

THE GALAXY OF COXETER GROUPS

YURI SANTOS REGO AND PETRA SCHWER

ABSTRACT. In this paper we introduce the galaxy of Coxeter groups – an infinite dimensional, locally finite, ranked simplicial complex which captures isomorphisms between Coxeter systems. In doing so, we would like to suggest a new framework to study the isomorphism problem for Coxeter groups. We prove some structural results about this space, provide a full characterization in small ranks and propose many questions. In addition we survey known tools, results and conjectures.

Along the way we show profinite rigidity of triangle Coxeter groups – a result which is possibly of independent interest.

*We dedicate this paper to the memory of Jacques Tits for his influential work on Coxeter groups. It was him who, as an honorary Bourbaki, coined the terms Coxeter group and Coxeter diagram.*¹

1. INTRODUCTION

The universe of finitely generated groups is pretty wild. Even distinguishing two of its groups algorithmically is a hopeless task since Dehn’s isomorphism problem is undecidable by work of Novikov [Nov55]. On the other hand, the region containing Coxeter groups is fairly well explored by group theorists and it is expected that an algorithm should exist that tells two given Coxeter groups apart.

In this paper we introduce the *Coxeter galaxy* – a simplicial complex which encodes Coxeter systems and non-type preserving isomorphisms between the underlying Coxeter groups. This space provides a framework to study the isomorphism problem in the class of Coxeter groups as well as related more refined questions.

To be a little more precise, the Coxeter galaxy is the flag simplicial complex \mathcal{G} whose vertices are (graph-isomorphism classes of) Coxeter systems, two of which are connected if their underlying Coxeter groups are isomorphic as abstract groups. Solving the isomorphism problem amounts to algorithmically being able to determine the connected components of the galaxy. This approach may a priori seem to be just packaging. However, it makes the isomorphism problem more tractable, yields some obvious refinements and partial versions of the isomorphism problem and allows to naturally formulate related questions.

1.1. Structure of the galaxy. The Coxeter galaxy is automatically organized into horizontal layers \mathcal{G}_k containing all Coxeter systems of rank k ; see Definition 3.3. Its connected components typically span over several layers as distinct Coxeter systems for a given group may have different ranks. The subcomplex spanned by Coxeter systems of rank at most k is denoted by $\mathcal{G}_{\leq k}$. A solution to the isomorphism problem for (finitely generated) Coxeter groups is then equivalent to a solution for all ‘height- k restricted isomorphism

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20F55.

Key words and phrases. Coxeter groups, Isomorphism problem, diagram twist, pseudo transposition, profinite rigidity.

¹See: S. Roberts, “Donald Coxeter: The man who saved geometry”, 2003. [Rob03]

problems', i.e., for all $\mathcal{G}_{\leq k}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Clearly, a full description of connected components of the galaxy would yield a complete classification of isomorphic Coxeter groups admitting nonisomorphic Coxeter systems.

In this paper we address multiple questions about the general structure of the Coxeter galaxy. As a consequence of results in the literature, we show that the Coxeter galaxy is locally finite, with finite dimensional connected components; see Section 4.2 and Theorem 4.18. We also identify some useful subspaces, such as arbitrarily large 'clusters of (irreducible) little stars' (Lemma 4.13) or the *vertical core* of the galaxy (Definition 3.6). The vertical core is a subcomplex obtained by deleting certain vertical edges of the galaxy. We prove that it has the same connected components as \mathcal{G} (Proposition 4.22). Both the galaxy and the vertical core are disconnected, infinite dimensional simplicial complexes, (Corollary 4.14). It would be interesting to know whether the vertical core is a deformation retract of the galaxy. We summarize our main structural findings in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.1 (Structure of the Coxeter galaxy \mathcal{G}).

- (i) *The galaxy \mathcal{G} is a locally finite, infinite dimensional simplicial complex with finite connected components, all of which are simplices. (See Theorem 4.18 and Corollary 4.14.)*
- (ii) *Solving the isomorphism problem reduces to algorithmically computing (a spine of) the vertical core. (See Proposition 4.22.)*
- (iii) *The subcomplex $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$ is a 1-dimensional complex and equal to its vertical core. In particular, the isomorphism problem is solvable for groups in this subcomplex. (See Corollary 4.27 and 4.28.)*

Many questions, such as 4.20 about the growth rate of the dimensions of each layer, are posed throughout the text. See, for example, Questions 3.11, 3.12, 4.16 and 5.11.

1.2. Layers and profinite rigidity. The last item in Theorem 1.1 uses profinite techniques. We paint a complete picture of the first few layers $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$ of the galaxy in Section 4.3 by showing that Coxeter groups in $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$ are profinitely rigid within that family. This extends results of Bridson–Conder–Reid [BCR16, Section 8]. We summarize Theorems 4.24 and 4.26 as Theorem 1.2 below.

Theorem 1.2 (Profinite rigidity in rank ≤ 3).

Coxeter groups with diagrams in $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$ are profinitely rigid within this class. Two such groups are isomorphic if and only if their profinite completions agree. Moreover, isomorphism of triangle groups can be decided by comparing the multisets of edge labels of their defining complete Coxeter graphs.

As a consequence, we obtain a new proof that the 'height-3 restricted isomorphism problem' is decidable, see item (iii) of Theorem 1.1. We expect the idea of using finite quotients (besides finite subgroups) to distinguish Coxeter groups will lead to further developments.

1.3. Navigating the galaxy. The classical approach to the isomorphism problem aims to reduce the problem to a specific subclass of Coxeter groups (e.g. angle- or reflection compatible Coxeter groups) and to finding explicit moves between such systems. These moves often amount to explicit manipulations of the underlying defining diagram and correspond to edges in the Coxeter galaxy. Finding all such moves is an interesting problem on its own which we posed as Question 5.11. This reachability problem immediately raises two related questions. The first can be viewed as an 'edge coloring problem' for the galaxy, where colors correspond to the types of moves that yield a certain edge.

Question 1.3 (Coloring problem). *Suppose Question 5.11 is solvable. Can the algorithm also output which kinds of edges appear in a path between vertices of the galaxy? In a similar vein, can we classify which types of moves (i.e., maps between Coxeter generating sets) transform a complete Coxeter graph into another without changing the underlying Coxeter group?*

This question has been (implicitly) asked multiple times in the literature, and has been answered positively in some cases. For instance, known results e.g., by Mihalik, Ratcliffe, and Tschantz [MRT07; MR09], imply that the so-called blow-ups along pseudo-transpositions suffice to vertically navigate the galaxy; see Corollary 4.6 and Theorem 4.9. In particular, each vertical edge decomposes as a sequence of vertical edges, corresponding to blow ups, between adjacent layers. Hence blow ups and downs can be thought of as vertical atomic moves. The corresponding horizontal question is still open.

Question 1.4 (Atomic horizontal moves). *Is it possible to determine all existing kinds of horizontal moves? Does there exist a finite list of atomic moves such that every move decomposes as a concatenation of those?*

The current state of the art revolves around developments related to Mühlherr’s twist conjecture; cf. Conjecture 5.13. See, for example, [Bra+02; Müh06; CM07; RT08; CP10; Wei11; Nui14; HP18]. Section 5 contains an in-depth discussion of this conjecture along with illustrations of other known horizontal moves. Since the Coxeter galaxy is locally finite, though, we ask whether there is an upper bound on the total number of possible moves between Coxeter systems.

1.4. Some comments on methods and proofs. Most of the present work draws from multiple sources. We attempted a thorough overview of the literature in Section 5, but also throughout the body of the work while translating some of the known results into our language.

The motivating problem for our work is to paint a complete picture of Coxeter systems that have isomorphic underlying groups. Obviously, some complexity reductions towards such an algorithm might be very useful. There are some known reduction steps in the literature that motivate the study of groups with certain restrictions on their Coxeter generating sets, such as reflection- or angle-compatibility; cf. Section 5.2. However, since the main reason for introducing our framework is to give a complete picture of all Coxeter systems (and how to navigate between them), we intentionally avoid such reductions, or aim at translating some reductions into our language with explicit arguments. As a byproduct, all results proved here either use new methods (for instance those in Section 4.3) or employ results whose proof techniques are independent of developments around the twist conjecture, e.g. Corollary 4.6. We make no use of automorphisms of Coxeter groups.

1.5. Organization of the paper. Notation is set and some basic results are recalled in Section 2. The Coxeter galaxy \mathcal{G} and its vertical core \mathcal{G}^{VC} are defined in Section 3.1 with reformulations of the isomorphism problem in Section 3.2. Section 4 is devoted to collecting results on vertical moves in Section 4.1 and proving structural results about the Coxeter galaxy, such as local finiteness and properties of useful subcomplexes in Section 4.2. In Section 4.3 we give a full description of the galaxy in smaller ranks along with results on profinite rigidity of Coxeter groups. The final Section 5 is an exposition on the known horizontal moves between Coxeter systems (see Section 5.1), with focus on the twist conjecture in Section 5.2. We also discuss some reductions of the isomorphism problem in Section 5.3 and summarize other known results in Section 5.4.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In order to fix notation and to avoid ambiguity we recall basic definitions and results around Coxeter groups in this section. Feel free to skip and refer back to it later if you prefer to start the galactic journey right away.

Definition 2.1 (Coxeter matrix). A *Coxeter matrix* M_S for a given finite set S is a symmetric $|S| \times |S|$ -matrix whose entries $m_{s,t}$, with $s, t \in S$, satisfy the following conditions: all diagonal entries $m_{s,s}$ equal 1 and all off-diagonal entries belong to $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 2} \cup \{\infty\}$.

Definition 2.2 (Coxeter groups and systems). A *Coxeter system* consists of a triple (W, S, M_S) where W is a group, $S \subset W$ is a generating set and M_S is a Coxeter matrix for S for which W admits a presentation of the following form:

$$W \cong \langle s \in S \mid (st)^{m_{s,t}} \text{ for every pair } s, t \in S \text{ with } m_{s,t} \neq \infty \rangle.$$

A *Coxeter group* is the underlying group W arising from a Coxeter system (W, S, M_S) . The set $S \subset W$ is usually called a *Coxeter generating set* for W . The *type* (or *Coxeter type*) of a Coxeter system (W, S, M_S) is the pair (S, M_S) . We say that two Coxeter systems (W_1, S_1, M_{S_1}) and (W_2, S_2, M_{S_2}) *have the same type* (or are *isomorphic*) if there is a bijection $f: S_1 \rightarrow S_2$ such that, for each $s, t \in S_1$, the corresponding entry $m_{f(s), f(t)}$ in M_{S_2} is equal to the original entry $m_{s,t}$ in M_{S_1} .

For brevity, one typically omits the Coxeter matrix in the notation and speaks about ‘the’ Coxeter system (W, S) . We remark that two systems of the same type have isomorphic underlying Coxeter groups.

Definition 2.3 (Spherical Coxeter system, longest element). A Coxeter system (W, S) is called *spherical* if its underlying Coxeter group W is finite. The *longest element* of W is the unique element $w_0 \in W$ of maximal word length with respect to the Coxeter generating set S . (Such a w_0 exists if and only if W is spherical [Dav08, Lemma 4.6.1].)

Definition 2.4 (Parabolics). A subgroup $W_T = \langle T \rangle \leq W$ generated by $T \subseteq S$ in a Coxeter system (W, S, M_S) is called a *standard parabolic* (or *special* or *visible*) subgroup of W . Any $P \leq W$ conjugate to some standard parabolic is called *parabolic*. By [Dav08, Theorem 4.1.6], a parabolic subgroup is (isomorphic to) a Coxeter group with underlying system (W_T, T, M_T) , where M_T is the (sub)matrix obtained from M_S by taking only entries in $T \times T$.

As usual in the theory of Coxeter groups, it is helpful to encode Coxeter systems as certain graphs. Two popular such graphs are the following.

Definition 2.5 (Coxeter–Dynkin diagram and defining graph). The *Coxeter–Dynkin diagram* of a Coxeter system (W, S, M_S) is the undirected edge-labeled graph with vertex set S , where distinct $s, t \in S$ are joined by an edge if $m_{s,t}$ lies in $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 3} \cup \{\infty\}$, in which case the edge is unlabeled if $m_{s,t} = 3$ and otherwise $m_{s,t}$ is the label of the given edge. Similarly, the *defining graph* of (W, S, M_S) is the undirected labeled graph whose vertex set is S , but now with (distinct) vertices $s, t \in S$ connected by an edge labeled $m_{s,t}$ in case $m_{s,t} \neq \infty$.

Remark 2.6. Coxeter–Dynkin diagrams are in the literature sometimes called Dynkin diagrams, Coxeter diagrams, or C-diagrams. The defining graph of a Coxeter system is in some places referred to as its presentation diagram or P-diagram. Here we stick to the notions defined in 2.5. \triangle

Since it is useful to consider all orders $m_{s,t}$ at once (hence have all of them depicted), we introduce a third type of graph representing Coxeter systems.

Definition 2.7 (Complete Coxeter graph). Given a Coxeter system (W, S, M_S) , its *complete Coxeter graph*, denoted by $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$, is the complete simplicial graph with vertices the elements of S and with edges labeled by the orders $m_{s,t} \in M_S$ for $s \neq t$. When the Coxeter system is implicit from context, we sometimes also write $\mathfrak{C}(W)$ or simply \mathfrak{C} for the Complete Coxeter graph of (W, S, M_S) . The (Coxeter) *type* of $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ is the (Coxeter) type of the underlying system (W, S, M_S) . (Equivalently, the type of $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ is its *isomorphism type* as an edge-labeled graph.)

For easier visualization, we draw in a complete Coxeter graph its ∞ -labeled edges dashed, and its 2-labeled edges thick and grey.




FIGURE 1. From left to right: the Coxeter–Dynkin diagram, the defining graph, and the complete Coxeter graph for the system giving the Coxeter group $W = \langle r, s, t, u \mid r^2, s^2, t^2, u^2, (rs)^3, (st)^5, (ru)^2, (su)^2 \rangle$.

The term ‘diagram’ is used interchangeably with ‘graph’ when speaking about any such graphs. We constantly interchange between Coxeter systems and their complete Coxeter graphs. Any concept introduced for a system (e.g., sphericity) is also interpreted as a concept for the diagram and vice-versa.

We say that a Coxeter system and the associated Coxeter group is *reducible* if its Coxeter–Dynkin diagram is disconnected. Otherwise it is called *irreducible*. Recall that a group G is called *directly decomposable* if there exist $H_1, H_2 \leq G$ such that $G \cong H_1 \times H_2$; otherwise it is called *directly indecomposable*. The following well-known result (cf. [Ric82; MRT07] or [Nui06, Theorem 3.3]) characterizes directly decomposable Coxeter groups.

Theorem 2.8 (Few irreducibles decompose). *Let (W, S) be an irreducible Coxeter system. Then W is directly decomposable if and only if (W, S) is of type B_{2k+1} or $I_2(4k+2)$, for some $k \geq 1$, or of type E_7 or H_3 .*

Note that an infinite Coxeter group is reducible if and only if it is directly decomposable.

Similarly, decompositions of Coxeter groups into free products are well understood. Recall that G *decomposes* (or *splits*) *as an amalgam* of A and B , amalgamated along C , if there exist subgroups $A, B, C \leq G$ with $A \neq 1 \neq B$ and $C \leq A \cap B$ such that $G \cong A *_C B$. The following was shown in [MT09] using Bass–Serre theory.

Theorem 2.9 (Splittings along Coxeter subgroups). *A Coxeter group W splits as an amalgam along a finite subgroup if and only if there exist nontrivial parabolic subgroups $W_1, W_2 \leq W$ and a common spherical parabolic $P \leq W_1 \cap W_2$ such that $W \cong W_1 *_P W_2$.*

A group G is said to be *freely decomposable* if it can be written as a free product of two subgroups, otherwise G is called *freely indecomposable*.

Corollary 2.10 (Free decompositions). *A Coxeter group is freely decomposable if and only if it is a free product of Coxeter subgroups.*

As elucidated above, the structure of Coxeter groups is very much constrained by its parabolic subgroups. A particularly powerful tool to compare Coxeter systems is given by the matching theorems. These were established by Mihalik, Ratcliffe and Tschantz [MRT07] drawing from classical results [Bou02] and the work of Deodhar [Deo82].

Definition 2.11 (Basic subsets). Given a Coxeter system (W, S) , a subset $B \subseteq S$ is said to be *basic* if $\langle B \rangle$ is a maximal irreducible noncyclic spherical parabolic subgroup. (That is, $(\langle B \rangle, B)$ is irreducible with $2 < |\langle B \rangle| < \infty$.)

Theorem 2.12 (Basic matchings [MRT07, Theorem 4.18]). *Let (W_1, S_1) and (W_2, S_2) be Coxeter systems with $W_1 \cong W_2$. Then, for each $B_1 \subseteq S_1$ basic, there exists a basic subset $B_2 \subseteq S_2$ such that the following hold.*

- (i) *In case $\langle B_1 \rangle$ and $\langle B_2 \rangle$ have the same order, then $(\langle B_1 \rangle, B_1)$ and $(\langle B_2 \rangle, B_2)$ have the same type, with an isomorphism $f : \langle B_1 \rangle \rightarrow \langle B_2 \rangle$. (Here we say that B_1 and B_2 match isomorphically.)*
- (ii) *If $\langle B_1 \rangle$ and $\langle B_2 \rangle$ do not have the same order, $|\langle B_1 \rangle| < |\langle B_2 \rangle|$ say, then there is some $k \geq 1$ such that either $\langle B_1 \rangle$ is of type D_{2k+1} and $\langle B_2 \rangle$ is of type B_{2k+1} , or $\langle B_1 \rangle$ is of type $I_2(2k+1)$ and $\langle B_2 \rangle$ is of type $I_2(4k+2)$. Furthermore there exists an embedding $f : \langle B_1 \rangle \hookrightarrow \langle B_2 \rangle$.*

Moreover, the basic subset $B_2 \subseteq S_2$ with the above properties is unique, and in both cases (i) and (ii) the commutator subgroups $f([\langle B_1 \rangle, \langle B_1 \rangle])$ and $[\langle B_2 \rangle, \langle B_2 \rangle]$ are conjugate in W_2 .

Theorem 2.12 has a series of consequences for Coxeter matrices and ranks of Coxeter systems; see, e.g., [MRT07, Theorems 7.7 and 9.1] and [MR09]. In the next section, we introduce a space encoding complete Coxeter graphs, and we shall translate some of those results into statements about that space.

3. THE GALAXY OF COXETER GROUPS

*A galaxy is a massive, gravitationally bound system that consists of stars, stellar objects, [...], black holes, and an unknown component of dark matter.*²

In order to study the isomorphism problem for Coxeter groups from a slightly new perspective we now introduce a simplicial complex encoding complete Coxeter graphs and their isomorphism types. Some regions of this space are well understood and the isomorphism problem is solved in those parts. However, some regions and pieces of its structure remain mysterious.

3.1. Definition of the Coxeter galaxy.

Definition 3.1 (The Coxeter galaxy). The *Coxeter galaxy* \mathcal{G} is the flag simplicial complex defined as follows. Vertices in the Coxeter galaxy are complete Coxeter graphs up to (edge-labeled) graph-isomorphism. There is an edge between any pair of vertices whenever there exists an isomorphism between their underlying Coxeter groups. The higher dimensional simplices of the Coxeter galaxy \mathcal{G} are spanned by the complete subgraphs of the graph above.

It is clear from the definition that the connected components in the Coxeter galaxy are (potentially infinite dimensional) simplices. Compare Theorem 4.18 for more on their size and shape.

Remark 3.2 (Dark matter³ in the galaxy, and isolated points). Some information about Coxeter groups cannot be seen in the Coxeter galaxy. Recall that two edge-labeled graphs are isomorphic when there exists a bijective map from one vertex set to the other that preserves adjacency and labels. This implies:

²From <https://space-facts.com/galaxies/>, accessed July 22nd 2022.

³From https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dark_matter, accessed November 24th 2022: “Dark matter is called “dark” because it does not appear to interact with the electromagnetic field, [...] and is, therefore, difficult to detect.”

- (i) Two distinct vertices in the Coxeter galaxy never correspond to Coxeter groups of the same Coxeter type. (In particular, an edge always corresponds to an (abstract) non-type preserving isomorphism between the underlying Coxeter groups.)
- (ii) Since any group automorphism $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(W)$ preserves orders, it canonically induces a graph isomorphism between $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ and $\mathfrak{C}(W, \alpha(S))$, so that the systems (W, S) and $(W, \alpha(S))$ are represented by the same vertex in the Coxeter galaxy \mathcal{G} . (In particular, if a system (W, S) is given representing the vertex \mathfrak{C} in \mathcal{G} , we may replace (W, S) by any of its conjugates (W, S^w) for $w \in W$.)

Thus, a Coxeter group is rigid (in the sense of [Bra+02]) if and only if it corresponds to an isolated point in the Coxeter galaxy. \triangle

We will now organize the Coxeter galaxy into layers according to the number of vertices in the complete Coxeter graph.

Definition 3.3 (Layer). We say that a vertex $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ in the Coxeter galaxy \mathcal{G} lies in layer $k \in \mathbb{N}$ if S has k elements. We let $\mathcal{G}_{\leq k}$ denote the subcomplex of \mathcal{G} spanned by all vertices in layer at most k . (For convenience we set $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 0} = \emptyset$.) The layer k of the Coxeter galaxy, denoted by \mathcal{G}_k , is its subcomplex spanned by the vertices of $\mathcal{G}_{\leq k} \setminus \mathcal{G}_{\leq k-1}$.

The concept of layers gives us an easy, visual way of sorting the Coxeter galaxy. We think of each layer \mathcal{G}_k as sitting at a fixed ‘height’ k , so that its elements are depicted horizontally. This also motivates the following definition.




FIGURE 2. A 2-simplex in the Coxeter galaxy. The graphs labeling the vertices can be found in Fig. 3.

Definition 3.4 (Vertical and horizontal edges). An edge $\{\mathfrak{C}_1, \mathfrak{C}_2\}$ in the Coxeter galaxy is called *horizontal* if the graphs \mathfrak{C}_1 and \mathfrak{C}_2 are both contained in the same layer, and *vertical of height k* if \mathfrak{C}_1 and \mathfrak{C}_2 are in different layers \mathcal{G}_{l_1} and \mathcal{G}_{l_2} , respectively, with $|l_1 - l_2| = k > 0$. We call an edge *vertical* if it is vertical of height k for some k .

Example 3.5. Fig. 2 shows a 2-simplex in \mathcal{G} . The vertices $\mathfrak{C}_0, \mathfrak{C}_1$ and \mathfrak{C}_3 are the graphs illustrated in Fig. 3. They all define the same underlying group and lie in layers $\mathcal{G}_3, \mathcal{G}_4$ and \mathcal{G}_5 , respectively. All three edges of this simplex are vertical. The edge connecting \mathfrak{C}_0 with \mathfrak{C}_3 connects a vertex in layer 3 with one in layer 5. \triangle

We now introduce a natural subcomplex of the galaxy which, as will be shown in Proposition 4.22, encodes the connected components of \mathcal{G} .

Definition 3.6 (Vertical core). The *vertical core* of the Coxeter galaxy is the subcomplex \mathcal{G}^{VC} of \mathcal{G} obtained by deleting, for every $k > 1$, all vertical edges of height k , and all open

simplices containing such edges. Considering layers, we define $\mathcal{G}_{\leq n}^{\text{VC}} := \mathcal{G}_{\leq n} \cap \mathcal{G}^{\text{VC}}$ as well as $\mathcal{G}_n^{\text{VC}} := \mathcal{G}_n \cap \mathcal{G}^{\text{VC}}$.

Visually, the vertical core is obtained by deleting edges that ‘jump’ between nonsuccessive layers.




FIGURE 3. Four complete Coxeter graphs describing a same group. The three graphs \mathcal{C}_i with $i = 1, 2, 3$ may be obtained from \mathcal{C}_0 (leftmost) by (repeated) applications of blow ups.

Example 3.7. Let \mathcal{C}_0 be the complete Coxeter graph on three vertices v_1, v_2, v_3 . Suppose the edge $\{v_1, v_2\}$ is labeled by $2(2k_1 + 1)$ and the edge $\{v_2, v_3\}$ by $2(2k_2 + 1)$. The remaining third edge has label ∞ . This graph is an instance of a starlet defined later in Definition 4.12. In case $4k_1 + 2 = 6$ and $4k_2 + 2 = 10$ the graph is shown in Fig. 4. It yields the same group as the graphs \mathcal{C}_1 , \mathcal{C}_2 and \mathcal{C}_3 pictured in the same figure.

The connected component of the graph \mathcal{C}_0 in the Coxeter galaxy is a three-simplex on these four vertices. The vertical core contains two triangles. One with vertices $\mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2$ and the other has vertex \mathcal{C}_3 instead of \mathcal{C}_0 . A spine would be given by any tree on the four vertices. For example the following three edges: $\{\mathcal{C}_0, \mathcal{C}_1\}$, $\{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_3\}$ and $\{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2\}$. The first two edges are vertical edges from layer three to four and four to five, respectively. The last edge is a horizontal one within layer four. See also Example 5.10 for further details on this example. \triangle




FIGURE 4. A tetrahedron (3-cell) in the galaxy (left) and its intersection with the vertical core (right), two 2-cells attached. The graphs labeling the vertices are shown in Fig. 3.

Remark 3.8. The vertex sets of the Coxeter galaxy \mathcal{G} and of its vertical core \mathcal{G}^{VC} agree as we only delete edges and higher dimensional (open) cells to construct it. In particular, $\mathcal{G}_n \cap \mathcal{G}^{\text{VC}} = \mathcal{G}_n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \triangle

We now introduce another notion which will be helpful to study algorithmic aspects of the isomorphism problem.

Definition 3.9 (Spine). Define a *spine* of the galaxy of Coxeter groups to be a spanning forest of the one-skeleton of the vertical core, consisting of a single spanning tree for each component. A *spine* of a component is just a spanning tree for it.

A spine, by definition, visits every vertex of a connected component once. One can label or color the edges of a spine by the underlying group isomorphisms or moves; cf. Sections 4.1 and 5.1.

3.2. The isomorphism problem and related questions. The isomorphism problem for Coxeter groups is a classic problem which appeared, together with closely related questions, in several places in the literature. See, for example, Problem 1 and 2 and further discussions in [Müh06]. In our setting, the isomorphism problem for (finitely generated) Coxeter groups can be formulated as follows.

Question 3.10 (The (classic) isomorphism problem). *Given two complete Coxeter graphs, is there an algorithm that decides whether the corresponding vertices of the Coxeter galaxy are in a same connected component?*

A slightly stronger question is the following.

Question 3.11 (The isomorphism class problem). *Does there exist an algorithm that takes as an input a vertex in the Coxeter galaxy and lists all vertices in its connected component?*

We also propose the following question which is aimed towards finding an efficient algorithm computing all vertices in a connected component.

Question 3.12 (The effective isomorphism class problem). *Does there exist an algorithm that takes as input a vertex of the Coxeter galaxy and computes a spine (of minimal diameter) of its connected component?*

4. A FIRST EXPEDITION INTO THE GALAXY

In this section we collect general properties of the Coxeter galaxy and the size and shape of its connected components.

4.1. Vertically navigating the Coxeter galaxy. Classic examples (cf. [Nui06]) of abstractly isomorphic Coxeter groups with generating sets of different ranks immediately imply, that some edges in the Coxeter galaxy connect vertices in different layers. This phenomenon gives means to vertical moves between different layers which can be fully characterized.

4.1.1. Blow-ups along pseudo-transpositions. A first type of isomorphism between Coxeter groups changing the number of generators is a blow-up along a pseudo-transposition. This increases the rank of a Coxeter system by one.

Definition 4.1. Given a Coxeter system (W, S, M_S) , a Coxeter generator $t \in S$ is called a *pseudo-transposition* when the following conditions are satisfied.

- (i) The generator t is contained in a subset $J \subseteq S$ for which any $s \in S \setminus J$ either has $m_{s,t} = \infty$ or satisfies $m_{s,u} = 2$ for all $u \in J$.
- (ii) The parabolic subgroup W_J is of classical type B_k for some odd k or of type $I_2(2k)$ for some odd $k > 2$.

- (iii) In case W_J is of type B_k , the element t must also satisfy $m_{t,u} = 2$ for all $u \in J$ except for a single $v \in J$ for which $m_{t,v} = 4$. (Pictorially, t is represented by the external vertex of the unique 4-labeled edge of the Coxeter–Dynkin diagram B_k .)

In case the Coxeter system (W, S, M_S) does not admit any pseudo-transpositions, then we call it *expanded*⁴

Notice that if the parabolic W_J is of type $I_2(k)$ in condition (ii) above, then $J = \{t, v\}$ and $m_{t,v} \neq 2$. In particular, regardless of whether W_J is of type B_k or $I_2(k)$, there is always a unique element $v \in J$ which does not commute with t .

That pseudo-transpositions are a source of moves to transform Coxeter systems without transforming the underlying Coxeter group is summarized in the following folklore result.

Lemma 4.2 (Blow-ups). *Suppose a Coxeter system (W, S, M_S) contains a pseudo-transposition $t \in J \subset S$ as in Definition 4.1, with $v \in S$ being the unique element of J for which $m_{t,v} \neq 2$. Then the set*

$$S' := \{tvt, w_J\} \cup (S \setminus \{t\}),$$

where w_J is the longest element of the parabolic W_J , is a Coxeter generating set for W with $|S'| = |S| + 1$. Moreover, the Coxeter matrix $M_{S'}$ has entries $(m'_{x,y})$ as follows.

$$m'_{x,y} = \begin{cases} \frac{m_{t,v}}{2} & \text{if } x = tvt \text{ and } y = v, \\ m_{x,y} & \text{if } x, y \in S \cap S', \\ m_{v,y} & \text{if } x = tvt \text{ and } y \in J \setminus \{t, v\}, \\ 2 & \text{if } x = w_J \text{ and } y \in (\{tvt\} \cup J) \setminus \{t\}, \\ \infty & \text{if } x \in \{tvt, w_J\} \text{ and } y \in S \setminus J \text{ and } m_{t,y} = \infty, \\ 2 & \text{if } x \in \{tvt, w_J\} \text{ and } y \in S \setminus J \text{ and } m_{t,y} \neq \infty. \end{cases}$$

In particular, the unique element $v \in J$ not commuting with the pseudo-transposition $t \in J$ is still contained in the new Coxeter generating set S' . (In fact, $S \setminus J \subset S'$.) The pseudo-transposition t gets replaced by the reflection tvt , and the longest element $w_J \in \langle J \rangle$ gets ‘promoted’ to a reflection in the new system S' .

While Lemma 4.2 is not new, we briefly sketch a proof for the sake of completeness.

Proof. The pseudo-transposition t that has been dropped out of the generating set is contained in the subgroup generated by tvt^{-1} , w_J and v . Hence S' is still a generating set for W .

The fact that the relations among the elements of S' are Coxeter relations as in Definition 2.2 follows from standard results (see, e.g., [Dav08]). Indeed, most of them can be read off of the original Coxeter system (W, S, M_S) , namely for elements in $S \cap S'$. The relations $(tvtw_J)^2 = 1 = (w_Jy)^2$ for $y \in S' \cap J$ are clear since w_J is central in W_J , and it is immediate that $tvtv = (tv)^2$ has order $m_{t,v}/2$. By Definition 4.1, v is the unique Coxeter generator in J not commuting with t , so that $(tvtv)^n = t(vv)^nt$ for any $y \in J \setminus \{v\}$, hence $tvtv$ has order $m_{v,y}$. Now, if some $y \in (S \cap S') \setminus J$ satisfies $m_{t,y} = \infty$, then W decomposes as the amalgamated free product of its (maximal) parabolics $W_{S \setminus \{t\}}$ and $W_{S \setminus \{y\}}$, amalgamated along the common parabolic $W_{S \setminus \{t,y\}}$. Hence, since $t \notin S'$ and both tvt and w_J include t in their reduced expressions, the order of $tvtv$ and of w_Jy is infinite. In case $m_{t,y} < \infty$, then the definition of pseudo-transposition implies that y commutes with all elements of J , whence $m_{tvt,y} = 2 = m_{w_J,y}$.

⁴We should mention that expanded Coxeter systems are also referred to as *reduced*. We chose to stick with the term *expanded* introduced in [RT08]. This fits better with the fact that the rank grows when the system admits a pseudo-transposition. This terminology also avoids potential confusion with ‘reducibility’ concepts, such as those from Section 2.

Thus the subgroup $\langle S' \rangle \leq W$ maps onto the Coxeter group defined by the generating set S' and Coxeter matrix $M_{S'}$. It is straightforward to check that such a Coxeter group injects into W with image $\langle S' \rangle$, so that it is indeed isomorphic to $\langle S' \rangle$. The Coxeter matrix $M_{S'}$ is obtained from the computations in the previous paragraph. \square

In view of Definition 4.1 and Lemma 4.2, we interchangeably say that $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ can be blown up if (W, S) admits a pseudo-transposition.

Example 4.3. Let us illustrate how blow-ups modify the underlying diagrams. For the sake of tradition, we work this example out using the Coxeter–Dynkin diagram (cf. Definition 2.5). Consider the spherical Coxeter group whose classical type is the disjoint union of B_5 and $I_2(6)$, so that this group is the direct product of the hyperoctahedral group of order $2^5 5!$ and the dihedral group of order 12. It represents a vertex in \mathcal{G} shown as the bottom corner of Fig. 5.

One quickly checks (cf. Definition 4.1) that this system admits two blow-ups, one along the subgroup of type B_5 , and another along the subgroup of type $I_2(6)$. The top right diagram of Fig. 5 shows the blown up diagram along the old edge of type $I_2(6)$, in which case the added vertex is the longest element from $I_2(6)$, now ‘promoted’ to a reflection, and the dihedral order gets halved. The top left graph in Fig. 5 represents the diagram blown up along the parabolic subgroup of type B_5 , which gets replaced by the diagram of type D_5 , and the added vertex is the longest element from B_5 . By Definition 3.1, the three diagrams span a 2-simplex in the Coxeter galaxy. \triangle




FIGURE 5. An example of how blow-ups modify Coxeter–Dynkin diagrams, starting with the disjoint union of $I_2(6)$ and B_5 (bottom vertex).

Drawing from the work of Mihalik–Ratcliffe–Tschantz [MRT07] one can see that blow-ups are ‘vertical atomic edges’, in the sense that they suffice to describe vertical navigation within the Galaxy.

Theorem 4.4 (Vertical edges decompose into blow-ups [MRT07]). *Let $\mathfrak{C}_1, \mathfrak{C}_2$ be adjacent vertices in \mathcal{G} lying in layers \mathcal{G}_k and \mathcal{G}_{k+m} , respectively, with $m \geq 1$. Then \mathfrak{C}_1 admits a blow-up and there exists a vertex \mathfrak{C}_3 in \mathcal{G}_{k+1} obtained from \mathfrak{C}_1 using the corresponding pseudo-transposition, as described in Lemma 4.2, so that $\mathfrak{C}_1, \mathfrak{C}_2$ and \mathfrak{C}_3 span a 2-simplex in \mathcal{G} .*

Proof. Write $\mathfrak{C}_1 = \mathfrak{C}(W, S)$, where $|S| = k$. By the Maximum Rank Theorem [MRT07, Theorem 9.1], (W, S) must admit some blow up, for otherwise $|S|$ would be maximal

among cardinalities of Coxeter generating sets for W . That is, S contains a subset $J \subset S$ spanning a maximal spherical parabolic of classical type $I_2(4n + 2)$ or B_{2n+1} for some $n \geq 1$ and satisfying the conditions from Definition 4.1. By Lemma 4.2, we can construct a Coxeter generating set $S' \subset W$ for W with $|S'| = k + 1$. Thus $\mathfrak{C}_3 := \mathfrak{C}(W, S') \in \mathfrak{G}_{k+1}$ is adjacent to both \mathfrak{C}_1 and \mathfrak{C}_2 , whence the theorem. \square

A similar result was shown as Proposition 7 in an unpublished preprint by Howlett and Mühlherr, see Appendix B in [CP10] or Theorem 9.1 in [RT08].

Remark 4.5. It is useful to keep in mind the following fact, contained in [MRT07, Theorem 9.1] and used in the proof of Theorem 4.4: Given a Coxeter system (W, S) , the set S has maximal cardinality among Coxeter generating sets of W if and only if S does not admit a blow-up (i.e., S contains no pseudo-transpositions). \triangle

Theorem 4.4 has the following straightforward, but structurally important consequences.

Corollary 4.6 (Navigating up). *Every vertical path in the Coxeter galaxy \mathfrak{G} from layer k to layer $k+l$ can be homotoped to a sequence of l vertical edges between adjacent layers, potentially followed by a single horizontal edge within layer $k+l$. All vertical edges in this sequence correspond to blow-ups.*

Corollary 4.7 (Connected components do not skip layers). *Any connected component \mathcal{C} of the Coxeter galaxy \mathfrak{G} containing a vertex in some layer k and a vertex in some layer $k+m$ with $m > 1$ also contains vertices in all layers \mathfrak{G}_{k+i} with $0 < i < m$.*

The results discussed in this section explain how to move to a higher layer. The next subsection will consider moves to a lower layer of the galaxy.

4.1.2. *Blowing down.* A second type of isomorphism between Coxeter groups that alters the number of generators is a blow-down. This move was introduced by Mihalik in [Mih07].

Given a Coxeter system (W, S) and a subset of generators $X \subseteq S$, we let X^\perp denote the set of all elements $s \in S$ for which $m_{s,x} = 2$ for all $x \in X$.

Theorem 4.8 (Blow-downs[MR09]). *Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system. There exists a Coxeter generating set $S' \subseteq W$ with $|S'| < |S|$ if and only if all of the following conditions are satisfied.*

- (i) *There is a basic subset $B \subseteq S$ (cf. Definition 2.11) with $(\langle B \rangle, B)$ of classical type D_{2n+1} or $I_2(2n + 1)$ (with $n \geq 1$) and an element $r \in B^\perp$ such that each generator $s \in S$ for which $m_{s,r} < \infty$ lies in $B \cup B^\perp$ and satisfies $m_{s,r} = 2$.*
- (ii) *In case $(\langle B \rangle, B)$ is of type D_{2n+1} , the two vertices x, y at the split end of the Coxeter–Dynkin diagram for $(\langle B \rangle, B)$ satisfy $\{s \in S \mid m_{s,x}, m_{s,y} < \infty\} = B \cup B^\perp$. Similarly, if $B = \{x, y\}$ (thus $(\langle B \rangle, B)$ is of type $I_2(2n + 1)$), then $\{s \in S \mid m_{s,x}, m_{s,y} < \infty\} = B \cup B^\perp$.*
- (iii) *In both cases above, if there is an edge cycle in $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ of length at least four containing $\{x, y\}$ and with no ∞ -labeled edges, then such a cycle must have a finite-labeled chord, that is, there exist two nonconsecutive vertices in this cycle whose label in $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ is finite.*

The relationship between blow-downs and blow-ups is summarized in the following, a proof of which can be deduced from the proof of [MR09, Theorem 4.1].

Theorem 4.9 (Moving down in the galaxy [MR09]). *A vertex $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ in the Coxeter galaxy \mathfrak{G} has a neighbor in a lower layer \mathfrak{G}_{n-m} with $n > m > 0$ if and only if it has a neighbor $\mathfrak{C}(W, S') \in \mathfrak{G}_{n-1}$ that admits a pseudo-transposition (Definition 4.1), along which (W, S') can be blown-up as in Lemma 4.2.*

We stress that the statement above does not imply that a blow-down is the exact inverse move of a blow-up. For instance, $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ might first connect to some other point $\mathfrak{C}(W, S'') \in \mathcal{G}_{|S'|}$ without pseudo-transpositions and one might need an intermediate horizontal move connecting $\mathfrak{C}(W, S'')$ to the neighbor $\mathfrak{C}(W, S')$ which does exhibit a pseudo-transposition. This further motivates the investigation of horizontal moves, which will be addressed in more detail in Section 5.1.

4.2. Shape and connected components of the galaxy. This section concerns the connected components of the Coxeter galaxy and their ‘shapes’. Though it is easy to check that the galaxy is infinite dimensional, we prove that each of its components is finite dimensional and provide an upper bound on the number of vertices in a component. In order to compute the bound we need some statistics on complete Coxeter graphs.

Definition 4.10 (Statistics on complete Coxeter graphs.). Let $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ be a complete Coxeter graph and let, by definition,

- (i) $u_{\mathfrak{C}}$ be the number of distinct blow-ups the graph \mathfrak{C} admits,
- (ii) $d_{\mathfrak{C}}$ be the number of distinct blow-downs the graph \mathfrak{C} admits, and
- (iii) $p_{\mathfrak{C}}$ be the number of distinct parabolic subgroups of W of type B_{2n+1} , D_{2n+1} , $I_2(4n+2)$ or $I_2(2n+1)$ for $n \geq 1$.

A first observation is, that the Galaxy contains arbitrarily long (vertical) paths. This is a direct consequence of the next example.

Example 4.11. For every $k \geq 1$ and $n \geq 1$, let W be the n -fold direct product of the group of type $I_2(4k+2)$. In each of the n copies of $I_2(4k+2)$ one can find a pseudo-transposition (cf. Definition 4.1), so that the given group can be blown-up. In total n distinct blow ups are possible. Notice, that each blow-up of the original graph yields the same vertex in the next layer as the resulting complete Coxeter graphs (after having applied any one of the available blow-ups) are isomorphic. \triangle

The reader might rightfully protest that the example above is uninteresting in the sense that it uses a reducible Coxeter group. But it is possible to provide irreducible examples which produce arbitrarily big simplices.

Definition 4.12 (Starlets⁵). A *starlet* is a complete (simplicial) edge-labeled graph \mathfrak{C} on a vertex set $S = \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_{n-1}\}$ which is constructed as follows. Take k_1, \dots, k_{n-1} to be pairwise distinct positive integers. Connect s_0 to each s_i , $i \neq 0$, with an edge labeled $4k_i + 2$, and connect all other pairs s_i, s_j with $i \neq j$ by an edge labeled ∞ .

Lemma 4.13 (Little stars in the galaxy). *Let $n > 1$ be arbitrary.*

- (i) *A starlet on $|S| = n$ vertices is an irreducible complete Coxeter graph $\mathfrak{C}(W, S) \in \mathcal{G}_n$, which is an isolated point in $\mathcal{G}_{\leq n}$ and allows for exactly $n - 1$ distinct blow-ups. (That is, $u_{\mathfrak{C}(W, S)} = n - 1$.)*
- (ii) *The connected component \mathcal{C} of a starlet intersects nontrivially with all layers \mathcal{G}_{n+k} with $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n - 1\}$.*
- (iii) *The component \mathcal{C} contains a simplex σ_{\max} of dimension $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{i}$ and, for each $i = 0, \dots, n - 2$, a horizontal simplex $\sigma_i \subseteq \mathcal{G}_{n+i}$ of dimension $\binom{n-1}{i} - 1$.*

Proof. Let \mathfrak{C} be a starlet. The Coxeter system (W, S) with $|S| = n$ having \mathfrak{C} as its complete Coxeter graph is even, i.e., all of its labels are either even positive integers or ∞ . By work of Bahls [Bah02] and Mihalik [Mih07], even Coxeter groups have unique even Coxeter systems, which in turn cannot be blown-down. It thus follows that $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ is isolated within $\mathcal{G}_{\leq n}$.

⁵We chose this name since the corresponding presentation diagram looks like a little star centered around s_0 .

By construction, each generator $s_i \neq s_0$ of $W = \langle S \rangle$ satisfies the conditions of Definition 4.1. Since the corresponding integers $4k_1 + 2, \dots, 4k_{n-1} + 2$ yielding pseudo-transpositions for (W, S) are all distinct, $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ admits exactly $n - 1$ blow-ups. Moreover, after applying all such blow-ups successively, the resulting vertex lies in \mathcal{G}_{2n-1} and has edge-labels contained in the (set) $\{2, \infty, 2k_1 + 1, \dots, 2k_{n-1} + 1\}$, hence cannot be further blown-up; see Remark 4.5.

To obtain the simplices of prescribed dimensions, observe that $\mathfrak{C}(W, S) \in \mathcal{G}_n$ can be blown up to \mathcal{G}_{n+1} in $n-1$ distinct manners, one for each pseudo-transposition. Inductively, each neighbor of $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ in layer \mathcal{G}_{n+i} , for $0 \leq i < n-1$, can be connected (upwards) with $\binom{n-1}{i}$ different neighbors in layer \mathcal{G}_{n+i+1} , one for each distinct available blow-up (that has not been applied, yet). By definition, the $\binom{n-1}{i}$ neighbors of $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ contained in layer \mathcal{G}_{n+i} form a complete graph and thus span a $(\binom{n-1}{i} - 1)$ -simplex entirely contained in \mathcal{G}_{n+i} . Taking all such vertices at once, from \mathcal{G}_n to the top layer \mathcal{G}_{2n-1} , we obtain the simplex σ_{\max} of dimension $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \binom{n-1}{i}$. \square

A direct consequence is the following.

Corollary 4.14 (Dimension of the galaxy). *Both the Coxeter galaxy \mathcal{G} and its vertical core \mathcal{G}^{VC} are infinite dimensional. They contain arbitrarily large simplices all of whose vertices can be taken to be irreducible Coxeter systems.*

Corollary 4.15 (Bounded heights). *Let \mathfrak{C} be a vertex in layer \mathcal{G}_n of \mathcal{G} (or of \mathcal{G}^{VC}). The connected component of \mathfrak{C} in \mathcal{G} (resp. in \mathcal{G}^{VC}) is contained in $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 2n-1}$ (resp. in $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 2n-1}^{\text{VC}}$). This bound is optimal in the sense that there exist vertices in \mathcal{G}_n whose connected components nontrivially intersect \mathcal{G}_{2n-1} .*

Proof. By Corollary 4.6, any path from $\mathfrak{C}(W, S) \in \mathcal{G}_n$ to higher layers can be replaced by a sequence of edges arising from blow-ups. Since (any neighbor of) $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ can have at most $|S| - 1$ pseudo-transpositions, the first claim follows. The fact that the bound is optimal was just proved in Lemma 4.13 using starlets. \square

We have obtained local vertical bounds on the size of the galaxy. But what about the horizontal behavior?

Question 4.16 (Diameter). *Is there an algorithm which computes the diameter (or the dimension) of any given connected component of the Coxeter galaxy or of the vertical core using the graph of any of its vertices as an input?*

We now explore layers horizontally. Recall from Definition 4.10 and Theorem 2.12 that the number $p_{\mathfrak{C}}$ bounds (from above) the number of neighbors of $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathcal{G}$ having basic subsets (cf. Definition 2.11) that do not isomorphically match basic subsets of \mathfrak{C} .

Lemma 4.17. *Any vertex $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ in an arbitrary layer \mathcal{G}_k of the Coxeter galaxy has finitely many horizontal neighbors. Moreover, the number of neighbors is bounded above by $p_{\mathfrak{C}} \cdot \binom{k}{2}!$ and thus \mathcal{G}_k is finite dimensional.*

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{C} = \mathfrak{C}(W, S) \in \mathcal{G}_k$ be given, where $|S| = k$. Assume first that S is a maximal Coxeter generating set for W . We argue that $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ has only finitely many neighbors in its layer \mathcal{G}_k . By the Maximum Rank Theorem [MRT07, Theorem 9.1], one deduces that the basic subsets of (W, S) and of any of its neighbors within \mathcal{G}_k match isomorphically (in the sense of Theorem 2.12). It then follows from the Simplex Matching Theorem [MRT07, Theorem 7.7] that the multisets of entries of the Coxeter matrix M_S are the same as those of a Coxeter matrix of its neighbors in \mathcal{G}_k . Therefore the complete Coxeter graph of any neighbor of $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ in \mathcal{G}_k is obtained from $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ by permuting labels (though not necessarily vertices!). Since $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ is finite, there can be only finitely many (in fact at most $\binom{k}{2}!$) elements in \mathcal{G}_k adjacent to $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$.

Suppose now that \mathfrak{C} is arbitrary. In that case $\mathfrak{C}(W, S) \in \mathfrak{G}_k$ is not necessarily in the highest possible layer and S is not necessarily a maximal Coxeter system for W . We also argue using basic subsets. Theorem 2.12 implies that either the basic subsets of $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ isomorphically match those of its neighbors, or the non-matching basic subsets generate irreducible spherical parabolics of prescribed Coxeter types, which depend only on $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$. In the former case, we argue as in the last paragraph using the Simplex Matching Theorem [MRT07, Theorem 7.7]. In the latter case, one has by Theorem 2.12 that nonisomorphic matchings only occur either between types B_{2n+1} and D_{2n+1} or between types $I_2(4n+2)$ and $I_2(2n+1)$ for some $n \geq 1$. In particular, one can directly inspect on $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ whether these types occur. The number of such parabolics is bounded above by $p_{\mathfrak{C}}$ as defined in Definition 4.10. Thus $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ has at most $\binom{k}{2}! \cdot p_{\mathfrak{C}}$ neighbors within \mathfrak{G}_k . The lemma follows. \square

We can now establish the following.

Theorem 4.18 (The galaxy is locally finite). *Every connected component of the Coxeter galaxy \mathfrak{G} is a finite dimensional simplex.*

Proof. The fact that a connected component of any point in \mathfrak{G} is a simplex is immediate from Definition 3.1. Let $\mathfrak{C} \in \mathfrak{G}$ be an arbitrary vertex, lying in layer \mathfrak{G}_k say. By Corollary 4.15, its connected component is entirely contained in $\mathfrak{G}_{\leq 2k-1}$. By Lemma 4.17, every vertex in this component has only finitely many neighbors within each layer, hence the theorem. \square

Corollary 4.19. *Every connected component of the vertical core \mathfrak{G}^{VC} of the Coxeter galaxy is a finite dimensional subcomplex.*

Now we know that the galaxy and its vertical core are arbitrarily big. The size of the simplices grows as we move up layers. But how fast? Notice that, by Corollary 4.15, the height of a connected component is linear as a function of the rank of their bottom-most vertices. In contrast, Lemma 4.17 gives a (non-optimal) big upper bound on the dimensions of simplices within each layer.

Question 4.20. *How big is the Coxeter galaxy or its vertical core up until a fixed layer n ? How fast do the functions $n \mapsto \dim(\mathfrak{G}_n)$, $n \mapsto \dim(\mathfrak{G}_{\leq n})$, $n \mapsto \dim(\mathfrak{G}_n^{\text{VC}})$, and $n \mapsto \dim(\mathfrak{G}_{\leq n}^{\text{VC}})$ grow?*

Question 4.21. *Given a connected component \mathcal{C} of the Coxeter galaxy or of its vertical core \mathfrak{G}^{VC} , how large is it ‘horizontally’ in comparison to its height? That is, defining the width and the height of \mathcal{C} as*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wid}(\mathcal{C}) &:= \max\{\dim(\mathcal{C} \cap \mathfrak{G}_n) \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\} \quad \text{and} \\ \text{ht}(\mathcal{C}) &:= \max\{|m - k| \mid \mathcal{C} \cap \mathfrak{G}_m \neq \emptyset \neq \mathcal{C} \cap \mathfrak{G}_k\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively, what is the ratio $\frac{\text{wid}(\mathcal{C})}{\text{ht}(\mathcal{C})}$?

Let \mathfrak{G}_n be the lowest layer that a component intersects nontrivially. What is the asymptotic behavior of $\text{wid}(\mathcal{C})$, $\text{ht}(\mathcal{C})$ or their ratio, when n goes to infinity?

In view of Remark 3.8, the concepts of width and height of a connected component $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathfrak{G}$ coincide with those for $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathfrak{G}^{\text{VC}}$ (where we replace \mathfrak{G}_n by $\mathfrak{G}_n^{\text{VC}}$ in the definitions). The next proposition implies that the vertex sets of \mathcal{C} and $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathfrak{G}^{\text{VC}}$ agree, so that we may restrict ourselves to understand the vertical core in order to solve the isomorphism problem

Proposition 4.22 (Reduction to the core). *Every connected component of the vertical core \mathfrak{G}^{VC} contains the same set of vertices as the connected component of any of its elements in the galaxy \mathfrak{G} .*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{G}^{\text{VC}}$ be an arbitrary connected component. The vertex sets of \mathcal{G}^{VC} and \mathcal{G} agree and, by definition of \mathcal{G}^{VC} only edges of height strictly greater than one and corresponding higher-dimensional open cells are missing in the vertical core. Hence $\mathcal{C} \cap \mathcal{G}_k = \mathcal{C}$.

Thus it remains to show that if \mathcal{C} has a vertex $\mathfrak{C}_1 \in \mathcal{G}_k$ and a vertex $\mathfrak{C}_2 \in \mathcal{G}_{k+m}$ for $m \geq 2$, then there must be a path entirely contained in \mathcal{G}^{VC} connecting \mathfrak{C}_1 to \mathfrak{C}_2 . But the existence of such a path is guaranteed by Corollary 4.6. \square

4.3. The first layers are 1-dimensional. The goal of this subsection is to paint a complete picture of $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$, the first three layers of the Coxeter galaxy \mathcal{G} . In the very first layer there is a single 1-generated Coxeter group, namely the cyclic group C_2 of order two. The second layer is given by the family of all dihedral groups. The study of the third layer occupies most of this subsection. We recall the following definition.

Definition 4.23 (Triangle groups). A *triangle Coxeter group*, in the following simply referred to as *triangle group*, is a Coxeter group W having a complete Coxeter graph $\mathfrak{C}(W, S) \in \mathcal{G}_3$. Any such group can be given by a Coxeter presentation of the form

$$\langle a, b, c \mid a^2, b^2, c^2, (ab)^p, (bc)^q, (ca)^r \rangle,$$

where $p = m_{a,b}$, $q = m_{b,c}$, $r = m_{c,a}$. A triangle group with defining orders p, q, r as above will be denoted by $\Delta(p, q, r)$.

The triangle groups $\Delta(p, q, r)$ can be realized as reflection groups of the 2-sphere \mathbb{S}^2 , the Euclidean plane \mathbb{R}^2 or the hyperbolic plane \mathbb{H}^2 , depending on whether the value $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r}$ is bigger than, equal to, or less than one, respectively. (Here we adopt the convention $\frac{1}{\infty} = 0$.) The multiset $\{p, q, r\}$ and the triangle group is called spherical, Euclidean or hyperbolic accordingly. Most triangle groups are hyperbolic and act on the hyperbolic plane, with generators being reflections about hyperbolic lines.

Any triangle group $\Delta(p, q, r)$ contains a subgroup of index two given by the presentation

$$\Gamma(p, q, r) := \langle x, y, z \mid x^p, y^q, z^r, xyz \rangle.$$

Such a subgroup $\Gamma(p, q, r)$ is sometimes also referred to as a triangle group in the literature [BCR16; Bri+21]. It is also known as a *von Dyck* group or a *rotation triangle (sub)group*. In the standard realization of the ambient triangle Coxeter groups, the triangle rotation group $\Gamma(p, q, r)$ can be interpreted as the subgroup of $\Delta(p, q, r)$ generated by rotations of prescribed orders p, q and r . If the triple $\{p, q, r\}$ is hyperbolic, then $\Gamma(p, q, r)$ is a Fuchsian group as it is a discrete subgroup of $\text{Isom}^+(\mathbb{H}^2) \cong \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

Making use of results of Bridson–Conder–Reid [BCR16] and Bridson–McReynolds–Reid–Spitler [Bri+21] we show that, in rank three, finite quotients can be used to distinguish Coxeter systems. For an overview on profinite rigidity and in order to gain a better understanding of its relevance in group theory we refer the interested reader to the excellent ICM survey of Reid [Rei18].

Theorem 4.24. *Within $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$ all Coxeter groups are profinitely rigid. That is, if $\mathfrak{C}(W_1, S_1)$ and $\mathfrak{C}(W_2, S_2)$ are vertices in $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$, then $W_1 \cong W_2$ if and only if $\widehat{W}_1 \cong \widehat{W}_2$.*

Proof. Since Coxeter groups of finite rank are finitely generated and residually finite, the implication $W_1 \cong W_2 \implies \widehat{W}_1 \cong \widehat{W}_2$ is immediate.

For the converse, we first rule out a trivial case: the profinite completion of a Coxeter group is finite if and only if the given group is itself finite. We henceforth assume that the groups considered are infinite.

Suppose W_1 and W_2 are both infinite and 2-generated. Then $W_1 \cong D_\infty \cong W_2$ and the theorem is true in this case.

Now suppose W_1 is a triangle group, say $W_1 = \Delta(p, q, r)$, and $W_2 = W$ with complete Coxeter graph contained in $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$. We want to check that $\widehat{\Delta(p, q, r)} \cong \widehat{W}$ implies $\Delta(p, q, r) \cong W$. Let us first deal with the case where W is also a triangle group, say $W = \Delta(p', q', r')$, which we assume not to be finite.

Assume first that $\Delta(p, q, r)$ is Euclidean, hence virtually abelian. In this case $\Delta(p, q, r) \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \rtimes W_0$ for some $n \geq 1$ and some finite Coxeter group W_0 . Thus

$$\widehat{\Delta(p', q', r')} \cong \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n \rtimes W_0} \cong \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n} \rtimes W_0.$$

Now, taking $o = |W_0|$, the power w^o of an arbitrary element $w \in \Delta(p', q', r') \leq \widehat{\Delta(p', q', r')}$ lies in the abelian subgroup $\Delta(p', q', r') \cap \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n} \leq \widehat{\Delta(p', q', r')}$. Therefore the triangle group $\Delta(p', q', r')$ is virtually abelian as well, hence also Euclidean. The only possible Euclidean triples are the multisets $\{2, 3, 6\}$, $\{2, 4, 4\}$, $\{2, 2, \infty\}$ and $\{3, 3, 3\}$. The corresponding triangle groups have abelianizations C_2^2 , C_2^3 , C_2^3 and C_2 , respectively. Since groups with isomorphic profinite completions must have the same abelianizations by [Rei18, Proposition 3.1], it follows that the multisets $\{p, q, r\}$ and $\{p', q', r'\}$ agree. Hence either $\Delta(p, q, r) \cong \Delta(p', q', r')$, or we have that $\{p, q, r\} = \{2, 4, 4\}$ and $\{p', q', r'\} = \{2, 2, \infty\}$. But the latter situation cannot occur, as we now explain. The former group $\Delta(2, 4, 4)$ is the group of type \widehat{B}_2 isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rtimes W_0$, where W_0 is the spherical Coxeter group D_4 of classical type $B_2 = I_2(4)$. The latter group, $\Delta(2, 2, \infty)$, is isomorphic to the direct product $D_\infty \times C_2 \cong (\mathbb{Z} \times C_2) \times C_2$. Hence

$$\widehat{\Delta(2, 4, 4)} \cong \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^2} \rtimes D_4 \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\Delta(2, 2, \infty)} \cong (\widehat{\mathbb{Z}} \times C_2) \times C_2.$$

However, these groups are not isomorphic as $(\widehat{\mathbb{Z}} \times C_2) \times C_2$ contains no elements of order four, whereas $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}^2} \rtimes D_4$ does.

Suppose now that $\Delta(p, q, r)$ is hyperbolic. Since $\widehat{\Delta(p, q, r)} \cong \widehat{\Delta(p', q', r')}$, it follows that the completion of the rotation subgroup $\Gamma(p', q', r')$ embeds as a subgroup of index two in $\widehat{\Delta(p, q, r)}$. Then, using [BCR16, Proposition 2.3], we identify $\Gamma(p', q', r')$ itself as a subgroup of index two in $\Delta(p, q, r)$. Thus $\Delta(p, q, r)$ is an index-two extension of the von Dyck group $\Gamma(p', q', r')$. Since $\Delta(p, q, r)$ is hyperbolic, so is $\Gamma(p', q', r')$ as it acts by isometries on \mathbb{H}^2 . Now, by [Bri+21, Proposition 3.1], there are (up to isomorphism) four possible index-two extensions of $\Gamma(p', q', r')$. Since all such extensions have non-isomorphic profinite completions by [Bri+21, Lemma 4.3] and the completion of its extension $\widehat{\Delta(p', q', r')}$ is isomorphic to $\widehat{\Delta(p, q, r)}$ by hypothesis, it follows that $\Delta(p', q', r') \cong \Delta(p, q, r)$, as desired.

Finally, assume W is generated by two elements. Being infinite, W is the infinite dihedral group, hence virtually \mathbb{Z} . Arguing as in the Euclidean case, this would imply that $\Delta(p, q, r)$ is also virtually abelian and thus a Euclidean triangle group. Moreover, the triple $\{p, q, r\}$ is neither $\{2, 4, 4\}$, $\{2, 2, \infty\}$ nor $\{3, 3, 3\}$ as the corresponding triangle groups have abelianizations not isomorphic to that of $W = D_\infty$. Thus $\Delta(p, q, r) = \Delta(2, 3, 6)$. This is also not possible since $\widehat{D_\infty} \cong \widehat{\mathbb{Z}} \times C_2$ contains no copy of $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}^2}$, whereas $\widehat{\Delta(2, 3, 6)}$ does. It follows that an infinite triangle group $\Delta(p, q, r)$ cannot have profinite completion isomorphic to that of a Coxeter group of rank two, which finishes the proof. \square

To put Theorem 4.24 in perspective, compare the following strong form of profinite rigidity for von Dyck triangle groups $\Gamma(p, q, r)$.

Theorem 4.25 (Bridson–Conder–Reid [BCR16, Section 8]). *Suppose $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r} < 1$ and $\frac{1}{p'} + \frac{1}{q'} + \frac{1}{r'} < 1$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (i) $\Gamma(p, q, r) \cong \Gamma(p', q', r')$.
- (ii) $\widehat{\Gamma(p, q, r)} \cong \widehat{\Gamma(p', q', r')}$.
- (iii) *The multisets $\{p, q, r\}$ and $\{p', q', r'\}$ are equal.*

This theorem should not be understated as it yields a bijection between the ‘complete Coxeter graph’ for hyperbolic von Dyck triangle groups and the groups themselves, while also showing that this geometric information is entirely encoded by finite quotients. It also raises the question whether a similar statement holds for all triangle groups. This is in fact the case.

Theorem 4.26. *Let $\{p, q, r\}$ and $\{p', q', r'\}$ be multisets of elements in $\mathbb{N}_{\geq 2} \cup \{\infty\}$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (i) $\Delta(p, q, r) \cong \Delta(p', q', r')$.
- (ii) $\widehat{\Delta(p, q, r)} \cong \widehat{\Delta(p', q', r')}$.
- (iii) $\{p, q, r\} = \{p', q', r'\}$.

Proof. The implications (iii) \implies (i) \implies (ii) are immediate. The claim (ii) \implies (i) is a special case of Theorem 4.24. So we need only prove that (i) implies (iii), and shall do this on a case-by-case analysis.

If $\Delta(p, q, r)$ (or $\Delta(p', q', r')$) acts geometrically on a contractible manifold, a theorem of Charney–Davis [CD00] shows that $\Delta(p, q, r)$ (or $\Delta(p', q', r')$) is an isolated point in \mathcal{G} . Hence $\{p, q, r\} = \{p', q', r'\}$. The result of Charney–Davis is applicable to all (infinite) triangle groups without an ∞ -labeled edge. For the finite triangle groups (of which there are only finitely many), the equality $\{p, q, r\} = \{p', q', r'\}$ follows by direct inspection of their Coxeter–Dynkin diagrams after Coxeter’s classification theorem.

We may henceforth assume that $r = \infty = r'$.

We claim that it is not possible for $\{p, q\}$ to have some odd element while $\{p', q'\}$ does not. Indeed, if this were the case then $\Delta(p, q, \infty)^{\text{ab}} \cong C_2^2$ whereas $\Delta(p', q', \infty)^{\text{ab}} \cong C_2^3$, which cannot happen as the groups are assumed to be isomorphic. Thus either p, q, p', q' are all contained in $2\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ or $p, p' \in 2\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $q, q' \in \mathbb{N}$ are both odd.

Suppose first that $p = q = 2$. In this case $\Delta(p, q, \infty)$ is isomorphic to $\cong D_\infty \times C_2$, a virtually abelian group. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 4.24, $\Delta(p', q', \infty)$ must hence also be Euclidean. But the only Euclidean triple containing ∞ is the set $\{2, 2, \infty\}$. We hence obtain $\{p, q, \infty\} = \{p', q', \infty\}$.

Now suppose p and q are both odd. Then the abelianization of $\Delta(p, q, \infty)$ is just C_2 . In particular, $\Delta(p, q, \infty)$ does not map onto the Klein four group $C_2 \times C_2$ and therefore contains a single subgroup of index two; see, e.g., [BBM70, Theorem 1]. As $\Delta(p, q, \infty) \cong \Delta(p', q', \infty)$, the same holds for the latter group. Now, this unique subgroup of index 2 must be the corresponding von Dyck subgroup, so that the isomorphism $\Delta(p, q, \infty) \cong \Delta(p', q', \infty)$ maps $\Gamma(p, q, \infty)$ isomorphically onto $\Gamma(p', q', \infty)$. By Theorem 4.25, it follows that $\{p, q, \infty\} = \{p', q', \infty\}$ as we are now in the hyperbolic case.

We may hence assume that $\{p, q\}$ and $\{p', q'\}$ both have at most one odd element. We resort to the work of Mihalik–Ratcliffe–Tschantz [MRT07] to clear the remaining cases.

Let \mathcal{B} (respectively \mathcal{B}') denote the set of maximal basic subsets of $\Delta(p, q, \infty)$ (respectively $\Delta(p', q', \infty)$); cf. Definition 2.11. By Theorem 2.12, we have that $|\mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{B}'| \leq 2$ and in particular the complete Coxeter graphs for

$$\Delta(p, q, \infty) = \langle a, b, c \mid a^2, b^2, c^2, (ab)^p, (bc)^q \rangle$$

and

$$\Delta(p', q', \infty) = \langle \alpha, \beta, \gamma \mid \alpha^2, \beta^2, \gamma^2, (\alpha\beta)^{p'}, (\beta\gamma)^{q'} \rangle$$

have the same number of ∞ -labeled edges. (As usual we interpret ‘ $(xy)^\infty$ ’ as ‘no relations between x and y ’.) Thus (up to reordering) one has $p = \infty \iff p' = \infty$ (analogously for q, q').

Moreover, Theorem 2.12 also implies that the dihedral subgroups

$$D_p \cong \langle a, b \rangle \text{ and } D_q \cong \langle b, c \rangle \text{ of } \Delta(p, q, \infty)$$

and the dihedral subgroups

$$D_{p'} \cong \langle \alpha, \beta \rangle \text{ and } D_{q'} \cong \langle \beta, \gamma \rangle \text{ of } \Delta(p', q', \infty)$$

satisfy the following conditions on their derived subgroups.

$$\begin{aligned} [D_p, D_p] &\cong [D_{p'}, D_{p'}] \text{ and } [D_q, D_q] \cong [D_{q'}, D_{q'}], \text{ or} \\ [D_p, D_p] &\cong [D_{q'}, D_{q'}] \text{ and } [D_q, D_q] \cong [D_{p'}, D_{p'}]. \end{aligned}$$

But the derived subgroup of a finite dihedral group D_m is cyclic of order $m/2$ (if m is even) or m (otherwise). Thus, if $p, q, p', q' \in 2\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$, or if $p = p' = \infty$ while q, q' are odd, it follows that $\{p, q, \infty\} = \{p', q', \infty\}$.

Therefore the only remaining possibility is the case where $p \geq 3$ and $p' \geq 3$ are even while q and q' are odd. Again from the above condition on finite dihedral parabolics, it follows that $q' = p/2$ and $q = p'/2$. Thus, we can write $p = 4k + 2$ and $p' = 4l + 2$ for some $k, l \geq 1$, and we are in the case

$$\Delta(p, q, r) = \Delta(4k + 2, 2l + 1, \infty) \text{ and } \Delta(p', q', r') = \Delta(4l + 2, 2k + 1, \infty).$$

Of course, if $k = l$ then those groups are isomorphic and $\{p, q, r\} = \{p', q', r'\}$. Otherwise we argue that the groups cannot be isomorphic.

Suppose, on the contrary, that $W := \Delta(4k + 2, 2l + 1, \infty) \cong \Delta(4l + 2, 2k + 1, \infty)$ with $k \neq l$. Assume, without loss of generality, that $l > k$. By Definition 4.1, both such triangle groups admit (a single) pseudo-transposition. Applying Lemma 4.2 to both, we obtain the following Coxeter presentations for them.

$$\begin{aligned} W &\cong \langle x, y, z, w \mid x^2, y^2, z^2, w^2, (xz)^{2k+1}, (xy)^{2l+1}, (xw)^2, (zw)^2 \rangle, \\ W &\cong \langle a, b, c, d \mid a^2, b^2, c^2, d^2, (ac)^{2k+1}, (ab)^{2l+1}, (ad)^2, (bd)^2 \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Since $m_{y,z} = \infty = m_{b,c}$, we obtain two distinct splittings for W along finite parabolics using the Coxeter generators $S = \{x, y, z, w\}$ and $S' = \{a, b, c, d\}$, namely

$$\begin{aligned} W &\cong \langle \{x, z, w\} \rangle *_{\langle \{x,w\} \rangle} \langle \{x, y, w\} \rangle, \\ W &\cong \langle \{a, d, c\} \rangle *_{\langle \{a,d\} \rangle} \langle \{a, b, d\} \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the (maximal) parabolic subgroups $P := \langle \{a, b, d\} \rangle$ and $Q_1 := \langle \{x, z, w\} \rangle$ of W (relative to S' and S , respectively) are finite. More precisely,

$$P \cong \Delta(2l + 1, 2, 2) \text{ and } Q_1 \cong \Delta(2k + 1, 2, 2).$$

In turn, the (maximal) parabolic subgroup $Q_2 = \langle \{x, y, w\} \rangle \cong \Delta(2l + 1, 2, \infty)$ is infinite. By [Ser80, Theorem 8], the (maximal) finite subgroup $P \leq W$ must be contained in a conjugate of Q_1 or Q_2 . In the former case, P and Q_1 would have to be isomorphic as they are maximal finite subgroups of W , but this cannot happen since $l > k$. In the latter case, Q_2 also cannot contain a copy of P because no finite subgroup of Q_2 has order $8l + 4 = |P| = |\Delta(2l + 1, 2, 2)|$, a contradiction. The theorem follows. \square

Corollary 4.27 (A complete picture of $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$). *The layers $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$ form a disconnected 1-dimensional subcomplex of the Coxeter galaxy and of its vertical core. More precisely, $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3} = \mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}^{\text{VC}}$ and the following hold.*

- (i) *The vertices from $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 2}$ are isolated in $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$, except for the dihedral groups $I_2(4k+2)$ with $k \geq 1$. Each such dihedral group has exactly one neighbor, namely the triangle group $\Delta(2k + 1, 2, 2)$.*
- (ii) *All vertices in $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$ distinct from the above exceptions are also isolated.*

Proof. The edges arise from pseudo-transpositions applied to certain dihedral groups in \mathcal{G}_2 . The relevant groups are, by Lemma 4.2, exactly those listed in (i). Apply Theorem 4.24 to conclude that D_∞ is also an isolated point. The remaining cases of (infinite) triangle groups follow immediately from Theorem 4.26. \square

Corollary 4.28. *The isomorphism problem is decidable for groups in the layers $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$.*

Proof. Straightforward from Corollary 4.27 as the connected components of vertices in $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$ are completely determined by the multiset of edge labels of their underlying complete Coxeter graph. \square

To the best of our knowledge, Corollary 4.28 has not explicitly appeared in the literature before. However, it was pointed out to us by Piotr Przytycki that it can be deduced from the works of Caprace–Mühlherr [CM07] and Weigel [Wei11]. Alternatively, it also follows from Ratcliffe and Tschantz’s solution to the twist conjecture for chordal Coxeter groups; see [RT08]. We remark, however, that both such solutions have an intermediate step shown in an unpublished preprint by Howlett and Mühlherr; cf. [CP10, Appendix B].

5. HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM, CLASSICAL RESULTS AND CONJECTURES

In several sub-classes of Coxeter groups the isomorphism problem is known to be decidable. And there exist ways to reduce the full problem to a sub-problem about expanded, angle-compatible Coxeter systems. A key tool in these reductions are certain types of horizontal moves (edges) within the Coxeter galaxy. We describe these horizontal moves in Section 5.1. In Section 5.2 we explain how the twist conjecture provides a way to solve the isomorphism problem. Finally we summarize other approaches and known solutions to the isomorphism problem within certain sub-classes of Coxeter groups in Section 5.4.

5.1. Horizontally navigating within a layer. In this section we describe the known types of horizontal moves: twists, cross-eyed twists and J -deformations.

5.1.1. Twisting the diagram. Twists were discovered by Mühlherr by means of an example in [Müh00], and later formally introduced in [Bra+02]. The definition below is essentially the one provided in [CP10]. Compare also Remark 5.2. Given a subset $J \subset S$ of a generating set S of a Coxeter system, recall that J^\perp consists of those elements in $S \setminus J$ that commute with all elements in J .

Definition 5.1 (Elementary twist). Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system and \mathfrak{C} its complete Coxeter graph. Then \mathfrak{C} admits a twist if there exist subsets A, B, J of S as follows. The set $J \subset S$ generates an irreducible, spherical Coxeter group. Denote by w_J the longest element in that group. The subsets $A, B \subset S$ are disjoint and such that

- (i) $S \setminus (J \cup J^\perp) = A \cup B$, and
- (ii) all edges between A and B have label ∞ .

We then define the *twist of B along J* to be the map $\tau : S \rightarrow W$ where

$$\tau(s) = \begin{cases} s & \text{if } s \in A, \\ w_J s w_J & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The image $\tau(S)$ is called *twisted generating set* of W . The *twisted complete Coxeter graph* \mathfrak{C}' is the complete edge-labeled graph with vertices $\tau(S)$ and, for all $s \neq t$ in S , the edge in \mathfrak{C}' between $\tau(s)$ and $\tau(t)$ has label $m_{\tau(s), \tau(t)} = \text{ord}(\tau(s)\tau(t))$.

An elementary twist depends both on the choice of J and on the choice of A and B . For a given J there may be several choices for A and B in $S \setminus (J \cup J^\perp)$. Every elementary twist is invertible in the sense that we get back the original Coxeter generating set and complete diagram when we twist B^{w_J} along the same set J .

It was shown in [Bra+02, Theorem 4.5] that the pair (W, S') , with S' a twisted generating set as above in Definition 5.1, is also a Coxeter generating set of W . Hence the twisted Coxeter generating set and twisted complete Coxeter graph deserve their names.

Remark 5.2 (Discussion of the definition of twists). In the definition of an elementary twist provided in [CP10], the possibility that $A \cap B$ is nonempty or that either A or B is empty was not excluded.

However, the fact that we assume $A \cup B$ to be a disjoint union in Definition 5.1 is not an important restriction, and is also done, for instance, in Mühlherr's definition of twist in the survey [Müh06] and in [HP18, p. 2083]. Suppose that $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$. In this case the map τ is the identity on all of A (including those elements that are also in B) and equals conjugation by w_J on $B \setminus A$. We may hence replace B by $B \setminus A$ and obtain a disjoint union without changing the map τ .

The definition in [Bra+02] coincides with the definition in [CP10] if one chooses $V = J$ and $U = B$. Similarly, the definition in [Müh06] coincides with Definition 5.1 by choosing $K = A$ (and thus $L = B$). \triangle

In order to facilitate drawing the twisted graph for W with respect the twisted Coxeter system we will now explicitly state how to obtain \mathfrak{C}' from \mathfrak{C} . This might also explain why we call it a *twist of B* .

Remark 5.3 (Drawing the twisted Coxeter graph). Let (W, S) , the graph \mathfrak{C} , a subset $J \subset S$ and subsets $A, B \subset S$ be given as in Definition 5.1. Recall that the set S of vertices in \mathfrak{C} is the following disjoint union:

$$S = A \cup B \cup J \cup J^\perp.$$

Check with Definition 5.1 that $\tau(A \cup J \cup J^\perp) = A \cup J \cup J^\perp$ as τ restricted to A or J^\perp is the identity and permutes J . Thus

$$\tau(S) = A \cup \tau(B) \cup J \cup J^\perp = A \cup B^{w_J} \cup J \cup J^\perp.$$

The graph \mathfrak{C}' is then obtained as follows. Remove from \mathfrak{C} all vertices $b \in B$ and with them all edges connecting b to other elements. Then add for all $b \in B$ a new vertex $\tau(b) = b^{w_J}$. Also add, for all $b \in B$ and $s \in A \cup J \cup J^\perp$, an edge between $\tau(b) = b^{w_J}$ and s with label

$$m_{\tau(b),s} = \begin{cases} m_{b,b'} & \text{if } s = \tau(b') \text{ for some } b' \in B, \\ \infty & \text{if } s = \tau(a) = a \text{ for some } a \in A, \\ m_{b,j} & \text{if } s = \tau(j) \text{ for some } j \in J, \\ m_{b,i} & \text{if } s = i = \tau(i) \text{ for some } i \in J^\perp. \end{cases}$$

Short computations yield that this agrees with Definition 5.1. The graph \mathfrak{C}' hence differs from \mathfrak{C} only in the vertices B and edges connecting to this set. \triangle

The obvious question at hand is whether a twisted diagram \mathfrak{C}' always differs from \mathfrak{C} . The answer is no. If, for example, the element w_J is central in W_J , then \mathfrak{C}' and \mathfrak{C} are isomorphic. This is in particular the case if $|J| = 2$ and the corresponding parabolic subgroup is of classical type $I_2(2k)$ for some $k \geq 1$. Moreover, if J contains only a single element the graphs \mathfrak{C}' and \mathfrak{C} are canonically isomorphic. This motivates the following definition. The term nontrivial twist was defined implicitly in Remark 4.7 of [Bra+02].

Definition 5.4 (Nontrivial elementary twists). An elementary twist for \mathfrak{C} is *nontrivial* if \mathfrak{C} and the twisted diagram \mathfrak{C}' are not isomorphic as edge-labeled graphs. It is *trivial* otherwise.

We now examine which twists are nontrivial.

Lemma 5.5. *Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system with complete Coxeter graph \mathfrak{C} . Let τ be a twist of B along J as in Definition 5.1. Then τ is trivial if one of the following holds:*

- (i) J contains a single element,

- (ii) w_J is central in $W_J = \langle J \rangle$,
- (iii) $A = \emptyset$, or
- (iv) $B = \emptyset$.

Proof. In case $|J| = 1$ conjugation by $w_J = s \in J$ potentially results in replacing B by the set B^s . All connecting edges from $b \in B$ to $s \in J$ are replaced by edges connecting b^s to s that carry the same label. Hence the complete Coxeter graphs of S and $\tau(S)$ are canonically isomorphic.

If w_J is central in W_J the permutation on J induced by τ is trivial. Hence we are in a similar situation as in the first case and the new graph is canonically isomorphic to the old one.

Suppose that $A = \emptyset$. In this case the definition above results in τ being the conjugation of S by w_J . Such a map does not change the underlying complete Coxeter graph.

If $B = \emptyset$, then τ is the identity on S . Therefore the complete Coxeter diagram remains unchanged. \square

As stated in [Bra+02], the finite Coxeter groups in which the element w_J in Definition 5.1 is not central are those of type A_n for $n \geq 2$, D_n for n odd, E_6 or $I_2(m)$ for odd m ; see [BS72, § 7] for details. These are the only cases in which twists may be nontrivial.

To get a nontrivial twist we have to make sure that we are not in the situation that the map τ defined by partial conjugation with w_J as in Definition 5.1 results in a trivial move. In the last two cases, where either A or B were equal to the empty set, the map τ had the property that it was a (potentially trivial) permutation of S . We have to exclude that this happens when both $A \neq \emptyset$ and $B \neq \emptyset$.

Lemma 5.6. *Suppose (W, S) is a Coxeter system and let $J, A, B \subset S$ be as in Definition 5.1. Suppose further that the resulting twist τ of B along J satisfies $\tau(S) = S$. Then $A = \emptyset$ or $B = \emptyset$.*

Proof. So suppose that J, A and B are as in Definition 5.1. Observe that $\tau|_B$ is a permutation of B as a consequence of $\tau(S) = S$. As $J^\perp \cap B = \emptyset$ such a permutation will not have a fixed point. Let $b \in B$. Then $\tau(b) = w_J b w_J$ is a reflection in the Coxeter group W . The smallest parabolic containing $\tau(b)$ is spanned by J and b and strictly contains $\langle J \rangle$. Therefore b is mapped to a reflection not contained in the parabolic spanned by B , and in particular is not mapped to some $b' \in B \setminus \{b\}$. This yields a contradiction. \square

Conjecturally, twists are the only relevant horizontal moves when it comes to solving the isomorphism problem (more on that in Section 5.3). In Section 5.2 we formally discuss the twist conjecture which, in essence, states just that.

5.1.2. *Angle-deformations, cross-eyed twists and other moves.* Before we proceed to explain the various reductions of the isomorphism problem and how they relate to the twist conjecture let us comment on other existing horizontal moves. We start with angle-deformations, introduced by Marquis and Mühlherr in Definition 3.1 of [MM08].

Definition 5.7. (Angle-deformations) Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system and $J = \{r, s\} \subset S$ an edge in its Coxeter–Dynkin diagram $\Gamma = \Gamma(W, S)$. Choose $w \in \langle J \rangle$ such that $\langle wrw^{-1}, s \rangle = \langle J \rangle$. An (r, s, w) -deformation of S is a map $\delta : S \rightarrow W$ such that the following hold:

- (AD1) $\delta(S) \subset S^W$,
- (AD2) $\delta(s) = s$ and $\delta(r) = wrw^{-1}$,
- (AD3) $\delta(S)$ is a Coxeter generating set of W , and
- (AD2) there exists a bijection Δ from the set of edges of Γ to the set of edges of $\Gamma' := \Gamma(W, \delta(S))$ such that $\Delta(J) = \{wrw^{-1}, s\}$ and such that for all edges $K \neq J$ in Γ there exists some $w_K \in W$ with $\Delta(K) = K^{w_K}$.

A J -deformation is an (r, s, w) -deformation for $J = \{r, s\}$ and some choice of w . By an *angle-deformation* we mean a J -deformation for some J .

Some but not all angle deformations extend to automorphisms of W . Properties like this are discussed for example in Proposition 3.4. of [MM08]. Marquis and Mühlherr also provide characterizations of configurations which allow for angle-deformations.

5.1.3. *Cross-eyed twists.* The definition of a cross-eyed twist is similar to, but technically more involved than the definition of an angle deformation. Cross-eyed twists were introduced by Ratcliffe and Tschantz [RT08, p. 69] for chordal Coxeter groups only. It is worth mentioning that this paper motivated the work of Marquis and Mühlherr in [MM08].

The name ‘cross-eyed twist’ probably comes from the situation illustrated in Figure 3 of [RT08] where in a diagram looking like a crossed out eye certain edges are swapped by a cross-eyed twist. They are also referred to as *5-edge angle deformations* and are indeed a deformation of the Coxeter–Dynkin diagram obtained from certain sub-configurations of the diagram in relation to an edge $J = \{r, s\}$ with label 5. Certain (good irreducible) subsets A of Γ are twisted by a conjugation with a suitably chosen element w_A in W . Other (bad irreducible simplices) $A \subset S$ are replaced by $w_A \beta_A(A) w_A^{-1}$ for some well chosen w_A and a non-inner automorphism $\beta_A : \langle A \rangle \rightarrow \langle A \rangle$.

We will not state the precise definition here but refer the reader to Theorem 5.2 and the definition right below it in [RT08]. It would be interesting to know precisely how cross-eyed twists and angle-deformations are related. Both moves were used to solve or reduce the expanded isomorphism problem. See Section 5.3 for details.

5.1.4. *Further comments on horizontal moves.* There is also a notion of an S -transvection. Such a move is another example of a non-reflection preserving modification of a given Coxeter generating set S . It was introduced by Howlett and Mühlherr in an unpublished preprint. See Section 4 of [Müh06] for a (partial) definition. As Mühlherr states, this is not an isomorphism easily seen from the diagram.

Another type of move also mentioned in [Müh06] is the following. We call a subset $J \subset S$ of a Coxeter generating set S of W a *graph factor* of (W, S) if J is spherical and if for all $t \in S \setminus J$ either $t \in J^\perp$ or the order of tj is infinite for all $j \in J$. If J is a graph factor and α an automorphism of $\langle J \rangle$, then one can verify that there is a unique automorphism of W stabilizing the subgroup $\langle J \rangle$, inducing α on it and inducing the identity on $S \setminus J$. Such an automorphism is then called J -local. The S -transvections and J -local automorphisms are used to reduce the isomorphism problem; see [Müh06, Section 4] for details.

5.2. **The twist conjecture.** As discussed in the previous subsection, twists provide a way to move within a fixed layer of the Coxeter galaxy. For a given Coxeter system (W, S) with complete Coxeter graph \mathfrak{C} one may obtain by a nontrivial twist a non-isomorphic complete Coxeter graph \mathfrak{C}' of the same rank which defines the same group. It is shown in [Bra+02] that not only does \mathfrak{C} have the same rank as \mathfrak{C}' , they also define the same set of reflections. This theorem motivated the following conjecture, which was first stated as Conjecture 8.1 in [Bra+02]. See also [Nui14, Conjecture 7.3].

Conjecture 5.8 (The (reflection compatible) twist conjecture). *Let (W, S) and (W, S') be two reflection-compatible (cf. Definition 5.16) Coxeter generating systems of the same rank for the same group W . Let \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{C}' be their respective complete Coxeter diagrams. Then the complete graph \mathfrak{C}' can be obtained from \mathfrak{C} by a sequence of elementary twists.*

In other words, it was conjectured that Coxeter systems are *reflection rigid* up to diagram twisting. See for example [Nui14] for a precise definition.

Definition 5.9 (Twist equivalence). Suppose \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{C}' are two complete Coxeter graphs. We say that \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{C}' are *twist equivalent* if one can be obtained from the other by a sequence of elementary twists.

Twist equivalent graphs are thus contained in a same layer of a connected component of the Coxeter galaxy.

A natural question to ask is whether the intersection of a connected component with a fixed layer \mathcal{G}_k can be computed by twists only. In other words, are twists enough to obtain all Coxeter graphs of a fixed rank for a given Coxeter group? Stated like this, the answer is easily seen to be ‘no’ as not all vertices in a layer of a connected component are reflection compatible.

Example 5.10. Consider the starlet \mathfrak{C} on three vertices and edge labels $4k + 2$, $4l + 2$ and ∞ , with $k \neq l$. This starlet has two distinct pseudo-transpositions, along which we can blow it up following Lemma 4.2. Let \mathfrak{C}_1 (resp. \mathfrak{C}_2) be obtained from \mathfrak{C} by blowing up the edge with label $4k + 2$ (resp. $4l + 2$). For an illustration in case $k = 1$ and $l = 2$ see Fig. 4 with the vertices labeled by the graphs shown in Fig. 3.

By construction and by Definition 3.1, there must be an (horizontal) edge connecting \mathfrak{C}_1 to \mathfrak{C}_2 within their layer \mathcal{G}_4 . This edge, however, cannot arise from a diagram twist. Indeed, let

$$W \cong \langle x, c, b, w \mid x^2, c^2, b^2, w^2, (xc)^{2k+1}, (cb)^{4l+2}, (xw)^2, (cw)^2 \rangle$$

be the Coxeter presentation for the group corresponding to \mathfrak{C}_1 . In the notation of Definition 5.1, one can only twist \mathfrak{C}_1 along $J = \{x, c\}$ or along $J = \{c, b\}$.

The first case, $J = \{x, c\}$, gives $J^\perp = \{w\}$ and forces $A = \emptyset$ (otherwise this twist is already trivial). Applying the twist along this choice of J yields the new Coxeter generating set $\{x, c, w, w_J b w_J\}$. Since $\text{ord}(x w_J b w_J) = 4l + 2$ and $\text{ord}(w w_J b w_J) = \infty = \text{ord}(c w_J b w_J)$, it follows that \mathfrak{C}_1 and the twisted complete Coxeter graph are isomorphic (as edge-labeled graphs) by mapping $x \mapsto c$, $c \mapsto x$, $w \mapsto w$ and $b \mapsto w_J b w_J$. In other words, the given twist is trivial.

In the second case, $J = \{c, b\}$, one has $J^\perp = \emptyset$. Again, in order to get a possibly nontrivial twist, this choice of J forces $A = \emptyset$. Thus $B = \{x, w\}$. Since $4l + 2$ is even, the longest element w_J is central in $\langle J \rangle$, so that the twisted Coxeter generating set $\{w_J x w_J, c, b, w_J w w_J\}$ is merely a conjugate of $\{x, c, b, w\}$. Thus the given twist is trivial also in this case. \triangle

It hence becomes clear that one cannot expect that twists provide a full picture of every layer of the galaxy. This example, however, does not imply that Conjecture 5.8 is false. An actual counterexample to Conjecture 5.8 was provided in Figure 3 of [RT08] by Ratcliffe and Tschantz. See also Section 7 of [Nui14] for a related discussion. Their example provides two non-isomorphic but reflection-compatible graphs defining the same group which are not twist equivalent.

One can see that the twist conjecture needs to be restricted to the top layer, that is, to expanded Coxeter systems and graphs.

Question 5.11 (Reachability Question). *Does there exist a finite list of vertical and horizontal moves such that for any vertex in the Coxeter galaxy any other vertex in its connected component can be reached by applying a finite sequence of these moves?*

The counterexample to Conjecture 5.8 by Ratcliffe and Tschantz suggests to replace reflection-compatible system by angle-compatible ones.

Definition 5.12 (Angle-compatible). Two Coxeter generating sets S and S' of a Coxeter group W are called *angle-compatible* if for all $s, t \in S$ with $\langle s, t \rangle$ finite the set $\{s, t\}$ is conjugate to some pair $\{s', t'\}$ in S' . We also refer to the Coxeter systems or any of its graphs or diagrams as being *angle compatible*.

By taking $s = s'$ one can see that angle-compatible systems are reflection-compatible.

Conjecture 5.13 (The (expanded) angle-compatible twist conjecture). *Let (W, S) and (W, S') be two (expanded) angle-compatible Coxeter generating systems. Let \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{C}' be their respective complete Coxeter diagrams. Then the complete graph \mathfrak{C}' can be obtained from \mathfrak{C} by a sequence of elementary twists.*

Conjecture 5.13 (in the non-expanded version) was stated as Conjecture 2 in [Müh06]. As we will explain in Section 5.3 its proof might lead to the existence of a solution to the isomorphism problem.

Instances for which the angle compatible twist conjecture is solved are, for example, the following: Mühlherr and Weidmann established the conjecture for large-type Coxeter groups [MW02]. Ratcliffe and Tschantz showed that chordal Coxeter groups satisfy the twist conjecture [RT08]. Weigel proved the conjecture for Coxeter groups of rank at least three and not containing parabolics of certain types [Wei11]. And more recently Huang and Przytycki [HP18] proved the twist conjecture for certain Coxeter groups of FC-type.

Remark 5.14 (Adjustments on the twist conjecture). Some more clarification about the twist conjecture and its variants is due. Although we formulated them here for complete Coxeter graphs, the original conjectures were stated for Coxeter systems. While the systems and their diagrams are usually interchangeable, there is a subtlety around the twist conjecture that might require them to be looked separately. Despite this subtlety being clear to experts, we explain it in the sequel for convenience of the reader.

As originally stated, the (angle-compatible, nonexpanded) twist conjecture [Müh06, Conjecture 2] simply predicts that angle-compatible Coxeter generating sets for the same Coxeter group can be transformed into one another by a (finite) sequence of (possibly trivial) elementary twists. On the other hand, the conjecture typically cited in the literature as Mühlherr’s twist conjecture is often meant as follows: if $S, S' \subset W$ are angle-compatible Coxeter generating sets for the same Coxeter group W , then there exists a finite sequence of elementary twists and/or conjugations sending S to S' ; see, for instance, [CP10, penultimate paragraph of p. 2244] or [HP18, second paragraph of p. 2083].

The above ‘popular correction’ of the twist conjecture amounts to adapting the definition of twist equivalence [Müh06] as to allow for conjugations. That is, S and S' are called *twist equivalent* if they differ by conjugations in W and (finitely many) elementary twists. Without this modification, the twist conjecture as originally stated ([Müh06, Conjecture 2]) cannot hold true because not every conjugation is realized by an elementary twist. Alternatively, if the twist conjecture only allows for nontrivial twists (in particular, does not take arbitrary conjugations into account), then the validity of [Müh06, Conjecture 2] would contradict [CP10, Theorem 1.1].

Altogether, Mühlherr’s twist conjecture says that, if $S, S' \subset W$ are angle-compatible, then there exists a (possibly trivial) $w \in W$ such that S' is obtained from the conjugate S^w by applying finitely many elementary twists. As seen above, this is consistent with the literature [CP10; RT08; Wei11; HP18] but also with the adjusted version of twist rigidity: a system (W, S) is called *twist rigid* if it does not admit a nontrivial elementary twist that yields a conjugate system; cf. [Müh06, p. 6].

Lastly, we stress that Mühlherr’s twist conjecture (with or without conjugations) and Conjecture 5.13 are compatible in our language by Remark 3.2. Indeed, if two systems (W, S) and (W, S') differ by a conjugation and a sequence of elementary twists, then their respective complete Coxeter graphs \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{C}' can be obtained from one another by a sequence of elementary twists. \triangle

5.3. Reduction of the isomorphism problem. This section contains an overview on how the isomorphism problem reduces to certain sub-problems. We summarize all known reductions in Fig. 6 and will explain how the various arrows in this figure are obtained.

Implications from top to bottom and left to right in the two columns of this figure simply follow from the definitions and by restriction of the problem.




FIGURE 6. The implications illustrated in this figure follow from (potential) reductions of the isomorphism problem. It illustrates how finding a solution to the isomorphism problem reduces to proving the twist conjecture. Note that some of the implications are not equivalences.

A first possibility to reduce the isomorphism problem to a smaller problem is provided by Theorem 4.4. This theorem allows us to transform any complete Coxeter graph into an expanded graph with isomorphic Coxeter group. That is, Question 3.10 reduces to solving the isomorphism problem in the top layer. Hence in Fig. 6 the two topmost problems (the isomorphism problem and the expanded isomorphism problem) are equivalent.

Question 5.15 (The expanded isomorphism problem.). *Given two expanded complete Coxeter graphs, is there an algorithm that decides whether the corresponding vertices of the Coxeter galaxy are in a same connected component?*

A second reduction is done by passing to the reflection-compatible case, that is considering (ERIP) instead of (RIP) in Fig. 6. The expanded version of the isomorphism problem admits a reduction to the reflection-compatible case by an unpublished theorem of Howlett and Mühlherr, stated as Theorem B.2 in [CP10]. Let us now state the corresponding definitions and questions. By Lemma 3.7 of [Bra+02] or Corollary A.2 of [CP10], reflection-compatibility may be defined as follows.

Definition 5.16 (Reflection-compatible Coxeter systems). Let W be a Coxeter group and S and S' two Coxeter generating sets for W . Then S and S' are *reflection-compatible* if $S^W = (S')^W$, that is, their sets of reflections agree. By slight abuse of notation we will also call the associated graphs and diagrams reflection-compatible.

Question 5.17 ((Expanded) reflection-compatible isomorphism problem). *Given two (expanded and) reflection-compatible complete Coxeter graphs, is there an algorithm that*

decides whether the corresponding vertices of the Coxeter galaxy are in a same connected component?

The notion of J -deformations (Definition 5.7) allows one to reduce Question 5.17 to the expanded and angle-compatible version, that is Question 5.18 below. (See (ERIP) and (EAIP) in the right column of Fig. 6).

Question 5.18 ((Expanded) angle-compatible isomorphism problem). *Given two (expanded and) reflection compatible complete Coxeter graphs, is there an algorithm that decides whether the corresponding vertices of the Coxeter galaxy are in a same connected component?*

Putting all these reductions together we have seen that it should suffice to solve the (expanded) angle-compatible twist conjecture in order to prove existence of a solution to the isomorphism problem. In doing so one has to rely on the unpublished Theorem B.2 in [CP10] of Howlett and Mühlherr.

Proposition 5.19. *If the (expanded) angle-compatible twist conjecture is true, then the isomorphism problem for Coxeter groups is decidable.*

Proof. A proof of the angle-compatible twist conjecture implies a solution to the angle-compatible isomorphism problem, which is Question 5.18. By Theorem 2 of [MM08], a solution to the angle-compatible problem implies that the reflection-compatible one, see Question 5.17, is solvable. This obviously implies a solution to its expanded version. By Howlett and Mühlherr's result, Theorem B.2 in [CP10], this in turn implies an existing solution to the expanded isomorphism problem stated in Question 5.15. Finally, Theorem 4.4 implies that there exists a solution to the (classic) isomorphism problem. \square

5.4. Known parts of the galaxy. As it turns out, for many subfamilies of Coxeter groups there is a fairly complete understanding of possible horizontal edges. We finish the paper by collecting major results that allow us to paint a larger picture of the well-known parts of the Coxeter galaxy. Many results have intersections with one another.

5.4.1. Notions of rigidity. Starting with geometry, the theorem of Charney–Davis [CD00] establishes that Coxeter groups with geometric actions on (pseudo-)manifolds are isolated points in the galaxy. This was further generalized by Caprace–Przytycki [CP11], who identified the broader geometric condition of bipolarity that still yields strong rigidity in the sense of Charney–Davis. In particular, if (W, S) is bipolar, then $\mathfrak{C}(W, S) \in \mathcal{G}$ is an isolated vertex in the Coxeter galaxy.

As the definition of bipolarity is rather technical (cf. Theorem 1.2 in [CP11]), we will not state it but list some prominent examples. Bipolar Coxeter systems include Coxeter groups W with a geometric action on a pseudo-manifold [CD00]. In particular those W that are cocompact Euclidean or hyperbolic reflection groups [Dav83]. Irreducible, 2-spherical, and nonspherical [CM07] (W, S) are also examples of bipolar systems.

In a related paper by Huang and Przytycki [HP18] the notion of k -rigid Coxeter systems is introduced. Twist rigid systems are the same point in the top layer of their connected components if the twist conjecture holds. So in the top layer twist rigidity is equivalent to rigidity given the twist conjecture. Below the top layer the two concepts differ, as previous examples show.

5.4.2. Chordal Coxeter groups. Ratcliffe and Tschantz [RT08] study a particular class of Coxeter groups called chordal. Within this class of groups the isomorphism problem is solved, the angle-compatible twist conjecture Conjecture 5.13 is proven and the reachability question Question 5.11 is positively answered. A Coxeter group is *chordal* if its defining graph (as defined in Definition 2.5) is a chordal graph.

Theorem 9.2 of [RT08] states that, given (W, S) and (W, S') two expanded chordal Coxeter groups, then W and W' are isomorphic if and only if the complete Coxeter graph $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ can be deformed into a labeled graph isomorphic to $\mathfrak{C}(W', S')$ by a finite sequence of elementary twists and cross-eyed twists. This result also relies on an unpublished Theorem by Howlett and Mühlherr. See Theorem 9.1. in [RT08].

Hence Question 3.10 is solvable within the class of chordal Coxeter groups. Even more is true: for an expanded chordal Coxeter group the elementary twists and cross-eyed twists suffice to fully obtain the top layer of its connected component. Even more, the Reachability Question 5.11 has a positive answer in the case of chordal graphs with a short list of moves: blow-ups and -downs, elementary twists, and cross-eyed twists.

5.4.3. Even Coxeter groups. A further breakthrough was the work of Bahls [Bah02] and Mihalik [Mih07], which describe whether two even Coxeter groups lie in the same connected component of the Galaxy. (Recall that the system (W, S) is *even* if all labels in $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ belong to $2\mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$.) A Coxeter group W is said to be even if it admits some Coxeter generating set $S' \subset W$ for which the system (W, S) is even.

Both the isomorphism problem (Question 3.10) and the Reachability Question 5.11 are solved. There exists an algorithm that decides whether there is a path in \mathcal{G} from $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ to an even diagram $\mathfrak{C}(W, S')$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{C}(W, S')$ is the unique even system connected to $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$, and the edges in the path from $\mathfrak{C}(W, S)$ to $\mathfrak{C}(W, S')$ can be taken to be blow-ups, blow-downs, and/or elementary twists.

5.4.4. Final remarks. So far we have been able to completely determine how the Coxeter galaxy looks like up to its third layer, resorting essentially to three power tools: matchings of maximal spherical parabolics, finite quotients and profinite rigidity, and geometric actions. Up until $\mathcal{G}_{\leq 3}$ there are barely any horizontal moves, i.e. edges connecting Coxeter systems in the same layer. There is essentially a single type of horizontal move, namely the edges that arise from a blow-up followed by a direct blow-down. Though as seen in Section 5.1.1 (building up on work of Mühlherr and Brady–McCammond–Mühlherr–Neumann) the galaxy becomes considerably more complicated from layer four onwards since twists come into play, giving new types of horizontal edges.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are indebted to Olga Varghese for decisive discussions. We would also like to thank Piotr Przytycki for pointing out some references. This work was partially supported by the DFG priority program SPP 2026 *Geometry at infinity*, project 62, as well as by the DFG research training group RTG 2297 *MathCore*.

REFERENCES

- [Bah02] C. P. Bahls. “Even rigidity in Coxeter groups”. PhD thesis. Vanderbilt University, USA, 2002, p. 66. ISBN: 978-0493-61636-0.
- [Bou02] N. Bourbaki. *Lie groups and Lie algebras. Chapters 4–6*. Elements of Mathematics (Berlin). Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002, pp. xii+300. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-540-89394-3.
- [Bra+02] N. Brady, J. P. McCammond, B. Mühlherr, and W. D. Neumann. “Rigidity of Coxeter groups and Artin groups”. *Geom. Dedicata* 94 (2002), pp. 91–109. DOI: 10.1023/A:1020948811381.
- [BCR16] M. R. Bridson, M. D. E. Conder, and A. W. Reid. “Determining Fuchsian groups by their finite quotients”. *Israel J. Math.* 214.1 (2016), pp. 1–41. DOI: 10.1007/s11856-016-1341-6.
- [Bri+21] M. R. Bridson, D. B. McReynolds, A. W. Reid, and R. Spitler. “On the profinite rigidity of triangle groups”. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* 53.6 (2021), pp. 1849–1862. DOI: 10.1112/blms.12546.

- [BS72] E. Brieskorn and K. Saito. “Artin-Gruppen und Coxeter-Gruppen”. *Invent. Math.* 17 (1972), pp. 245–271. DOI: 10.1007/BF01406235.
- [BBM70] M. Bruckheimer, A. C. Bryan, and A. Muir. “Groups which are the union of three subgroups”. *Amer. Math. Monthly* 77 (1970), pp. 52–57. DOI: 10.2307/2316854.
- [CM07] P.-E. Caprace and B. Mühlherr. “Reflection rigidity of 2-spherical Coxeter groups”. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* 94.2 (2007), pp. 520–542. DOI: 10.1112/plms/pdl015.
- [CP10] P.-E. Caprace and P. Przytycki. “Twist-rigid Coxeter groups”. *Geom. Topol.* 14.4 (2010), pp. 2243–2275. DOI: 10.2140/gt.2010.14.2243.
- [CP11] P.-E. Caprace and P. Przytycki. “Bipolar Coxeter groups”. *J. Algebra* 338 (2011), pp. 35–55. DOI: 10.1016/j.jalgebra.2011.05.007.
- [CD00] R. Charney and M. Davis. “When is a Coxeter system determined by its Coxeter group?” *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* 61.2 (2000), pp. 441–461. DOI: 10.1112/S0024610799008583.
- [Dav83] M. W. Davis. “Groups generated by reflections and aspherical manifolds not covered by Euclidean space”. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 117.2 (1983), pp. 293–324. DOI: 10.2307/2007079.
- [Dav08] M. W. Davis. *The geometry and topology of Coxeter groups*. Vol. 32. Lond. Math. Soc. Monogr. Ser. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008. ISBN: 978-0-691-13138-2.
- [Deo82] V. V. Deodhar. “On the root system of a Coxeter group”. *Comm. Algebra* 10.6 (1982), pp. 611–630. DOI: 10.1080/00927878208822738.
- [HP18] J. Huang and P. Przytycki. “A step towards twist conjecture”. *Doc. Math.* 23 (2018), pp. 2081–2100. DOI: 10.25537/dm.2018v23.2081-2100.
- [MM08] T. Marquis and B. Mühlherr. “Angle-deformations in Coxeter groups”. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 8.4 (2008), pp. 2175–2208. DOI: 10.2140/agt.2008.8.2175.
- [Mih07] M. Mihalik. “The even isomorphism theorem for Coxeter groups”. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 359.9 (2007), pp. 4297–4324. DOI: 10.1090/S0002-9947-07-04133-5.
- [MT09] M. Mihalik and S. Tschantz. “Visual decompositions of Coxeter groups”. *Groups Geom. Dyn.* 3.1 (2009), pp. 173–198. DOI: 10.4171/GGD/53.
- [MR09] M. L. Mihalik and J. G. Ratcliffe. “On the rank of a Coxeter group”. *J. Group Theory* 12.3 (2009), pp. 449–464. DOI: 10.1515/JGT.2008.089.
- [MRT07] M. L. Mihalik, J. G. Ratcliffe, and S. T. Tschantz. “Matching theorems for systems of a finitely generated Coxeter group”. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.* 7 (2007), pp. 919–956. DOI: 10.2140/agt.2007.7.919.
- [Müh00] B. Mühlherr. “On isomorphisms between Coxeter groups”. Vol. 21. 1-3. Special issue dedicated to Dr. Jaap Seidel on the occasion of his 80th birthday (Oisterwijk, 1999). 2000, p. 189. DOI: 10.1023/A:1008347930052.
- [Müh06] B. Mühlherr. “The isomorphism problem for Coxeter groups”. *The Coxeter legacy*. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006, pp. 1–15. ISBN: 0-8218-3722-2.
- [MW02] B. Mühlherr and R. Weidmann. “Rigidity of skew-angled Coxeter groups”. *Adv. Geom.* 2.4 (2002), pp. 391–415. DOI: 10.1515/advgeom.2002.018.
- [Nov55] P. S. Novikov. *Ob algoritmičeskoj nerazrešivosti problemy toždestva slov v teorii grupp*. Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov. no. 44. Izdat. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Moscow, 1955, p. 143.
- [Nui06] K. Nuida. “On the direct indecomposability of infinite irreducible Coxeter groups and the isomorphism problem for Coxeter groups”. *Comm. Algebra* 34.7 (2006), pp. 2559–2595. DOI: 10.1080/00927870600651281.
- [Nui14] K. Nuida. “On the isomorphism problem for Coxeter groups and related topics.” *Groups of exceptional type, Coxeter groups and related geometries. Invited articles based on the presentations at the international conference on “Groups and geometries”, Bangalore, India, December 10–21, 2012*. New Delhi: Springer, 2014, pp. 217–238. DOI: 10.1007/978-81-322-1814-2_12.
- [RT08] J. G. Ratcliffe and S. T. Tschantz. “Chordal Coxeter groups.” *Geom. Dedicata* 136 (2008), pp. 57–77. DOI: 10.1007/s10711-008-9274-9.
- [Rei18] A. W. Reid. “Profinite rigidity”. *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Rio de Janeiro*. Vol. II. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2018, pp. 1193–1216. DOI: 10.1142/11060.
- [Ric82] R. W. Richardson. “Conjugacy classes of involutions in Coxeter groups”. *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* 26.1 (1982), pp. 1–15. DOI: 10.1017/S0004972700005554.

- [Rob03] S. Roberts. *Donald Coxeter: The man who saved geometry*. Toronto Live, <https://www.math.toronto.edu/mpugh/Coxeter.pdf>. [Online; accessed 05-October-2022]. 2003.
- [Ser80] J.-P. Serre. *Trees*. Translated from the French by John Stillwell. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1980, pp. ix+142. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-61856-7.
- [Wei11] C. J. Weigel. “The twist conjecture for Coxeter groups without small triangle subgroups”. *Innov. Incidence Geom.* 12 (2011), p. 30. DOI: 10.2140/iig.2011.12.111.

OTTO-VON-GUERICKE-UNIVERSITÄT MAGDEBURG,
FAKULTÄT FÜR MATHEMATIK – INSTITUT FÜR ALGEBRA UND GEOMETRIE,
PSF 4120, 39016 MAGDEBURG, DEUTSCHLAND
Email address: yuri.santos@ovgu.de
Email address: petra.schwer@ovgu.de