rank of W) and equips V^* with the standard (Euclidean) topology. Let $C = \bigcap_{s \in S} H_{\alpha_s}^+$ and $D = \overline{C}$, the closure of C in V^* . Let $T = \bigcup_{w \in W} wD$. This is a W -stable subset of V^* which is proved to be a convex cone. We call T the *Tits cone*. The set T can be partitioned into the so called facets. Namely, for each $I \subset S$, define

$$C_I = \left(\bigcap_{s \in I} H_{\alpha_s} \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{s \notin I} H_{\alpha_s}^+ \right).$$

The sets of the form wC_I ($w \in W, I \subset S$) are called facets.

For each $I \subset S$, let W_I be the subgroup of W (called a standard parabolic subgroup of W) generated by $s \in I$.

Theorem 1.3 ([5, Theorem 5.13]). (1) W_I is precisely the stabilizer in W of each point in C_I , and $T = \bigcup_{w \in W, I \subset S} wC_I$.

(2) D is the fundamental domain for the action of W on T . That is, the W -orbit of each point in T meets D in exactly one point.

(3) $T = V^*$ if and only if W is finite.

(4) W is finite if and only if B is positive definite.

1.3. Results on the Bruhat order. Let $<$ be the Bruhat order on W . The following result is an easy consequence of [5, Proposition 5.7].

Lemma 1.4. Let $\alpha \in \Phi^+, w \in W$. Then the following are equivalent: (1) $\sigma_\alpha w > w$; (2) $w^{-1}\alpha \in \Phi^+$; (3) $wC \in H_\alpha^+$.

For $w \in W, H \in \mathfrak{P}$, it is clear that $\text{sgn}\langle wf, \alpha_H \rangle$ is a constant ($= 1, -1$) for any $f \in C$. We write $\langle wC, \alpha_H \rangle := \text{sgn}\langle wf, \alpha_H \rangle$ ($f \in C$) by abuse of notation.

Lemma 1.5. Let $w_1, w_2 \in W$ and $H \in \mathfrak{P}$. Assume that $w_1^{-1}w_2 = s_1 \cdots s_k$ be a reduced expression of $w_1^{-1}w_2$. Then $\langle w_1 C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle w_2 C, \alpha_H \rangle = -1$ if and

only if

$$\sigma_H = w_1 s_1 \cdots s_{i-1} s_i s_{i-1} \cdots s_1 w_1^{-1}$$

for some $1 \leq i \leq k$.

Proof. Let α the positive root corresponding to $w_1^{-1}H \in \mathfrak{P}$ and $w = w_1^{-1}w_2$.

Only if part: Applying w_1^{-1} to $\langle w_1 C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle w_2 C, \alpha_H \rangle = -1$ and note that $\alpha = \pm w_1^{-1} \alpha_H$, we have $\langle C, \alpha \rangle \langle w C, \alpha \rangle = -1$, and hence $\langle w C, \alpha \rangle = -1$. Let i be the minimal number such that $\langle s_1 \cdots s_i C, \alpha \rangle = -1$ and $u = s_1 \cdots s_{i-1}$. Since $\langle u C, \alpha \rangle = 1$ by assumption on i , we have $u C \subset H_\alpha^+$, and hence $\beta := u^{-1} \alpha \in \Phi^+$ by Lemma 1.4. Applying u^{-1} to $\langle u s_i C, \alpha \rangle = -1$ we get $\langle s_i C, \beta \rangle = -1$, i.e., $s_i C \in H_\beta^-$. It follows that $\sigma_\beta s_i < s_i$ by Lemma 1.4, which forces $\sigma_\beta = s_i$. Combining this with $\sigma_\beta = u^{-1} \sigma_\alpha u = u^{-1} w_1^{-1} \sigma_H w_1 u$ yields $\sigma_H = w_1 u s_i u^{-1} w_1^{-1}$.

If part: Assume that $\sigma_H = w_1 u s_i u^{-1} w_1^{-1}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq k$, where $u = s_1 \cdots s_{i-1}$. We have

$$\sigma_\alpha s_1 \cdots s_j = u s_i u^{-1} u s_i \cdots s_k = s_1 \cdots \widehat{s_i} \cdots s_k < s_1 \cdots s_k,$$

which implies that $\langle s_1 \cdots s_k C, \alpha \rangle = -1$ by Lemma 1.4, and hence

$$\langle w_2 C, w_1 \alpha \rangle = \langle w_1 s_1 \cdots s_k C, w_1 \alpha \rangle = -1.$$

It follows that $\langle w_1 C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle w_2 C, \alpha_H \rangle = -1$ as desired since $\alpha_H = \pm w_1 \alpha$. \square

2. FIRST PROPERTIES ON INTERSECTION OF HYPERPLANES

In this section, we give some elementary properties on the intersection of hyperplanes in \mathfrak{P} inside T° , the set of inner points of T . These results are crucial to the proof of main theorem.

It is known that the set of inner points of a convex set is convex, and the set of inner points of a convex cone is stable under multiplying a positive scalar. In particular, T° is an open convex cone, i.e., $T^\circ + T^\circ \subset T^\circ$ and $\lambda T^\circ = T^\circ$ for any $\lambda > 0$.

It is known that the set of reflections in W is in one-to-one correspondence to Φ^+ . Let $\mathfrak{P} = \{H_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi\}$. For any $H \in \mathfrak{P}$, let $\alpha_H \in \Phi^+$, $\sigma_H \in W$ be the positive root and reflection corresponding to H , respectively.

For any subset A, B of V^* , write $A \hat{\cap} B$ for $A \cap B \cap T^\circ$. Generally, for a family $\{A_i\}$ of subsets of V^* , denote $\hat{\bigcap}_i A_i = \bigcap_i A_i \cap T^\circ$.

Definition 2.1. A finite subset Ω of \mathfrak{P} is called *intersecting* if $H_1 \hat{\cap} H_2 \neq \emptyset$ for any $H_1, H_2 \in \Omega$.

Let $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m \in \Phi$ be linearly independent roots. Clearly, connected components (“components” for short) of $V^* \setminus \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m\}$ are precisely the sets of the form

$$\{f \in V^* \mid \langle f, \beta_i \rangle > 0, (i \in I), \langle f, \beta_i \rangle < 0, (i \notin I)\},$$

where $I \subset \{1, \dots, m\}$, whose closure is

$$\{f \in V^* \mid \langle f, \beta_i \rangle \geq 0, (i \in I), \langle f, \beta_i \rangle \leq 0, (i \notin I)\}.$$

In particular, if $f, g \in V^*$ are in the same (resp. closure of) component, then $\langle f, \beta_i \rangle \langle g, \beta_i \rangle > 0$ (resp. ≥ 0) for any $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $P, H, H_1, H_2 \in \mathfrak{P}$ and let E be a component of $V^* \setminus \{H_1, H_2\}$. Assume that $H \dot{\cap} H_i \dot{\cap} \overline{E} \neq \emptyset$ ($i = 1, 2$), $H_1 \cap H_2 \subset P$, and $P \cap \overline{E} \neq \emptyset$. Then $P \dot{\cap} H \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Choose $f_i \in H \dot{\cap} H_i$ ($i = 1, 2$), and $p \in P \cap \overline{E}$, we have

$$(2.1) \quad \langle f_i, \alpha_{H_i} \rangle = 0, \langle f_i, \alpha_{H_i} \rangle \langle p, \alpha_{H_i} \rangle \geq 0, \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

Since $H_1 \cap H_2 \subset P$, we have $\alpha_P = x_1 \alpha_1 + x_2 \alpha_2$ for some $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. It follows that

$$(2.2) \quad \langle f_1, \alpha_P \rangle = x_2 \langle f_1, \alpha_{H_2} \rangle, \langle f_2, \alpha_P \rangle = x_1 \langle f_2, \alpha_{H_1} \rangle$$

by first formula of (2.1).

Since $\langle p, \alpha_P \rangle = 0$, we have

$$(2.3) \quad x_1 \langle p, \alpha_{H_1} \rangle + x_2 \langle p, \alpha_{H_2} \rangle = 0.$$

Combining the second formula of (2.1), (2.2), (2.3) yields $\langle f_1, \alpha_P \rangle \langle f_2, \alpha_P \rangle \leq 0$. By Zero Point Theorem we have $[f_1 f_2] \cap P \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, we have $[f_1 f_2] \subset H \cap T^\circ$ since $H \cap T^\circ$ is convex. It follows that

$$P \dot{\cap} H = H \cap T^\circ \cap P \supset [f_1 f_2] \cap P \neq \emptyset$$

as desired. \square

Lemma 2.3. *Assume that $\{P, H, H_1, H_2\} \subset \mathfrak{P}$ is intersecting, and there exist $f_i \in H_i \dot{\cap} H$, $g_i \in H_i \dot{\cap} P$ ($i = 1, 2$) such that $\langle f_1, \alpha_P \rangle \langle f_2, \alpha_P \rangle \geq 0$ and $\langle g_1, \alpha_H \rangle \langle g_2, \alpha_H \rangle \leq 0$. Then $\sigma_H P \dot{\cap} H_1 \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_H P \dot{\cap} H_2 \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. If $\langle f_1, \alpha_P \rangle \langle f_2, \alpha_P \rangle = 0$ or $\langle g_1, \alpha_H \rangle \langle g_2, \alpha_H \rangle = 0$, then $f_1 \in P$ or $f_2 \in P$ or $g_1 \in H$ or $g_2 \in H$, and in particular, we have $P \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} H_1 \neq \emptyset$ or $P \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} H_2 \neq \emptyset$, and hence $\sigma_H P \dot{\cap} H_1 \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_H P \dot{\cap} H_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Assume that $\langle f_1, \alpha_P \rangle \langle f_2, \alpha_P \rangle > 0$ and $\langle g_1, \alpha_H \rangle \langle g_2, \alpha_H \rangle < 0$. Let

$$C_i = \{f \in V^* \mid \langle f, \alpha_P \rangle \langle f_1, \alpha_P \rangle > 0, \langle f, \alpha_H \rangle \langle g_i, \alpha_H \rangle > 0\}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Then C_i are components of $V^* \setminus \{H, P\}$ and

$$\overline{C_i} = \{f \in V^* \mid \langle f, \alpha_P \rangle \langle f_1, \alpha_P \rangle \geq 0, \langle f, \alpha_H \rangle \langle g_i, \alpha_H \rangle \geq 0\}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Since $f_1, g_1 \in \overline{C_1}$ and $f_2, g_2 \in \overline{C_2}$ by assumption, we have

$$(2.4) \quad H_1 \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} \overline{C_1}, H_1 \dot{\cap} P \dot{\cap} \overline{C_1}, H_2 \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} \overline{C_2}, H_2 \dot{\cap} P \dot{\cap} \overline{C_2} \neq \emptyset.$$

It is clear that

$$(2.5) \quad H \cap P \subset \sigma_H P.$$

If $\sigma_H P = P$ or $\sigma_H P = H$, there is nothing to prove. Assume that

$$(2.6) \quad \sigma_H P \neq P, H.$$

By (2.5), we have $\sigma_H \alpha_P = x_1 \alpha_P + x_2 \alpha_H$ for some $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, and hence (2.6) is equivalent to $x_1, x_2 \neq 0$. There is a $g \in V^*$ such that $\langle g, \alpha_P \rangle = x_2$ and

$\langle g, \alpha_H \rangle = -x_1$ since $H \neq P$. Thus $g, -g \in \sigma_H P$ and $\langle g, \alpha_P \rangle, \langle g, \alpha_H \rangle \neq 0$. Replacing g with $-g$ when necessary, one can assume that

$$(2.7) \quad \langle g, \alpha_P \rangle \langle f_1, \alpha_P \rangle > 0.$$

Since $\langle g_1, \alpha_H \rangle \langle g_2, \alpha_H \rangle < 0$, we have $\langle g, \alpha_H \rangle \langle g_1, \alpha_H \rangle > 0$ or $\langle g, \alpha_H \rangle \langle g_2, \alpha_H \rangle > 0$. Combining this with (2.7) yields $g \in C_1 \cup C_2$, and in particular, we have $\sigma_H P \cap (C_1 \cup C_2) \neq \emptyset$, and hence

$$(2.8) \quad \sigma_H P \cap C_1 \neq \emptyset \text{ or } \sigma_H P \cap C_2 \neq \emptyset.$$

Now (2.4), (2.5), (2.8) enable us to apply P, H, H_1, H_2, E in Lemma 2.2 to $\sigma_H P, H_1$ (resp. H_2), H, P, C_1 (resp. C_2), respectively, to obtain $\sigma_H P \dot{\cap} H_1 \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_H P \dot{\cap} H_2 \neq \emptyset$. \square

Let $A \subset T$ and $H \in \mathfrak{P}$ such that $A \dot{\cap} H = \emptyset$. Define $H^{A,+}$ (resp. $H^{A,-}$) to be the set of all $f \in T$ such that $\langle f, \alpha_H \rangle \langle a, \alpha_H \rangle > 0$ (resp. $\langle f, \alpha_H \rangle \langle a, \alpha_H \rangle < 0$) for some (hence for any) $a \in A$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $P, H, H_1, H_2 \in \mathfrak{P}$. Assume that $H_1 \dot{\cap} H_2 = \emptyset$, $P \dot{\cap} H_1 \neq \emptyset$, and $P \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} H_2^{H_1, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$. Then $P \dot{\cap} H_2 \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let $f \in P \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} H_2^{H_1, \leq 0}$ and $g \in P \dot{\cap} H_1$. Then $\langle f, \alpha_{H_2} \rangle \langle g, \alpha_{H_2} \rangle \leq 0$. By Zero Point Theorem we have $[fg] \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset$. Since $P \cap T^\circ$ is convex and $f, g \in P \cap T^\circ$, we have $[fg] \subset P \cap T^\circ$, and hence

$$P \dot{\cap} H_2 = P \cap T^\circ \cap H_2 \supset [fg] \cap H_2 \neq \emptyset$$

as desired. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let $P, H, H_1, H_2 \in \mathfrak{P}$. Assume that $\{H, H_1, H_2\}$ is intersecting, and there exist $f_i \in H \dot{\cap} H_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) such that $\langle f_1, \alpha_P \rangle \langle f_2, \alpha_P \rangle \leq 0$. Then $\sigma_H P \dot{\cap} H_1 \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_H P \dot{\cap} H_2 \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Assume that

$$(2.9) \quad \sigma_H P \dot{\cap} H_1 = \emptyset.$$

By assumption, we have $\langle f_1, \sigma_H(\alpha_P) \rangle \langle f_2, \sigma_H(\alpha_P) \rangle \leq 0$ since $\sigma_H f_i = f_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and hence $f_2 \in H_2 \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} (\sigma_H P)^{H_1, \leq 0}$. In particular, we have

$$(2.10) \quad H_2 \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} (\sigma_H P)^{H_1, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset.$$

Moreover, we have

$$(2.11) \quad H_2 \dot{\cap} H_1 \neq \emptyset$$

by assumption. Now (2.9), (2.10), (2.11) enable us to apply P, H, H_1, H_2 Lemma 2.4 to $H_2, H, H_1, \sigma_H P$, respectively, to obtain $\sigma_H P \dot{\cap} H_2 \neq \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 2.6. *Let $w_1, w_2 \in W$ and $P, P' \in \mathfrak{P}$. Assume that $P' \dot{\cap} P^{w_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$, and $\langle w_1 C, \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_2 C, \alpha_P \rangle = 1$, $\langle w_1 C, \alpha_{P'} \rangle \langle w_2 C, \alpha_{P'} \rangle = -1$. Then $P' \dot{\cap} P \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Choose $f_i \in w_i C$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $g \in P' \dot{\cap} P^{w_1 C, \leq 0}$. Since

$$\langle f_1, \alpha_{P'} \rangle \langle f_2, \alpha_{P'} \rangle < 0$$

by assumption, we have $[f_1 f_2] \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$ by Zero Point Theorem and the fact that $f_1, f_2 \in T^\circ$ and T° is convex. Choose $f_{12} \in [f_1 f_2] \dot{\cap} P'$, we have $f_{12} \in P^{w_1 C, +} \subset P^{w_1 C, \geq 0}$ since $f_1, f_2 \in P^{w_1 C, +}$ and $P^{w_1 C, +}$ is convex. It follows that $[f_{12} g] \cap P \neq \emptyset$ by Zero Point Theorem. Moreover, since $P' \cap T^\circ$ is convex and $f_{12}, g \in P' \cap T^\circ$, we have $[f_{12} g] \subset P' \cap T^\circ$. It follows that

$$P' \dot{\cap} P = P' \cap T^\circ \cap P \supset [f_{12} g] \cap P \neq \emptyset$$

as desired. \square

Lemma 2.7. *Let $H, P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{P}$ and $w \in W$. Assume that*

- (1). $\langle wC, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle \sigma_H wC, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle = 1$;
- (2). $\langle wC, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle \langle \sigma_H wC, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle = -1$;
- (3). $P_2 \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} P_1^{wC, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$.

Then $\sigma_H P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. By applying σ_H , (1) is equivalent to

$$(2.12) \quad \langle wC, \sigma_H \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle \sigma_H wC, \sigma_H \alpha_{P_1} \rangle = 1.$$

By (3), one can choose $f \in P_2 \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} P_1^{wC, \leq 0}$, and hence $\langle f, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle wC, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \leq 0$, which becomes $\langle f, \sigma_H \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle \sigma_H wC, \sigma_H \alpha_{P_1} \rangle < 0$ since $\sigma_H f = f$. It follows that $f \in P_2 \dot{\cap} (\sigma_H P_1)^{\sigma_H wC, \leq 0}$, and hence

$$(2.13) \quad P_2 \dot{\cap} (\sigma_H P_1)^{\sigma_H wC, -} \neq \emptyset.$$

Thus (2), (2.12), (2.13) enable us to apply w_1, w_2, P, P' in Lemma 2.6 to $w, \sigma_H w, \sigma_H P_1, P_2$, respectively, to obtain $\sigma_H P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let $P, H \in \mathfrak{P}$ with $P \dot{\cap} H \neq \emptyset$, and Λ be a connected component of $V^* \setminus P$, and Λ_1, Λ_2 be two components of $\Lambda \setminus H$. Then $\sigma_H \Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda$ or $\sigma_H \Lambda_2 \subset \Lambda$.*

Proof. We have

$$(2.14) \quad \langle \sigma_H f, \alpha_P \rangle = \langle f, \sigma_H \alpha_P \rangle = \langle f, \alpha_P \rangle - 2B(\alpha_P, \alpha_H) \langle f, \alpha_H \rangle$$

for any $f \in V^*$. It is clear that $\Lambda_i \subset \Lambda$ ($i = 1, 2$), and

- (a) $\text{sgn} \langle f, \alpha_P \rangle \neq 0$, and is constant for any $f \in \Lambda$;
- (b) For each $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\text{sgn} \langle f, \alpha_H \rangle \neq 0$, and is constant for any $f \in \Lambda_i$;
- (c) For any $f_1 \in \Lambda_1, f_2 \in \Lambda_2$, we have $\langle f_1, \alpha_H \rangle \langle f_2, \alpha_H \rangle < 0$.

If $B(\alpha_P, \alpha_H) = 0$, then $\langle \sigma_H f, \alpha_P \rangle = \langle f, \alpha_P \rangle$ for any $f \in V^*$ by (2.14). Thus, (a) implies that $\sigma_H \Lambda = \Lambda$. In particular, we have $\sigma_H \Lambda_i \subset \Lambda$ ($i = 1, 2$).

If $B(\alpha_P, \alpha_H) \neq 0$, combining (a), (b), (c) we see that

$$B(\alpha_P, \alpha_H) \langle f, \alpha_H \rangle \langle f, \alpha_P \rangle < 0$$

either for any $f \in \Lambda_1$, or for any $f \in \Lambda_2$. It follows that

$$\langle f, \alpha_P \rangle \langle \sigma_H f, \alpha_P \rangle = \langle f, \alpha_P \rangle^2 - 2B(\alpha_P, \alpha_H) \langle f, \alpha_H \rangle \langle f, \alpha_P \rangle > 0,$$

i.e., $\text{sgn}\langle\sigma_H f, \alpha_P\rangle = \text{sgn}\langle f, \alpha_P\rangle$, either for any $f \in \Lambda_1$, or for any $f \in \Lambda_2$. That is, $\sigma_H \Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda$ or $\sigma_H \Lambda_2 \subset \Lambda$. \square

Lemma 2.9. *Let $w, w' \in W$, and $\{H, P_1, P_2\} \subset \mathfrak{P}$ be intersecting set. Assume that*

- (1). $\langle w' C, \alpha_{P_i} \rangle \langle w C, \alpha_{P_i} \rangle = 1$, $i = 1, 2$;
- (2). $\langle w' C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle w C, \alpha_H \rangle = -1$;
- (3). $\langle w' C, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle \sigma_H w C, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle = -1$;
- (4). $\langle w' C, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle \langle \sigma_H w C, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle = 1$;
- (5). (a) $P_2 \dot{\cap} H \dot{\cap} P_1^{w' C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$; (b) $P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \dot{\cap} H^{w' C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset$.

Then $\sigma_H P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Let $\Lambda = P_1^{w' C, +} = P_1^{w C, +}$, $\Lambda_1 = P_1^{w' C, +} \cap H^{w' C, +}$, and $\Lambda_2 = P_1^{w C, +} \cap H^{w C, +}$. As in the proof of Lemma 5, we have $\sigma_H \Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda$. Let $f \in P_2 \dot{\cap} H$, $g \in P_2 \dot{\cap} P_1$. Since $g \in \overline{\Lambda_1}$ by (5)(b), it follows that $\sigma_H g \in \sigma_H \overline{\Lambda_1} \subset \overline{\Lambda}$. Combining this with (5)(a) yields $\langle f, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle \sigma_H g, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \leq 0$. Since $f \in H$, we have $\sigma_H f = f$. Applying σ_H we get $\langle f, \sigma_H \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle g, \sigma_H \alpha_{P_1} \rangle < 0$. It follows that $[fg] \cap \sigma_H P_1 \neq \emptyset$ by Zero Point Theorem. Since $f, g \in P_2 \cap T^\circ$ and $P_2 \cap T^\circ$ is convex, we have $[fg] \subset P_2 \cap T^\circ$, and hence

$$P_2 \dot{\cap} \sigma_H P_1 = P_2 \cap T^\circ \cap \sigma_H P_1 \supset [fg] \cap \sigma_H P_1 \neq \emptyset$$

which completes the proof. \square

3. PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

3.1. Ideas of the proof. Our goal is to prove Theorem 1.2. It is natural to consider (3.1), the expansion of $\tilde{T}_x \tilde{T}_y$ for $x, y \in W$. Thus, the boundness of $\deg_\xi f_{x,y,z}$ ($x, y, z \in W$) will follow if we proved that all p_I in the right side of (3.1) are uniformly bounded for all $x, y \in W$. The number p_I seems hard to estimate in general using purely algebraic approach. But on the geometric side, Theorem 3.2 says that each term $\xi^{p_I} \tilde{T}_{z_I}$ in (3.1) gives rise to an intersecting subset (see Section 3 for the definition) of \mathfrak{P} of cardinality p_I . Thus, the boundness of all p_I will follow if we proved that the cardinality of intersecting subsets is bounded, which follows from Theorem 3.22.

Theorem 3.2 will be proved by a simultaneous induction on $n = p_I$. In Theorem 3.2, $\mathbf{I}(n)$ is the goal to be proved, and $\mathbf{D}(n)$, $\mathbf{O}(n)$, $\mathbf{E}(n)$, $\mathbf{L}(n)$ are assistant properties used to prove $\mathbf{I}(n)$.

In order to prove Theorem 3.22, i.e., cardinality of intersecting subsets is bounded, we reduce to prove that the cardinality of the subsets $\mathfrak{S} \subset \mathfrak{P}$ such that $\dot{\cap}_{P \in \mathfrak{S}'} P \neq \emptyset$ for any $\mathfrak{S}' \subset \mathfrak{S}$ with $|\mathfrak{S}'| = t$ and $\dot{\cap}_{P \in \mathfrak{S}''} P = \emptyset$ for any $\mathfrak{S}'' \subset \mathfrak{S}$ with $|\mathfrak{S}''| = t + 1$ are uniformly bounded in t using Ramsey's Theorem. The proof of this fact is based on the fact that the sum of inner angles of a hyperbolic (Euclidean) triangle is $< \pi$ (resp. $= \pi$).

The remaining subsections of this section are details of the proof.

3.2. A key intersecting subset. This subsection will give a key intersecting subset (see. Theorem 3.2) arising from the complete expansion of $\tilde{T}_x \tilde{T}_y$ (see. (3.1) below). This intersecting subset is crucial to the proof of Theorem 1.2 since it will be proved at Subsection 3.5 that the cardinality of such subsets are bounded.

3.2.1. *Properties $\mathbf{I}(n), \mathbf{D}(n), \mathbf{O}(n), \mathbf{E}(n), \mathbf{L}(n)$.* Let $s_1 s_2 \cdots s_k$ be a reduced expression of y . Then by (1.1) and easy induction on k we have

$$(3.1) \quad \tilde{T}_x \tilde{T}_y = \sum_I \xi^{p_I} \tilde{T}_{z_I},$$

where I runs over sequences $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_{p_I}$ in $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ such that

$$(3.2) \quad x s_1 \cdots \widehat{s_{i_1}} \cdots \widehat{s_{i_{t-1}}} \cdots s_{i_t} < x s_1 \cdots \widehat{s_{i_1}} \cdots \widehat{s_{i_{t-1}}} \cdots \widehat{s_{i_t}}$$

for all $t = 1, 2, \dots, p_I$, and $z_I = x s_1 \cdots \widehat{s_{i_1}} \cdots \widehat{s_{i_{p_I}}} \cdots s_k$. Let $u_t = x s_1 \cdots s_{i_{t-1}}$, $u'_t = x s_1 \cdots \widehat{s_{i_1}} \cdots \widehat{s_{i_{t-1}}} \cdots \widehat{s_{i_t}}$, and $H_t \in \mathfrak{P}$ be the hyperplane corresponding to the reflection $u_t s_{i_t} u_t^{-1}$ in W . Then (3.2) becomes

$$(3.3) \quad (u'_t s_{i_t} u_t'^{-1}) u'_t < u'_t.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Keeping assumption (3.2) and notation above, we have*

$$\langle \sigma_{H_{t-1}} \cdots \sigma_{H_1} C, \alpha_{H_t} \rangle \langle u_1 C, \alpha_{H_t} \rangle < 0$$

for any $1 < t \leq p_I$.

Proof. In fact, we have

$$u'_t = (u_1 s_{i_1} u_1^{-1}) \cdots (u_{t-1} s_{i_{t-1}} u_{t-1}^{-1}) u_t = \sigma_{H_1} \cdots \sigma_{H_{t-1}} u_t$$

by easy calculation, and hence

$$u'_t s_{i_t} u_t'^{-1} = \sigma_{H_1} \cdots \sigma_{H_{t-1}} (u_t s_{i_t} u_t^{-1}) \sigma_{H_{t-1}} \cdots \sigma_{H_1}.$$

In other words, $u'_t s_{i_t} u_t'^{-1} = \sigma_H$, here $H = \sigma_{H_1} \cdots \sigma_{H_{t-1}} H_t \in \mathfrak{P}$. Thus (3.3) says that $\sigma_H u'_t < u'_t$, and hence $\langle u'_t C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle C, \alpha_H \rangle < 0$ by Lemma 1.4. It follows that

$$(3.4) \quad \langle u_t C, \alpha_{H_t} \rangle \langle \sigma_{H_{t-1}} \cdots \sigma_{H_1} C, \alpha_{H_t} \rangle < 0.$$

by the W -invariance of $\langle -, - \rangle$. Since $s_1 \cdots s_k \in \text{Red}(y)$, we have

$$\langle u_1 C, \alpha_{H_t} \rangle \langle u_t C, \alpha_{H_t} \rangle > 0.$$

Combining this and (3.4) yields

$$\langle u_1 C, \alpha_{H_t} \rangle \langle \sigma_{H_{t-1}} \cdots \sigma_{H_1} C, \alpha_{H_t} \rangle < 0$$

which completes the proof. \square

The main theorem of this section is the following

Theorem 3.2. *If*

$$xs_1 \cdots \widehat{s_{i_1}} \cdots \widehat{s_{i_{t-1}}} \cdots s_{i_t} < xs_1 \cdots \widehat{s_{i_1}} \cdots \widehat{s_{i_{t-1}}} \cdots \widehat{s_{i_t}}$$

for all $1 \leq t \leq n$, then there exists a subset $\mathfrak{P}_n, \mathfrak{Q}_n$ of \mathfrak{P} containing H_n such that

I(n): $\mathfrak{P}_n, \mathfrak{Q}_n$ are intersecting and $|\mathfrak{P}_n| = |\mathfrak{Q}_n| = n$;

D(n): $\langle w_n C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle u_1 C, \alpha_H \rangle = 1$ for any $H \in \mathfrak{P}_n$;

O(n): $P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$ or $P_1 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_2^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$ for any $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{Q}_n \setminus \{H_n\}$;

E(n): For any $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{Q}_n \setminus \{H_n\}$, $P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \Leftrightarrow P_1 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_2^{u_1 C, \geq 0}$.

L(n): $\langle u_n C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle u_1 C, \alpha_H \rangle = -1$ for any $H \in \mathfrak{P}_n \setminus \{H_n\}$,

where $w_t = \sigma_{H_t} \cdots \sigma_{H_1}$ ($1 \leq t \leq n$).

We proceed by induction on n . The case $n = 1, 2$ is trivial.

Assume that $n > 2$. Assume that $\mathfrak{P}_{n-1}, \mathfrak{Q}_{n-1}$ are constructed as desired.

3.2.2. **I**($n-1$), **L**($n-1$), **D**($n-1$) \Rightarrow **O**(n), **E**(n).

*Proof. Step1: Existence of \mathfrak{Q}_n satisfying **I**(n).*

Let $\mathfrak{Q}_n = \mathfrak{P}_{n-1} \cup \{H_n\}$. For any $H \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1} \setminus \{H_{n-1}\}$, **L**($n-1$) implies that $\langle u_1 C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle u_{n-1} C, \alpha_H \rangle < 0$, and hence there is an $i_1 \leq i(H) < i_{n-1}$ (hence $i_1 \leq i(H) < i_n$) so that

$$\sigma_H = u_1 s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i(H)-1} s_{i(H)} s_{i(H)-1} \cdots s_{i_1} u_1^{-1}$$

by the ‘‘only if’’ part of Lemma 1.5. This, and the ‘‘if’’ part of Lemma 1.5 imply $\langle u_1 C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle u_n C, \alpha_H \rangle < 0$ for all $H \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1} \setminus \{H_{n-1}\}$. Since

$$\sigma_{H_{n-1}} = u_1 s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{n-1}-1} s_{i_{n-1}} s_{i_{n-1}-1} \cdots s_{i_1} u_1^{-1},$$

the ‘‘if’’ part of Lemma 1.5 implies that $\langle u_1 C, \alpha_{H_{n-1}} \rangle \langle u_n C, \alpha_{H_{n-1}} \rangle < 0$. Thus, we have

$$(3.5) \quad \langle u_n C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle u_1 C, \alpha_H \rangle < 0, \text{ (hence } u_n C \subset H^{u_1 C, -}), H \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}.$$

It follows that

$$(3.6) \quad u_n C_{\{s_{i_n}\}} \subset \overline{u_n C} \subset H^{u_1 C, \leq 0}, H \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}.$$

Since $\sigma_{H_n} = u_n s_{i_n} u_n^{-1}$, we have

$$(3.7) \quad u_n C_{\{s_{i_n}\}} \subset H_n,$$

It is clear that $u_n C_{\{s_{i_n}\}} \in T^\circ$. Combining this and (3.6), (3.7) yields

$$(3.8) \quad H_n \dot{\cap} H^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset, H \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}.$$

We have

$$(3.9) \quad \langle w_{n-1} C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle u_1 C, \alpha_H \rangle > 0 \text{ for any } H \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}$$

by **D**($n-1$) and

$$(3.10) \quad \langle u_1 C, \alpha_{H_n} \rangle \langle w_{n-1} C, \alpha_{H_n} \rangle < 0$$

by Lemma 3.1. Thus, for each $H \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}$, (3.8), (3.9), (3.10), enable us to apply w_1, w_2, P, P' in Lemma 2.6 to u_1, w_{n-1}, H, H_n , respectively, to obtain

$$(3.11) \quad H_n \dot{\cap} H \neq \emptyset, \quad H \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}.$$

We have \mathfrak{P}_{n-1} is intersecting and $|\mathfrak{P}_{n-1}| = n - 1$ by $\mathbf{I}(n - 1)$. Combining this with (3.11) yields (note that $H_n \neq H$ by (3.9), (3.10))

$$(3.12) \quad \mathfrak{Q}_n \text{ is intersecting and } |\mathfrak{Q}_n| = n.$$

Step 2: Prove $\mathbf{O}(n)$.

Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}$. Suppose that (a) $P_1 \dot{\cap} H_n \subset P_2^{u_1 C, +}$ and (b) $P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \subset P_1^{u_1 C, +}$. Combining (3.6), (3.7) yields $H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \dot{\cap} P_2^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \in H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \dot{\cap} P_2^{u_1 C, \leq 0}$ and $b \in P_1 \dot{\cap} H_n$. We have $[ba] \subset H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0}$ since $H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0}$ is convex. Combining this with (b) yields $[ba] \dot{\cap} P_2 = \emptyset$. On the other hand, since $b \in P_2^{u_1 C, +}$ by (a), and $a \in P_2^{u_1 C, \leq 0}$, we have $[ba] \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$ by Zero Point Theorem, which is contradicted. This proves $\mathbf{O}(n)$.

Step 3: Prove $\mathbf{E}(n)$.

By symmetry, it suffices to prove \Rightarrow . Suppose that $P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0}$ and

$$(3.13) \quad P_1 \dot{\cap} H_n \subset P_2^{u_1 C, -},$$

so in particular, we have $P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n = \emptyset$, and hence

$$(3.14) \quad P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \subset P_1^{u_1 C, -}.$$

Let $f \in u_1 C, g \in w_{n-1} C$. Since $f, g \in P_1^{u_1 C, +} \dot{\cap} P_2^{u_1 C, +}$ and $\langle f, \alpha_{H_n} \rangle \langle g, \alpha_{H_n} \rangle < 0$ by (3.9), we have $[fg] \dot{\cap} H_n \neq \emptyset$ by Zero Point Theorem. Let $a \in [fg] \dot{\cap} H_n$. Then

$$(3.15) \quad a \in P_1^{u_1 C, +} \dot{\cap} P_2^{u_1 C, +} \dot{\cap} H_n$$

since $P_1^{u_1 C, +} \dot{\cap} P_2^{u_1 C, +}$ is convex. Let $b \in P_1 \dot{\cap} H_n$. Then $b \in P_2^{u_1 C, -}$ by (3.13). Combining this with (3.15) and Zero Point Theorem yields $[ab] \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$. On the other hand, $[ab] \subset P_1^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \dot{\cap} H_n$ since $P_1^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \dot{\cap} H_n$ is convex and $a, b \in P_1^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \dot{\cap} H_n$ (by (3.15)). It follows that $[ab] \dot{\cap} P_2 = \emptyset$ by (3.14) which contradicts to $[ab] \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$. \square

For $\mathfrak{P}_1, \mathfrak{P}_2 \subset \mathfrak{P}$, denote $\mathfrak{P}_1 \blacktriangle \mathfrak{P}_2$ if $P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$ for all $P_1 \in \mathfrak{P}_1, P_2 \in \mathfrak{P}_2$. It is clear that $\mathfrak{P}_1 \blacktriangle \mathfrak{P}_2$ is always true if $\mathfrak{P}_1 = \emptyset$ or $\mathfrak{P}_2 = \emptyset$ in sense of mathematical logic.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{U}^+ &= \{P \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1} \mid \langle u_1 C, \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_n C, \alpha_P \rangle = 1\}; \\ \mathfrak{U}^- &= \{P \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1} \mid \langle u_1 C, \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_n C, \alpha_P \rangle = -1\}; \\ \mathfrak{W}^+ &= \{P \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1} \mid \langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_n C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = 1\}; \\ \mathfrak{W}^- &= \{P \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1} \mid \langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_n C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = -1\}; \\ \mathfrak{B} &= \{P \in \mathfrak{W}^+ \cap \mathfrak{U}^+ \mid \{\sigma_{H_n} P\} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{W}^-, \neg(\{\sigma_{H_n} P\} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{U}^-)\}, \end{aligned}$$

and define $\mathfrak{R}_k, \mathfrak{B}_k, \mathfrak{B}'_k$ ($k \geq 0$) inductively as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{R}_0 &= \{P \in \mathfrak{Y}^+ \mid \neg(\{\sigma_{H_n} P \blacktriangle \mathfrak{Y}^-\})\}; \\ \mathfrak{B}_0 &= \{P \in \mathfrak{Y}^+ \cap \mathfrak{U}^+ \mid \{\sigma_{H_n} P\} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{Y}^-, \{\sigma_{H_n} P\} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{U}^-\}; \\ \mathfrak{B}'_0 &= \{B_0 \in \mathfrak{B}_0 \mid \neg(\sigma_{H_n} B_0 \blacktriangle \mathfrak{R}_0)\},\end{aligned}$$

and for any $k > 0$,

$$\mathfrak{R}_k = \mathfrak{R}_{k-1} \cup \mathfrak{B}'_{k-1}, \mathfrak{B}_k = \mathfrak{B}_{k-1} \setminus \mathfrak{B}'_{k-1}, \mathfrak{B}'_k = \{B_k \in \mathfrak{B}_k \mid \neg(\{\sigma_{H_n} B_k\} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{R}_k)\}.$$

By definition, we have

$$(3.16) \quad \sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{B} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{Y}^-,$$

$$(3.17) \quad \mathfrak{B}'_k = \{B_k \in \mathfrak{B}_k \mid \neg(\{\sigma_{H_n} B_k\} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{B}'_{k-1})\},$$

and

$$(3.18) \quad \mathfrak{U}^+ \cap \mathfrak{Y}^+ \supset \mathfrak{B}_0 \supset \mathfrak{B}_1 \supset \mathfrak{B}_2 \supset \cdots \supset \mathfrak{B}_k \supset \mathfrak{B}'_k.$$

for any k .

It is clear that

$$(3.19) \quad \langle w_{n-1} C, \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_n C, \alpha_P \rangle = 1 (\text{resp. } -1), \quad P \in \mathfrak{U}^+ (\text{resp. } \mathfrak{U}^-)$$

3.2.3. $\mathbf{I}(n-1), \mathbf{D}(n-1), \mathbf{O}(n), \mathbf{E}(n) \Rightarrow \mathbf{I}(n), \mathbf{D}(n), \mathbf{L}(n)$. An immediate consequence of Lemma 2.7 is the following two claims.

Claim 1. *If $P_1 \in \mathfrak{U}^+$, $P_2 \in \mathfrak{U}^-$, and $P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$, then $\sigma_{H_n} P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 2.7. \square

Claim 2. *If $P_1 \in \mathfrak{Y}^+$, $P_2 \in \mathfrak{Y}^-$, and $P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$, then $\sigma_{H_n} P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. $P_1 \in \mathfrak{Y}^+$ implies that $\langle w_{n-1} C, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle \sigma_{H_n} u_1 C, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle = 1$. Combining this with $\mathbf{D}(n-1)$ yields

$$(3.20) \quad \langle u_1 C, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle \sigma_{H_n} u_1 C, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle = 1,$$

and $P_2 \in \mathfrak{Y}^-$ implies that $\langle w_{n-1} C, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle \langle \sigma_{H_n} u_1 C, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle = -1$. Combining this with $\mathbf{D}(n-1)$ yields

$$(3.21) \quad \langle u_1 C, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle \langle \sigma_{H_n} u_1 C, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle = -1.$$

The conditions (3.20), (3.21), $P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$ enable us to apply H, P_1, P_2, w in Lemma 2.7 to H_n, P_1, P_2, u_1 , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$. \square

The following two claims are immediate consequence of Lemma 2.9.

Claim 3. *If $P \in \mathfrak{U}^+$, $P' \in \mathfrak{U}^-$, $P \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P'^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$, $P \dot{\cap} P' \dot{\cap} H_n^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset$, then $\sigma_{H_n} P' \dot{\cap} P \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 2.9. \square

Claim 4. If $P_1 \in \mathfrak{V}^-$, $P_2 \in \mathfrak{V}^+$, $P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$, $P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$, then $\sigma_{H_n} P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. Since $P_1 \in \mathfrak{V}^-$, $P_2 \in \mathfrak{V}^+$, we have

$$(3.22) \quad \langle w_{n-1}C, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle \sigma_{H_n} u_1 C, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle = -1$$

and

$$(3.23) \quad \langle w_{n-1}C, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle \langle \sigma_{H_n} u_1 C, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle = 1.$$

Combining $P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{D}(n-1)$ yields

$$(3.24) \quad P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P_1^{w_{n-1}C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$$

Combining $P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$ and (3.10) yields

$$(3.25) \quad P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \dot{\cap} H_n^{w_{n-1}C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset.$$

The conditions (3.22), (3.23), (3.24), (3.25) enable us to apply w, w', P_1, P_2, H in Lemma 2.9 to $u_1, w_{n-1}, P_1, P_2, H_n$, respectively, to obtain $\sigma_{H_n} P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$. \square

Claim 5. $\mathfrak{U}^- \subset \mathfrak{V}^+$ (hence $\mathfrak{V}^- \subset \mathfrak{U}^+$), and $\langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_{n-1}C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = -1$ for any $P \in \mathfrak{U}^-$.

Proof. Let $P \in \mathfrak{U}^-$. Since $P \in \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}$, $\mathbf{D}(n-1)$ implies that $u_1 C, w_{n-1}C$ are in the same component $\Lambda = P^{u_1 C, +} = P^{w_{n-1}C, +}$ of $V^* \setminus P$. Moreover, (3.9) implies that $\Lambda_1 = P^{u_1 C, +} \cap H_n^{u_1 C, +}$ and $\Lambda_2 = P^{w_{n-1}C, +} \cap H_n^{w_{n-1}C, +}$ are components of $\Lambda \setminus H_n$. It is clear that $w_{n-1}C \subset \Lambda_2$, and $P \in \mathfrak{U}^-$ implies that $w_n C \subset P^{u_1 C, -}$, and hence $\sigma_{H_n} w_{n-1}C = w_n C \notin \Lambda$. Thus, we have $\sigma_{H_n} \Lambda_2 \not\subset \Lambda$. It follows that $\sigma_{H_n} \Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda$ by Lemma 2.8, and in particular

$$(3.26) \quad \sigma_{H_n} u_1 C \subset \Lambda = P^{w_{n-1}C, +}$$

since $u_1 C \subset \Lambda_1$. That is, $\langle \sigma_{H_n} u_1 C, \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_{n-1}C, \alpha_P \rangle = 1$. Applying σ_{H_n} we obtain $\langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_n C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = 1$, and hence $P \in \mathfrak{V}^+$.

We have $\langle \sigma_{H_n} u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_{n-1}C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = -1$ since $P \in \mathfrak{U}^-$, and $\langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle \sigma_{H_n} u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = 1$ by $\mathbf{D}(n-1)$. It follows that

$$\langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_{n-1}C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = -1$$

as desired. \square

Claim 6. $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{U}^- \blacktriangle \mathfrak{V}^-$ (hence $\mathfrak{R}_0 \subset \mathfrak{U}^+$).

Proof. Let $P \in \mathfrak{V}^-, P' \in \mathfrak{U}^-$. Then we have we have $P \in \mathfrak{U}^+$ and $P' \in \mathfrak{V}^+$ by Claim 5. We must prove $\sigma_{H_n} P \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$, or equivalently, $\sigma_{H_n} P' \dot{\cap} P \neq \emptyset$.

Assume that $P' \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$. Then this, together with $P \in \mathfrak{U}^+$, $P' \in \mathfrak{U}^-$ enable us to Apply P_1, P_2 in Claim 1 to P, P' , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} P \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$.

Otherwise, we have $P \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P'^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$ by $\mathbf{O}(n)$. This, together with $P' \in \mathfrak{V}^+, P \in \mathfrak{V}^-$ enable us to apply P_1, P_2 in Claim 2 to P', P , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} P' \dot{\cap} P \neq \emptyset$. \square

Claim 7. $\mathfrak{R}_k \subset \mathfrak{U}^+$ for any k .

Proof. We prove by induction on k . The case $k = 0$ is Claim 6. If $k > 0$, then $\mathfrak{R}_k = \mathfrak{R}_{k-1} \cup \mathfrak{B}'_{k-1}$. We have $\mathfrak{R}_{k-1} \subset \mathfrak{U}^+$ by induction and $\mathfrak{B}'_{k-1} \subset \mathfrak{U}^+$ by (3.18), and hence $\mathfrak{R}_k \subset \mathfrak{U}^+$. \square

Claim 8. $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{U}^- \blacktriangle \mathfrak{R}_0$.

Proof. Let $P \in \mathfrak{R}_0, P' \in \mathfrak{U}^-$. We have $P \in \mathfrak{U}^+$ by Claim 6. By definition, we have $\sigma_{H_n} P \dot{\cap} Q = \emptyset$ for some $Q \in \mathfrak{B}^-$.

Property **O**(n) enables us to prove case by case according to the following figure (here, (2.1),(2.2) are subcases of (2), and (2.2.1) and (2.2.2) are subcases of (2.2)).

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1) P' \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset \\ (2) P' \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P'^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (2.1) P \dot{\cap} P' \dot{\cap} H_n^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset \\ (2.2) P \dot{\cap} P' \subset H_n^{u_1 C, -} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (2.2.1) Q \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset \\ (2.2.2) P \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} Q^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right.$$

Thus, it suffices to deal with (1), (2.1), (2.2.1), (2.2.2).

(1). The conditions $P \in \mathfrak{U}^+, P' \in \mathfrak{U}^-$, (1) enable us to apply P_1, P_2 in Claim 1 to P, P' , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} P \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$.

(2.1). The conditions (2), (2.1), $P \in \mathfrak{U}^+, P' \in \mathfrak{U}^-$ enable us to apply Claim 3 to get $\sigma_{H_n} P' \dot{\cap} P \neq \emptyset$.

(2.2.1). Combining (2) and **E**(n) yields $P' \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset$. This and (2.2.1) enable us to apply P, H, H_1, H_2 in Lemma 2.5 to P, H_n, P', Q , respectively to obtain $\sigma_{H_n} P \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_{H_n} P \dot{\cap} Q \neq \emptyset$. But the latter is false, and hence $\sigma_{H_n} P \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$.

(2.2.2). In this case, suppose that

$$(3.27) \quad P \dot{\cap} Q \dot{\cap} H_n^{w_{n-1} C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset.$$

Then $Q \in \mathfrak{B}^-, P \in \mathfrak{B}^+$, (3.27), and (2.2) enable us to apply P_1, P_2 in Claim 4 to Q, P , respectively, to obtain $\sigma_{H_n} Q \dot{\cap} P \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts to assumption on Q . This shows that

$$(3.28) \quad P \dot{\cap} Q \subset H_n^{w_{n-1} C, -} = H_n^{u_1 C, +}.$$

The conditions (3.28), (2), (2.2), (2.2.2) enable us to apply P, H, H_1, H_2 in Lemma 2.3 to P, H_n, Q, P' , respectively, to obtain $\sigma_{H_n} P \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_{H_n} P \dot{\cap} Q \neq \emptyset$. But the latter is false by assumption on Q , and hence $\sigma_{H_n} P \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$. \square

Claim 9. $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{B} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{R}_0$.

Proof. Let $B \in \mathfrak{B}, R_0 \in \mathfrak{R}_0$. We have $B \in \mathfrak{U}^+, R_0 \in \mathfrak{B}^+$, and $\sigma_{H_n} R_0 \dot{\cap} Q = \emptyset$ for some $Q \in \mathfrak{B}^-$ and $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} P = \emptyset$ for some $P \in \mathfrak{U}^-$ (hence $P \in \mathfrak{B}^+$ by Claim 5).

Suppose that $Q \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} R_0^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$. This, $R_0 \in \mathfrak{B}^+, Q \in \mathfrak{B}^-$ enable us to apply P_1, P_2 in Claim 2 to R_0, Q , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} R_0 \dot{\cap} Q \neq$

\emptyset , which contradicts to assumption. This, together with $\mathbf{O}(n)$ shows that $R_0 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} Q^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$, which implies that

$$(3.29) \quad Q \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} R_0^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset$$

by $\mathbf{E}(n)$.

If $B \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} R_0^{u_1 C, \leq 0}$, then applying H_1, H_2, P in Lemma 2.5 to Q, B, R_0 , respectively, we get $\sigma_{H_n} R_0 \dot{\cap} Q \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_{H_n} R_0 \dot{\cap} B \neq \emptyset$. But the former is false by assumption, and hence $\sigma_{H_n} R_0 \dot{\cap} B \neq \emptyset$.

Otherwise, we have

$$(3.30) \quad R_0 \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B^{u_1 C, \leq 0}$$

by $\mathbf{O}(n)$. Suppose that $P \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$. Then the conditions $B \in \mathfrak{U}^+$, $P \in \mathfrak{U}^-$, $P \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$ enable us to applying P_1, P_2 in Claim 1 to B, P , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} P \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts to assumption. This, together with $\mathbf{O}(n)$ implies that $B \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$, and hence

$$(3.31) \quad P \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset$$

by $\mathbf{E}(n)$. Now (3.30), (3.31) enable us to apply P, H, H_1, H_2 in Lemma 2.5 to B, H_n, P, R_0 , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} P \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} R_0 \neq \emptyset$. But the former is false by assumption, and hence $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} R_0 \neq \emptyset$. \square

For convenience, we denote $\mathfrak{B}'_{-2} = \mathfrak{Y}^-$ and $\mathfrak{B}'_{-1} = \mathfrak{X}_0$. We have

Claim 10. $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{B}'_k \blacktriangle \mathfrak{B}$ for any $k \geq -2$.

Fix a $k \geq -1$, and let $B'_k \in \mathfrak{B}'_k$. Combining (3.17) and definition of \mathfrak{Y}^- and \mathfrak{X}_0 , there exists $B'_i \in \mathfrak{B}'_i$ such that $\sigma_{H_n} B'_i \dot{\cap} B'_{i-1} = \emptyset$ for any $-1 \leq i \leq k$. This follows from easy (inverse) induction on i . In particular, we have

$$(3.32) \quad B'_i \dot{\cap} B'_{i-1} \dot{\cap} H_n = \emptyset, \quad -1 \leq i \leq k.$$

Before proving Claim 10, we prove the following

Lemma 3.3. For any $k \geq -1$, we have $B'_k \dot{\cap} B'_{k-1} \subset H_n^{u_1 C, +}$ and

$$\begin{cases} B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B'^{u_1 C, \leq 0}_k \neq \emptyset & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\ B'_k \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B'^{u_1 C, \leq 0}_{k-1} \neq \emptyset & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Step 1: The case $k = -1$.

Suppose that $B'_{-2} \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B'^{u_1 C, \leq 0}_{-1} \neq \emptyset$. Since $B'_{-2} \in \mathfrak{Y}^-$ and $B'_{-1} \in \mathfrak{X}_0 \subset \mathfrak{Y}^+$, we have $\sigma_{H_n} B'_{-1} \dot{\cap} B'_{-2} \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts to assumption, and hence $B'_{-1} \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B'^{u_1 C, \leq 0}_{-2} \neq \emptyset$ by $\mathbf{O}(n)$.

Suppose that $B'_{-1} \dot{\cap} B'_{-2} \dot{\cap} H_n^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$. This, together with $B'_{-2} \in \mathfrak{Y}^-$, $B'_{-1} \in \mathfrak{Y}^+$, $B'_{-1} \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B'^{u_1 C, \leq 0}_{-2} \neq \emptyset$ enable us to apply P_1, P_2 in Claim 4 to B'_{-2}, B'_{-1} , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} B'_{-2} \dot{\cap} B'_{-1} \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts to assumption. This shows that $B'_{-1} \dot{\cap} B'_{-2} \subset H_n^{u_1 C, +}$.

Step 2: Induction on k .

We have

$$(3.33) \quad \sigma_{H_n} B'_k \dot{\cap} B'_{k-1} = \emptyset, \quad \sigma_{H_n} B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} B'_{k-2} = \emptyset$$

by the construction of B'_i , and

$$(3.34) \quad B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} B'_{k-2} \subset H_n^{u_1 C, +}$$

by induction.

Assume that k is even. Since $k-1$ is odd, we have $B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B'^{u_1 C, \leq 0}_{k-2} \neq \emptyset$ by induction, and hence

$$(3.35) \quad B'_{k-2} \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B'^{u_1 C, \geq 0}_{k-1} \neq \emptyset.$$

by $\mathbf{E}(n)$.

Suppose that $B'_k \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B'^{u_1 C, \leq 0}_{k-1} \neq \emptyset$. Then this, (3.35) enable us to apply P, H, H_1, H_2 in Lemma 2.5 to $B'_{k-1}, H_n, B'_{k-2}, B'_k$, respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} B'_{k-2} \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_{H_n} B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} B'_k \neq \emptyset$, which contradicts to (3.33). It follows that

$$(3.36) \quad B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B'^{u_1 C, \leq 0}_k \neq \emptyset$$

by $\mathbf{O}(n)$ and (3.32).

Suppose that $B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} B'_k \dot{\cap} H_n^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$. This, together with (3.35), (3.36), (3.34) enable us to apply P, H, H_1, H_2 in Lemma 2.3 to $B'_{k-1}, H_n, B'_k, B'_{k-2}$, respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} B'_k \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_{H_n} B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} B'_{k-2} \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts to (3.33). It follows that

$$(3.37) \quad B'_k \dot{\cap} B'_{k-1} \subset H_n^{u_1 C, +}.$$

The result follows from (3.36), (3.37). Similar arguments show that the result hold for odd k . \square

Proof of Claim 10. The case $k = -2$ is trivial. Assume that $k \geq -1$.

Let $B \in \mathfrak{B}$. Then $B \in \mathfrak{U}^+$, and $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} P' = \emptyset$ for some $P' \in \mathfrak{U}^-$. Suppose that $P' \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$. Applying P_1, P_2 in Claim 1 to B, P' , respectively, we get $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts to $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} P' = \emptyset$. This shows that

$$(3.38) \quad (a) B \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} P'^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset, \quad (b) P' \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B^{u_1 C, \geq 0}$$

by $\mathbf{O}(n)$ and $\mathbf{E}(n)$.

Suppose that

$$(3.39) \quad B \dot{\cap} P' \dot{\cap} H_n^{u_1 C, \geq 0}.$$

The conditions $B \in \mathfrak{U}^+, P' \in \mathfrak{U}^-, (3.38)(a), (3.39)$ enable us to apply P, P' in Claim 3 to B, P' , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} P' \dot{\cap} B \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts to $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} P' = \emptyset$. This shows that

$$(3.40) \quad B \dot{\cap} P' \subset H_n^{u_1 C, -}.$$

Assume that $B'_k \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B^{u_1 C, -} \neq \emptyset$. This, together with (3.38)(b) enable us to apply P, H, H_1, H_2 in Lemma 2.5 to B, H_n, P', B'_k , respectively, to

get $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} B'_k \neq \emptyset$. But the former is false by assumption, and hence $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} B'_k \neq \emptyset$.

Otherwise, we have

$$(3.41) \quad (a) B \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B_k'^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset \quad (b) B'_k \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset$$

by **O**(n).

Assume that k is odd, then $B'_k \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B_{k-1}'^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset$ by Lemma 3.3, and hence

$$(3.42) \quad B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B_k'^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset$$

by **E**(n). Due to (3.41)(a), (3.42), one can apply P, H, H_1, H_2 in Lemma 2.5 to B'_k, H_n, B'_{k-1}, B , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} B'_k \dot{\cap} B'_{k-1} \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_{H_n} B'_k \dot{\cap} B \neq \emptyset$. But the former is false by assumption, and hence $\sigma_{H_n} B'_k \dot{\cap} B \neq \emptyset$.

Assume that k is even. Then

$$(3.43) \quad (a) B'_{k-1} \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B_k'^{u_1 C, \leq 0} \neq \emptyset \quad (b) B'_k \dot{\cap} H_n \dot{\cap} B_{k-1}'^{u_1 C, \geq 0} \neq \emptyset$$

by Lemma 3.3 and **E**(n). Assume that $B \dot{\cap} B'_k \dot{\cap} H_n^{u_1 C, \geq 0}$. This, together with (3.38)(b), (3.43)(b), (3.41)(b), (3.40) enable us to apply P, H, H_1, H_2 in Lemma 2.3 to B, H_n, B'_k, P' , respectively, to get $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} B'_k \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} P' \neq \emptyset$. But the latter is false, and hence $\sigma_{H_n} B \dot{\cap} B'_k \neq \emptyset$. Assume that

$$(3.44) \quad B \dot{\cap} B'_k \subset H_n^{u_1 C, -}.$$

Lemma 3.3 implies that

$$(3.45) \quad B'_k \dot{\cap} B'_{k-1} \subset H_n^{u_1 C, +}.$$

The conditions (3.41)(a), (3.43)(a), (3.44), (3.45) enable us to apply P, H, H_1, H_2 in Lemma 2.3 to B'_k, H_n, B'_{k-1}, B , to get $\sigma_{H_n} B'_k \dot{\cap} B'_{k-1} \neq \emptyset$ or $\sigma_{H_n} B'_k \dot{\cap} B \neq \emptyset$. But the former is false by assumption, and hence $\sigma_{H_n} B'_k \dot{\cap} B \neq \emptyset$. \square

Since $|\mathfrak{B}_0| < \infty$, (3.18) implies that $\mathfrak{B}_l = \mathfrak{B}_{l+1} = \dots$ for some l , and hence $\mathfrak{B}'_{l-1} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathfrak{B}'_l = \emptyset$. By definition, we have $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{B}_0 \blacktriangle \mathfrak{B}^-$. It follows that

$$(3.46) \quad \sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{B}_l \blacktriangle \mathfrak{B}^-$$

since $\mathfrak{B}_l \subset \mathfrak{B}_0$. We prove

$$(3.47) \quad \sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{U}^- \blacktriangle \mathfrak{R}_i \text{ for any } i$$

by induction on i . The case $i = 0$ is just Claim 9. Since $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{U}^- \blacktriangle \mathfrak{R}_{i-1}$ by induction and $\mathfrak{R}_i = \mathfrak{R}_{i-1} \cup \mathfrak{B}'_{i-1}$, it remains to show that $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{U}^- \blacktriangle \mathfrak{B}'_{i-1}$. But this is an easy consequence of $\mathfrak{B}'_{i-1} \subset \mathfrak{B}_{i-1} \subset \mathfrak{B}_0$ and $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{U}^- \blacktriangle \mathfrak{B}_0$ (follows from definition of \mathfrak{B}_0). Since $\mathfrak{B}'_l = \emptyset$, we have $\{\sigma_{H_n} B_l\} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{R}_l$ for any $B_l \in \mathfrak{B}_l$, and hence

$$(3.48) \quad \sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{B}_l \blacktriangle \mathfrak{R}_l.$$

We prove

$$(3.49) \quad \sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{B} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{R}_i \text{ for any } i$$

by induction on i . The case $i = 0$ is just Claim 8. We have $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{B} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{B}'_{i-1}$ by (10), and $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{B} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{R}_{i-1}$ by induction, and $\mathfrak{R}_i = \mathfrak{R}_{i-1} \cup \mathfrak{B}'_{i-1}$ by definition. Combining there yields (3.49).

Combining Claim 6, (3.16), (3.46), (3.47), (3.49), (3.48) yields

$$(3.50) \quad \sigma_{H_n} (\mathfrak{U}^- \cup \mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l) \blacktriangle (\mathfrak{Y}^- \cup \mathfrak{R}_l).$$

Moreover, by (3.12) $\mathfrak{U}^- \cup \mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l$ and $\mathfrak{Y}^- \cup \mathfrak{R}_l$ are intersecting. Now we set

$$(3.51) \quad \mathfrak{P}_n = \mathfrak{Y}^- \cup \mathfrak{R}_l \cup \sigma_{H_n} (\mathfrak{U}^- \cup \mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l) \cup \{H_n\}$$

It follows that \mathfrak{P}_n is intersecting by (3.12) and (3.50). It is clear that

$$(3.52) \quad \mathfrak{P}_{n-1} = \mathfrak{U}^- \sqcup \mathfrak{B} \sqcup \mathfrak{B}_l \sqcup \mathfrak{Y}^- \sqcup \mathfrak{R}_l.$$

Since $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{Y}^- \cap \mathfrak{U}^+ \neq \emptyset$, and $\mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l \in \mathfrak{U}^+$ by definition, we have

$$(3.53) \quad \sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{Y}^- \cap (\mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l) = \emptyset.$$

Suppose that $\sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{R}_l \cap (\mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l) \neq \emptyset$. We have $\sigma_{H_n} R \in \mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l \subset \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}$ for some $R \in \mathfrak{R}_l$. It follows that $\{\sigma_{H_n} R\} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}$ by $\mathbf{D}(n-1)$. On the other hand, an easy induction on k shows that $\neg(\mathfrak{R}_k \blacktriangle \mathfrak{P}_{n-1})$ for any k , and in particular, $\neg(\{\sigma_{H_n} R\} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{P}_{n-1})$ which contradicts to $\{\sigma_{H_n} R\} \blacktriangle \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}$. It follows that

$$(3.54) \quad \sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{R}_l \cap (\mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l) = \emptyset.$$

Suppose that $\sigma_{H_n} P \in \mathfrak{Y}^- \cup \mathfrak{R}_l \subset \mathfrak{P}_{n-1}$ for some $P \in \mathfrak{U}^-$. Then we have $\langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_{n-1} C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = 1$ by $\mathbf{D}(n-1)$. On the other hand, we have $\langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_{n-1} C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = -1$ by Claim 5 since $P \in \mathfrak{U}^-$, contradicted. This shows that

$$(3.55) \quad \sigma_{H_n} \mathfrak{U}^- \cap (\mathfrak{Y}^- \cup \mathfrak{R}_l) = \emptyset.$$

Combining (3.52), (3.53), (3.54), (3.55) yields $|\mathfrak{P}_n| = n$. This proves $\mathbf{I}(n)$.

For $P_1 \in \mathfrak{Y}^-$, we have $P_1 \in \mathfrak{U}^+$ by Claim 5, and hence

$$(3.56) \quad \langle u_1 C, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle \langle w_n C, \alpha_{P_1} \rangle = 1.$$

For $P_2 \in \mathfrak{R}_l$, we have $P_2 \in \mathfrak{U}^+$ by Claim 7, and hence

$$(3.57) \quad \langle u_1 C, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle \langle w_n C, \alpha_{P_2} \rangle = 1.$$

For $P_3 \in \mathfrak{U}^-$, we have $P_3 \in \mathfrak{Y}^+$ by Claim 5, and hence

$$(3.58) \quad \langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_{P_3} \rangle \langle w_n C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_{P_3} \rangle = 1$$

by Lemma 5. For $P_4 \in \mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l$, since $\mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l \subset \mathfrak{B}_0 \in \mathfrak{Y}^+$ by definition, we have

$$(3.59) \quad \langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_{P_4} \rangle \langle w_n C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_{P_4} \rangle = 1.$$

Combining (3.56), (3.57), (3.58), (3.59) yields $\mathbf{D}(n)$.

We have $\langle u_1 C, \alpha_H \rangle \langle u_n C, \alpha_H \rangle = -1$ for any $H \in \mathfrak{Y}^- \cup \mathfrak{R}_l$ by (3.5). Thus, to prove $\mathbf{L}(n)$, it suffices to show that $\langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle u_n C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = -1$ for

any $P \in \mathfrak{U}^- \cup \mathfrak{B} \cup \mathfrak{B}_l$ by (3.51). In fact, we have $\langle u_1 C, \alpha_P \rangle \langle \sigma_{H_n} u_n C, \alpha_P \rangle = -1$ By Lemma 1.5, and $\langle u_1 C, \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_{n-1} C, \alpha_P \rangle = 1$ by $\mathbf{D}(n-1)$. It follows that $\langle \sigma_{H_n} u_n C, \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_{n-1} C, \alpha_P \rangle = -1$, and hence

$$(3.60) \quad \langle u_n C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_n C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = -1$$

by applying σ_{H_n} . Combining Claim 5, (3.18), and definition of \mathfrak{B} , we have $P \in \mathfrak{B}^+$, and hence $\langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle w_n C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = 1$. Combining this with (3.60) yields $\langle u_1 C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle \langle u_n C, \sigma_{H_n} \alpha_P \rangle = -1$ and $\mathbf{L}(n)$ is proved.

3.3. Intersection of hyperplanes and reflection subgroups. In this subsection, we give the connection between the finiteness of reflection subgroups and the intersection of the corresponding hyperplanes. We begin with discussing the stabilizer of elements in T° .

For any $I \subset S$, Let V_I be the subspace of V spanned by α_s ($s \in I$) and $\iota^* : V^* \rightarrow V_I^*$ be the restriction, which is clearly W_I -equivariant. Let T_I be the Tits cone for W_I , i.e, $T_I = \cup_{w \in W_I} w D_I$, $D_I = \{h \in V_I^* \mid \langle h, \alpha_s \rangle \geq 0, s \in I\}$. Let T_I° be set of inner points of T_I . We claim that

$$(3.61) \quad \iota^* T^\circ \subset T_I^\circ.$$

To see this, let $f \in T^\circ$. By definition, we have $f \in U \subset T$ for some open ball U . For any $g \in U$, we have $g \in wD$ for some $w \in W$ by the definition of T . Let $D'_I = \{h \in V^* \mid \langle h, \alpha_s \rangle \geq 0, s \in I\}$. Write $w = w_1 w_2$ with $w_1 \in W_I$, $w_2 \in {}^I W = \{w \in W \mid sw > w, s \in I\}$. We claim that $g \in w_1 D'_I$. In fact, Lemma 1.4 implies that $w_2^{-1} \alpha_s > 0$ for each $s \in I$, and hence $\langle w_1^{-1} g, \alpha_s \rangle = \langle w^{-1} g, w_2^{-1} \alpha_s \rangle \geq 0$ for each $s \in I$ since $w^{-1} g \in D$. It follows that $w_1^{-1} g \in D'_I$. This proves the claim. Thus, we have $U \subset \cup_{w \in W_I} w D'_I$. Let $D_I = \{h \in V_I^* \mid \langle h, \alpha_s \rangle \geq 0, s \in I\}$. It is clear that $\iota^* D'_I = D_I$, and hence $\iota^* U \subset \cup_{w \in W_I} \iota^* w D'_I = \cup_{w \in W_I} w D_I = T_I$. Thus, $\iota^* f \in \iota^* U \subset V_I^*$, and hence $\iota^* f \in T_I^\circ$ (clearly, $\iota^* U$ is an open ball in V_I^*). This proves (3.61).

Lemma 3.4. *If $f \in T^\circ$, then the stabilizer of f in W is finite.*

Proof. Conjugating by elements in W when necessary, one can assume that $f \in C_I$ for some $I \subset S$. By Theorem 1.3, W_I is the stabilizer of f in W . Assume that $f \in T^\circ$. By (3.61), T_I is a convex cone in V_I^* containing an open ball (containing $\iota^* f = 0$) in V_I^* , and hence $T_I = V_I^*$, which implies W_I is finite by Lemma 1.3. \square

Corollary 3.5. *Let $\mathfrak{Q} \subset \mathfrak{P}$, W' is the subgroup of W generated by σ_Q ($Q \in \mathfrak{Q}$). Then W' is finite if and only if $\dot{\cap}_{Q \in \mathfrak{Q}} Q \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. The if part follows immediately from Lemma 3.4. For the only if part, assume that W' is finite. It is clear that the fixed subspace $(V^*)^{W'} = \cap_{Q \in \mathfrak{Q}} Q$ and $T^\circ \neq \emptyset$. Let $f_0 \in T^\circ$ and put $\bar{f}_0 = \frac{1}{|W'|} \sum_{w \in W'} w f_0$. We have $\bar{f}_0 \in (V^*)^{W'} \cap T^\circ$ since T° is an open convex cone, and hence $\dot{\cap}_{Q \in \mathfrak{Q}} Q \neq \emptyset$. \square

Let $\mathfrak{Q} \subset \mathfrak{P}$, and W' be the subgroup of W generated by σ_Q ($Q \in \mathfrak{Q}$) and let $\Phi' = \{w\gamma \mid w \in W', H_\gamma \in \mathfrak{Q}\}$ and $\Phi'^+ = \Phi' \cap \Phi^+$. By [3], there

is a subset $\Delta' \subset \Phi^{+'}$ such that (W', S') is a Coxeter system, where S' be the set of reflections corresponding to roots in Δ' . Thus, Φ' , Φ'^{+} , Δ' are the set of roots, positive roots, simple roots for W' , respectively. Let V' be the subspace of V spanned by roots in Δ' . Then V' is also spanned by α_Q ($Q \in \Omega$). Now one can work with geometric representation V' of W' , the Tits cone $T' \subset V'^*$, and the natural pair $\langle -, - \rangle': V'^* \times V' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Let $\iota^* : V^* \rightarrow V'^*$ be the restriction. It is clear that $\mathfrak{H}' = \{\iota^* H_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi'^{+}\}$ are reflecting hyperplanes for W' in V'^* . For $A, B \subset V'^*$, write $A \dot{\cap}' B = A \cap B \cap T'^{\circ}$. It is clear that the $\dot{\cap}'$ of a family of hyperplanes in $\{H_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi'^{+}\}$ is $\neq \emptyset$ if and only if the $\dot{\cap}'$ of their images under ι^* is $\neq \emptyset$ (since both of them are equivalent to “the subgroup (of W') generated by the reflection of these hyperplanes are finite” by Corollary 3.5).

Combining the discussion above, Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 3.5, we obtain the following

Corollary 3.6. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathfrak{H}$, W' is the subgroup of W generated by σ_Q ($Q \in \Omega$), and V' be the subspace of V spanned by α_Q ($Q \in \Omega$). Then the following are equivalent: (1) W' is finite; (2) $\dot{\cap}'_{Q \in \Omega} Q \neq \emptyset$; (3) $\dot{\cap}'_{Q \in \Omega} \iota^* Q \neq \emptyset$; (4) B is positive definite on V' . (5) W' is conjugate to a reflection subgroup of some finite parabolic subgroup W_I and $\text{rank } W' = |I|$.*

3.4. Hyperbolic Coxeter groups and Lobachevskian geometry. In this subsection, we recall basic definitions and results on hyperbolic Coxeter groups and Lobachevskian (or hyperbolic) geometry (see. [2] for details).

We always assume that B has signature $(r - 1, 1)$ throughout this subsection. The image \tilde{N} of $N = \{v \in V \mid B(v, v) < 0\}$ in the projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$ of V is called *Lobachevskian (or hyperbolic) space*.

Let $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{c} \in \tilde{N}$, viewed as lines in V through origin. We will define the Lobachevskian angle $\angle_L \tilde{a} \tilde{b} \tilde{c}$. Let $b \in V$ be an inverse image of \tilde{b} with $B(b, b) = -1$ and $V_b = \{v \in V \mid B(b, v) = 0\}$. Clearly, B is positive definite on V_b due to its signature, and hence V_b is Euclidean relative to B . It follows that $V_b \cap N = \emptyset$. In particular, $a \notin V_b$ for any $0 \neq a \in \tilde{a}$, and hence $\tilde{a} \cap \mathbb{E}_b \neq \emptyset$, where $\mathbb{E}_b = b + V_b$. Let $\dot{a} = \tilde{a} \cap \mathbb{E}_b$. Since $\tilde{b} \cap V_b = 0$, we have $\dot{a} = b + \beta_{\tilde{a}}$ for a unique $\beta_{\tilde{a}} \in V_b$. Define $\beta_{\tilde{c}}$ likewise, and define $\angle_L \tilde{a} \tilde{b} \tilde{c}$ be the Euclidean angle between $\beta_{\tilde{a}}$ and $\beta_{\tilde{c}}$ in V_b relative to B . It is well known that

Theorem 3.7. *We have $\angle_L \tilde{b} \tilde{a} \tilde{c} + \angle_L \tilde{a} \tilde{b} \tilde{c} + \angle_L \tilde{a} \tilde{c} \tilde{b} < \pi$ for any $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{c} \in \tilde{N}$.*

Since B is nondegenerate, one identifies V with V^* by the map $v \mapsto B(v, -)$ ($v \in V$). Under this identification, we still denote $C = \{v \in V \mid B(v, \alpha_s) > 0, s \in S\}$, $D = \{v \in V \mid B(v, \alpha_s) \geq 0, s \in S\}$, the fundamental domain for the action of W on $T = \cup_{w \in W} wD$, and $H_\alpha = \{v \in V \mid B(\alpha, v) = 0\}$ ($\alpha \in \Phi^+$). An irreducible Coxeter system (W, S) is called *hyperbolic* if $B(v, v) < 0$ for any $v \in C$.

Let W be an hyperbolic Coxeter group of rank r . Assume that \mathfrak{I} be the intersection of $r - 1$ hyperplane in \mathfrak{H} whose positive roots are linearly

independent (and hence \mathfrak{l} is a line through origin), and $\mathfrak{l} \cap T^\circ \neq \emptyset$. Let $V_{\mathfrak{l}} = \{v \in V \mid B(x, v) = 0, x \in \mathfrak{l}\}$. Then $V_{\mathfrak{l}}$ is the subspace of V spanned by positive roots corresponding to the above $r - 1$ hyperplanes. Corollary 3.6 implies that B is positive definite on $V_{\mathfrak{l}}$. Due to the signature of B , we have $B(x, x) < 0$ for $0 \neq x \in \mathfrak{l}$, and hence $\mathfrak{l} \in \tilde{N}$. Thus, one can talk about Lobachevskian angles for any three such lines \mathfrak{l}_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$). In particular, we have

$$(3.62) \quad \angle_L \mathfrak{l}_2 \mathfrak{l}_1 \mathfrak{l}_3 + \angle_L \mathfrak{l}_1 \mathfrak{l}_2 \mathfrak{l}_3 + \angle_L \mathfrak{l}_1 \mathfrak{l}_3 \mathfrak{l}_2 < \pi$$

by Theorem 3.7.

Theorem 3.8. *Assume that*

- (1) B is not positive definite.
- (2) For each $S \in S$, the Coxeter graph obtained by removing s from $\Gamma(W)$ is positive definite.

Then W is affine or (in fact, compact) hyperbolic

Proof. Suppose W is reducible, then (2) implies that each component of $\Gamma(W)$ is of finite type, and hence W is finite which contradicts to (1). This shows that W is irreducible. Thus, the result follows immediately from [5, 4.7 and 6.8]. \square

3.5. The boundness of the cardinality of intersecting subsets. This subsection devotes to show that the cardinality of intersecting subsets of \mathfrak{P} is bounded (Theorem 3.22).

Definition 3.9. A subset $\Omega \subset \mathfrak{P}$ is called *minimal infinite* if

$$(3.63) \quad \text{(a) } \bigcap_{P \in \Omega} P = \emptyset, \text{ (b) } \bigcap_{H \in \Omega \setminus \{Q\}} H \neq \emptyset \text{ for any } Q \in \Omega.$$

Lemma 3.10. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathfrak{P}$ be minimal infinite. Then α_Q ($Q \in \Omega$) are linearly independent.*

Proof. (3.63) (b) enables us to choose $\omega_Q \in \bigcap_{H \in \Omega \setminus \{Q\}} H$ for each $Q \in \Omega$, i.e., $\langle \omega_Q, \alpha_P \rangle \neq 0$ ($P \neq Q$), and (3.63) (a) implies that $\omega_Q \notin Q$ and hence $\langle \omega_Q, \alpha_Q \rangle \neq 0$. Assume that $\sum_{P \in \Omega} x_P \alpha_P = 0$ ($x_P \in \mathbb{R}$). Then $x_Q \langle \omega_Q, \alpha_Q \rangle = \langle \omega_Q, \sum_{P \in \Omega} x_P \alpha_P \rangle = 0$ for all $Q \in \Omega$, and hence all $x_Q = 0$ as desired. \square

Lemma 3.11. *Let Ω be minimal infinite, and W' be the subgroup of W generated by σ_P ($P \in \Omega$). Then W' is affine or compact hyperbolic.*

Proof. In this proof, we keep notations in the discussion below Lemma 3.10.

Combining Corollary 3.5, Theorem 3.8, and the above discussion, it suffices to prove that

$$(3.64) \quad \bigcap'_{\alpha \in \Delta'} \iota^* H_\alpha = \emptyset, \bigcap'_{\alpha \in \Delta' \setminus \{\alpha'\}} \iota^* H_\alpha \neq \emptyset \text{ for any } \alpha' \in \Delta'.$$

By the above discussion, it remains to prove the second formula of (3.64). For each $Q \in \Omega$, let $L_Q = \bigcap'_{H \in \iota^*(\Omega \setminus \{Q\})} H$. By (3.63) and the above discussion, we have $L_Q \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, Lemma 3.10 implies that L_Q an

intersection of a line (through origin) in V'^* and T'° . Since W' is infinite by Corollary 3.5, T'° is a proper open convex cone in V'^* . Thus, L_Q is a ray in V'^* starting from (but excluding) origin. Let E be the convex hull of $\cup_{Q \in \Omega} L_Q$. Choose an $\omega_Q \in L_Q$ for each $Q \in \Omega$, then $\langle \omega_Q, \alpha_P \rangle' = 0$ ($P \in \Omega \setminus \{Q\}$), and the first formula of (3.63) implies $\omega_Q \notin Q$ and hence $\langle \omega_Q, \alpha_Q \rangle' \neq 0$. The inner points of E is $E^\circ = \sum_{Q \in \Omega} \mathbb{R}^{>0} \omega_Q$, which is a component of $V'^* \setminus \iota^* \Omega$ by the choice of ω_Q . Thus, E° contains a component of $V'^* \setminus \mathfrak{P}'$ since $\mathfrak{P}' \supset \iota^* \Omega$, and hence contain some $w' C'$ since $E^\circ \subset T'^\circ$, where $w' \in W'$, and $C' = \{f' \in V'^* \mid \langle f', \alpha' \rangle' > 0, \alpha' \in \Delta'\}$. Conjugating by an element in W' when necessary, one can assume that $w' = 1$ (hence $C' \subset E^\circ$). In particular, $\langle f', \alpha_Q \rangle' > 0$ for $f' \in C' \subset E^\circ$ and $Q \in \Omega$ since $0 \neq \alpha_Q \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0} \Delta'$, and hence $\langle f', \alpha_Q \rangle' > 0$ for all $f' \in E^\circ$ since for each Ω , $\text{sgn} \langle f', \alpha_Q \rangle'$ is constant for all $f' \in E^\circ$. For each $\alpha' \in \Delta'$, let $L_{\alpha'} = \cap_{\alpha \in \Delta' \setminus \{\alpha'\}} \iota^* H_\alpha \cap \iota^* H_{\alpha'}^+$. It is clear that $L_{\alpha'} \subset \overline{C'} \subset \overline{E} = E \cup \{0\}$ and $0 \notin L_{\alpha'}$, and hence $L_{\alpha'} \subset E \subset T'^\circ$. In particular, we have $\dot{\cap}'_{\alpha \in \Delta' \setminus \{\alpha'\}} \iota^* H_\alpha \neq \emptyset$ which proves the second formula of (3.64). \square

Definition 3.12. A *bone* of W is the intersection of several hyperplanes in \mathfrak{P} . The dimension of a bone is defined to be the dimension of it as a subspace of V^* .

Let \mathbf{a} be a bone and $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}) = \{v \in V \mid \langle a, v \rangle = 0, \forall a \in \mathbf{a}\}$. Then we have the exact sequence

$$(3.65) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathbf{a} \rightarrow V^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})^* \rightarrow 0,$$

where the first map is inclusion and the second one is restriction.

Let $\mathbf{a} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ be a bones, and $\dim \mathfrak{l} = \dim \mathbf{a} + 1$ and $\mathbf{a} \cap T^\circ \neq \emptyset$. Define the map $\tau_{\mathbf{a}} : \mathfrak{l} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})$ as follows: Since B is positive definite (hence nondegenerate) on $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})$ by Corollary 3.6, there is an isomorphism $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}) \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})^*$ sending $v \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})$ to $B(v, -)$. Thus, one naturally transfers the Euclidean structure of $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})$ relative to B to an Euclidean structure on $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})^*$, on which the corresponding bilinear form still denoted by B . Let $\tau_{\mathbf{a}} : V^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})^*$ be the restriction. By (3.65), we have $\ker \tau_{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{a}$, and hence $\dim \tau_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathfrak{l}) = \dim \mathfrak{l} - \dim \mathbf{a} = 1$. Since $\dim \mathfrak{l} = \dim \mathbf{a} + 1$, $\mathfrak{l} \setminus \mathbf{a}$ (and hence $(\mathfrak{l} \setminus \mathbf{a}) \cap T^\circ = (\mathfrak{l} \cap T^\circ) \setminus (\mathbf{a} \cap T^\circ)$) has two components, and each component is convex.

Lemma 3.13. *Assume that $\mathbf{a} \subset \mathfrak{l}$ be a bones, $\dim \mathfrak{l} = \dim \mathbf{a} + 1$, $\mathbf{a} \cap T^\circ \neq \emptyset$, and $a_1, a_2 \in \mathfrak{l} \cap T^\circ$ are in the same (resp. different) component of $(\mathfrak{l} \setminus \mathbf{a}) \cap T^\circ$. Then $\tau_{\mathbf{a}}(a_1) = c \tau_{\mathbf{a}}(a_2)$ for some $c > 0$ (resp. $c < 0$).*

Proof. Let $\beta_i = \tau_{\mathbf{a}}(a_i)$, ($i = 1, 2$). By assumption, we have $a_i \notin \mathbf{a}$ and hence $\beta_i \neq 0$. It follows that $\beta_1 = c \beta_2$ for some $c \neq 0$ since $\dim \tau_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathfrak{l}) = 1$. Since $\tau_{\mathbf{a}}$ is linear, we have

$$(3.66) \quad \tau_{\mathbf{a}}[a_1 a_2] = [\beta_1 \beta_2].$$

Assume that a_1, a_2 are in the same component Λ of $(\mathfrak{l} \setminus \mathbf{a}) \cap T^\circ$. To prove $c > 0$, it suffices to prove $0 \notin [\beta_1 \beta_2]$. By (3.66), we must show that $\tau_{\mathbf{a}}(a) \neq 0$

(i.e., $a \notin \ker \tau_{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{a}$) for any $a \in [a_1 a_2]$. Indeed, since Λ is convex, we have $a \in \Lambda$, and hence $a \notin \mathbf{a} \cap T^\circ$. Since T° is convex, we have $a \in T^\circ$. It follows that $a \notin \mathbf{a}$.

Assume that a_1, a_2 are in the different component (and hence $a' \in \mathbf{a} \cap T^\circ$ for some $a' \in [l_1 l_2]$). It follows that $\tau_{\mathbf{a}}(a') = 0$. This and (3.66) imply that $0 \in [\beta_1 \beta_2]$ which proves $c < 0$. \square

Let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}$ be bones of W of same dimension with $\mathbf{a} \cap T^\circ, \mathbf{b} \cap T^\circ, \mathbf{c} \cap T^\circ \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{a} \hat{\cap} \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c} \hat{\cap} \mathbf{b} = \emptyset$ and $\dim(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{a}) = \dim(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}) = \dim \mathbf{b} + 1$. Choose $a \in \mathbf{a} \cap T^\circ, c \in \mathbf{c} \cap T^\circ$, and define $\angle \mathbf{abc}$ be the Euclidean angle between $\tau_{\mathbf{b}}(a)$ and $\tau_{\mathbf{b}}(c)$ in $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{b})^*$. It is important to notice that $\angle \mathbf{abc}$ is independent to the choice of a, c by Lemma 3.13.

Corollary 3.14. *Let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) be bones of W of same dimension with $\mathbf{a} \cap T^\circ, \mathbf{b} \cap T^\circ, \mathbf{c}_i \cap T^\circ \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{a} \hat{\cap} \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c}_i \hat{\cap} \mathbf{b} = \emptyset$, $\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}_1 = \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}_2 (= \mathbf{l})$, $\dim \mathbf{l} = \dim \mathbf{b} + 1$. If \mathbf{c}_i ($i = 1, 2$) are in a same (resp. different) component of $(\mathbf{l} \setminus \mathbf{b}) \cap T^\circ$, then $\angle \mathbf{abc}_1 = \angle \mathbf{abc}_2$ (resp. $\angle \mathbf{abc}_1 + \angle \mathbf{abc}_2 = \pi$).*

Proof. Assume that \mathbf{c}_i ($i = 1, 2$) are in a same (resp. different) component of $(\mathbf{l} \setminus \mathbf{b}) \cap T^\circ$. Choose $a \in \mathbf{a}$ and $c_i \in \mathbf{c}_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) and denote $\gamma = \tau_{\mathbf{b}}(a)$, $\beta_i = \tau_{\mathbf{b}}(c_i)$ ($i = 1, 2$). Then Lemma 3.13 implies that $\beta_1 = c\beta_2$ for some $c > 0$ (resp. $c < 0$). This, together with

$$\cos \angle \mathbf{abc}_i = \frac{B(\gamma, \beta_i)}{B(\gamma, \gamma)B(\beta_i, \beta_i)}, \quad i = 1, 2$$

imply that $\angle \mathbf{abc}_1 = \angle \mathbf{abc}_2$ (resp. $\angle \mathbf{abc}_1 + \angle \mathbf{abc}_2 = \pi$). \square

Definition 3.15. Let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}$ be bones of W of same dimension. we call $[\mathbf{abc}]$ a *triangle* if $\mathbf{a} \cap T^\circ, \mathbf{b} \cap T^\circ, \mathbf{c} \cap T^\circ \neq \emptyset$, $\mathbf{a} \hat{\cap} \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a} \hat{\cap} \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b} \hat{\cap} \mathbf{c} = \emptyset$ and $\dim(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}) = \dim(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{c}) = \dim(\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}) = \dim \mathbf{a} + 1$.

Write $v[\mathbf{abc}] = \angle \mathbf{bac} + \angle \mathbf{abc} + \angle \mathbf{acb}$ for each triangle $[\mathbf{abc}]$.

Example 3.16. Let W be the Coxeter group of type

$$\begin{array}{cccc} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & \bullet \\ & 4 & & 5 \end{array}$$

which is one of the compact hyperbolic types. Let $\Delta = \{\alpha_i \mid i = 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and let $\mathbf{a}_i = \cap_{\alpha \in \Delta \setminus \{\alpha_i\}} H_\alpha$. We calculate We have $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}_4) = \mathbb{R}\alpha_1 + \mathbb{R}\alpha_2 + \mathbb{R}\alpha_3$. The Gram matrix of B on $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}_4)$ is

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & 0 \\ -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} & 1 & -\frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In the following calculation, we identify elements in $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}_4)^*$ with that in $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}_4)$ by the canonical isomorphism between them induced by B . Choose $a_2 \in \mathbf{a}_2 \cap T^\circ$ so that $\langle a_2, \alpha_1 \rangle = \langle a_2, \alpha_3 \rangle = 0$ and $\langle a_2, \alpha_2 \rangle = 1$. Then $\beta_2 = \tau_{\mathbf{a}_4}(a_2)$ satisfies $B(\beta_2, \alpha_1) = B(\beta_2, \alpha_3) = 0$ and $B(\beta_2, \alpha_2) = 1$. Choose

$a_1 \in \mathbf{a}_1$ likewise, then $\beta_1 = \tau_{\mathbf{a}_4}(a_1)$ satisfies $B(\beta_1, \alpha_2) = B(\beta_1, \alpha_3) = 0$ and $B(\beta_1, \alpha_1) = 1$. If $\beta_2 = x_1\alpha_1 + x_2\alpha_2 + x_3\alpha_3$, $\beta_1 = y_1\alpha_1 + y_2\alpha_2 + y_3\alpha_3$, then the above conditions become $GX = (0 \ 1 \ 0)^T$, $GY = (1 \ 0 \ 0)^T$, where $X = (x_1 \ x_2 \ x_3)^T$, $Y = (y_1 \ y_2 \ y_3)^T$. It follows that

$$B(\beta_2, \beta_1) = X^T GY = (0 \ 1 \ 0)G^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = 2\sqrt{2},$$

and similarly $B(\beta_2, \beta_2) = 3$, $B(\beta_1, \beta_1) = 4$, and hence

$$\cos \angle \mathbf{a}_2 \mathbf{a}_4 \mathbf{a}_1 = \frac{B(\beta_2, \beta_1)}{\sqrt{B(\beta_2, \beta_2)B(\beta_1, \beta_1)}} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Same calculation shows that $\cos \angle \mathbf{a}_4 \mathbf{a}_2 \mathbf{a}_1 = 0$, $\cos \angle \mathbf{a}_2 \mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_4 = \frac{2+\sqrt{5}}{\sqrt{15+6\sqrt{5}}}$.

Thus,

$$\mathbf{v}[\mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_2 \mathbf{a}_4] = \arccos \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} + \frac{\pi}{2} + \arccos \frac{2+\sqrt{5}}{\sqrt{15+6\sqrt{5}}} \approx 2.83863 < \pi.$$

Let $\Omega \subset \mathfrak{P}$ be minimal infinite. Let W' be the subgroup generated by σ_Q ($Q \in \Omega$). Lemma 3.11 implies that W' is affine or hyperbolic. Let V' be the subspace of V spanned by α_Q ($Q \in \Omega$). It is clear that $V' = \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})$, where $\mathbf{a} = \bigcap_{Q \in \Omega} Q$.

For any distinct hyperplane $Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 \in \Omega$, define $\mathbf{a}_i = \bigcap_{P \in \Omega \setminus \{Q_i\}} P$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$). It is clear that $\dim \mathbf{a}_i = \dim \mathbf{a} + 1$ by assumption on Ω . Since $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}_2) \subset \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})$, one has the restriction $\iota : V'^* = \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a})^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}_2)^*$. By assumption on Ω , it is clear that (1) $\mathbf{a}_i \cap T^\circ \neq \emptyset$; (2) $\dim(\mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{a}_1) = \dim(\mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{a}_3) = \dim \mathbf{a}_2 + 1$; (3) $\mathbf{a}_2 \dot{\cap} \mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{a}_2 \dot{\cap} \mathbf{a}_3 = \emptyset$. Thus, $\angle \mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_2 \mathbf{a}_3$ makes sense.

Denote $\mathbf{a}'_i = \tau_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{a}_i)$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$), then $\mathbf{a}'_i \cap T'^\circ \neq \emptyset$ since $\tau_{\mathbf{a}}(T^\circ) \subset T'^\circ$. Since all \mathbf{a}_i contain $\mathbf{a} = \ker \tau_{\mathbf{a}}$ (by (3.65)), we have $\dim \mathbf{a}'_i = \dim \mathbf{a}_i - \dim \mathbf{a} = 1$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$), and $\dim(\mathbf{a}'_2 + \mathbf{a}'_i) = \dim \tau_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{a}_i) = \dim(\mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{a}_i) - \dim \mathbf{a} = 2 = \dim \mathbf{a}'_2 + 1$ ($i = 1, 3$). Moreover, $\mathbf{a}'_2 \dot{\cap} \mathbf{a}'_1 = \mathbf{a}'_2 \dot{\cap} \mathbf{a}'_3 = \emptyset$ by the discussion before Corollary 3.6. Thus, $\angle \mathbf{a}'_1 \mathbf{a}'_2 \mathbf{a}'_3$ makes sense.

It is clear that $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}_i) = \mathcal{V}'(\mathbf{a}'_i) := \{v \in V' \mid \langle a, v \rangle = 0, a \in \mathbf{a}'_i\}$. Let $a_i \in \mathbf{a}_i \cap T^\circ$ and $a'_i = \tau_{\mathbf{a}}(a_i)$ ($i = 1, 3$). By definition, $\angle \mathbf{a}'_1 \mathbf{a}'_2 \mathbf{a}'_3$ is the Euclidean angle between $\iota(a'_1)$ and $\iota(a'_3)$ in $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}_2)^* = \mathcal{V}'(\mathbf{a}'_2)^*$, i.e., between $\tau_{\mathbf{a}_2}(a_1)$ and $\tau_{\mathbf{a}_2}(a_3)$ in $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}_2)^*$ since $\tau_{\mathbf{a}_2} = \iota \tau_{\mathbf{a}}$. It follows that $\angle \mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_2 \mathbf{a}_3 = \angle \mathbf{a}'_1 \mathbf{a}'_2 \mathbf{a}'_3$.

Assume that W' is affine. Following [5, 6.5], the radical V'^\perp of B is one dimensional, and V'/V'^\perp is Euclidean relative to the bilinear form \overline{B} induced by B . Moreover $V'^\perp = \mathbb{R}\lambda$, where $\lambda = \sum_{s \in S} c_s \alpha_s$ with all $c_s > 0$. The space $Z = \{f \in V'^* \mid \langle f, \lambda \rangle = 0\}$ is naturally identified with dual space of $\overline{V'} = V'/V'^\perp$, and hence Euclidean. Thus, the translated affine hyperplane $\mathbb{E} = \{f \in V'^* \mid \langle f, \lambda \rangle = 1\}$ has an Euclidean structure transferred naturally from Z . Suppose that $\mathbf{a}'_i \subset Z$, then $\lambda \in \mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}'_2)$ and hence $B(\lambda, \lambda) > 0$ since B is positive definite on $\mathcal{V}(\mathbf{a}'_2)$, which contradicts to $\lambda \in V'^\perp$. This shows

that $\mathfrak{a}'_i \cap \mathbb{E} \neq \emptyset$. It is known that $\mathbb{E} \subset T'^{\circ}$, which enable us to choose $a'_i \in \mathfrak{a}'_i \cap \mathbb{E} \subset \mathfrak{a}'_i \cap T'^{\circ}$.

We claim that the Euclidean angle between $\overrightarrow{a'_2 a'_1}$ and $\overrightarrow{a'_2 a'_3}$ in \mathbb{E} coincides with $\angle \mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3$. Indeed, the former angle is equal to the Euclidean angle θ between $a'_1 - a'_2$ and $a'_3 - a'_2$ in Z . The map $\mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2) \rightarrow \overline{V'}$ sending α_Q ($Q \in \mathfrak{Q} \setminus \{Q_2\}$) to $\overline{\alpha_Q}$ is an isometry, which naturally induces the isometry $\varphi : Z \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)^*$ by dualizing. Thus, θ is the Euclidean angle between $\varphi(a'_1 - a'_2) = \varphi(a'_1)$ and $\varphi(a'_3 - a'_2) = \varphi(a'_3)$ in $\mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)$ since $\varphi(a'_2) = 0$. Moreover, φ coincides with composition $Z \subset V'^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)^*$. Thus, $\theta = \angle \mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3$ which proves the claim. It follows immediately from the claim that $\mathbf{v}[\mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3] = \mathbf{v}[\mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3] = \pi$ by Euclidean geometry.

Assume that W' is hyperbolic. One identifies V'^* with V' as in Subsection 3.4, and hence identifies all subsets of V'^* (in particular, \mathfrak{a}_i , T' , T'°) with corresponding subsets in V' , and we use the same notation for subsets in V' as that in V'^* . Thus, \mathfrak{a}'_i are lines in V' through origin, and $\mathfrak{a}'_i \cap T'^{\circ} \neq \emptyset$, and hence $\mathfrak{a}'_i \in \tilde{N}'$ by the discussion in Subsection 3.4, where \tilde{N}' is the image of $N' = \{v' \in V' \mid B(v', v') < 0\}$ in $\mathbb{P}(V')$.

We claim that $\angle \mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3 = \angle_L \mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3$. Let $a'_i \in \mathfrak{a}'_i \cap T'^{\circ}$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) and a'_2 is normalized so that $B(a'_2, a'_2) = -1$. Let $\mathbb{E}_{a'_2} = a'_2 + \mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)$ (note that $\mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)$ coincides with V_{a_2} defined in Subsection 3.4). Since $B(v', v') < 0$ for any $v' \in C'$, the fundamental chamber for the action of W' on V' , we have $B(u', u') \leq 0$ for any $u' \in T'^{\circ}$, while $B(u', u') > 0$ for any $0 \neq u' \in \mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)$ since B is positive definite on $\mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)$. It follows that $T'^{\circ} \cap \mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2) = \emptyset$ since $0 \notin T'^{\circ}$. It follows that $B(a'_2, a'_i) < 0$ ($i = 1, 3$) since T'° is convex (otherwise, we have $B(a'_2, a'_2) \leq 0$ and $B(a'_2, a'_i) \geq 0$, which implies that $B(a'_2, a) = 0$ for some $a \in [a'_2 a'_i] \subset T'^{\circ}$ by Zero Point Theorem, and hence contradicts to $T'^{\circ} \cap \mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2) = \emptyset$). Denote $k'_i = -1/B(a'_2, a'_i)$ ($i = 1, 3$), then $k'_i a'_i \in \mathfrak{a}'_i \cap \mathbb{E}_{a'_2}$ ($i = 1, 3$). Moreover, since $k'_i > 0$, we have $k'_i T'^{\circ} = T'^{\circ}$, and hence $k'_i a'_i \in \mathfrak{a}'_i \cap T'^{\circ}$ ($i = 1, 3$). Since $\angle \mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3$ is independent of the choice of $a'_i \in \mathfrak{a}'_i \cap T'^{\circ}$ ($i = 1, 3$), one can replace them by $k'_i a'_i \in \mathfrak{a}'_i \cap T'^{\circ}$ ($i = 1, 3$). Thus, $\angle \mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3$ is the Euclidean angle in $\mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)$ between $k'_1 b'_1$ and $k'_3 b'_3$ (b'_i be the image of a'_i in $\mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)$ under the map $V' \rightarrow V'^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}'(\mathfrak{a}'_2)$), which, by definition, is also $\angle_L \mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3$. Thus, we have $\angle \mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3 = \angle_L \mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3$, and hence $\mathbf{v}[\mathfrak{a}'_1 \mathfrak{a}'_2 \mathfrak{a}'_3] < \pi$ by Theorem 3.7.

To summarize, we proved the following

Corollary 3.17. *Let $\mathfrak{Q} \subset \mathfrak{P}$ be minimal infinite. Then for any distinct hyperplanes $Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 \in \mathfrak{Q}$, we have $\mathbf{v}[\mathfrak{a}_1 \mathfrak{a}_2 \mathfrak{a}_3] \leq \pi$ where $\mathfrak{a}_i = \cap_{P \in \mathfrak{Q} \setminus \{Q_i\}} P$.*

Definition 3.18. A set \mathfrak{L} of d -dimensional bones of W is called *admissible* if (1) \mathfrak{L} is finite and $\mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{l}' \neq \emptyset$ for any $\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{l}' \in \mathfrak{L}$; (2) $\dim \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{l}' = d - 1$ for any $\mathfrak{l}, \mathfrak{l}' \in \mathfrak{L}$; (3) For any $\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathfrak{l}_2, \mathfrak{l}_3 \in \mathfrak{L}$, we have $\mathfrak{l}_1 \cap \mathfrak{l}_2 \cap \mathfrak{l}_3 = \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{v}[\mathfrak{a}_{12} \mathfrak{a}_{13} \mathfrak{a}_{23}] \leq \pi$, where $\mathfrak{a}_{ij} := \mathfrak{l}_i \cap \mathfrak{l}_j$ (It is clear that $[\mathfrak{a}_{12} \mathfrak{a}_{13} \mathfrak{a}_{23}]$ is a triangle).

Let \mathfrak{L} be an admissible set of d -dimensional bones and $\mathfrak{p} = \sum_{\mathfrak{l} \in \mathfrak{L}} \mathfrak{l}$. Choose $\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathfrak{l}_2 \in \mathfrak{L}$, for any $\mathfrak{l} \in \mathfrak{L} \setminus \{\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathfrak{l}_2\}$, we have $\dim \mathfrak{l}_i \cap \mathfrak{l} = d - 1$ ($i = 1, 2$).

Since $l_1 \cap l \neq l_2 \cap l$ (otherwise we have $l_1 \hat{\cap} l_2 \hat{\cap} l \neq \emptyset$ which contradicts to assumption), we have $l = l_1 \cap l + l_2 \cap l \subset l_1 + l_2$. It follows that $\mathfrak{p} = l_1 + l_2$ and $\dim \mathfrak{p} = d + 1$, and hence $(\mathfrak{p} \setminus l) \cap T^\circ$ has two components for each $l \in \mathfrak{L}$.

Definition 3.19. Let \mathfrak{L} be an admissible set of d -dimensional bones. Call \mathfrak{L} *good* if there is an $l \in \mathfrak{L}$ such that all $l' \hat{\cap} l''$ with $l', l'' \in \mathfrak{L} \setminus \{l\}$ are in the same component of $(\mathfrak{p} \setminus l) \cap T^\circ$.

Lemma 3.20. *There is an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\mathfrak{L}| \leq M$ for any good admissible set \mathfrak{L} of d -dimensional bones of W .*

Proof. By assumption, there is an $l \in \mathfrak{L}$ such that all $l' \hat{\cap} l''$ with $l', l'' \in \mathfrak{L} \setminus \{l\}$ are in the same component of $(\mathfrak{p} \setminus l) \cap T^\circ$. Let $\mathfrak{L} \setminus \{l\} = \{l_1, \dots, l_t\}$, $\mathfrak{a}_i := l_i \hat{\cap} l$, and $\mathfrak{a}_{ij} := l_i \hat{\cap} l_j$ ($1 \leq i \neq j \leq t$). One can assume that \mathfrak{a}_{i-1} and \mathfrak{a}_{i+1} are in the different components of $(l \setminus \mathfrak{a}_i) \cap T^\circ$ for any $1 < i < t$. Set $\theta_i := \angle \mathfrak{a}_{i,i+1} \mathfrak{a}_i \mathfrak{a}_{i+1}$ ($1 \leq i < t$) and $\theta_t = \pi - \angle \mathfrak{a}_{t-1,t} \mathfrak{a}_t \mathfrak{a}_{t-1}$. Since $\mathfrak{a}_i, \mathfrak{a}_{i+2}$ are in the different components of $(l \setminus \mathfrak{a}_{i+1}) \cap T^\circ$, and $\mathfrak{a}_{i,i+1}, \mathfrak{a}_{i+1,i+2}$ are in the same component of $(l_{i+1} \setminus \mathfrak{a}_{i+1}) \cap T^\circ$, we have

$$\theta_{i+1} = \angle \mathfrak{a}_{i,i+1} \mathfrak{a}_{i+1} \mathfrak{a}_{i+2} = \pi - \angle \mathfrak{a}_{i,i+1} \mathfrak{a}_{i+1} \mathfrak{a}_i$$

by Corollary 3.14. Combining this with $\nu[\mathfrak{a}_i \mathfrak{a}_{i,i+1} \mathfrak{a}_{i+1}] \leq \pi$ (by assumption) yields

$$(3.67) \quad \theta_{i+1} \geq \theta_i + \angle \mathfrak{a}_i \mathfrak{a}_{i,i+1} \mathfrak{a}_{i+1} > \theta_i$$

For each $1 \leq i \leq t$, W_i be the subgroup of W generated by σ_P with $P \supset \mathfrak{a}_i$. Since $\mathfrak{a}_i \cap T^\circ \neq \emptyset$, W_i is conjugate to a subgroup of some finite parabolic subgroup W_I ($I \subset S$) with $\text{rank } W_i = |I|$ by Corollary 3.6 (5). Let $\iota_i^* : V^* \rightarrow \mathcal{V}(\mathfrak{a}_i)^*$ be the restriction. Denote $\mathfrak{a}' := \iota_i^* \mathfrak{a}$ for any $\mathfrak{a} \subset V$, then l'_i and l' are lines through $\mathfrak{a}'_i = 0$, and $\mathfrak{a}'_{i,i+1}, \mathfrak{a}'_{i+1}$ are $\neq 0$ points in l'_i, l' respectively. Thus, $\theta_i = \angle \mathfrak{a}_{i,i+1} \mathfrak{a}_i \mathfrak{a}_{i+1} = \angle \mathfrak{a}'_{i,i+1} 0 \mathfrak{a}'_{i+1}$ is just the angle between l'_i and l' in Euclidean space $\mathcal{V}(\mathfrak{a}_i)^*$ by definition, which is an angle between two one dimensional bones of W_I . Clearly, for each $I \subset S$ with W_I finite, the set A_I of such angles are finite. Let $M = |\cup_I A_I| + 1$, where I runs over subsets of S such that W_I is finite. It follows from (3.67) that $t \leq |\cup_I A_I|$, and hence $|\mathfrak{L}| \leq M$ as desired. \square

Following [4], we recall the definition of Ramsey's number $R(m, n, p)$ for a complete hypergraph, i.e., a pair (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E}) in which \mathbf{V} is set of vertices and \mathbf{E} is the set of nonempty subsets of \mathbf{V} . The number $R(m, n, p)$ is the minimal number R such that for any 2-coloring (say, by red and blue) of elements with cardinality p in \mathbf{E} and any $\mathbf{U} \subset \mathbf{V}$ with $|\mathbf{U}| = R$, either there exists $\mathbf{U}_1 \subset \mathbf{U}$ with $|\mathbf{U}_1| = m$ such that any $\mathbf{U}'_1 \subset \mathbf{U}_1$ with $|\mathbf{U}'_1| = p$ is colored by red, or there exists $\mathbf{U}_2 \subset \mathbf{U}$ with $|\mathbf{U}_2| = n$ such that any $\mathbf{U}'_2 \subset \mathbf{U}_2$ with $|\mathbf{U}'_2| = p$ is colored by blue.

Corollary 3.21. *There is an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\mathfrak{L}| \leq M$ for any admissible set \mathfrak{L} of d -dimensional bones of W .*

Proof. Choose an $\mathfrak{l} \in \mathfrak{L}$ and denote by Λ_1, Λ_2 be the two components of $(\mathfrak{p} \setminus \mathfrak{l}) \cap T^\circ$. It is clear that for any $\mathfrak{l}', \mathfrak{l}'' \in \mathfrak{L} \setminus \{\mathfrak{l}\}$, either $\mathfrak{l}' \hat{\cap} \mathfrak{l}'' \subset \Lambda_1$ or $\mathfrak{l}' \hat{\cap} \mathfrak{l}'' \subset \Lambda_2$ since $\mathfrak{l}' \hat{\cap} \mathfrak{l}'' \hat{\cap} \mathfrak{l} = \emptyset$ by assumption. By Lemma 3.20, there is an upper bound M' of cardinality of good admissible sets of d -dimensional bones. Suppose that $|\mathfrak{L} \setminus \{\mathfrak{l}\}| \geq R(M', M', 2)$, then either there is an $\mathfrak{L}_1 \subset \mathfrak{L} \setminus \{\mathfrak{l}\}$ such that $|\mathfrak{L}_1| = M'$ and $\mathfrak{l}' \hat{\cap} \mathfrak{l}'' \subset \Lambda_1$ for all $\mathfrak{l}', \mathfrak{l}'' \in \mathfrak{L}_1$, or there is an $\mathfrak{L}_2 \subset \mathfrak{L} \setminus \{\mathfrak{l}\}$ such that $|\mathfrak{L}_2| = M'$ and $\mathfrak{l}' \hat{\cap} \mathfrak{l}'' \subset \Lambda_2$ for all $\mathfrak{l}', \mathfrak{l}'' \in \mathfrak{L}_2$. On the other hand, $\mathfrak{L}_i \cup \{\mathfrak{l}\}$ ($i = 1, 2$) are good, and hence $|\mathfrak{L}_i \cup \{\mathfrak{l}\}| \leq M'$, i.e., $|\mathfrak{L}_i| < M'$, contradicted. This shows that $|\mathfrak{L} \cup \{\mathfrak{l}\}| < R(M', M', 2)$, and hence $|\mathfrak{L}| \leq R(M', M', 2)$ as desired. \square

For $I \subset S$ with W_I finite, denote by w_I be the longest element in W_I . Let $N(W) = \max\{\ell(w_I) \mid I \subset S, W_I \text{ is finite}\}$. We begin to prove the main result of this subsection.

Theorem 3.22. *There is an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|\mathfrak{Q}| \leq M$ for all intersecting subset \mathfrak{Q} .*

Proof. Let $f(\mathfrak{Q})$ be the maximal number q such that there exist $\mathfrak{Q}' \subset \mathfrak{Q}$ with $|\mathfrak{Q}'| = q$ and $\hat{\cap}_{P \in \mathfrak{Q}'} P \neq \emptyset$. For such \mathfrak{Q}' , the subgroup of W generated by σ_Q ($Q \in \mathfrak{Q}'$) is finite by Corollary 3.6 and conjugates to a reflection subgroup of some finite parabolic subgroup W_I . It follows that $|\mathfrak{Q}'| \leq \ell(w_I) \leq N(W)$, and hence

$$(3.68) \quad f(\mathfrak{Q}) \leq N(W).$$

By Corollary 3.21, there is an upper bound b' for cardinality of admissible sets of bones with same dimension. Define $a_1 = 2$, $a_m = R(b + 1, a_{m-1}; m)$ ($m > 1$), where $b = N(W)b'$. Let $t = f(\mathfrak{Q})$. We claim that

$$(3.69) \quad |\mathfrak{Q}| \leq a_t - 1.$$

We prove this by induction on t . The case $t = 1$ is trivial. Call a subset $\mathfrak{S} \subset \mathfrak{Q}$ satisfy $\mathbf{P}(t)$ if

$$\hat{\cap}_{P \in \mathfrak{S}'} P \neq \emptyset \text{ for any } \mathfrak{S}' \subset \mathfrak{S} \text{ with } |\mathfrak{S}'| = t.$$

We will prove that

$$(3.70) \quad |\mathfrak{S}| \leq b \text{ for all } \mathfrak{S} \subset \mathfrak{Q} \text{ satisfying } \mathbf{P}(t).$$

Assume $\mathfrak{S} \subset \mathfrak{Q}$ satisfies $\mathbf{P}(t)$. If $|\mathfrak{S}| = t$, then $|\mathfrak{S}| \leq N(W)$ by (3.68). Assume that $|\mathfrak{S}| < t$. In this case, we have

$$(3.71) \quad \text{rank } \mathfrak{T} = |\mathfrak{T}| \text{ for any } \mathfrak{T} \subset \mathfrak{S} \text{ with } |\mathfrak{T}| \leq t.$$

Indeed, \mathfrak{T} is embedded in a minimal infinite subset of cardinality $t + 1$ by $\mathbf{P}(t)$ and the definition of $t = f(\mathfrak{Q})$, and hence α_Q ($Q \in \mathfrak{T}$) are linearly independent by Lemma 3.10 which implies the (3.71). Choose a $\mathfrak{P}_0 \subset \mathfrak{S}'$ with $|\mathfrak{P}_0| = t - 2$, then $|\mathfrak{P}_0| = t - 2$, and denote

$$\mathfrak{L} = \{P \cap \bigcap_{Q \in \mathfrak{P}_0} Q \mid P \in \mathfrak{S} \setminus \{\mathfrak{P}_0\}\},$$

then any element of \mathfrak{L} is a $r - t + 1$ -dimensional bone by (3.71). For any $l_i = P_i \cap \bigcap_{Q \in \mathfrak{P}_0} Q \in \mathfrak{L}$, $P_i \in \mathfrak{S} \setminus \{\mathfrak{P}_0\}$, ($i = 1, 2, 3$), we have $\mathbf{a}_{ij} := l_i \dot{\cap} l_j = P_i \dot{\cap} P_j \dot{\cap} \bigcap_{Q \in \mathfrak{P}_0} Q \neq \emptyset$ by assumption on \mathfrak{S} . Moreover,

$$(3.72) \quad l_1 \dot{\cap} l_2 \dot{\cap} l_3 = P_1 \dot{\cap} P_2 \dot{\cap} P_3 \dot{\cap} \bigcap_{Q \in \mathfrak{P}_0} Q = \emptyset$$

since $f(\mathfrak{Q}) = t$. We have $\dim l_1 \cap l_2 = r - t$ by (3.71). Let $\mathfrak{R} = \{P_1, P_2, P_3\} \cup \bigcup_{Q \in \mathfrak{P}_0} Q$. Then $|\mathfrak{R}| = t + 1$, and the intersection (inside T°) of any t hyperplanes in \mathfrak{R} is nonempty since $\mathfrak{R} \subset \mathfrak{S}$ and \mathfrak{S} satisfies $\mathbf{P}(t)$. Combining this and (3.72), and applying “ $\mathfrak{Q}, Q_1, Q_2, Q_3$ ” in Corollary 3.17 to $\mathfrak{R}, P_1, P_2, P_3$, respectively, one obtain $v[\mathbf{a}_{12}\mathbf{a}_{13}\mathbf{a}_{23}] \leq \pi$. To summarize, \mathfrak{L} is admissible set of $r - t + 1$ -dimensional bones. It follows that $|\mathfrak{L}| \leq b'$ by Corollary 3.21. For each $l \in \mathfrak{L}$, let \mathfrak{S}_l be the set of hyperplanes in \mathfrak{S} containing l . Then $|\mathfrak{S}_l| \leq N(W)$ by Corollary 3.6 (5). Since $\mathfrak{S} = \bigcup_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} \mathfrak{S}_l$, we have $|\mathfrak{S}| = \sum_{l \in \mathfrak{L}} |\mathfrak{S}_l| \leq b'N(W) = b$. This proves (3.70).

On the other hand, since $R(m, n, p) \geq n$, it follows that $\{a_n\}$ is increasing, we have

$$(3.73) \quad |\mathfrak{T}| \leq a_{f(\mathfrak{T})} - 1 \leq a_{t-1} - 1 \text{ for } \mathfrak{T} \subset \mathfrak{Q} \text{ with } f(\mathfrak{T}) < t$$

by induction. Suppose that $|\mathfrak{Q}| \geq a_t = R(b + 1, a_{t-1}, t)$. Then either there is a $\mathfrak{P}_1 \subset \mathfrak{Q}$ with $|\mathfrak{P}_1| = b + 1$ such that $\dot{\cap}_{P \in \mathfrak{P}'_1} P \neq \emptyset$ for any $\mathfrak{P}'_1 \subset \mathfrak{P}_1$ with $|\mathfrak{P}'_1| = t$, or a $\mathfrak{P}_2 \subset \mathfrak{Q}$ with $|\mathfrak{P}_2| = a_{t-1}$ such that $\dot{\cap}_{P \in \mathfrak{P}'_2} P = \emptyset$ for any $\mathfrak{P}'_2 \subset \mathfrak{P}_2$ with $|\mathfrak{P}'_2| = t$. The existence of \mathfrak{P}_1 contradicts to (3.70) since \mathfrak{P}_1 satisfies $\mathbf{P}(t)$, and that of \mathfrak{P}_2 contradicts to (3.73) since $f(\mathfrak{P}_2) < t$. This proves (3.69).

Combining (3.68) and (3.69) yields $|\mathfrak{Q}| \leq a_{N(W)} - 1 =: M$ as desired. \square

3.6. The end of proof. Theorem 3.22 enables us to define

$$N'(W) = \max\{|\mathfrak{Q}| \mid \mathfrak{Q} \subset \mathfrak{P} \text{ and } \mathfrak{Q} \text{ is intersecting}\}.$$

For each I in the right side of (3.1), Theorem 3.2 implies that (3.2) induces an intersecting subset of cardinality p_I , and in particular, $p_I \leq N'(W)$. Combining (1.2) and (3.1) yields $\deg_\xi f_{x,y,z} \leq \max(p_I)$, I runs over indices in the right side of (3.1). Thus, we obtain

Theorem 3.23. *We have $\deg_\xi f_{x,y,z} \leq N'(W)$ for any $x, y, z \in W$.*

As a consequence, Theorem 1.2 is proved.

4. SOME REMARKS

4.1. Some examples. It is clear that $N'(W) \geq N(W)$ in general. In this section, we make first attempts to compare $N'(W)$ and $N(W)$. We give some examples.


Example 4.1. If W is finite, it is clear that $N'(W) = N(W)$.

Example 4.2. Assume that W is affine. Let \mathbb{E} be the affine Euclidean space defined in the discussion before Corollary 3.17. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{P \cap \mathbb{E} \mid P \in \mathfrak{P}\}$. It is known that (c.f. [5, 6.5]): (1) \mathcal{F} is a set of Euclidean affine hyperplanes; (2) The map $P \mapsto P \cap \mathbb{E}$ is a bijection between \mathfrak{P} and \mathcal{F} ; (3) $P_1 \hat{\cap} P_2 \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $P_1 \cap P_2 \cap \mathbb{E} \neq \emptyset$; (4) \mathcal{F} is partitioned into $N(W)$ classes, and hyperplanes in each class are pairwise parallel. To summarize, we have $N'(W) = N(W)$.

Example 4.3. Assume that W is infinite of rank 3, $S = \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$, and $(s_1 s_2)^m = (s_2 s_3)^n = (s_1 s_3)^p = 1$ ($m, n, p \in \{2, 3, \dots\} \cup \{\infty\}$). It is known that W is affine or hyperbolic. In this case, \mathfrak{P} is in bijection with a set of lines in (Euclidean or hyperbolic) plane. Let $\mathfrak{Q} \subset \mathfrak{P}$ be intersecting. If one of m, n, p is ∞ , then the lines corresponding to elements in \mathfrak{Q} are concurrent, and hence $N'(W) = N(W)$. Assume the m, n, p are finite. Then the (Euclidean or Lobachevskian) angles between two intersecting lines are in $A = \{\frac{k\pi}{N} \mid N \in \{m, n, p\}, 0 < k < N\}$. Denote $t = |\mathfrak{Q}|$, then one can find $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{t-1}\} \subset A$ so that $\theta_1 < \dots < \theta_{t-1} < \pi$ and $\theta_{i+1} - \theta_i \in A$ for any i as in the proof of Corollary. In particular, we have $\frac{(t-1)\pi}{t} \leq \theta_{t-1} < \pi$, where $l = \max(m, n, p) = N(W)$. It follows that $t \leq l = N(W)$. Thus, $N(W)$ is an upper bound for all $|\mathfrak{Q}|$, and hence $N(W) \geq N'(W)$, the supremum of all $|\mathfrak{Q}|$. Thus, $N'(W) = N(W)$.

The same arguments shows that $N'(W) = N(W)$ if $\Gamma(W)$ is a complete graph, i.e., $m_{st} > 2$ for any $s, t \in S$.

Example 4.4. Assume that the Coxeter graph of W is



Let $I = \{s_2, s_3, s_4\}$. Then $N(W) = \ell(w_I) = 6$. All roots of W_I are $\beta_1 = \alpha_3$, $\beta_2 = \alpha_2$, $\beta_3 = \alpha_4$, $\beta_4 = \alpha_3 + \alpha_2$, $\beta_5 = \alpha_2 + \alpha_4$, $\beta_6 = \alpha_3 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_4$. Since W_I is finite, $\{H_{\beta_i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq 6\}$ is intersecting. We claim that $H_{\alpha_1} \hat{\cap} H_{\beta_i} \neq \emptyset$ ($1 \leq i \leq 6$). To see this, it suffices to show that B is positive definite on $V_i = \mathbb{R}\alpha_1 + \mathbb{R}\beta_i$ ($1 \leq i \leq 6$) by Corollary 3.6, which amounts to check that the determinant D_i of the Gram matrix of B on V_i is positive. In fact, $D_i = 1 - B(\alpha_1, \beta_i)^2$, and simple calculations show that $D_1 = D_3 = 1$, $D_2 = D_4 = D_5 = D_6 = \frac{1}{4}$. This proves the claim. Thus, $\{H_{\alpha_1}, H_{\beta_1}, \dots, H_{\beta_6}\}$ is intersecting, and in particular $N'(W) \geq 7 > N(W)$.

The above examples suggest that it might be interesting to determine for which W we have $N'(W) = N(W)$.

4.2. Remark on weighted version. Let (W, S, L) be the the weighted Coxeter group of finite rank, where $L : W \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be the weight function, i.e., $L(w w') = L(w) + L(w')$ if $\ell(w w') = \ell(w) + \ell(w')$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$. The

Hecke algebra \mathcal{H} of (W, S, L) is the free \mathcal{A} -module with basis $\{\tilde{T}_w \mid w \in W\}$ with multiplication rule:

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{T}_w \tilde{T}_{w'} = \tilde{T}_{ww'} & \text{if } \ell(ww') = \ell(w) + \ell(w') \\ \tilde{T}_s^2 = 1 + \xi_s \tilde{T}_s & \text{if } s \in S \end{cases},$$

where $\xi_s = v^{L(s)} - v^{-L(s)}$. One can write (1.2) identically and consider the boundness of $\deg_v f_{x,y,z}$ ($x, y, z \in W$). Similarly, we have $\tilde{T}_x \tilde{T}_y = \sum_I \xi_I \tilde{T}_{z_I}$, where I, z_I as in Subsection 3.2, and $\xi_I = \xi_{s_{i_1}} \cdots \xi_{s_{i_{p_I}}}$. Denote $L_m = \max\{L(s) \mid s \in S\}$, then $\deg_v \xi_I = \sum_{k=1}^{p_I} L(s_{i_k}) \leq p_I L_m \leq N'(W) L_m$, and hence $\deg_v f_{x,y,z} \leq N'(W) L_m$ for all $x, y, z \in W$.

REFERENCES

1. M. Belolipetsky. *Cells and representations of right-angled Coxeter groups*. Selecta Math. (N.S.) **10** (3) (2004): 325–339.
2. Benedetti, Riccardo. *Lectures on Hyperbolic Geometry*. Springer, 1992.
3. V. Deodhar. *A note on subgroups generated by reflections in Coxeter groups*. Arch. Math. **53** (1989): 543–546.
4. R. L. Graham, B. L. Rothschild, J. H. Spencer. *Ramsey theory (2nd ed)*. Wiley-Interscience, 1990.
5. J. E. Humphreys. *Reflection groups and Coxeter groups*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Vol. 29 Cambridge University Press, 1992.
6. D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig. *Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras*. Invent. Math. **53** (1979): 165–184.
7. G. Lusztig. *Cells in affine Weyl groups*. in Algebraic Groups and Related Topics, Advanced Studies in Pure Mathematics, Vol. 6 (North-Holland Amsterdam, 1985), pp. 255–287.
8. G. Lusztig. *Hecke algebras with unequal parameters*. arXiv: math/0208154v2 [math.RT] 10 Jun 2014.
9. G. Lusztig. *Cells in Affine Weyl groups II*. J. Algebra **109** (1987): 536–548.
10. G. Lusztig. *Open problems on Iwahori-Hecke algebras*. arXiv:2006.08535v1 [math.RT] 15 Jun 2020.
11. Y. Li and J. Y. Shi. *The boundness of a weighted Coxeter group with non-3-edge-labeling graph*. J. Algebra Appl. **18** (2019), no. 5 1950085, 43 pp.
12. J. Y. Shi and G. Yang. *The boundedness of the weighted Coxeter group with complete graph*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **144** (11) (2016): 4573–4581.
13. N. H. Xi. *Lusztig's α -function for Coxeter groups with complete graphs*. Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sinica **7** (1) (2012): 71–90.
14. N. H. Xi. *Representations of affine Hecke algebras*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1587. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1994.
15. P. P. Zhou. *Lusztig's α -function for Coxeter groups of rank 3*. J. Algebra. **384** (2013): 169–193.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHANGHAI NORMAL UNIVERSITY, 100 GUILIN ROAD, SHANGHAI 200234, P. R. CHINA

Email address: gauss_1024@126.com