

## Lengths of Involutions in Coxeter Groups

Sarah B. Perkins and Peter J. Rowley

Communicated by K.-H. Neeb

**Abstract.** Let  $t$  be an involution in a Coxeter group  $W$ . We determine the minimal and maximal (in the case of finite  $W$ ) length of an involution in the conjugacy class of  $t$ .

*Mathematics Subject Classification 20F55.*

Let  $W$  be a finitely generated Coxeter group whose distinguished set – the set of fundamental reflections – is  $R$ . The length  $l(w)$  of a non-trivial element  $w$  in  $W$  is defined to be

$$l(w) = \min\{l \in \mathbb{N} : w = r_1 r_2 \cdots r_l \text{ some } r_i \in R\}$$

and  $l(1) = 0$ . Suppose  $t$  is an involution in  $W$ , and let  $C = t^W$  be the conjugacy class of  $t$  in  $W$ . The aim of this short paper is to determine the minimal and maximal (in which case  $W$  is assumed finite) length of an involution in  $C$ .

Associated to any Coxeter group  $W$  is the root system  $\Phi$ , which is the disjoint union of its positive and negative roots (denoted  $\Phi^+$  and  $\Phi^-$  respectively). The fundamental reflections  $r \in R$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the fundamental roots  $\alpha_r, r \in R$  and  $W$  acts faithfully on  $\Phi$  (see [1]). For  $w \in W$ , define  $N(w) := \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ : w \cdot \alpha \in \Phi^-\}$ ,  $I(w) := \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ : w \cdot \alpha = -\alpha\}$  and  $\text{Fix}(w) := \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ : w \cdot \alpha = \alpha\}$ . It is well known that for each  $w \in W$ ,  $l(w) = |N(w)|$ . For  $J \subseteq R$ , write  $W_J$  for the (Coxeter) group generated by  $J$ ,  $\Phi_J$  for its root system and, when it is finite,  $w_J$  for the unique longest element of  $W_J$ . Our main result is given in

**Theorem 1.1.** *Suppose  $t$  is an involution in  $W$ , and put  $C = t^W$ . We have*

- (i)  $\min_{s \in C} \{l(s)\} = |I(t)|$  and if  $x$  is of minimal length in  $C$ , then  $x = w_J$  for some  $J \subseteq R$ .
- (ii) If  $W$  is finite, then  $\max_{s \in C} \{l(s)\} = |\Phi^+| - |\text{Fix}(t)|$  and for  $y$  of maximal length in  $C$ ,  $y = w_K w_R$  for some  $K \subseteq R$ .

Put another way, Theorem 1.1 is saying that the maximum and minimum length in a conjugacy class of involutions may be obtained by examining the action on  $\Phi$

of any one involution in that class. We remark that part (i) appears as Theorem A (a) in [3]. We include a (shorter, and different) proof here to emphasise the similarity between parts (i) and (ii).

**Proof.** Let  $t$  be an involution and  $C = t^W$ . Note that for any  $t' \in C$ ,  $|I(t')| = |I(t)|$  and  $|\text{Fix}(t')| = |\text{Fix}(t)|$ , because  $t \cdot \alpha = \pm\alpha$  if and only if  $t^g \cdot (g \cdot \alpha) = \pm(g \cdot \alpha)$ , for each  $g \in W$ . It is clear from this that the length of any involution in  $C$  is at least  $|I(t)|$  and at most  $|\Phi^+| - |\text{Fix}(t)|$ . Let  $r \in R$  with  $\alpha_r \notin N(t)$ , and suppose  $\alpha_r \notin \text{Fix}(t)$ . It is well known that for any  $w \in W$ ,  $r \in R$ ,  $l(wr) > l(w)$  if and only if  $w \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi^+$ . We have  $t \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi^+ \setminus \{\alpha_r\}$ , so  $rt \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi^+$ . Therefore  $l(rtr) > l(rt)$ . Now  $rt = (tr)^{-1}$ , hence  $l(rt) = l(tr) > l(t)$ , since  $\alpha_r \notin N(t)$ . Thus  $l(rtr) > l(t)$ . Suppose now that  $\alpha_r \in N(t)$  with  $\alpha_r \notin I(t)$ . We have  $l(rtr) < l(rt)$  because  $rt \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi^-$ , and  $l(rt) = l(tr) < l(r)$  because  $\alpha_r \in N(t)$ . Thus  $l(rtr) < l(t)$ .

We have shown that if  $\alpha_r \notin N(t)$ , then either  $l(rtr) > l(t)$  or  $\alpha_r \in \text{Fix}(t)$ , and that if  $\alpha_r \in N(t)$ , then either  $l(rtr) < l(t)$  or  $\alpha_r \in I(t)$ . Thus for each  $x$  of minimal length in  $C$ , there exists  $J \subseteq R$  with  $\alpha_r \in I(x)$  for each  $r \in J$  and  $\alpha_r \notin N(x)$  when  $r \notin J$ . Let  $r \in J$ . Then  $w_J x \cdot \alpha_r = -w_J \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi^+$ . If  $r \notin J$  then  $w_J x \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi^+$  unless  $x \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi_J^+$ . But this would imply that  $x^2 \cdot \alpha_r = -x \cdot \alpha_r \neq \alpha_r$ , which is impossible. Thus  $N(w_J x) = \emptyset$  and hence  $x = w_J$ . Now  $N(x) = \Phi_J^+ = I(x)$  and so  $x$  has length  $|I(t)|$  in  $C$ , which is minimal.

Similarly, when  $W$  is finite, for  $y$  of maximal length in  $C$  there exists  $K \subseteq R$  with  $\alpha_r \in \text{Fix}(y)$  whenever  $r \in K$ , and  $\alpha_r \in N(y)$  for  $r \notin K$ . We claim that  $\text{Fix}(y) = \Phi_K^+$ . Certainly  $\Phi_K^+ \subseteq \text{Fix}(y)$ . For the reverse inclusion, let  $\alpha = \sum_{r \in R} \lambda_r \alpha_r \in \text{Fix}(y)$  (where each  $\lambda_r \geq 0$ ). Now  $y \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi^-$  for all  $r \in R \setminus K$ , so  $\sum_{r \in R \setminus K} \lambda_r y \cdot \alpha_r$  is a negative linear combination of roots, say  $-\sum_{r \in R} \mu_r \alpha_r$  for some  $\mu_r \geq 0$ . We have  $\sum_{r \in R} \lambda_r \alpha_r = \alpha = y \cdot \alpha = \sum_{r \in K} (\lambda_r - \mu_r) \alpha_r - \sum_{r \in R \setminus K} \mu_r \alpha_r$ . For  $r \in R \setminus K$  then, we see that  $\lambda_r = -\mu_r$ . Hence  $\lambda_r = \mu_r = 0$ . Therefore  $\alpha \in \Phi_K^+$  and so  $\text{Fix}(y) \subseteq \Phi_K^+$ .

Now for  $r \in K$ ,  $w_K y \cdot \alpha_r = w_K \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi^-$ . If  $r \notin K$ ,  $w_K y \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi^+$  only when  $y \cdot \alpha_r \in \Phi_K^-$ , which is impossible. Consequently  $N(w_K y) = \Phi^+$ , that is  $y = w_K w_R$  and  $l(y) = |N(y)| = |\Phi^+| - |\Phi_K^+| = |\Phi^+| - |\text{Fix}(y)|$  and this is the maximum possible length of an involution in  $C$ . ■

We remark that it is necessary, as Proposition 1.3 shows, to assume, when  $W$  is irreducible, that  $W$  is finite in order for  $\max_{s \in C} \{l(s)\}$  to be defined. We require the following lemma, which follows from the fact that the geometric representation of  $W$  is irreducible and faithful (see [1]).

**Lemma 1.2.** (*[2], Lemma 2.3*) *Let  $W$  be an irreducible Coxeter group and let  $\alpha \in \Phi$ . Then  $W$  acts faithfully on the orbit  $W \cdot \alpha$ .*

**Proposition 1.3.** *Suppose  $W$  is an infinite irreducible Coxeter group. Then each conjugacy class of involutions in  $W$  contains elements of arbitrarily large length.*

**Proof.** Let  $t$  be an involution of  $W$ . Then, by Theorem 1.1,  $I(t)$  is non-empty, so there exists  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$  with  $t \cdot \alpha = -\alpha$ . Let  $\beta \in W \cdot \alpha$ . Then  $\beta = w \cdot \alpha$  for

some  $w \in W$ . Now  $t^w \cdot \beta = wtw^{-1} \cdot (w \cdot \alpha) = -\beta$ , whence  $\beta \in N(t^w)$ . Thus  $W \cdot \alpha \subseteq \cup_{w \in W} N(t^w)$ . Each element  $t^w$  has finite length, but  $W \cdot \alpha$  is infinite, by Lemma 1.2, hence the conjugacy class of  $t$  must be infinite. Consequently, since there can only be finitely many elements of a given length in  $W$ , the conjugacy class of  $t$  must contain elements of arbitrarily large length. ■

### References

- [1] J. E. Humphreys, “Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups,” Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **29**, 1990.
- [2] Perkins, S. B., and P. J. Rowley, *Bad Upward Elements in Infinite Coxeter Groups*, Manchester Centre for Pure Mathematics Preprint, 2000/6.
- [3] Richardson, R. W., *Conjugacy classes of involutions in Coxeter groups*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **30** (1982), 1–15.

S. B. Perkins and P. J. Rowley  
Department of Mathematics,  
UMIST, PO Box 88,  
Manchester M60 1QD  
United Kingdom  
Sarah.Perkins@umist.ac.uk

Received June 30, 2002  
and in final form October 13, 2003