

ISOMORPHISMS OF GROUPS OF KAC-MOODY TYPE OVER \mathbb{F}_2

SEBASTIAN BISCHOF

ABSTRACT. In [CM06] Caprace and Mühlherr solved the isomorphism problem for Kac-Moody groups of non-spherical type over finite fields of cardinality at least 4. In this paper we solve the isomorphism problem for RGD-systems (e.g. Kac-Moody groups) over \mathbb{F}_2 whose type is 2-complete and \tilde{A}_2 -free.

1. INTRODUCTION

Chevalley groups of type Φ (over fields) are abstract groups which come equipped with a family of subgroups $(U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi}$ indexed by the root system Φ and satisfying the axioms of an *RGD-system*. It is known that each automorphism of a Chevalley group (of irreducible type and over a perfect field) can be written as a product of an inner, a diagonal, a graph and a field automorphism (cf. [Ste16, Theorem 30]). As a consequence of this result, any automorphism of a Chevalley group induces an automorphism of its underlying RGD-system.

Kac-Moody groups are infinite-dimensional generalizations of Chevalley groups. While in Chevalley groups opposite Borel subgroups are conjugate, this is no longer true in Kac-Moody groups of non-spherical type and a new class of automorphisms arises, the so-called *sign automorphisms*. It was conjectured in [KP87] that any automorphism of a Kac-Moody group over an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 can be written as a product of an inner, a diagonal, a graph, a field and a sign automorphism. This result was shown to be true in [CM05] by Caprace and Mühlherr for algebraically closed fields of any characteristic (and generalized by Caprace in [Cap09]). They deduced this result from the solution of the isomorphism problem for Kac-Moody groups or, more generally, for RGD-systems.

Isomorphism problem for RGD-systems. Given a Coxeter system (W, S) , an *RGD-system of type (W, S)* is a pair $\mathcal{D} = (G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$ consisting of a group G and a family of subgroups indexed by the set of roots Φ of (W, S) satisfying some axioms (we refer to Section 5 for the precise definition). The group G is also denoted by $G^{\mathcal{D}}$ and the *torus* of \mathcal{D} is defined to be the subgroup $H := \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Phi} N_G(U_\alpha)$.

The isomorphism problem for RGD-systems is the question whether, given two RGD-systems \mathcal{D} of type (W, S) and \mathcal{D}' of type (W', S') , a group isomorphism $\varphi : G^{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow G^{\mathcal{D}'}$ induces an isomorphism from \mathcal{D} to \mathcal{D}' . Caprace and Mühlherr have shown in [CM05, Theorem 2.2] that this is the case as soon as there exists $x \in G^{\mathcal{D}'}$ such that

$$\{\varphi(U_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \Phi(W, S)\} = \{xU'_\alpha x^{-1} \mid \alpha \in \Phi(W', S')\}.$$

This reduction is also used in [CM06] to solve the isomorphism problem for Kac-Moody groups over finite fields of cardinality at least 4. The proof makes a crucial

email: sebastian.bischof@math.uni-paderborn.de.

UCLouvain, IRMP, Chemin du Cyclotron 2, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

Keywords: Groups of Kac-Moody type, Isomorphism problem, Buildings.

Mathematics Subject Classification 2020: 20E36, 20E42, 22E65, 51E24.

use of the action of the torus on the associated twin building, and more precisely of the fact that the torus fixes no chamber outside the fundamental twin apartment. If we consider an RGD-system over \mathbb{F}_2 (i.e. any root group has cardinality 2), then the torus is trivial and fixes the whole twin building. In particular, we cannot follow the strategy of [CM06]. We note that without any further condition the isomorphism problem has a negative answer for example witnessed by the two exceptional isomorphisms $\mathrm{PSL}_2(7) \cong \mathrm{PSL}_3(2)$ and ${}^2A_3(2) \cong C_2(3)$. Caprace and Mühlherr excluded these cases by assuming that the root groups are large enough. We will exclude these isomorphisms by assuming that all root groups have cardinality 2.

In [Bis23] we have constructed uncountably many new examples of RGD-systems over \mathbb{F}_2 of type $(4, 4, 4)$ and it would be most desirable to know that all these groups are pairwise non-isomorphic. This was originally our main motivation to solve the isomorphism problem for such RGD-systems. It turned out that our arguments work not only for the type $(4, 4, 4)$, but for Coxeter system (W, S) which are 2-*complete* (i.e. $2 < o(st) < \infty$ for all $s \neq t \in S$) and \tilde{A}_2 -free (for any $J \subseteq S$ the Coxeter system $(\langle J \rangle, J)$ is not of type \tilde{A}_2). Following [Cap07], we call an RGD-system $(G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$ *centered* if $G = \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi \rangle$.

Theorem A. *Suppose that (W, S) and (W', S') are 2-complete and \tilde{A}_2 -free Coxeter systems of finite rank at least 3 and let \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' be two centered RGD-systems over \mathbb{F}_2 of type (W, S) and (W', S') . Then any isomorphism $G^{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow G^{\mathcal{D}'}$ induces an isomorphism of \mathcal{D} to \mathcal{D}' .*

Corollary B. *Suppose that (W, S) is a 2-complete and \tilde{A}_2 -free Coxeter system of finite rank at least 3 and let \mathcal{D} be a centered RGD-system of type (W, S) over \mathbb{F}_2 . Then any automorphism of G is a product of an inner, a graph and a sign automorphism.*

The proof of Theorem A is based on the following fact: Any reflection triangle (see Section 3 for the precise definition) of a 2-complete and \tilde{A}_2 -free Coxeter system of rank 3 is a chamber (cf. classification in [Fel98, Fig. 8 in §5.1]). We first show that an analogous result holds in higher rank (cf. Theorem 3.8). Then we introduce the notion of *triangles* in general buildings which can be seen as generalization of reflection triangles from apartments to buildings and we obtained the following generalization of Theorem 3.8 (cf. Theorem 4.9):

Theorem C. *Let (W, S) be a 2-complete and \tilde{A}_2 -free Coxeter system of finite rank at least 3, let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ be a building of type (W, S) and let $\{R_1, R_2, R_3\}$ be a triangle. Then $R_1 \cap R_2 \cap R_3$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber.*

Overview. Section 2 is devoted to fixing notation, to recalling some known facts and to proving some useful and elementary results about buildings. In Section 3 we study reflection and combinatorial triangles in Coxeter buildings. The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 3.8. In Section 4 we introduce the notion of *triangles* and prove some result about them. We end the section by proving Theorem C. In Section 5 we recall the definitions of twin buildings and RGD-systems and we recall or prove some results about them. In Section 6 we put everything together and solve the isomorphism problem for centered RGD-systems over \mathbb{F}_2 of 2-complete and \tilde{A}_2 -free type.

Acknowledgement. I am grateful to Bernhard Mühlherr for drawing my attention to this problem. I thank him and François Thilmany for many helpful discussions on the topic. I also thank Timothée Marquis for valuable remarks on an earlier

draft. This work was supported by a fellowship of the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) via the grant 57664192.

2. PRELIMINARIES

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

It is well-known that for each $J \subseteq S$ the pair $(\langle J \rangle, J)$ is a Coxeter system (cf. [Bou02, Ch. IV, §1 Theorem 2]). A subset $J \subseteq S$ is called *spherical* if $\langle J \rangle$ is finite. Given a spherical subset J of S , there exists a unique element of maximal length in $\langle J \rangle$, which we denote by r_J (cf. [AB08, Corollary 2.19]). The Coxeter system (W, S) is called *spherical* if S is spherical; it is called *2-spherical* if $\langle J \rangle$ is finite for each $J \subseteq S$ with $|J| \leq 2$ (i.e. $m_{st} < \infty$ for all $s, t \in S$).

Definition 2.1. Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system.

- (a) (W, S) is called *2-complete*, if it is 2-spherical and if the underlying Coxeter diagram is the complete graph.
- (b) (W, S) is called *\tilde{A}_2 -free*, if for each $J \subseteq S$ the Coxeter system $(\langle J \rangle, J)$ is not of type \tilde{A}_2 .

Lemma 2.2. *Let (W, S) be a 2-complete Coxeter system of finite rank. Suppose $w \in W$ and $s \neq t \in S$ with $\ell(ws) = \ell(w) + 1 = \ell(wt)$ and suppose $w' \in \langle s, t \rangle$ with $\ell(w') \geq 2$. Then we have $\ell(ww'r) = \ell(w) + \ell(w') + 1$ for each $r \in S \setminus \{s, t\}$.*

Proof. This is [Bis24b, Corollary 2.8]. □

Buildings. Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system. A *building of type (W, S)* is a pair $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ where \mathcal{C} is a non-empty set and where $\delta : \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow W$ is a *distance function* satisfying the following axioms, where $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$ and $w = \delta(x, y)$:

- (Bu1) $w = 1_W$ if and only if $x = y$;
- (Bu2) if $z \in \mathcal{C}$ satisfies $s := \delta(y, z) \in S$, then $\delta(x, z) \in \{w, ws\}$, and if, furthermore, $\ell(ws) = \ell(w) + 1$, then $\delta(x, z) = ws$;
- (Bu3) if $s \in S$, there exists $z \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $\delta(y, z) = s$ and $\delta(x, z) = ws$.

The *rank* of Δ is the rank of the underlying Coxeter system. The elements of \mathcal{C} are called *chambers*. Given $s \in S$ and $x, y \in \mathcal{C}$, then x is called *s-adjacent* to y , if $\delta(x, y) = s$. The chambers x, y are called *adjacent*, if they are *s-adjacent* for some $s \in S$. A *gallery* from x to y is a sequence $(x = x_0, \dots, x_k = y)$ such that x_{l-1} and x_l are adjacent for all $1 \leq l \leq k$; the number k is called the *length* of the gallery. A gallery from x to y of length k is called *minimal* if there is no gallery from x to y of length $< k$. For two chambers x and y we define $\ell(x, y) := \ell(\delta(x, y))$.

Given a subset $J \subseteq S$ and $x \in \mathcal{C}$, the *J-residue* of x is the set $R_J(x) := \{y \in \mathcal{C} \mid \delta(x, y) \in \langle J \rangle\}$. Each *J-residue* is a building of type $(\langle J \rangle, J)$ with the distance function induced by δ (cf. [AB08, Corollary 5.30]). A *residue* is a subset R of \mathcal{C} such that there exist $J \subseteq S$ and $x \in \mathcal{C}$ with $R = R_J(x)$. Since the subset J is uniquely determined by R , the set J is called the *type* of R and the *rank* of R is defined to be the cardinality of J . Given $x \in \mathcal{C}$ and a *J-residue* R , then there exists

a unique chamber $z \in R$ such that $\ell(x, y) = \ell(x, z) + \ell(z, y)$ holds for every $y \in R$ (cf. [AB08, Proposition 5.34]). The chamber z is called the *projection of x onto R* and is denoted by $\text{proj}_R x$. Moreover, if $z = \text{proj}_R x$ we have $\delta(x, y) = \delta(x, z)\delta(z, y)$ for each $y \in R$. A residue is called *spherical* if its type is a spherical subset of S . Let R be a spherical J -residue. Then $x, y \in R$ are called *opposite in R* if $\delta(x, y) = r_J$. Two residues $P, Q \subseteq R$ are called *opposite in R* if for each $p \in P$ there exists $q \in Q$ such that p, q are opposite in R . A *panel* is a residue of rank 1 and we define $\mathcal{P}_s(c) := R_{\{s\}}(c)$ for all $(c, s) \in \mathcal{C} \times S$. The building Δ is called *thick*, if each panel of Δ contains at least three chambers; it is called *spherical* if its type is spherical.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ be a building of type (W, S) . Let R and Q be two residues of Δ with $Q \subseteq R$, and let $c \in \mathcal{C}$ with $\text{proj}_R c \in Q$. Then $\text{proj}_R c = \text{proj}_Q c$.*

Proof. This follows from the following easy computation (the first equation follows from the fact $Q \subseteq R$; the second equation follows from the fact $\text{proj}_R c \in Q$):

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(c, \text{proj}_Q c) &= \ell(c, \text{proj}_R c) + \ell(\text{proj}_R c, \text{proj}_Q c) \\ &= \ell(c, \text{proj}_Q c) + \ell(\text{proj}_Q c, \text{proj}_R c) + \ell(\text{proj}_R c, \text{proj}_Q c) \\ &= \ell(c, \text{proj}_Q c) + 2 \cdot \ell(\text{proj}_Q c, \text{proj}_R c) \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ and $\Delta' = (\mathcal{C}', \delta')$ be two buildings of type (W, S) . An *isometry* between $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{X}' \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ is a bijection $\varphi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}'$ such that $\delta'(\varphi(x), \varphi(y)) = \delta(x, y)$ holds for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$. In this case \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' are called *isometric*. An (*type-preserving*) *automorphism* of a building $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ is an isometry $\varphi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$. We remark that some authors distinguish between automorphisms and type-preserving automorphisms. An automorphism in our sense is type-preserving. We denote the set of all automorphisms of the building Δ by $\text{Aut}(\Delta)$.

Example 2.4. We define $\delta : W \times W \rightarrow W, (x, y) \mapsto x^{-1}y$. Then $\Sigma(W, S) := (W, \delta)$ is a building of type (W, S) . The group W acts faithfully on $\Sigma(W, S)$ by multiplication from the left, i.e. $W \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma(W, S))$.

Apartments. Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system and let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ be a building of type (W, S) . A subset $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is called *convex* if $\text{proj}_P c \in \Sigma$ for all $c \in \Sigma$ and each panel $P \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ which meets Σ . We note that if $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is a convex subset and if R is a residue which meets Σ , then $\text{proj}_R c \in \Sigma$ for all $c \in \Sigma$ (cf. [AB08, Lemma 5.45]). A subset $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is called *thin* if $P \cap \Sigma$ contains exactly two chambers for each panel $P \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ which meets Σ . An *apartment* is a non-empty subset $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, which is convex and thin. Moreover, a subset $\Sigma \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is an apartment if and only if it is isometric to $\Sigma(W, S)$ (cf. [AB08, Corollary 5.67]). Furthermore, any subset of \mathcal{C} that is isometric to a subset of W is contained in an apartment (cf. [AB08, Theorem 5.73]). As a consequence we note that for any two chambers there exists an apartment containing both (cf. [AB08, Corollary 5.74]).

Roots. Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system. A *reflection* is an element of W that is conjugate to an element of S . For $s \in S$ we let $\alpha_s := \{w \in W \mid \ell(sw) > \ell(w)\}$ be the *simple root* corresponding to s . A *root* is a subset $\alpha \subseteq W$ such that $\alpha = v\alpha_s$ for some $v \in W$ and $s \in S$. We denote the set of all roots by $\Phi(W, S)$. The set $\Phi(W, S)_+ := \{\alpha \in \Phi(W, S) \mid 1_W \in \alpha\}$ is the set of all *positive roots* and $\Phi(W, S)_- := \{\alpha \in \Phi(W, S) \mid 1_W \notin \alpha\}$ is the set of all *negative roots*. For each root $\alpha \in \Phi(W, S)$, the complement $-\alpha := W \setminus \alpha$ is again a root; it is called the root *opposite* to α . We denote the unique reflection which interchanges these two roots by $r_\alpha \in W \leq \text{Aut}(\Sigma(W, S))$. We note that roots are convex (cf. [AB08, Lemma

3.44]). A pair $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ of roots is called *prenilpotent* if both $\alpha \cap \beta$ and $(-\alpha) \cap (-\beta)$ are non-empty sets. For such a pair we will write $[\alpha, \beta] := \{\gamma \in \Phi(W, S) \mid \alpha \cap \beta \subseteq \gamma \text{ and } (-\alpha) \cap (-\beta) \subseteq -\gamma\}$ and $(\alpha, \beta) := [\alpha, \beta] \setminus \{\alpha, \beta\}$.

Let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ be a building of type (W, S) . A subset $\alpha \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is called *root*, if it is isometric to α_s for some $s \in S$. We denote the set of roots contained in some apartment Σ by Φ^Σ . We note that we can identify Φ^Σ with $\Phi(W, S)$.

Convention 2.5. For the rest of this paper we let (W, S) be a Coxeter system of finite rank and we define $\Phi := \Phi(W, S)$ (resp. Φ_+, Φ_-).

Lemma 2.6. *Let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ be a building of type (W, S) . Let (d_0, \dots, d_k) be a minimal gallery and let $c \in \mathcal{C}$. Let Σ be an apartment containing c, d_0, \dots, d_{k-1} and suppose that no apartment contains c, d_0, \dots, d_k . Suppose $e \in \Sigma$ with $\delta(d_{k-1}, e) = \delta(d_{k-1}, d_k)$ and let $\alpha \in \Phi^\Sigma$ be the unique root containing d_{k-1} but not e . Then $c \notin \alpha$.*

Proof. By contrary we assume $c \in \alpha$. Define $s := \delta(d_{k-1}, d_k)$ and $P := \mathcal{P}_s(d_k)$. As (d_0, \dots, d_k) is a minimal gallery, we have $\text{proj}_P d_0 = d_{k-1}$. Note that $P \cap \alpha = \{d_{k-1}\}$. As $c, d_{k-1} \in \alpha$ and roots are convex, we deduce $\text{proj}_P c \in \alpha \cap P = \{d_{k-1}\}$. As apartments are isometric to $\Sigma(W, S)$ we have the following:

$$\delta(c, d_k) = \delta(c, d_{k-1})s = \delta(c, d_0)\delta(d_0, d_{k-1})s = \delta(c, d_0)\delta(d_0, d_k).$$

But this implies that $\{c, d_0, d_k\} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is isometric to a subset of W . We conclude that there exists an apartment containing c, d_0, d_k (cf. also [AB08, Exercise 5.77(a)]). This is a contradiction and we infer $c \notin \alpha$. \square

Parallel residues in buildings. In this subsection we let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ be a building of type (W, S) . For two residues R, T we define the mapping $\text{proj}_T^R : R \rightarrow T, x \mapsto \text{proj}_T x$ and we define $\text{proj}_T R := \{\text{proj}_T r \mid r \in R\}$. We note that $\text{proj}_T R$ is a residue contained in T (cf. [AB08, Lemma 5.36(2)]). The residues R, T are called *parallel* if $\text{proj}_R T = R$ and $\text{proj}_T R = T$. We note that for parallel residues R and T the element $\delta(c, \text{proj}_T c)$ is independent of the choice of $c \in R$ (cf. [MPW15, Proposition 21.10]).

Lemma 2.7. *Let R and T be two residues. Then the following hold:*

- (a) *The residues $\text{proj}_R T$ and $\text{proj}_T R$ are parallel.*
- (b) *R and T are parallel if and only if proj_T^R and proj_R^T are bijections inverse to each other.*
- (c) *Let Σ be an apartment containing chambers of R and T . Then R and T are parallel if and only if $R \cap \Sigma$ and $T \cap \Sigma$ are parallel residues of Σ .*

Proof. Part (a) is [MPW15, Proposition 21.8(i)]. One implication of part (b) is easy; the other is [MPW15, Proposition 21.10(i)]. Part (c) is [MPW15, Proposition 21.17]. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let R and T be two residues and let $c \in \text{proj}_R T$. Then we have $\text{proj}_R(\text{proj}_T c) = c$.*

Proof. Note that by Lemma 2.7 the residues $R' := \text{proj}_R T$ and $T' := \text{proj}_T R$ are parallel and we have $\text{proj}_{R'}(\text{proj}_{T'} c) = c$. It follows now from Lemma 2.3 that $\text{proj}_{T'} c = \text{proj}_T c$ and $\text{proj}_{R'}(\text{proj}_T c) = \text{proj}_R(\text{proj}_T c)$. \square

Lemma 2.9. *Let R and T be two residues and let Σ be an apartment with $\Sigma \cap R \neq \emptyset \neq \Sigma \cap T$. Then the following hold:*

- (a) $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_R T = \text{proj}_{\Sigma \cap R}(\Sigma \cap T)$;
- (b) $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_R T$ is a residue of Σ having the same type as $\text{proj}_R T$.

Proof. We first note that for $c \in \Sigma$ we have $\text{proj}_{\Sigma \cap R} c = \text{proj}_R c$, as Σ is convex. This implies $\text{proj}_{\Sigma \cap R}(\Sigma \cap T) \subseteq \Sigma \cap \text{proj}_R T$. For the other inclusion let $c \in \Sigma \cap \text{proj}_R T$ be a chamber. By Lemma 2.8 we have $\text{proj}_R(\text{proj}_T c) = c$. As Σ is convex and $c \in \Sigma$, we have $c' := \text{proj}_T c \in \Sigma \cap T$. But then $c = \text{proj}_R c' = \text{proj}_{\Sigma \cap R} c' \in \text{proj}_{\Sigma \cap R}(\Sigma \cap T)$. This shows (a). Part (b) follows from (a), as $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_R T \neq \emptyset$. \square

Compatible paths and parallel panels. Compatible paths were introduced in [DMVM12]. Let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ be a building of type (W, S) and let Γ be the graph whose vertices are the panels of Δ and in which two panels form an edge if and only if there exists a rank 2 residue in which the two panels are opposite. For two adjacent panels P, Q , there exists a unique rank 2 residue containing P and Q , which will be denoted by $R(P, Q)$. A path $\gamma = (P_0, \dots, P_k)$ in Γ is called *compatible* if $\text{proj}_{R(P_{i-1}, P_i)} P_0 = P_{i-1}$ holds for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let (P_0, \dots, P_k) be a compatible path. By definition, (P_0, \dots, P_i) is a compatible path for all $0 \leq i \leq k$. Moreover, (P_k, \dots, P_0) is a compatible path as well (cf. [BM23, Proposition (4.2)(d)]).

Lemma 2.10. *Let $m > 1$ and let (P_0, \dots, P_m) be a compatible path. Then we have $\text{proj}_{R(P_{m-1}, P_m)} R(P_i, P_{i+1}) = \text{proj}_{R(P_{m-1}, P_m)} R(P_0, P_1)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq m - 2$.*

Proof. The claim is trivial for $m = 2$. Thus we can assume $m > 2$. As (P_i, \dots, P_m) is again a compatible path, it suffices to show $\text{proj}_{R(P_{m-1}, P_m)} R(P_0, P_1) = P_{m-1}$. We define $R_j := R(P_{j-1}, P_j)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$. Clearly, we have $P_{m-1} = \text{proj}_{R_m} P_0 \subseteq \text{proj}_{R_m} R_1$. Assume that $\text{proj}_{R_m} R_1 \supsetneq P_{m-1}$. Then, as $\text{proj}_{R_m} R_1$ is a residue, we would have $\text{proj}_{R_m} R_1 = R_m$. By Lemma 2.7, the residues $\text{proj}_{R_m} R_1 = R_m$ and $R := \text{proj}_{R_1} R_m$ are parallel and $\text{proj}_R^{R_m}$ is a bijection. But (P_m, \dots, P_0) and (P_{m-1}, \dots, P_0) are compatible paths and hence, as $m > 1$, $\text{proj}_{R(P_0, P_1)} P_m = P_1 = \text{proj}_{R(P_0, P_1)} P_{m-1}$. This is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.11. *Let P and Q be two panels. Then the following hold:*

- (a) *The following are equivalent:*
 - (i) *P and Q are parallel.*
 - (ii) $|\text{proj}_Q P| \geq 2$;
 - (iii) *There exists a compatible path from P to Q .*
- (b) *If P and Q are parallel and if R is a residue containing Q , then $\text{proj}_R P$ is a panel parallel to both P and Q .*

Proof. Part (a) follows from [DMVM12, Lemma 13 and Lemma 19]; part (b) is [DMVM12, Lemma 17]. \square

Lemma 2.12. *Suppose that (W, S) is 2-complete. Let $m > 0$, let (P_0, \dots, P_m) be a compatible path and let $c \in \mathcal{C}$. Suppose that the following two conditions hold:*

- (i) $\ell(c, \text{proj}_{P_0} c) < \ell(c, \text{proj}_{P_1} c)$;
- (ii) $\ell(\text{proj}_{R(P_0, P_1)} c, \text{proj}_{P_1} c) \geq 2$.

Then $\ell(c, \text{proj}_{P_0} c) < \ell(c, \text{proj}_{P_m} c)$ and $\ell(\text{proj}_{R(P_{m-1}, P_m)} c, \text{proj}_{P_m} c) \geq 2$ hold.

Proof. We will show the claim by induction on m . For $m = 1$ this is exactly the assumption. Thus we can assume $m > 1$. Using induction the following hold:

- $\ell(c, \text{proj}_{P_0} c) < \ell(c, \text{proj}_{P_{m-1}} c)$;
- $\ell(\text{proj}_{R(P_{m-2}, P_{m-1})} c, \text{proj}_{P_{m-1}} c) \geq 2$.

Now Lemma 2.2 yields $\text{proj}_{R(P_{m-1}, P_m)} c = \text{proj}_{P_{m-1}} c$ and we infer

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(c, \text{proj}_{P_m} c) &= \ell(c, \text{proj}_{R(P_{m-1}, P_m)} c) + \ell(\text{proj}_{R(P_{m-1}, P_m)} c, \text{proj}_{P_m} c) \\ &\geq \ell(c, \text{proj}_{P_{m-1}} c) \\ &> \ell(c, \text{proj}_{P_0} c) \end{aligned}$$

Note that P_{m-1} and P_m are opposite in $R(P_{m-1}, P_m)$. As (W, S) is 2-complete, we conclude $\ell(\text{proj}_{R(P_{m-1}, P_m)} c, \text{proj}_{P_m} c) \geq 2$. This finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.13. *Suppose that (W, S) is 2-complete. Let (P_0, \dots, P_m) and (Q_0, \dots, Q_n) be two compatible paths such that P_m and Q_0 are opposite in a rank 2 residue. If $\text{proj}_{R(P_m, Q_0)} P_0 = P_m$, then $(P_0, \dots, P_m, Q_0, \dots, Q_n)$ is a compatible path.*

Proof. We show the claim by induction on n . For $n = 0$ the claim follows by definition. Thus we can assume $n > 0$. Using induction, $(P_0, \dots, P_m, Q_0, \dots, Q_{n-1})$ is a compatible path. We define $P_{m+i+1} := Q_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$. We have to show that $\text{proj}_{R(P_{m+n}, P_{m+n+1})} P_0 = P_{m+n}$. As (P_0, \dots, P_{m+n}) is a compatible path, we have $\text{proj}_{R(P_{m+n-1}, P_{m+n})} P_0 = P_{m+n-1}$. As P_{m+n-1} and P_{m+n} are opposite in $R(P_{m+n-1}, P_{m+n})$, we deduce from Lemma 2.2 that $\text{proj}_{R(P_{m+n}, P_{m+n+1})} p = \text{proj}_{P_{m+n}} p$ holds for all $p \in P_0$. As P_0 and P_{m+n} are parallel by Lemma 2.11(a), we infer $\text{proj}_{R(P_{m+n}, P_{m+n+1})} P_0 = \text{proj}_{P_{m+n}} P_0 = P_{m+n}$. This finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.14. *Suppose that (W, S) is 2-complete. Let $m > 0$, let (P_0, \dots, P_m) be a compatible path, let $c \in P_0$ and let $d \in R(P_{m-1}, P_m) \setminus P_{m-1}$. Let $\{s, t\}$ be the type of $R(P_{m-1}, P_m)$ for $s \neq t \in S$. Then $\ell(\delta(c, d)r) = \ell(c, d) + 1$ holds for each $r \in S \setminus \{s, t\}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.2 it suffices to show the claim for d adjacent to $\text{proj}_{R(P_{m-1}, P_m)} c$. We prove the claim by induction on m . For $m = 1$ the claim follows from [AB08, Lemma 2.15]. Suppose now $m > 1$. Let $s \in S$ be the type of P_{m-1} and let $\{s, q\}$ be the type of $R(P_{m-2}, P_{m-1})$. We define $d' := \text{proj}_{P_q(e)} c$ where $e := \text{proj}_{R(P_{m-1}, P_m)} c$. Then $d' \in R(P_{m-2}, P_{m-1}) \setminus P_{m-2}$. Using induction, we have

$$\ell(\delta(c, d')r') = \ell(c, d') + 1$$

for each $r' \in S \setminus \{s, q\}$. Now let $r \in S \setminus \{s, t\}$. If $r = q$, then the claim follows from the previous equation with $r' = t$ and the fact that $m_{rt} > 2$. If $r \neq q$, then the previous equation implies $\ell(\delta(c, e)r) = \ell(c, e) + 1$ which itself yields the claim. \square

Lemma 2.15. *Let P and Q be two panels and let $H \leq \text{Stab}(P) \cap \text{Stab}(Q)$ be a subgroup which does not fix a chamber in P . Then the following hold:*

- The panels P and Q are parallel.*
- For a residue R containing Q , $\text{proj}_R P$ is a panel and $H \leq \text{Stab}(\text{proj}_R P)$.*

Proof. Let $q \in Q$ and put $p := \text{proj}_P q$. As $H \leq \text{Stab}(P) \cap \text{Stab}(Q)$ does not fix p , there exists $h \in H$ with $h.p \neq p$. Using the uniqueness of the projection chamber, we infer

$$\text{proj}_P(h.q) = \text{proj}_{h.P}(h.q) = h.p \neq p$$

Thus $|\text{proj}_P Q| \geq 2$ and Lemma 2.11(a) implies that P and Q are parallel.

Now let R be a residue containing Q . Then $\text{proj}_R P$ is a panel parallel to both P and Q by Lemma 2.11(b). Let $x \in \text{proj}_R P$ and $h \in H$. We have to show that $h.x \in \text{proj}_R P$. There exists $p \in P$ with $x = \text{proj}_R p$. Using the uniqueness of the

projection chamber and the fact that $H \leq \text{Stab}(P) \cap \text{Stab}(Q) \leq \text{Stab}(P) \cap \text{Stab}(R)$, we conclude

$$h.x = h.(\text{proj}_R p) = \text{proj}_{h.R}(h.p) = \text{proj}_R(h.p) \in \text{proj}_R P. \quad \square$$

3. COXETER BUILDINGS

In this section we consider the Coxeter building $\Sigma(W, S)$. For $\alpha \in \Phi$ we denote by $\partial\alpha$ (resp. $\partial^2\alpha$) the set of all panels (resp. spherical residues of rank 2) stabilized by r_α . We note that for $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$ with $\alpha \neq \pm\beta$ we have $o(r_\alpha r_\beta) < \infty$ if and only if $\partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\beta \neq \emptyset$ (cf. [Bis24a, Lemma 2.8(a)]).

The set $\partial\alpha$ is called the *wall* associated with α . Let $G = (c_0, \dots, c_k)$ be a gallery. We say that G *crosses the wall* $\partial\alpha$ if there exists $1 \leq i \leq k$ such that $\{c_{i-1}, c_i\} \in \partial\alpha$. It is a basic fact that a minimal gallery crosses a wall at most once (cf. [AB08, Lemma 3.69]). Moreover, a gallery which crosses each wall at most once is already minimal.

Lemma 3.1. *Let R, T be two spherical residues of $\Sigma(W, S)$. Then the following are equivalent:*

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

Proof. This is [CM06, Proposition 2.7]. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $|\langle J \rangle| = \infty$ for all $J \subseteq S$ containing at least three elements.*

- (a) *Let R and T be two different spherical residues of $\Sigma(W, S)$ of rank 2. Then R and T are not parallel.*
- (b) *Let $\alpha, \beta \in \Phi$ with $\alpha \neq \pm\beta$. Then $|\partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\beta| \leq 1$.*

Proof. Part (a) follows from Lemma 3.1 and (b) follows from [Bis24b, Lemma 2.5]. \square

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

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

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

Remark 3.3. Let R be a reflection triangle. Then there exist three roots $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \in \Phi$ such that $R = \{r_{\beta_1}, r_{\beta_2}, r_{\beta_3}\}$. Let $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. As $o(r_{\beta_i} r_{\beta_j}) < \infty$, there exists $\sigma_k \in \partial^2\beta_i \cap \partial^2\beta_j$. Since R is a reflection triangle, we have $\sigma_k \notin \partial^2\beta_k$. Now [Bis24b, Lemma 2.2] yields $\sigma_k \subseteq \beta_k$ or $\sigma_k \subseteq -\beta_k$. Let $\varepsilon_k \in \{+, -\}$ with $\sigma_k \subseteq \varepsilon_k \beta_k$ and define $\alpha_k := \varepsilon_k \beta_k$. Then $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$ is a combinatorial triangle, which induces the reflection triangle R .

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$ be a combinatorial triangle and let $R_k \in \partial^2\alpha_i \cap \partial^2\alpha_j$ for $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then the following hold:*

- (a) *The residue $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ is a panel which is contained in $\partial\alpha_k$.*
- (b) *The panels $\text{proj}_{R_k} R_i$ and $\text{proj}_{R_k} R_j$ are not parallel.*

Proof. We know that $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ is a residue. As $R_i, R_j \in \partial^2\alpha_k$, there are panels $P_i \subseteq R_i$ and $P_j \subseteq R_j$ with $P_i, P_j \in \partial\alpha_k$. In particular, P_i and P_j are parallel by Lemma 3.1 and $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ contains the panel $\text{proj}_{R_i} P_j$ (cf. Lemma 2.11(c)). Suppose $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ is not a panel. Then $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j = R_i$. As $R_i = \text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ and $\text{proj}_{R_j} R_i$ are parallel by Lemma 2.7(a), it follows $\text{proj}_{R_j} R_i = R_j$ by Lemma 3.1 (as they must have the same rank). But then R_i and R_j are parallel and Lemma 3.1 implies $R_i \in \partial^2\alpha_i$. In particular, $R_i \in \partial^2\alpha_i \cap \partial^2\alpha_j \cap \partial^2\alpha_k$, which is a contradiction. This shows the first part of (a).

Note that $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ is a panel containing the panel $\text{proj}_{R_i} P_j$ and hence $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j = \text{proj}_{R_i} P_j$. As $P_i, P_j \in \partial\alpha_k$ and $P_i \subseteq R_i$, it follows from Lemma 2.15(b) that $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j = \text{proj}_{R_i} P_j \in \partial\alpha_k$. Similarly, we obtain $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_k \in \partial\alpha_j$. As $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3\}$ is a combinatorial triangle, we have in particular $\alpha_k \neq \pm\alpha_j$. Since for each panel there exists a unique reflection which stabilizes it, Lemma 3.1 implies that the panels are not parallel. This finishes the claim. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose (W, S) is 2-complete. If T is a combinatorial triangle, then $(-\alpha, \beta) = \emptyset$ for all $\alpha \neq \beta \in T$. In particular, $|\alpha \cap \beta \cap R| = 1$ for each $R \in \partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\beta$.*

Proof. The first part is [Bis22, Proposition 2.3]. Now let $R \in \partial^2\alpha \cap \partial^2\beta$. As roots are convex and $\alpha \neq \pm\beta$, we deduce $\alpha \cap \beta \cap R \neq \emptyset$. Assume $c, d \in \alpha \cap \beta \cap R$ with $c \neq d$. As roots and residues are convex, we can assume that c and d are contained in a panel $P \subseteq R$. Let γ be a root with $P \in \partial\gamma$. Note that $R \in \partial^2\gamma$. Using [Bis24a, Lemma 2.9(b)] we obtain $\varepsilon\gamma \in (\alpha, \beta)$ for some $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$. But then $P \subseteq \alpha \cap \beta \subseteq \varepsilon\gamma$, which is a contradiction. This finishes the claim. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose (W, S) is 2-complete. Let $r, s, t, u \in S$ be such that $r \neq s \neq t \neq u$ and such that the panels $\mathcal{P}_r(1_W)$ and $\mathcal{P}_u(st)$ are parallel. Then $r = t$, $u = s$ and $m_{st} = 3$.*

Proof. By [AB08, Lemma 2.15] and the fact that $m_{st} > 2$ we have $\ell(rst) = 3$. As $\mathcal{P}_r(1_W)$ and $\mathcal{P}_u(st)$ are parallel, we must have $\ell(rstu) = 2$ by Lemma 2.7(b). But then Lemma 2.2 implies $r = t$, $u = s$ and $m_{st} = 3$. \square

Remark 3.7. Suppose (W, S) is 2-complete and let $T = \{\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k\}$ be a combinatorial triangle. By definition and Lemma 3.2(b) there exists a unique element contained in $\partial^2\alpha_i \cap \partial^2\alpha_j$.

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose (W, S) is 2-complete and \tilde{A}_2 -free. Let $T = \{\alpha_i, \alpha_j, \alpha_k\}$ be a combinatorial triangle. We denote the unique element contained in $\partial^2\alpha_i \cap \partial^2\alpha_j$ by R_k . Then $R_i \cap R_j \cap R_k$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber.*

Proof. We first show that $R_i \cap R_j \cap R_k \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 3.5, $\alpha_i \cap \alpha_j \cap R_k$ contains a unique chamber which we denote by c_k . As $c_i \in R_i \subseteq \alpha_i$ and roots are convex, we deduce $\text{proj}_{R_j} c_i \in \alpha_i$. Moreover, $c_i \in \alpha_k$ and hence $\text{proj}_{R_j} c_i \in \alpha_k$. We deduce

$$\text{proj}_{R_j} c_i \in \alpha_i \cap \alpha_k \cap R_j = \{c_j\}.$$

Define $P := \text{proj}_{R_j} R_k$. As before, we have $c_j = \text{proj}_{R_j} c_k \in P$ and Lemma 2.3 yields $c_j = \text{proj}_{R_j} c_k = \text{proj}_P c_k$. For $Q := \text{proj}_{R_k} R_j$ we infer $c_k = \text{proj}_Q c_j$ similarly. Without loss of generality we can assume $\ell(c_i, c_j) \geq \ell(c_j, c_k) \geq \ell(c_i, c_k)$. We define

$$w_{ij} := \delta(c_i, c_j), \quad w_{jk} := \delta(c_j, c_k), \quad w_{ik} := \delta(c_i, c_k).$$

Assume $\ell(w_{jk}) > 0$ and hence $\ell(w_{ij}) \geq \ell(w_{jk}) > 0$. As $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ and $\text{proj}_{R_j} R_i$ are panels by Lemma 3.4(a) which are parallel by Lemma 2.7(a), there exists a compatible path $(Q_0 := \text{proj}_{R_i} R_j, \dots, Q_q := \text{proj}_{R_j} R_i)$ by Lemma 2.11(a). As $c_i \in Q_0$ and $c_j \in Q_q$, we have $q > 0$. Using induction there exists a minimal gallery $(e_0 := c_i, \dots, e_l := c_j)$ with $e_z \in R(Q_{jz}, Q_{jz+1})$ for all $0 \leq z \leq l$. Note that $c_j \in \text{proj}_{R_j} R_i \cap \text{proj}_{R_j} R_k$ and hence $\text{proj}_{R_j} R_i \cap \text{proj}_{R_j} R_k \neq \emptyset$.

Let $\text{proj}_{R_j} R_i$ be an s -panel and let $\text{proj}_{R_j} R_k$ be a t -panel. By Lemma 3.4(b) we have, in particular, $\text{proj}_{R_j} R_i \neq \text{proj}_{R_j} R_k$. As $\text{proj}_{R_j} R_i \cap \text{proj}_{R_j} R_k \neq \emptyset$, we have $s \neq t$. Let $\{r, s\}$ be the type of $R(Q_{q-1}, Q_q)$. Then $\ell(w_{ij}sr) = \ell(w_{ij})$ (as Q_{q-1} and Q_q are opposite in $R(Q_{q-1}, Q_q)$) and by Lemma 2.2, r is the unique element in S with $\ell(w_{ij}r) < \ell(w_{ij})$. As before, there exists a compatible path $(P_0 := \text{proj}_{R_j} R_k, \dots, P_p := \text{proj}_{R_k} R_j)$ and we deduce $p > 0$. Note that $\text{proj}_{R_k} c_i = c_k \in \text{proj}_{R_k} R_j$ and, hence, Lemma 2.3 yields $\text{proj}_{P_p} c_i = \text{proj}_{R_k} c_i = c_k$.

If r is not contained in the type of $R(P_0, P_1)$, then Lemma 2.2 yields $\text{proj}_{R(P_0, P_1)} c_i = \text{proj}_{P_0} c_i$. As $\text{proj}_{R_j} c_i = c_j \in \text{proj}_{R_j} R_k$, Lemma 2.3 implies $c_j = \text{proj}_{R_j} c_i = \text{proj}_{P_0} c_i$. Now Lemma 2.12 yields

$$\ell(w_{ij}) = \ell(c_i, \text{proj}_{P_0} c_i) < \ell(c_i, \text{proj}_{P_p} c_i) = \ell(w_{ik}).$$

This is a contradiction. Thus we can assume that $R(P_0, P_1)$ is of type $\{r, t\}$. By Lemma 2.14 we have $\ell(w_{ij}rt) = \ell(w_{ij})$. If $m_{rt} \neq 3$, we deduce again a contradiction from Lemma 2.12. Thus we can assume $m_{rt} = 3$. We distinguish the following cases:

$p > 1$: Let $\{r, x\}$ be the type of $R(P_1, P_2)$. Note that (P_1, \dots, P_p) is again a compatible path. If $\text{proj}_{R(P_1, P_2)} c_i = \text{proj}_{P_1} c_i$, then Lemma 2.12 yields again

$$\ell(w_{ij}) = \ell(c_i, \text{proj}_{P_0} c_i) = \ell(c_i, \text{proj}_{P_1} c_i) < \ell(c_i, \text{proj}_{P_p} c_i) = \ell(w_{ik})$$

which is a contradiction. Thus we can assume $\text{proj}_{R(P_1, P_2)} c_i \neq \text{proj}_{P_1} c_i$ and hence $\ell(w_{ij}rtx) = \ell(w_{ij}) - 1$. This implies $\ell(w_{ij}rx) = \ell(w_{ij}) - 2$ and Lemma 2.14 yields $x = s$. Moreover, we have $\ell(w_{ij}rst) = \ell(w_{ij}) - 3$. But then Lemma 2.14 yields $m_{rs} = 3$. Since $c_jrs = \text{proj}_{R(Q_{q-1}, Q_q)} c_i$, we have $\ell(w_{ij}rsrt) = \ell(w_{ij}) - 2$ as above. Again, Lemma 2.14 yields $\ell(w_{ij}rst) = \ell(w_{ij}) - 2$ and hence $m_{st} = 3$. But then $(\langle r, s, t \rangle, \{r, s, t\})$ is a subsystem of type \tilde{A}_2 , which is a contradiction.

$p = 1$: Then we have $w_{jk} = rt$ and $c_k = c_jrt$. Moreover, we have $\ell(w_{jk}) = 2$ and $\ell(w_{ij}) = \ell(w_{ik})$, which implies $\ell(w_{ij}) = \ell(w_{jk}) = \ell(w_{ik}) = 2$ and, in particular, $w_{ij} = sr$, and $w_{ik} = st$. This implies $m_{rs} = 3$. Now it follows from Lemma 3.6 that $(\langle r, s, t \rangle, \{r, s, t\})$ is a subsystem of type \tilde{A}_2 , which is a contradiction.

Thus we can assume $\ell(w_{jk}) = 0$. Then $\ell(w_{ik}) \leq \ell(w_{jk}) = 0$ and hence $c_i = c_k = c_j$. In particular, $R := R_i \cap R_j \cap R_k \neq \emptyset$ and hence R is a residue. As $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ is a panel by Lemma 3.4(a), R is either a panel or a single chamber. Suppose R is a panel. Then $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j = R = \text{proj}_{R_i} R_k$ and, in particular, $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ and $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_k$ are parallel. But this is a contradiction to Lemma 3.4(b). Hence R is a single chamber and we are done. \square

Remark 3.9. Note that the previous theorem becomes false, if (W, S) is not \tilde{A}_2 -free.

4. TRIANGLES IN BUILDINGS

In this section we generalize the notion of combinatorial triangles in $\Sigma(W, S)$ (i.e. in apartments) to triangles in building. We remark that in the literature a combinatorial triangle is sometimes also called triangle. The main goal of this section is Theorem 4.9, where we prove a generalization of Theorem 3.8.

Convention 4.1. In this section we let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ be a building of type (W, S) .

Definition 4.2. A set T of three residues of spherical type and of rank 2 is called *triangle*, if the following hold:

- (T1) For $R, Q \in T$ with $R \neq Q$, the residue $\text{proj}_R Q$ is a panel.
- (T2) The panels $\text{proj}_R P$ and $\text{proj}_R Q$ are not parallel, where $T = \{P, Q, R\}$.

Let Σ be an apartment of Δ . A triangle T is called Σ -*triangle* if $\Sigma \cap R \neq \emptyset$ for all $R \in T$.

We first show that triangles exist. The next lemma shows that any reflection triangle in an apartment canonically provides a triangle in a building.

Lemma 4.3. *Let Σ be an apartment and let $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \in \Phi^\Sigma$ be three roots such that $\{r_{\beta_1}, r_{\beta_2}, r_{\beta_3}\}$ is a reflection triangle. Let $T := \{R_1, R_2, R_3\}$ be a set of three spherical residues of rank 2 with the following properties:*

- (i) $\Sigma \cap R \neq \emptyset$ for all $R \in T$;
- (ii) $\Sigma \cap R_k \in \partial^2 \alpha_i \cap \partial^2 \alpha_j$ for all possibilities $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Then T is a Σ -triangle.

Proof. We abbreviate $\Sigma_i := \Sigma \cap R_i$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. By Remark 3.3, there exists $\gamma_i \in \{\beta_i, -\beta_i\}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3\}$ is a combinatorial triangle. Using Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 2.9(a) we obtain the following:

- (a) $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_i} R_j = \text{proj}_{\Sigma_i} \Sigma_j$ is a panel in Σ for $i \neq j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.
- (b) The panels $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_k} R_i = \text{proj}_{\Sigma_k} \Sigma_i$ and $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_k} R_j = \text{proj}_{\Sigma_k} \Sigma_j$ are not parallel in Σ for $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Lemma 2.9(b) yields that $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ is a panel for all $i \neq j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Now Lemma 2.7(c) implies that $\text{proj}_{R_k} R_i$ and $\text{proj}_{R_k} R_j$ are not parallel, where $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. By definition, T is a Σ -triangle. \square

Remark 4.4. Let Σ be an apartment of Δ and let $T = \{R_i, R_j, R_k\}$ be a Σ -triangle. Then $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ and $\text{proj}_{R_j} R_i$ are panels by assumption and $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ and $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_j} R_i$ are panels in Σ by Lemma 2.9(b). By Lemma 2.7(a) and (c), the panels $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ and $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_j} R_i$ are parallel in Σ . It follows from Lemma 3.1 that there exists (up to sign) a unique root $\beta_k \in \Phi^\Sigma$ with $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_i} R_j, \Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_j} R_i \in \partial \beta_k$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let Σ be an apartment and let $T = \{R_i, R_j, R_k\}$ be a Σ -triangle. Then the following hold:*

- (a) *Let $\beta_k \in \Phi^\Sigma$ be one of the two roots with $\Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_i} R_j, \Sigma \cap \text{proj}_{R_j} R_i \in \partial \beta_k$. Then $\{r_{\beta_i}, r_{\beta_j}, r_{\beta_k}\}$ is a reflection triangle. Moreover, there exists $\gamma_l \in \{\beta_l, -\beta_l\}$ with $\Sigma \cap R_l \subseteq \gamma_l$ for all $l \in \{i, j, k\}$, and $\{\gamma_i, \gamma_j, \gamma_k\}$ is a combinatorial triangle.*

- (b) If (W, S) is 2-complete and \tilde{A}_2 -free, then $R_i \cap R_j \cap R_k$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber.
- (c) If (W, S) is 2-complete, then $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j \cap \text{proj}_{R_i} R_k$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber.

Proof. For all $a \neq b \in \{i, j, k\}$ we abbreviate the following:

$$\Sigma_a := \Sigma \cap R_a, \quad P_a^b := \text{proj}_{R_a} R_b, \quad \Sigma_a^b := \Sigma \cap P_a^b.$$

As $\Sigma_k^j \in \partial\beta_i$ and $\Sigma_k^j \subseteq \Sigma_k$, we have $\Sigma_k \in \partial^2\beta_i$. Using similar arguments, we deduce $\Sigma_k \in \partial^2\beta_i \cap \partial^2\beta_j$, which implies $o(r_{\beta_i}, r_{\beta_j}) < \infty$. Next we show $\partial^2\beta_i \cap \partial^2\beta_j \cap \partial^2\beta_k = \emptyset$. Assume by contrary that there exists $Q \in \partial^2\beta_i \cap \partial^2\beta_j \cap \partial^2\beta_k$. Then Q and Σ_i (resp. Q and Σ_j) are parallel by [Bis24b, Lemma 2.5(a)]. Now [MPW15, Corollary 21.21] implies that Σ_i and Σ_j are parallel. Using Lemma 2.7(c), the residues R_i and R_j are parallel as well. But $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ is a panel, hence $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j \neq R_i$, which is a contradiction. We conclude $\partial^2\beta_i \cap \partial^2\beta_j \cap \partial^2\beta_k = \emptyset$ and $\{r_{\beta_i}, r_{\beta_j}, r_{\beta_k}\}$ is a reflection triangle. The second part of (a) follows from Remark 3.3.

For Assertion (b) we note that $\Sigma_i \cap \Sigma_j \cap \Sigma_k$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber by (a) and Theorem 3.8. This implies $R := R_i \cap R_j \cap R_k \neq \emptyset$ and hence R is a residue. As $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ is a panel, R is either a panel or a single chamber. Suppose R is a panel. Then $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j = R = \text{proj}_{R_i} R_k$ and, hence, $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$ and $\text{proj}_{R_i} R_k$ are parallel. This is a contradiction to the fact that T is a triangle. Hence R is a single chamber and we are done.

For assertion (c) we first note that $|\gamma_i \cap \gamma_j \cap \Sigma_k| = 1$ holds by Lemma 3.5. We denote the unique chamber contained in $\gamma_i \cap \gamma_j \cap \Sigma_k$ by c_k . As roots are convex, we have $\text{proj}_{R_i} c_j, \text{proj}_{R_i} c_k \in \gamma_j \cap \gamma_k \cap \Sigma_i = \{c_i\}$. This implies $P_i^j \cap P_i^k \neq \emptyset$. Assume that $P_i^j \cap P_i^k$ is not a chamber. As both are panels, we must have $P_i^j = P_i^k$. But then P_i^j and P_i^k would be parallel, which is a contradiction. This finishes the claim. \square

Convention 4.6. Let $T = \{R_1, R_2, R_3\}$ be a triangle. For $i \neq j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ we let $P_i^j := \text{proj}_{R_i} R_j$. Note that P_i^j is a panel by definition. By Lemma 2.7(a), the panels P_i^j and P_j^i are parallel. By Lemma 2.11(a) there exists a compatible path $(P_0 := P_2^1, \dots, P_n := P_1^2)$ between P_2^1 and P_1^2 , and a compatible path $(Q_0 := P_3^2, \dots, Q_m := P_2^3)$ between P_3^2 and P_2^3 .

We extend the compatible path (P_0, \dots, P_n) by two panels. Let P_{n+1} be any panel contained in R_1 which is opposite to P_n in R_1 . Note that $R(P_n, P_{n+1}) = R_1$. As $\text{proj}_{R_1} P_0 = P_n$, the path (P_0, \dots, P_{n+1}) is again a compatible path. Similarly, we obtain a compatible path $(P_{-1}, P_0, \dots, P_{n+1})$ with $R(P_{-1}, P_0) = R_2$, as well as a compatible path (Q_{-1}, \dots, Q_{m+1}) with $R(Q_{-1}, Q_0) = R_3$ and $R(Q_m, Q_{m+1}) = R_2$.

A technical result. Assume that (W, S) is 2-complete and let $T = \{R_1, R_2, R_3\}$ be a triangle, which is not a Σ -triangle for any apartment Σ . Let $c \in P_3^1$ and let $d := \text{proj}_{P_2^1} c$. Then $\text{proj}_{R_1} d \neq d$, as T is not a Σ -triangle. Let $(d_0 := d, \dots, d_k := \text{proj}_{R_1} d)$ be a minimal gallery such that for all $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ there exists $0 \leq j_i \leq n-1$ with $\{d_i, d_{i+1}\} \subseteq R(P_{j_i}, P_{j_{i+1}})$. Let $0 \leq z \leq k-1$ be maximal such that there exists an apartment containing c, d_0, \dots, d_z , and let Σ be such an apartment. Let $\alpha \in \Phi^\Sigma$ be the root containing d_z but not $P \cap \Sigma$, where P is the panel containing d_z and d_{z+1} . Note that $\Sigma \cap P_2^1 \neq \emptyset$ and $\Sigma \cap P_2^3 \neq \emptyset$ (cf. Lemma 2.9). Let $\gamma_3 \in \Phi^\Sigma$ be the root containing d but not $\Sigma \cap P_2^1$ and let $\gamma_1 \in \Phi^\Sigma$ be the root containing d with $\Sigma \cap P_2^3 \in \partial\gamma_1$.

Proposition 4.7. *The following hold:*

- (a) *There exists a unique $0 \leq j \leq m$ such that $\Sigma \cap R(Q_{j-1}, Q_j) \in \partial^2 \alpha$.*
- (b) *$\{R(P_{j_z}, P_{j_z+1}), R(Q_{j-1}, Q_j), R_2\}$ is a Σ -triangle.*
- (c) *$\{r_\alpha, r_{\gamma_1}, r_{\gamma_3}\}$ is a reflection triangle.*

Proof. We abbreviate $R_P := R(P_{j_z}, P_{j_z+1})$. As $\Sigma \cap R_P \in \partial^2 \alpha \cap \partial^2 \gamma_3$ by Lemma 3.1, we have $o(r_\alpha r_{\gamma_3}) < \infty$. Moreover, we have $\Sigma \cap R_2 \in \partial^2 \gamma_1 \cap \partial^2 \gamma_3$ and hence $o(r_{\gamma_1} r_{\gamma_3}) < \infty$. Let $f \in P_2^3 \cap \gamma_1$ be the unique chamber. Then $\text{proj}_{R_3} f \in P_3^2$ and as $\Sigma \cap R_3 \neq \emptyset$, we have $\text{proj}_{R_3} f \in P_3^2 \cap \Sigma$. As P_2^3 and P_3^2 are parallel, Lemma 2.7(c) yields that $\Sigma \cap P_2^3$ and $\Sigma \cap P_3^2$ are parallel. As $\Sigma \cap P_2^3 \in \partial \gamma_1$, Lemma 3.1 implies $\Sigma \cap P_3^2 \in \partial \gamma_1$ and hence $\text{proj}_{R_3} f \in \gamma_1$ (as roots are convex). Note that $\{\Sigma \cap R(Q_{j-1}, Q_j) \mid 0 \leq j \leq m\} \subseteq \partial^2 \gamma_1$. We distinguish the following two cases:

- (i) $\text{proj}_{R_3} f \in \alpha$: Then, as $c \notin \alpha$ by Lemma 2.6, we have $\Sigma \cap R_3 \in \partial^2 \gamma_1 \cap \partial^2 \alpha \neq \emptyset$. In particular, we deduce $o(r_\alpha r_{\gamma_1}) < \infty$.
- (ii) $\text{proj}_{R_3} f \in (-\alpha)$: By Lemma 2.8 we have $\text{proj}_{R_2} d_k = d_0$. This implies that we can extend (d_{z+1}, \dots, d_0) to a minimal gallery from d_{z+1} to f . Replacing d_{z+1} by the unique chamber contained in Σ which is $\delta(d_z, d_{z+1})$ -adjacent to d_z , we infer $f \in \alpha$, as a minimal gallery crosses each wall at most once. As $\text{proj}_{R_3} f \in (-\alpha)$, there exists $1 \leq j \leq m$ with $Q_{j-1} \cap \Sigma \subseteq (-\alpha)$ and $Q_j \cap \Sigma \subseteq \alpha$. Then $R(Q_{j-1}, Q_j) \cap \Sigma \in \partial^2 \gamma_1 \cap \partial^2 \alpha$ and hence $o(r_{\gamma_1} r_\alpha) < \infty$.

Note that $\partial^2 \gamma_1 \cap \partial^2 \gamma_3 = \{\Sigma \cap R_2\}$ and $\partial^2 \alpha \cap \partial^2 \gamma_3 = \{\Sigma \cap R_P\}$ by Lemma 3.2(b). Assume that $\Sigma \cap R_2 \in \partial^2 \alpha$. Then we would have $\Sigma \cap R_P = \Sigma \cap R_2$ and hence $d_z, d_{z+1} \in R_P = R_2$. This implies $\text{proj}_{R_2}(\text{proj}_{R_1} d) \neq d$, which is a contradiction to Lemma 2.8. We infer $\partial^2 \gamma_3 \cap \partial^2 \gamma_1 \cap \partial^2 \alpha = \emptyset$ and hence $\{r_{\gamma_1}, r_{\gamma_3}, r_\alpha\}$ is a reflection triangle. Recall that $\{\Sigma \cap R(Q_{j-1}, Q_j) \mid 0 \leq j \leq m\} \subseteq \partial^2 \gamma_1$ and we know by (i) and (ii) that $\Sigma \cap R(Q_{j-1}, Q_j) \in \partial^2 \alpha$ for some $0 \leq j \leq m$. The uniqueness of j follows from the fact that $\partial^2 \gamma_1 \cap \partial^2 \alpha$ contains exactly one element by Lemma 3.2(b). Let $R_Q \in \{R(Q_{j-1}, Q_j) \mid 0 \leq j \leq m\}$ with $\partial^2 \alpha \cap \partial^2 \gamma_1 = \{\Sigma \cap R_Q\}$. Then Lemma 4.3 implies that $\{R_2, R_P, R_Q\}$ is a Σ -triangle. \square

Two generalizations. Theorem 4.8 can be seen as a generalization of Lemma 3.5.

Theorem 4.8. *Suppose that (W, S) is 2-complete and let $T = \{R_1, R_2, R_3\}$ be a triangle. Then $\text{proj}_{R_2} R_1 \cap \text{proj}_{R_2} R_3$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber.*

Proof. If T is a Σ -triangle for some apartment Σ , then the claim follows from Lemma 4.5(c). Thus we can assume that T is not a Σ -triangle for any apartment Σ . As T is a triangle, we have $P_2^1 \neq P_2^3$ by axiom (T2). Thus it suffices to show that $P_2^1 \cap P_2^3 \neq \emptyset$. Let $c \in P_3^1$ be any chamber and let $d := \text{proj}_{P_2^1} c$. As T is not a Σ -triangle, we have $d \neq \text{proj}_{R_1} d$. Note that $\text{proj}_{R_1} d = \text{proj}_{P_1^2} d$ holds by Lemma 2.3. Using induction, there exists a minimal gallery $(d_0 := d, \dots, d_k := \text{proj}_{R_1} d)$ such that for all $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ there exists $0 \leq j_i \leq n-1$ with $\{d_i, d_{i+1}\} \subseteq R(P_{j_i}, P_{j_i+1})$.

Now let $0 \leq z \leq k$ be maximal such that there exists an apartment containing $c, d = d_0, \dots, d_z$ and let Σ be such an apartment. As T is not a Σ -triangle, we have $z < k$. Define $R_P := R(P_{j_z}, P_{j_z+1})$. Let $\alpha \in \Phi^\Sigma$ be the root containing d_z but not $\Sigma \cap P$, where P is the panel containing d_z and d_{z+1} . Let $0 \leq j \leq m$ be the unique element as in Proposition 4.7(a) and define $R_Q := R(Q_{j-1}, Q_j)$. Then $\{R_P, R_Q, R_2\}$ is a Σ -triangle by Proposition 4.7(b). Applying Lemma 4.5(c) we deduce that $\text{proj}_{R_2} R_P \cap \text{proj}_{R_2} R_Q$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber. Now Lemma 2.10 implies $\text{proj}_{R_2} R_Q = \text{proj}_{R_2} R_3$ and $\text{proj}_{R_2} R_P = \text{proj}_{R_2} R_1$ (as (P_{n+1}, \dots, P_{-1}) is a compatible path). \square

Theorem 4.9. *Suppose that (W, S) is 2-complete and \tilde{A}_2 -free, and suppose that $T = \{R_1, R_2, R_3\}$ is a triangle. Then $R_1 \cap R_2 \cap R_3$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber.*

Proof. We let $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. We know by Theorem 4.8 that $P_i^j \cap P_i^k$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber, which we will denote by c_i . Note that $\text{proj}_{R_j} c_i = \text{proj}_{P_j^i} c_i$ by Lemma 2.3. As $c_j \in P_j^i$, we have $\ell(\text{proj}_{P_j^i} c_i, c_j) \leq 1$. By definition we have $P_j^k \neq P_j^i$ and hence $\text{proj}_{P_j^k} c_i = c_j$. Without loss of generality we can assume $\ell(c_3, c_2) \geq \ell(c_2, c_1) \geq \ell(c_3, c_1)$. We define

$$w_{32} := \delta(c_3, c_2), \quad w_{21} := \delta(c_2, c_1), \quad w_{31} := \delta(c_3, c_1).$$

If T is a Σ -triangle for some apartment Σ , then the claim follows from Lemma 4.5(b). Thus we can assume that T is not a Σ -triangle for any apartment Σ . In particular, we have $\text{proj}_{R_1} c_2 \neq c_2$ and $n > 0$ (cf. Convention 4.6). Using induction, there exists a minimal gallery $(d_0 := c_2, \dots, d_l := \text{proj}_{R_1} c_2)$ such that for all $0 \leq x \leq l-1$ there exists $0 \leq j_x \leq n-1$ with $\{d_x, d_{x+1}\} \subseteq R(P_{j_x}, P_{j_x+1})$. Let $0 \leq z \leq l$ be maximal such that there exists an apartment containing c_3, d_0, \dots, d_z and let Σ be such an apartment. As T is not a Σ -triangle, we deduce $z < l$. Let $0 \leq j \leq m$ be the unique element as in Proposition 4.7(a). We define $R_P := R(P_{j_z}, P_{j_z+1})$ and $R_Q := R(Q_{j-1}, Q_j)$. Then $\{R_P, R_Q, R_2\}$ is a Σ -triangle by Proposition 4.7(b). In particular, $R_P \cap R_2 \cap R_Q$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber by Lemma 4.5(b).

Claim: $R_P \cap R_2 \cap R_Q = \{d_0\}$.

By Lemma 2.10 we have $\text{proj}_{R_2} R_P = \text{proj}_{R_2} R_1 = P_2^1$ and $\text{proj}_{R_2} R_Q = \text{proj}_{R_2} R_3 = P_2^3$. As $R_2 \cap R_P \neq \emptyset$, the residue $R_2 \cap R_P$ is either a chamber, or a panel. If $R_2 \cap R_P$ would be a chamber, then [AB08, Lemma 2.15] implies that $\text{proj}_{R_2} R_P$ is also just a chamber. This is a contradiction and hence $R_2 \cap R_P$ is a panel. We infer $R_2 \cap R_P = \text{proj}_{R_2} R_P$. Using the same arguments, we deduce $R_2 \cap R_Q = \text{proj}_{R_2} R_Q$. We infer

$$R_2 \cap R_P \cap R_Q = (\text{proj}_{R_2} R_P) \cap (\text{proj}_{R_2} R_Q) = P_2^1 \cap P_2^3 = \{d_0\}.$$

Let $\gamma_3 \in \Phi^\Sigma$ be the root containing d_0 but not $\Sigma \cap P_2^1$ and let $\alpha \in \Phi^\Sigma$ be the root containing d_z but not $\Sigma \cap P$, where P is the panel containing d_z and d_{z+1} . Then $d_0, \dots, d_z \in \gamma_3 \cap \alpha \cap R_P$. Let $\gamma_1 \in \Phi^\Sigma$ be the root containing d_0 with $\Sigma \cap P_2^3 \in \partial\gamma_1$. By Proposition 4.7(c), we obtain that $\{r_\alpha, r_{\gamma_1}, r_{\gamma_3}\}$ is a reflection triangle.

As $\Sigma \cap R_2 \in \partial^2\gamma_1 \cap \partial^2\gamma_3$ and $d_0 \in \alpha$, we deduce $\Sigma \cap R_2 \subseteq \alpha$. Moreover, $\Sigma \cap R_Q \subseteq \gamma_3$ and $\Sigma \cap R_P \subseteq \gamma_1$. This implies that $\{\alpha, \gamma_1, \gamma_3\}$ is a combinatorial triangle. It follows from Lemma 3.5 that $z = 0$. Suppose $\delta(c_3, d_1) = \delta(c_3, d_0)\delta(d_0, d_1)$. Then there would exist an apartment containing c_3, d_0, d_1 , which is a contradiction to the maximality of z . Thus we have $\delta(c_3, d_0) = \delta(c_3, d_1)$ and hence $\ell(\delta(c_3, d_0)\delta(d_0, d_1)) = \ell(c_3, d_0) - 1$. Recall that $\ell(\text{proj}_{R_2} c_3, c_2) \leq 1$ and that $\text{proj}_{P_0} c_3 = \text{proj}_{P_2^1} c_3 = c_2$ and $\text{proj}_{P_n} c_3 = \text{proj}_{P_2^3} c_3 = c_1$. We distinguish the following cases:

- (a) $\ell(\text{proj}_{R_2} c_3, c_2) = 0$: As $\ell(\delta(c_3, d_0)\delta(d_0, d_1)) = \ell(c_3, d_0) - 1$, we infer from Lemma 2.14 that $\ell(\text{proj}_{R(P_0, P_1)} c_3, c_2) = 1$.
- (b) $\ell(\text{proj}_{R_2} c_3, c_2) = 1$: Then Lemma 2.2 implies similarly as in the previous case that $\ell(\text{proj}_{R(P_0, P_1)} c_3, c_2) = 1$.

As P_0 and P_1 are opposite in $R(P_0, P_1)$ and $\delta(c_3, d_0) = \delta(c_3, d_1)$, we deduce that $\ell(c_3, \text{proj}_{P_0} c_3) = \ell(c_3, c_2) < \ell(c_3, \text{proj}_{P_1} c_3)$ and $\ell(\text{proj}_{R(P_0, P_1)} c_3, \text{proj}_{P_1} c_3) \geq 2$ hold. Using Lemma 2.12, we deduce

$$\ell(w_{32}) = \ell(c_3, c_2) = \ell(c_3, \text{proj}_{P_0} c_3) < \ell(c_3, \text{proj}_{P_1} c_3) = \ell(c_3, c_1) = \ell(w_{31}).$$

But this is a contradiction to the assumption $\ell(c_3, c_2) \geq \ell(c_3, c_1)$. \square

5. GROUPS OF KAC-MOODY TYPE

Twin buildings. Let $\Delta_+ = (\mathcal{C}_+, \delta_+)$ and $\Delta_- = (\mathcal{C}_-, \delta_-)$ be two buildings of the same type (W, S) . A *codistance* (or *twinning*) between Δ_+ and Δ_- is a mapping $\delta_* : (\mathcal{C}_+ \times \mathcal{C}_-) \cup (\mathcal{C}_- \times \mathcal{C}_+) \rightarrow W$ satisfying the following axioms, where $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$, $x \in \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$, $y \in \mathcal{C}_{-\varepsilon}$ and $w = \delta_*(x, y)$:

$$(Tw1) \quad \delta_*(y, x) = w^{-1};$$

$$(Tw2) \quad \text{if } z \in \mathcal{C}_{-\varepsilon} \text{ is such that } s := \delta_{-\varepsilon}(y, z) \in S \text{ and } \ell(ws) = \ell(w) - 1, \text{ then} \\ \delta_*(x, z) = ws;$$

$$(Tw3) \quad \text{if } s \in S, \text{ there exists } z \in \mathcal{C}_{-\varepsilon} \text{ such that } \delta_{-\varepsilon}(y, z) = s \text{ and } \delta_*(x, z) = ws.$$

A *twin building of type* (W, S) is a triple $\Delta = (\Delta_+, \Delta_-, \delta_*)$, where $\Delta_+ = (\mathcal{C}_+, \delta_+)$ and $\Delta_- = (\mathcal{C}_-, \delta_-)$ are buildings of type (W, S) and where δ_* is a twinning between Δ_+ and Δ_- . Two chambers $c_+ \in \mathcal{C}_+$ and $c_- \in \mathcal{C}_-$ are called *opposite* if $\delta_*(c_+, c_-) = 1_W$. The twin building is called *thick*, if Δ_+ and Δ_- are thick. A *panel/residue* of a twin building is a panel/residue of one of its two buildings. Two residues R of Δ_+ and T of Δ_- are called *opposite* if they have the same type and if there exists $r \in R$ and $t \in T$ which are opposite.

Let $\Sigma_+ \subseteq \mathcal{C}_+$ and $\Sigma_- \subseteq \mathcal{C}_-$ be apartments of Δ_+ and Δ_- , respectively. Then the set $\Sigma := \Sigma_+ \cup \Sigma_-$ is called a *twin apartment* if for all $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$ and $x \in \Sigma_\varepsilon$ there exists exactly one $y \in \Sigma_{-\varepsilon}$ with $\delta_*(x, y) = 1_W$. Moreover, for any $c_+ \in \mathcal{C}_+$ and $c_- \in \mathcal{C}_-$ with $\delta_*(c_+, c_-) = 1_W$ there exists a unique twin apartment containing c_+ and c_- (cf. [AB08, Proposition 5.179(1)]). We denote this unique twin apartment by $\Sigma(c_+, c_-)$. An *automorphism* of Δ is a bijection $\varphi : \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_- \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_+ \cup \mathcal{C}_-$ which preserves the sign, the distances δ_+ and δ_- and the codistance δ_* .

Let $\Delta = (\Delta_+, \Delta_-, \delta_*)$ be a twin building of type (W, S) . A *twin root* of Δ is the convex hull of a pair of chambers at codistance 1, i.e. a pair $\{x, y\}$ such that $\delta_*(x, y) \in S$. For more information we refer to [AB08, Section 5.8.5]. A twin root can be seen as the union of two roots $\alpha_+ \cup \alpha_-$, where $\alpha_\varepsilon \subseteq \Sigma_\varepsilon$ is a root in an apartment Σ_ε for $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$ and $\Sigma_+ \cup \Sigma_-$ is a twin apartment. Moreover, if we fix a twin apartment Σ , then the set of twin roots in Σ is in one-to-one correspondence with the set of roots in one half of the twin apartment. Let Σ be any twin apartment and let R be a spherical residue with $\Sigma \cap R \neq \emptyset$. Then we denote by Φ^Σ the set of all twin roots of Σ and we let $\Phi^\Sigma(R)$ be the set of all twin roots $\beta \in \Phi^\Sigma$ such that $R \cap \beta$ and $R \cap (-\beta)$ are both non-empty.

Root group data. An *RGD-system of type* (W, S) is a pair $\mathcal{D} = (G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$ consisting of a group G together with a family of subgroups U_α (called *root groups*) indexed by the set of roots Φ , which satisfies the following axioms, where $H := \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Phi} N_G(U_\alpha)$ and $U_\varepsilon := \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi_\varepsilon \rangle$ for $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$:

(RGD0) For each $\alpha \in \Phi$, we have $U_\alpha \neq \{1\}$.

- (RGD1) For each prenilpotent pair $\{\alpha, \beta\} \subseteq \Phi$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$, the commutator group $\langle U_\alpha, U_\beta \rangle$ is contained in the group $U_{(\alpha, \beta)} := \langle U_\gamma \mid \gamma \in (\alpha, \beta) \rangle$.
- (RGD2) For each $s \in S$ and each $u \in U_{\alpha_s} \setminus \{1\}$, there exist $u', u'' \in U_{-\alpha_s}$ such that the product $m(u) := u'uu''$ conjugates U_β onto $U_{s\beta}$ for each $\beta \in \Phi$.
- (RGD3) For each $s \in S$, the group $U_{-\alpha_s}$ is not contained in U_+ .
- (RGD4) $G = H \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi \rangle$.

It is well-known that \mathcal{D} acts on a twin building, which is denoted by $\Delta(\mathcal{D})$ (cf. [AB08, Section 8.9]). This twin building is a so-called *Moufang twin building* (cf. [AB08, Section 8.3]). There is a distinguished pair of opposite chambers in $\Delta(\mathcal{D})$ corresponding to $B_\varepsilon := HU_\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$. We refer to this pair as the *fundamental pair of opposite chambers* and we refer to the unique twin apartment containing these two chambers as the *fundamental twin apartment*.

Two results about Moufang buildings. For more information about *Moufang buildings* we refer to [AB08, Section 7.3].

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ be a Moufang building of rank 2 and of irreducible and spherical type. Let Σ be an apartment and let $c_+, c_- \in \Sigma$ be the two fundamental opposite chambers. Let $(U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi^\Sigma}$ be the family of corresponding root groups. For $s \in S$ we let Q_s be a panel with $\langle U_{\alpha_s} \cup U_{-\alpha_s} \rangle \leq \text{Stab}(Q_s)$. Then we have $Q_s \neq Q_t$.*

In particular, if Q_s and Q_t are parallel, then Q_s and Q_t are opposite.

Proof. We assume by contrary that $Q_s = Q_t$. As $\mathcal{P}_s(c_+)$ is not stabilized by $U_{-\alpha_t}$, we deduce that $Q_s = Q_t$ is different from $\mathcal{P}_s(c_+)$. As Q_s and $\mathcal{P}_s(c_+)$ are parallel by Lemma 2.15, they are opposite by [DMVM12, Lemma 18]. Similarly, Q_t and $\mathcal{P}_t(c_+)$ are opposite. But then $Q_s = Q_t$ would be opposite to $\mathcal{P}_s(c_+)$ and to $\mathcal{P}_t(c_+)$, which is a contradiction. Thus we have $Q_s \neq Q_t$. Now if Q_s and Q_t are parallel, it follows from [DMVM12, Lemma 18] that Q_s and Q_t are opposite. \square

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\Delta = (\mathcal{C}, \delta)$ be a Moufang building of rank 2 and of irreducible and spherical type. Assume that all panels contain exactly three chambers. Let Σ be an apartment and let $c_+, c_- \in \Sigma$ be the two fundamental opposite chambers. Let $(U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi^\Sigma}$ be the family of corresponding root groups. Then we have*

$$\{c \in \mathcal{C} \mid \forall s \in S \exists s' \in S : \langle U_{\alpha_s} \cup U_{-\alpha_s} \rangle \leq \text{Stab}(\mathcal{P}_{s'}(c))\} = \{c_+, c_-\}.$$

Proof. One inclusion is obvious. For the other we let $c_+ \neq d \in \mathcal{C}$ be a chamber such that for each $s \in S$ there exists $s' \in S$ with $\langle U_{\alpha_s} \cup U_{-\alpha_s} \rangle \leq \text{Stab}(\mathcal{P}_{s'}(d))$. Note that $s' \neq t'$ for $S = \{s, t\}$ by the previous lemma.

Claim 1: $\mathcal{P}_r(c_+) \neq \mathcal{P}_{r'}(d) \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r(c_+)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{r'}(d)$ are opposite.

As both panels are stabilized by $\langle U_{\alpha_r} \cup U_{-\alpha_r} \rangle$ and no chamber in $\mathcal{P}_r(c_+)$ is fixed by $\langle U_{\alpha_r} \cup U_{-\alpha_r} \rangle$, Lemma 2.15(a) yields that the panels $\mathcal{P}_r(c_+)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{r'}(d)$ are parallel. Now [DMVM12, Lemma 18] implies that $\mathcal{P}_r(c_+)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{r'}(d)$ are opposite.

Claim 2: c_+ and d are opposite.

We first assume $\mathcal{P}_s(c_+) = \mathcal{P}_s(d)$ for some $s \in S$. As $U_{-\alpha_t}$ does not stabilize $\mathcal{P}_s(c_+)$, we infer $s = s', t = t'$ and $\langle U_{\alpha_t} \cup U_{-\alpha_t} \rangle \leq \text{Stab}(\mathcal{P}_t(d))$ for $S = \{s, t\}$. As $c_+ \neq d$, we infer $\mathcal{P}_t(c_+) \neq \mathcal{P}_t(d)$. Now Claim 1 implies $\delta(c_+, d) \in \{rst, r_s\}$. This is a contradiction to $\mathcal{P}_s(c_+) = \mathcal{P}_s(d)$. Thus we have $\mathcal{P}_s(c_+) \neq \mathcal{P}_s(d)$ for all $s \in S$. In particular, we have $\mathcal{P}_r(c_+) \neq \mathcal{P}_{r'}(d)$ for all $r \in S$ and Claim 1 yields $\delta(c_+, d) \in \{r_s s', r_s\} \cap \{r_s t', r_s\} = \{r_s\}$. Hence c_+ and d are opposite.

Now there exists $g \in U_+$ with $g.c_- = d$ (cf. [AB08, Corollary 7.67]). Let $r \in S$ and suppose $r'' \in S$ with $\langle U_{\alpha_r} \cup U_{-\alpha_r} \rangle \leq \text{Stab}(\mathcal{P}_{r''}(c_-))$. Then the subgroup $\langle U_{\alpha_r} \cup U_{-\alpha_r} \rangle$ stabilizes $\mathcal{P}_{r'}(d)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{r''}(c_-)$. If $m_{st} = 3$, then $r \neq r'$ and $r \neq r''$, which implies $r' = r''$. If $m_{st} \neq 3$, then $r' = r = r''$. We infer that $r' = r''$ in any case. We deduce $[g, U_{\pm\alpha_r}].\mathcal{P}_{r'}(c_-) = \mathcal{P}_{r'}(c_-)$. Note that $[g, U_{\alpha_r}] \in N_r := \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi_+ \setminus \{\alpha_r\} \rangle$. As no non-trivial element of N_r stabilizes $\mathcal{P}_r(c_-)$, we deduce $[g, U_{\alpha_r}] = 1$. We distinguish the following cases:

- $m_{st} = 3$ As $\langle U_{\alpha_r} \cup U_{-\alpha_r} \rangle$ stabilizes $\mathcal{P}_{r'}(d)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{r''}(c_-)$, they are parallel by Lemma 2.15. As $r' = r''$, they cannot be opposite and [DMVM12, Lemma 18] implies $\mathcal{P}_{r'}(d) = \mathcal{P}_{r''}(c_-)$. As this holds for all $r \in S$, we conclude $d = c_-$.
- $m_{st} = 4$ As $[g, U_{\alpha_r}] = 1$ holds for both $r \in S$, we deduce from the commutator relations that $g \in U_{t\alpha_s}U_{s\alpha_t}$. Now $[g, U_{-\alpha_r}] \in N_r$ as before and hence $[g, U_{-\alpha_r}] = 1$. We obtain $g = 1$ and hence $d = g.c_- = c_-$.
- $m_{st} = 6$ Now we use the notation from [TW02]. As $[g, U_{\alpha_6}] = 1$, we deduce from the commutator relations that $g \in U_3 \cdots U_6$. As $[g, U_{\alpha_1}] = 1$, we deduce that $g \in U_1 U_2 U_4$. By [TW02, 5.6] the expression is unique and hence $g \in U_4$. As before, we deduce $[g, U_{-\alpha_6}] = 1$. But then $[u_4, u_{-6}] = [u_2, u_6] = u_4 \neq 1$. This implies $g = 1$ and hence $d = g.c_- = c_-$. \square

Maximal finite subgroups. By a *maximal finite subgroup* $U \leq G$ of a group G we mean a finite subgroup which is not properly contained in any other finite subgroup of G .

Theorem 5.3. *Suppose that (W, S) is 2-complete of rank ≥ 3 . Let $\mathcal{D} = (G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$ be an RGD-system of type (W, S) such that all root groups are finite and such that $H := \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Phi} N_G(U_\alpha)$ is finite. Let $\Delta(\mathcal{D}) = (\Delta_+, \Delta_-, \delta_*)$ be the twin building associated with \mathcal{D} .*

- (a) *Let $M \leq G$ be a maximal finite subgroup. Then for $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$ there exists a unique spherical residue R_ε of Δ_ε which is stabilized by M . The residues R_+ and R_- are maximal spherical, and opposite in $\Delta(\mathcal{D})$. In particular, we have $M = \text{Stab}_G(R_+) \cap \text{Stab}_G(R_-)$.*
- (b) *Let $R_+ \subseteq \Delta_+$ and $R_- \subseteq \Delta_-$ be maximal spherical residues which are opposite. Then $M := \text{Stab}_G(R_+) \cap \text{Stab}_G(R_-)$ is a maximal finite subgroup.*

Proof. This follows from [CM06, Corollary 3.8, Theorem 4.1, Proposition 4.2]. \square

Let $\mathcal{D} = (G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$ be an RGD-system of type (W, S) . Let Σ be a twin apartment of $\Delta(\mathcal{D})$ and let R be a spherical residue of $\Delta(\mathcal{D})$ with $\Sigma \cap R \neq \emptyset$. Then we define

$$L^\Sigma(R) := \text{Fix}_G(\Sigma). \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi^\Sigma(R) \rangle.$$

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\mathcal{D} = (G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$ be an RGD-system of type (W, S) and let $\Delta(\mathcal{D}) = (\Delta_+, \Delta_-, \delta_*)$ be the associated twin building. Let $R_+ \subseteq \Delta_+$ and $R_- \subseteq \Delta_-$ be opposite spherical residues and let Σ be a twin apartment with $\Sigma \cap R_+ \neq \emptyset \neq \Sigma \cap R_-$. Then we have*

$$L^\Sigma(R_+) = \text{Stab}_G(R_+) \cap \text{Stab}_G(R_-).$$

Proof. One inclusion is obvious. For the other we let $g \in \text{Stab}_G(R_+) \cap \text{Stab}_G(R_-)$. Note that with the restriction of the codistance, (R_+, R_-, δ_*) is a Moufang twin building and $\langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi^\Sigma(R_+) \rangle$ acts strongly transitively on (R_+, R_-, δ_*) by [AB08, Proposition 8.19]. But this implies that there exists $h \in \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi^\Sigma(R_+) \rangle$ with $gh \in \text{Fix}_G(\Sigma)$. This finishes the proof. \square

Isomorphisms of (irreducible) RGD-systems.

Definition 5.5. Suppose that (W, S) and (W', S') are irreducible Coxeter systems of finite rank. Let $\mathcal{D} = (G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$ be an RGD-system of type (W, S) and let $\mathcal{D}' = (G', (U'_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi'})$ be an RGD-system of type (W', S') . Then \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' are called *isomorphic* if there exist an isomorphism $\varphi : G \rightarrow G'$, an isomorphism $\pi : W \rightarrow W'$ with $\pi(S) = S'$, an element $x \in G'$ and a sign $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$ such that

$$\varphi(U_\alpha) = xU'_{\varepsilon\pi(\alpha)}x^{-1}$$

for each $\alpha \in \Phi$. If φ is as above, then we say that φ *induces an isomorphism* of \mathcal{D} to \mathcal{D}' .

Theorem 5.6. Let $\mathcal{D} = (G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$ be an RGD-system of irreducible type (W, S) and let $\mathcal{D}' = (G', (U'_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi'})$ be an RGD-system of irreducible type (W', S') . Suppose that S and S' are finite. If $\varphi : G \rightarrow G'$ is an isomorphism and if there exists $x \in G'$ with

$$\{\varphi(U_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \Phi(W, S)\} = \{xU'_\alpha x^{-1} \mid \alpha \in \Phi(W', S')\},$$

then φ induces an isomorphism of \mathcal{D} to \mathcal{D}' .

Proof. This is [CM05, Theorem 2.2]. □

Definition 5.7. Let $\mathcal{D} = (G, (U_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \Phi})$ be an RGD-system of type (W, S) . We define $G^{\mathcal{D}} := G$. We say that \mathcal{D} has *trivial torus* if $H = \bigcap_{\alpha \in \Phi} N_G(U_\alpha) = \{1\}$. Moreover, \mathcal{D} is called *centered* if $G = \langle U_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi \rangle$; it is called *over \mathbb{F}_2* if all root groups have cardinality 2.

Remark 5.8. Note that a centered RGD-system over \mathbb{F}_2 has trivial torus.

6. THE MAIN RESULT

In this section we will solve the isomorphism problem for RGD-systems over \mathbb{F}_2 . We will follow the strategy used in [CM06, Theorem 5.1].

Convention 6.1. In this section we let (W, S) and (W', S') be two 2-complete and \tilde{A}_2 -free Coxeter systems of finite rank at least 3, \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' be two centered RGD-systems over \mathbb{F}_2 of type (W, S) and (W', S') , respectively, and $\varphi : G^{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow G^{\mathcal{D}'}$ be an isomorphism. Then \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' have trivial tori.

We let Δ (resp. Δ') be the twin building associated with \mathcal{D} (resp. \mathcal{D}'). We denote the root groups of Δ by U_α and the root groups of Δ' by U'_α . Let Σ be the fundamental twin apartment of Δ and let $c_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{C}_\varepsilon$ be the fundamental pair of opposite chambers of Δ for $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$. For $s \neq t \in S$ we define $M_{st} := L^\Sigma(R_{\{s,t\}}(c_+)) = \langle U_{\pm\alpha_s} \cup U_{\pm\alpha_t} \rangle = \text{Stab}_{G^{\mathcal{D}}}(R_{\{s,t\}}(c_+)) \cap \text{Stab}_{G^{\mathcal{D}}}(R_{\{s,t\}}(c_-))$ (cf. Lemma 5.4).

Lemma 6.2. Let $s \neq t \in S$ and $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$. Then there exists a unique spherical residue $R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}$ of Δ'_ε which is stabilized by $\varphi(M_{st})$. Moreover, $R_+^{\{s,t\}}$ and $R_-^{\{s,t\}}$ are opposite and of rank 2, and $\varphi(M_{st}) = \text{Stab}_{G^{\mathcal{D}'}}(R_+^{\{s,t\}}) \cap \text{Stab}_{G^{\mathcal{D}'}}(R_-^{\{s,t\}})$.

Proof. M_{st} is a maximal finite subgroup by Theorem 5.3(b). Thus $\varphi(M_{st})$ is a maximal finite subgroup of $G^{\mathcal{D}'}$. By Theorem 5.3(a), there exist unique spherical residues $R_+^{\{s,t\}}$ of Δ'_+ and $R_-^{\{s,t\}}$ of Δ'_- which are stabilized by $\varphi(M_{st})$. In particular, $\varphi(M_{st}) = \text{Stab}_{G^{\mathcal{D}'}}(R_+^{\{s,t\}}) \cap \text{Stab}_{G^{\mathcal{D}'}}(R_-^{\{s,t\}})$ and the residues $R_+^{\{s,t\}}$ and $R_-^{\{s,t\}}$ are opposite in Δ' and maximal spherical, i.e. of rank 2. □

Lemma 6.3. For $r, s, t \in S$ pairwise distinct and $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$ we have $R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}} \neq R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}$.

Proof. Assume by contrary $R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}} = R_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$. As $R_{-\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}}$ is opposite to $R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}}$, they have the same type. In particular, $R_{-\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}}$ and $R_{-\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$ have the same type. Now there exists an element $g \in \text{Stab}_{G^{\mathcal{D}'}}(R_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}})$ with $g \cdot R_{-\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}} = R_{-\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$ (cf. [AB08, Corollary 8.32]). This implies $\varphi(M_{st}) = g\varphi(M_{rs})g^{-1}$ and hence $M_{st} = hM_{rs}h^{-1}$ for $h := \varphi^{-1}(g)$. But then we have $M_{st} \leq \text{Stab}_{G^{\mathcal{D}'}}(R_{\{s,t\}}(c_{\varepsilon})) \cap \text{Stab}_{G^{\mathcal{D}'}}(h \cdot R_{\{r,s\}}(c_{\varepsilon}))$, which is a contradiction to Theorem 5.3(a) (residues having different types are different). \square

Definition 6.4. Let $\Delta = (\Delta_+, \Delta_-, \delta_*)$ be a twin building of type (W, S) and let R and T be two opposite residues of type J . Then (R, T) is called a *twin residue*. It is a basic fact that a twin residue is again a twin building of type $(\langle J \rangle, J)$.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $s \neq t \in S$, $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$ and let $\{\bar{s}, \bar{t}\}$ be the type of $R_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$. Then there exists a twin apartment Σ'_{st} of Δ' meeting $R_+^{\{s,t\}}$ and $R_-^{\{s,t\}}$, and $\varepsilon_{st} \in \{+, -\}$ such that for $r \in \{s, t\}$ we have $\varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_r}) = U'_{\pm\varepsilon_{st}\alpha_r}$ and $\varepsilon_{st}\alpha_r \in \Phi^{\Sigma'_{st}}$.*

Proof. We define $M'_{st} := \varphi(M_{st})$. We restrict the action of M_{st} (resp. M'_{st}) to the twin residue $(R_{\{s,t\}}(c_+), R_{\{s,t\}}(c_-))$ (resp. $(R_+^{\{s,t\}}, R_-^{\{s,t\}})$). Now [AB08, Proposition 8.82(b)] implies that $Z(M_{st})$ coincides with the kernel of the action of M_{st} on the twin residue. The same is true for M'_{st} . As M_{st} is center-free (the torus is trivial), we infer that M_{st} is isomorphic to one of the following groups:

$$A_2(2), B_2(2), G_2(2).$$

Note that these groups are pairwise non-isomorphic (cf. [Stel16, Theorem 37]). Let $\Sigma_{st'}$ be a twin apartment which meets $R_+^{\{s,t\}}$ and $R_-^{\{s,t\}}$. Now [Stel16, Theorem 30] implies that $\varphi|_{M_{st}} : M_{st} \rightarrow M'_{st}$ induces an isomorphism from the RGD-system $(M_{st}, (U_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \Phi^{\Sigma}(R_{\{s,t\}}(c_+))})$ to the RGD-system $(M'_{st}, (U'_{\alpha})_{\alpha \in \Phi^{\Sigma'_{st}}(R_+^{\{s,t\}})})$. This means that there exists an isomorphism $\pi : \langle s, t \rangle \rightarrow \langle \bar{s}, \bar{t} \rangle$ with $\pi(\{s, t\}) = \{\bar{s}, \bar{t}\}$, an element $x \in M'_{st}$ and a sign $\varepsilon_{st} \in \{+, -\}$ such that

$$\varphi(U_{\alpha}) = xU'_{\varepsilon_{st}\pi(\alpha)}x^{-1}$$

where $\varepsilon_{st}\pi(\alpha) \in \Phi^{\Sigma'_{st}}$. After replacing Σ'_{st} by $x\Sigma'_{st}$, we can assume without loss of generality that $\varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_r}) = U'_{\pm\varepsilon_{st}\alpha_r}$, where $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$ and $r \in \{s, t\}$. \square

Lemma 6.6. *Let $r, s, t \in S$ be pairwise distinct and $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$. Then the set $\{R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}}, R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,t\}}, R_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}\}$ is a triangle.*

Proof. We abbreviate $P_s^r := \text{proj}_{R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}}} R_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$. Note that $\{\varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_s}), \varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_t})\}$ are root groups corresponding to simple roots and their opposites in the twin apartment Σ'_{st} . We deduce that $\varphi(\langle U_{\alpha_s} \cup U_{-\alpha_s} \rangle)$ stabilizes a panel $P_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$ contained in $R_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$ and, moreover, $\varphi(\langle U_{\alpha_s} \cup U_{-\alpha_s} \rangle)$ acts transitively on $P_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$. By Lemma 2.15(b) the residue $\text{proj}_{R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}}} P_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$ is a panel, which is itself stabilized by $\varphi(\langle U_{\alpha_s} \cup U_{-\alpha_s} \rangle)$. Note that P_s^r contains the panel $\text{proj}_{R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}}} P_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$. By Lemma 6.3 we have $R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}} \neq R_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$. Now Lemma 2.7(c) and Lemma 3.2(a) yield $P_s^r = \text{proj}_{R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}}} P_{\varepsilon}^{\{s,t\}}$ and (T1) holds. Note that P_r^s is a panel which is stabilized by $\varphi(\langle U_{\alpha_r} \cup U_{-\alpha_r} \rangle)$.

To show that (T2) holds, we assume by contrary that P_s^r and P_r^s are parallel. Then they are opposite in $R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,s\}}$ by Lemma 5.1. Note that P_s^t and P_r^s (resp. P_r^s and P_r^t) are parallel by Lemma 2.7(a). Using Lemma 2.11(a) and Lemma 2.13 we obtain that the concatenation of compatible paths from P_s^t to P_r^s and from P_r^s to P_r^t (or rather an extension by one panel in $R_{\varepsilon}^{\{r,t\}}$ as in Convention 4.6) is again a compatible

path. We deduce $P_r^t = \text{proj}_{R_\varepsilon^{\{r,t\}}} P_s^t \subseteq P_t^r$ which is a contradiction to the facts that P_t^r is a panel and $P_r^t \neq P_t^r$ by Lemma 5.1. Hence P_s^r and P_r^s are not parallel and $\{R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}}, R_\varepsilon^{\{r,t\}}, R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}\}$ is a triangle. \square

Lemma 6.7. *For $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$ we have $\bigcap_{x \neq y \in S} R_\varepsilon^{\{x,y\}} = \{d_\varepsilon\}$ for some chamber $d_\varepsilon \in \Delta'_\varepsilon$. Moreover, d_+ and d_- are opposite, $\Sigma(d_+, d_-) = \Sigma'_{st}$ and for all $s \neq t \in S$, and $\{\varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_s}), \varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_t})\}$ are the root groups corresponding to the simple roots and their opposites in $\Sigma(d_+, d_-)$.*

Proof. Let $r, s, t \in S$ be pairwise distinct. Then $\{R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}}, R_\varepsilon^{\{r,t\}}, R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}\}$ is a triangle by the previous lemma. Theorem 4.9 implies that $R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{r,t\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber, which we denote by d_ε . Suppose that $R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}$ is just a chamber. Then [AB08, Lemma 2.15] would imply that $\text{proj}_{R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}}} R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}$ is also just a chamber, which is a contradiction to the fact that $\text{proj}_{R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}}} R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}$ is a panel. This, together with Lemma 6.3, implies that $R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}$ is a panel, and it coincides with $\text{proj}_{R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}} R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}}$. Let $s' \in S'$ be such that $R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}} = \mathcal{P}_{s'}(d_\varepsilon)$ (similarly for r' and t'). Then $r', s', t' \in S'$ are pairwise distinct. Note that $\delta'_*(d_+, d_-) \in \langle s', t' \rangle$, as $R_+^{\{s,t\}}$ and $R_-^{\{s,t\}}$ are opposite and of type $\{s', t'\}$. Using [AB08, Exercise 2.26] we deduce

$$\delta'_*(d_+, d_-) \in \langle r', s' \rangle \cap \langle r', t' \rangle \cap \langle s', t' \rangle = \{1\}.$$

This implies that d_+ and d_- are opposite. As $\mathcal{P}_{s'}(d_\varepsilon) = \text{proj}_{R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}} R_\varepsilon^{\{r,s\}}$ is stabilized by $\varphi(\langle U_{\alpha_s} \cup U_{-\alpha_s} \rangle)$ (cf. proof of Lemma 6.6) and $\mathcal{P}_{t'}(d_\varepsilon) = \text{proj}_{R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}}} R_\varepsilon^{\{r,t\}}$ is stabilized by $\varphi(\langle U_{\alpha_t} \cup U_{-\alpha_t} \rangle)$, it follows from Lemma 5.2 that $d_+, d_- \in \Sigma'_{st}$ for all $s \neq t \in S$ and, hence, $\Sigma'_{st} = \Sigma(d_+, d_-)$. Moreover, $\{\varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_s}), \varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_t})\}$ are the root groups corresponding to the simple roots and their opposites in $\Sigma(d_+, d_-)$, i.e. there exists $\varepsilon_{st} \in \{+, -\}$ and a bijection $\pi : \langle s, t \rangle \rightarrow \langle s', t' \rangle$ with $\pi(\{s, t\}) = \{s', t'\}$ such that $\varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_r}) = U'_{\pm\varepsilon_{st}\alpha_{\pi(r)}}$ for $r \in \{s, t\}$ where $\pm\varepsilon_{st}\alpha_{\pi(r)} \in \Phi^{\Sigma(d_+, d_-)}$.

Claim: *If $a, b, c, d \in S$ are pairwise distinct with $R_\varepsilon^{\{a,b\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{a,c\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{b,c\}} = \{d_\varepsilon\}$, then $d_\varepsilon \in R_\varepsilon^{\{c,d\}}$.*

As before, $R_\varepsilon^{\{b,c\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{b,d\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{c,d\}}$ is non-empty and contains a unique chamber, which we denote by d'_ε . Note that $R_\varepsilon^{\{a,b\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{a,d\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{b,d\}} \neq \emptyset$. Assume $d'_\varepsilon \neq d_\varepsilon$. Then, by Lemma 5.2, we know that d'_ε and d_ε are opposite in $R_\varepsilon^{\{b,c\}}$. If $\ell(c_{bd}, c_{ab}) \geq 2$ for all $c_{bd} \in R_\varepsilon^{\{b,d\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{b,c\}}$ and $c_{ab} \in R_\varepsilon^{\{a,b\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{b,c\}}$, then it follows from Lemma 2.2 that $R_\varepsilon^{\{a,b\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{b,d\}} = \emptyset$ which is a contradiction. Thus we can assume that there exist $c_{bd} \in R_\varepsilon^{\{b,d\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{b,c\}}$ and $c_{ab} \in R_\varepsilon^{\{a,b\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{b,c\}}$ with $\ell(c_{bd}, c_{ab}) = 1$. We deduce $\delta'_\varepsilon(c_{bd}, c_{ab}) = c'$. Let $e \in R_\varepsilon^{\{a,b\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{a,d\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{b,d\}}$. Then we have $\delta'_\varepsilon(e, c_{bd}) \in \langle b', d' \rangle$ and $\delta'_\varepsilon(e, c_{ab}) \in \langle a', b' \rangle$. In particular, we have $c' = \delta'_\varepsilon(c_{bd}, c_{ab}) \in \langle a', b', d' \rangle$ and [AB08, Exercise 2.26] implies $c' \in \{a', b', d'\}$. As a', b', c' as well as b', c', d' are pairwise distinct, we obtain a contradiction.

Now we are in the position to prove the claim. Let $u \neq v \in S$. Note that it suffices to show $d_\varepsilon \in R_\varepsilon^{\{u,v\}}$. For $u, v \in \{r, s, t\}$ there is nothing to show. Thus we can assume without loss of generality that $v \notin \{r, s, t\}$. If $u \in \{r, s, t\}$, then $d_\varepsilon \in R_\varepsilon^{\{u,v\}}$ follows from the claim and we can assume $u, v \notin \{r, s, t\}$. The claim applied to r, s, t, u implies $R_\varepsilon^{\{u,s\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{u,t\}} \cap R_\varepsilon^{\{s,t\}} = \{d_\varepsilon\}$. Applying the claim now to s, t, u, v , we infer $d_\varepsilon \in R_\varepsilon^{\{u,v\}}$. \square

Theorem 6.8. *φ induces an isomorphism between the RGD-systems \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{D}' .*

Proof. Recall from the proof of the previous lemma that for all $s \neq t \in S$ there exists an isomorphism $\pi_{st} : \langle s, t \rangle \rightarrow \langle s', t' \rangle$ with $\pi(\{s, t\}) = \{s', t'\}$ and $\varepsilon_{st} \in \{+, -\}$ such that $\varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_s}) = U'_{\pm\varepsilon_{st}\alpha_{\pi_{st}(s)}}$ and $\varphi(U_{\pm\alpha_t}) = U'_{\pm\varepsilon_{st}\alpha_{\pi_{st}(t)}}$ where $\pm\varepsilon_{st}\alpha_{\pi_{st}(s)}, \pm\varepsilon_{st}\alpha_{\pi_{st}(t)} \in \Phi^{\Sigma(d_+, d_-)}$.

Let $a, b, c, d \in S$. We first see that $\varepsilon_{ab} = \varepsilon_{ac}$ for all $a, b, c \in S$ pairwise distinct. Now it follows directly, that $\varepsilon_{ab} = \varepsilon_{ac} = \varepsilon_{cd}$. We define $\varepsilon := \varepsilon_{st}$ for some $s \neq t \in S$. Note that π_{st} extends to an isomorphism $\pi : W \rightarrow W'$ with $\pi(S) = S'$.

Claim: We have $\{\varphi(U_\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \Phi^\Sigma\} = \{U'_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi^{\Sigma(d_+, d_-)}\}$.

Note that for each $u \in U_{\pm\alpha_s}$ with $u \neq 1$ there are unique elements $u', u'' \in U_{\mp\alpha_s}$ such that $m(u) = u'uu''$ conjugates U_β onto $U_{s\beta}$ for each $\beta \in \Phi$. This implies

$$U'_{-\varepsilon\alpha_{\pi(s)}} = \varphi(U_{-\alpha_s}) = \varphi(m(u)^{-1}U_{\alpha_s}m(u)) = \varphi(m(u))^{-1}U'_{\varepsilon\alpha_{\pi(s)}}\varphi(m(u)).$$

We infer $\varphi(m(u)) = m(\varphi(u))$. Let $\alpha \in \Phi$ with $\alpha = s_1 \cdots s_k \alpha_s$ for some $s_1, \dots, s_k, s \in S$, then φ maps $U_\alpha = U_{\alpha_s}^{m(u_k) \cdots m(u_1)}$ to $(U'_{\varepsilon\alpha_{\pi(s)}})^{m(\varphi(u_k)) \cdots m(\varphi(u_1))} = U_{\varepsilon\pi(s_1) \cdots \pi(s_k)\alpha_{\pi(s)}}$.

Let Σ' be the fundamental twin apartment of Δ' . As $G^{\mathcal{D}'}$ acts strongly transitively on Δ' , there exists $x \in G^{\mathcal{D}'}$ with $\{U'_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Phi^{\Sigma(d_+, d_-)}\} = \{xU'_\alpha x^{-1} \mid \alpha \in \Phi^{\Sigma'}\}$. Now the claim follows from the claim together with Theorem 5.6. \square

REFERENCES

- [AB08] Peter Abramenko and Kenneth S. Brown, *Buildings*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 248, Springer, New York, 2008, Theory and applications. MR 2439729
- [Bis22] Sebastian Bischof, *On commutator relations in 2-spherical RGD-systems*, Comm. Algebra **50** (2022), no. 2, 751–769. MR 4375537
- [Bis23] ———, *Construction of RGD-systems of type (4, 4, 4) over \mathbb{F}_2* , PhD thesis, Justus-Liebig-Universität Giessen, 2023.
- [Bis24a] Sebastian Bischof, *Construction of Commutator Blueprints*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.15506>, 2024.
- [Bis24b] ———, *On Growth Functions of Coxeter Groups*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.10617>, 2024.
- [BM23] Sebastian Bischof and Bernhard Mühlherr, *Isometries of wall-connected twin buildings*, Advances in Geometry **23** (2023), no. 3, 371–388.
- [Bou02] Nicolas Bourbaki, *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 4–6*, Elements of Mathematics (Berlin), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002, Translated from the 1968 French original by Andrew Pressley. MR 1890629
- [Cap07] Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace, *On 2-spherical Kac-Moody groups and their central extensions*, Forum Math. **19** (2007), no. 5, 763–781. MR 2350773
- [Cap09] ———, *“Abstract” homomorphisms of split Kac-Moody groups*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **198** (2009), no. 924, xvi+84. MR 2499773
- [CM05] Pierre-Emmanuel Caprace and Bernhard Mühlherr, *Isomorphisms of Kac-Moody groups*, Invent. Math. **161** (2005), no. 2, 361–388. MR 2180452
- [CM06] ———, *Isomorphisms of Kac-Moody groups which preserve bounded subgroups*, Adv. Math. **206** (2006), no. 1, 250–278. MR 2261755
- [DMVM12] Alice Devillers, Bernhard Mühlherr, and Hendrik Van Maldeghem, *Codistances of 3-spherical buildings*, Math. Ann. **354** (2012), no. 1, 297–329. MR 2957628
- [Fel98] A. A. Felikson, *Coxeter decompositions of hyperbolic polygons*, European J. Combin. **19** (1998), no. 7, 801–817. MR 1649962
- [KP87] Victor G. Kac and Dale H. Peterson, *On geometric invariant theory for infinite-dimensional groups*, Algebraic groups Utrecht 1986, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1271, Springer, Berlin, 1987, pp. 109–142. MR 911137
- [MPW15] Bernhard Mühlherr, Holger P. Petersson, and Richard M. Weiss, *Descent in buildings*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 190, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2015. MR 3364836

- [Ste16] Robert Steinberg, *Lectures on Chevalley groups*, corrected ed., University Lecture Series, vol. 66, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2016, Notes prepared by John Faulkner and Robert Wilson, With a foreword by Robert R. Snapp. MR 3616493
- [TW02] Jacques Tits and Richard M. Weiss, *Moufang polygons*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002. MR 1938841