Abstract

Tibor Rado defined the Busy Beaver Competition in 1962. He used Turing machines to give explicit definitions for some functions that are not computable and grow faster than any computable function. He put forward the problem of computing the values of these functions on numbers 1, 2, 3, . . . . More and more powerful computers have made possible the computation of lower bounds for these values. In 1988, Brady extended the definitions to functions on two variables.

We give a historical survey of these works. The successive record holders in the Busy Beaver Competition are displayed, with their discoverers, the date they were found, and, for some of them, an analysis of their behavior.

We also survey the relations between busy beaver functions, the variants of their definitions, and the links with logical unprovability.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Noncomputable functions

In 1936, Turing succeeded in making formal the intuitive notion of a function computable by a finite, mechanical, procedure. He defined what is now called a Turing machine and stated that a function on integers is intuitively computable if and only if it is computable by a Turing machine. Other authors, such as Church, Kleene, Post, and, later, Markov, defined other models of computation that turn out to compute the same functions as Turing machines do. See Soare (1996, 2007, 2009) for more details about the history of the Church-Turing Thesis.
as is now named the capture of the intuitive notion of computability by the formal notion of Turing machine.

Given a model of computation, a noncomputable function can easily be defined by diagonalization. The list of all computable functions is written, and then a function is defined such that it is distinct from each function in the list. Then this function is noncomputable. Such a definition by diagonalization leaves too much room in the choice of the list and in the choice of the values of the final function. What is needed is a function whose definition is simple, natural and without ambiguousness.

In 1962, Rado succeeded in providing a natural definition for noncomputable functions on the integers. He defined a Busy Beaver game, leading to two functions $\Sigma$ and $S$ which are still the best examples of noncomputable functions that one can give nowadays. The values $\Sigma(n)$ and $S(n)$ are defined by considering the finite set of carefully defined Turing machines with two symbols and $n$ states, and picking among these machines those with some maximal behavior. It makes sense to compute the values $\Sigma(n)$ and $S(n)$ of these functions on small integers $n = 1, 2, \ldots$. We have $\Sigma(1) = S(1) = 1$, trivially. Lin and Rado (1965) gave proofs for the values $\Sigma(2)$, $S(2)$, $\Sigma(3)$ and $S(3)$, and Brady (1983) did for $\Sigma(4)$ and $S(4)$. Only lower bounds had been provided for $\Sigma(5)$ and $S(5)$, by the works of Green, Lynn, Schult, Uhing and eventually Marxen and Buntrock. The lower bounds for $\Sigma(6)$ and $S(6)$ are still an ongoing quest.

The initial Busy Beaver game, as defined by Rado, used Turing machines with two symbols. Brady (1988) generalized the problem to Turing machines with $k$ symbols, $k \geq 3$. He defined a function $S(n, k)$ such that $S(n, 2)$ is Rado’s $S(n)$, and gave some lower bounds. Michel (2004) resumed the computation of lower bounds for $S(n, k)$ and another function $\Sigma(n, k)$, and the search is going on, with the works of Brady, Souris, Lafitte and Papazian, T. and S. Ligocki.

Since 2004, results are sent by email to Marxen and to Michel, who record them on their websites. This paper aims to give a published version of these records.

### 1.2 Big numbers

Consider Rado’s functions $S$ and $\Sigma$. Not only they are not computable, but they grow faster than any computable function. That is, for any computable function $f$, there exists an integer $N$ such that, for all $n > N$, we have $S(n) > f(n)$. This property can be used to write big numbers. For example, if $S^k(n)$ denotes $S(S(\ldots S(n) \ldots))$, iterated $k$ times, then $S^9(9)$ is a very big number, bigger than any number that was written with six symbols before the definition of the $S$ function.

Bigger numbers can be obtained by defining functions growing much faster than Rado’s busy beaver functions. A natural idea to get such functions is to define Turing machines of order $k$ as follows. Turing machines of order 1 are usual Turing machines without oracle, and, for $k \geq 2$, Turing machines of order $k$ are Turing machines with oracle, where the oracle is the halting problem for Turing machines of order $k-1$. Then the $k$-th busy beaver function $B_k(n)$ is the maximum number of steps taken by a Turing machine of order $k$ with $n$ states and two symbols that stops when it is launched on a blank tape. So $B_1(n) = S(n)$, and $B_k(n)$ grows faster than any function computable by a Turing machine of order $k$.

Unfortunately, there is no canonical way to define a Turing machine with oracle, so Scott Aaronson, in his paper Who can name the bigger number? (see the website), asked for
naturally defined functions growing as fast as the \( k \)-th busy beaver functions for \( k \geq 2 \). Such functions were found by Nabutovsky and Weinberger (2007). By using homology of groups, they defined a function growing as fast as the third busy beaver function, and another one growing as fast as the fifth busy beaver function. Michel (2010) went on studying these functions.

### 1.3 Contents

The paper is structured as follows.

1. Introduction.
2. Preliminaries.
3. Historical overview.
4. Historical survey (lower bounds for \( S(n, k) \) and \( \Sigma(n, k) \), and tables of the Turing machines that achieve these lower bounds).
5. Behaviors of busy beavers. We also display the relations between these behaviors and open problems in mathematics called Collatz-like problems and we resume some machines with non-Collatz-like behaviors. We also present pairs of machines that have the same behaviors, but not the same numbers of states and symbols.
6. Properties of the busy beaver functions and relations between \( S(n) \) and \( \Sigma(n) \).
7. Variants of busy beavers:
   - Busy beavers defined by 4-tuples.
   - Busy beavers whose head can stand still.
   - Busy beavers on a one-way infinite tape.
   - Two-dimensional busy beavers.
8. The methods.

### 2 Preliminaries

There are many possible definitions for a Turing machine. We will follow the conventions chosen by Rado (1962) in his definition of functions \( \Sigma \) and \( S \). A Turing machine has a tape, made of cells, infinite to the left and to the right. On each cell a symbol is written. There is a finite set \( S = \{0, 1, \ldots\} \) of symbols. The symbol 0 is the blank symbol. A Turing machine has a tape head, which reads and writes symbols on the tape, and can move in both directions left or right, denoted by \( L \) and \( R \). A Turing machine has a finite set of states \( Q = \{A, B, \ldots\} \), plus a special state \( H \), the halting state. A Turing machine has a next move function

\[
\delta : Q \times S \rightarrow (S \times \{L, R\} \times Q) \cup \{(1, R, H)\}.
\]
If we have $\delta(q, a) = (b, d, p)$, then it means that, when the Turing machine is in state $q$ and reads symbol $a$ on the tape, then it writes symbol $b$ instead of $a$ on the cell currently read, it moves one cell in the direction $d \in \{L, R\}$, and it changes the state from $q$ to $p$. Each application of next move function $\delta$ is a step of the computation. If $\delta(q, a) = (1, R, H)$, then, when the machine is in state $q$ reading symbol $a$, it writes a 1, moves right, enters state $H$, and stops. We follow Rado (1962) in not allowing the center direction, that is in compelling the tape head to move left or right at each step. Like Rado, we keep the halting state $H$ out of the set of states. We differ from Rado in not allowing transitions $\delta(q, a) = (b, d, H)$ with $b \neq 1, d \neq R$.

Note that such a machine is a universal model of computation. That is, any computable function on integers can be computed by a Turing machine as defined above. Initially, a finite string of symbols is written on the tape. It is called the input, and can be a code for an integer. All other cells contain the blank symbol. The tape head reads the leftmost symbol of the input and the state is the initial state $A$. Then the computation is launched according to the next move function. If it stops, by entering the halting state $H$, then the string of symbols written on the tape is the output, which can be a code for an integer. So a Turing machine defines a partial function on integers. Reciprocally, any computable partial function on integers can be computed by a Turing machine as defined above.

In order to define functions $\Sigma$ and $S$, Rado (1962) considers Turing machines with $n$ states and two symbols 0 and 1. His definitions can be easily extended to Turing machines with $n$ states and $k$ symbols, $k \geq 3$, as Brady (1988) does. We consider the set $TM(n, k)$ of Turing machines with $n$ states and $k$ symbols. With our definitions, it is a finite set with $(2kn + 1)^{kn}$ members. We launch each of these $(2kn + 1)^{kn}$ Turing machines on a blank tape, that is a tape with the blank symbol 0 in each cell. Some of these machines never stop. The other ones, that eventually stop, are called busy beavers, and they are competing in two competitions, for the maximum number of steps and for the maximum number of non-blank symbols left on the tape. Let $s(M)$ be the number of computation steps taken by the busy beaver $M$ to stop. Let $\sigma(M)$ be the number of non-blank symbols left on the tape by the busy beaver $M$ when it stops. Then the busy beaver functions are

$$S(n, k) = \max\{s(M) : M \text{ is a busy beaver with } n \text{ states and } k \text{ symbols}\},$$

$$\Sigma(n, k) = \max\{\sigma(M) : M \text{ is a busy beaver with } n \text{ states and } k \text{ symbols}\}.$$  

For $k = 2$, we find Rado’s functions $S(n) = S(n, 2)$ and $\Sigma(n) = \Sigma(n, 2)$.

Note that a permutation of the states, symbols or directions does not change the behavior of a Turing machine. The choice between machines that differ only by such permutations is settled by the following normalizing rule: when a Turing machine is launched on a blank tape, it enters states in the order $A, B, C, \ldots$, it writes symbols in the order $1, 2, \ldots$, and it first moves right. So, normally, the first transition is $\delta(A, 0) = (1, R, B)$ or $\delta(A, 0) = (0, R, B)$.

Note about terminology and notations

Many names are used by authors: busy beaver game, busy beaver contest, busy beaver problem, busy beaver competition. All of them were first used early: game by Rado (1962), contest and problem by Rado (1963), competition by Green (1964).

What is exactly a busy beaver is rarely specified. Let us give some exceptions. For some authors, such as Green (1964) and Oberschelp et al. (1988), a busy beaver is any
Turing machine that participates to the busy beaver competition and halts. For others, such as Dewdney (1984) and Ben-Amram and Petersen (2002), a busy beaver is a winner of this competition. Rado (1962) called the winner a champion, and this term has been used sometimes afterwards.

The number of ones left on the tape by the Turing machine $M$ when it stops is often called the score and denoted by $\sigma(M)$, since Rado (1962). It is called the productivity by Boolos and Jeffrey (1974), a term used again by Hertel (2009) and Harland (2013,2016). Harland uses the term activity for the number of moves of a Turing machine.

Almost all authors use the notations $\Sigma(n)$ and $S(n)$ for the busy beaver functions. Notable exceptions are: ones $(n)$ and time$(n)$ by Ben-Amram et al. (1996) and Ben-Amram and Petersen (2002); $\text{bb}(n)$ and $\text{ff}(n)$ by Harland (2013,2016).

3 Historical overview

The search for champions in the busy beaver competition can be roughly divided into the following stages. Note that, from the beginnings, computers have been tools to find good competitors, so better results follow more powerful computers.

First stage: Following the definitions. The definitions of the busy beaver functions $\Sigma(n)$ and $S(n)$ by Rado (1962) were quickly followed by conjectures and proofs for $n = 2, 3$, by Rado and Lin. Brady (1964) gave a conjecture for $n = 4$, and Green (1964) gave lower bounds for many values of $n$. Lynn (1972) improved these lower bounds for $n = 5, 6$. Brady proved his conjecture for $n = 4$ in 1974, and published the result in 1983. Details on this first stage can be found in the articles of Lynn (1972) and Brady (1983, 1988).

Second stage: Following the Dortmund contest. More results for $n = 5, 6$ followed the contest that was organized at Dortmund in 1983, and was won by Schult. Uhling improved twice the result in 1984 and in 1986. Marxen and Buntrock began a search for competitors for $n = 5, 6$ in 1989. They quickly found a conjectural winner for $n = 5$, and went on finding many good machines for $n = 6$, up to 2001. Michel (1993) studied the behaviors of many competitors for $n = 5$, proving that they depend on well known open problems in number theory. Details on this second stage can be found in the articles of Dewdney (1984ab,1985ab), Brady (1988), and Marxen and Buntrock (1990). From 1997, results began to be put on the web, either on Google groups, or on personal websites.

Third stage: Machines with more than two symbols. As soon as 1988, Brady extended the busy beaver competition to machines with more than two symbols and gave some lower bounds. Michel (2004) resumed the search, and his lower bounds were quickly overtaken by those from Brady. Between 2005 and 2008, more than forty new machines, each one breaking a record, were found by two teams: the French one made of Grégory Lafitte and Christophe Papazian, and the father-and-son collaboration of Terry and Shawn Ligocki. Four new machines for the classical busy beaver competition of machines with 6 states and 2 symbols were also found, by the Ligockis and by Pavel Kropitz.

With the coming of the web age, researchers have faced two problems: how to announce results, and how to store them. In 1997, Heiner Marxen chose to post them on Google groups,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>(n,k)-TM: $s$, $\sigma$</th>
<th>$S(n, k)$, $\Sigma(n, k)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Rado, Lin</td>
<td>$S(2, 2) = 6$, $\Sigma(2, 2) = 4$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$S(3, 2) = 21$, $\Sigma(3, 2) = 6$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>(4,2)-TM: $s = 107, \sigma = 13$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>(5,2)-TM: $\sigma = 17$</td>
<td>(6,2)-TM: $\sigma = 35$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,2)-TM: $\sigma = 22,961$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>(5,2)-TM: $s = 435, \sigma = 22$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,2)-TM: $s = 522, \sigma = 42$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Weimann</td>
<td>(5,2)-TM: $s = 556, \sigma = 40$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>(5,2)-TM: $s = 7,707, \sigma = 112$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>$S(4, 2) = 107, \Sigma(4, 2) = 13$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>(6,2)-TM: $s = 13,488, \sigma = 117$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Schuit</td>
<td>(5,2)-TM: $s = 134,467, \sigma = 501$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,2)-TM: $s = 4,208,824, \sigma = 2,075$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1984</td>
<td>Uthing</td>
<td>(5,2)-TM: $s = 2,133,492, \sigma = 1,915$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1986</td>
<td>Uthing</td>
<td>(5,2)-TM: $s = 2,358,064$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>(2,3)-TM: $s = 38, \sigma = 9$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,4)-TM: $s = 7,195, \sigma = 90$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1990</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>(5,2)-TM: $s = 47,176,870, \sigma = 4,098$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,2)-TM: $s = 13,122,572,797, \sigma = 136,612$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1997</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>(6,2)-TM: $s = 8,690,333,381,690,951, \sigma = 95,524,079$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2000</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>(6,2)-TM: $s &gt; 5.3 \times 10^{42}, \sigma &gt; 2.5 \times 10^{24}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2000</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>(6,2)-TM: $s &gt; 6.1 \times 10^{925}, \sigma &gt; 6.4 \times 10^{862}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2001</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>(6,2)-TM: $s &gt; 3.0 \times 10^{1730}, \sigma &gt; 1.2 \times 10^{865}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Busy Beaver Competition from 1963 to 2001. In the last column, an $(n,k)$-Turing machine is a Turing machine with $n$ states and $k$ symbols. Number $s$ is the number of steps, and number $\sigma$ is the number of non-blank symbols left by the Turing machine when it stops. When $(n,k)$-TM is in bold type, the Turing machine is the current record holder. When values of $S(n, k)$ and $\Sigma(n, k)$ are indicated, the line refers to the proof that the functions have these values.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Competitor</th>
<th>(3,3)-TM: $s = 40,737, \sigma = 208$</th>
<th>(3,3)-TM: $s = 29,403,894, \sigma = 5,600$</th>
<th>(3,3)-TM: $s = 92,649,163, \sigma = 13,949$</th>
<th>(2,4)-TM: $s = 3,932,964, \sigma = 2,050$</th>
<th>(2,5)-TM: $s = 16,268,767, \sigma = 4,099$</th>
<th>(2,5)-TM: $s = 98,364,599, \sigma = 10,574$</th>
<th>(2,5)-TM: $s &gt; 7.0 \times 10^{21}, \sigma = 172,312,766,455$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2004</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2004</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2004</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>(2,4)-TM: $s = 3,932,964, \sigma = 2,050$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>(4,3)-TM: $s = 250,096,776, \sigma = 15,008$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4,3)-TM: $s = 262,759,288, \sigma = 17,323$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,5)-TM: $s = 148,304,214, \sigma = 11,120$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,6)-TM: $s = 493,600,387, \sigma = 15,828$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td>Souris</td>
<td>(3,3)-TM: $s = 544,884,219, \sigma = 36,089$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2005</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>(3,3)-TM: $s = 4,939,345,068, \sigma = 107,900$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,5)-TM: $s = 8,619,024,596, \sigma = 90,604$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>(3,3)-TM: $s = 987,522,842,126, \sigma = 1,525,688$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2005</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>(2,5)-TM: $s = 233,431,192,481, \sigma = 458,357$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,5)-TM: $s = 912,594,733,606, \sigma = 1,957,771$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2005</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>(2,5)-TM: $s = 924,180,005,181$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2006</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>(3,3)-TM: $s = 4,144,465,135,614, \sigma = 2,950,149$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2006</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>(2,5)-TM: $s = 3,793,261,759,791, \sigma = 2,576,467$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2006</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>(2,5)-TM: $s = 14,103,258,269,249, \sigma = 4,848,239$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2006</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>(2,5)-TM: $s = 26,375,397,569,930$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>(3,3)-TM: $s = 4,345,166,620,336,565, \sigma = 95,524,079$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,5)-TM: $s &gt; 7.0 \times 10^{21}, \sigma = 172,312,766,455$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Busy Beaver Competition from 2004 to 2006
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Busy Beaver Competitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>$S(2, 3) = 38, \Sigma(2, 3) = 9$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| September 2007 | T. and S. Ligocki | (3.4)-TM: $s > 5.7 \times 10^{92}$, $\sigma > 2.4 \times 10^{26}$  
(2.6)-TM: $s > 2.3 \times 10^{54}$, $\sigma > 1.9 \times 10^{27}$ |
| October 2007 | T. and S. Ligocki | (4.3)-TM: $s > 1.5 \times 10^{1426}$, $\sigma > 1.1 \times 10^{744}$  
(3.4)-TM: $s > 4.3 \times 10^{281}$, $\sigma > 6.0 \times 10^{140}$  
(3.4)-TM: $s > 7.6 \times 10^{868}$, $\sigma > 4.6 \times 10^{434}$  
(3.4)-TM: $s > 3.1 \times 10^{4256}$, $\sigma > 2.1 \times 10^{628}$  
(2.5)-TM: $s > 5.2 \times 10^{61}$, $\sigma > 9.3 \times 10^{30}$  
(2.5)-TM: $s > 1.6 \times 10^{211}$, $\sigma > 5.2 \times 10^{105}$ |
| November 2007 | T. and S. Ligocki | (6.2)-TM: $s > 8.9 \times 10^{1762}$, $\sigma > 2.5 \times 10^{981}$  
(3.3)-TM: $s = 119,112,334,170,342,540, \sigma = 374,676,383$  
(4.3)-TM: $s > 7.7 \times 10^{618}$, $\sigma > 1.6 \times 10^{890}$  
(4.3)-TM: $s > 3.7 \times 10^{973}$, $\sigma > 8.0 \times 10^{886}$  
(4.3)-TM: $s > 3.9 \times 10^{7721}$, $\sigma > 4.0 \times 10^{9860}$  
(4.3)-TM: $s > 3.9 \times 10^{9122}$, $\sigma > 2.5 \times 10^{4561}$  
(3.4)-TM: $s > 8.4 \times 10^{2601}$, $\sigma > 1.7 \times 10^{1301}$  
(3.4)-TM: $s > 3.4 \times 10^{4710}$, $\sigma > 1.4 \times 10^{3355}$  
(3.4)-TM: $s > 5.9 \times 10^{4744}$, $\sigma > 2.2 \times 10^{3372}$  
(2.5)-TM: $s > 1.9 \times 10^{704}$, $\sigma > 1.7 \times 10^{352}$  
(2.6)-TM: $s > 4.9 \times 10^{1643}$, $\sigma > 8.6 \times 10^{821}$  
(2.6)-TM: $s > 2.5 \times 10^{9863}$, $\sigma > 6.9 \times 10^{931}$ |
| December 2007 | T. and S. Ligocki | (6.2)-TM: $s > 2.5 \times 10^{2875}$, $\sigma > 4.6 \times 10^{749}$  
(4.3)-TM: $s > 7.9 \times 10^{9863}$, $\sigma > 8.9 \times 10^{931}$  
(4.3)-TM: $s > 5.3 \times 10^{2068}$, $\sigma > 4.2 \times 10^{6034}$  
(3.4)-TM: $s > 5.2 \times 10^{103036}$, $\sigma > 3.7 \times 10^{6518}$ |
| January 2008 | T. and S. Ligocki | (4.3)-TM: $s > 1.0 \times 10^{14072}$, $\sigma > 1.3 \times 10^{5936}$  
(2.6)-TM: $s > 2.4 \times 10^{9866}$, $\sigma > 1.9 \times 10^{4933}$ |
| May 2010 | Kropitz | (6.2)-TM: $s > 3.8 \times 10^{21132}$, $\sigma > 3.1 \times 10^{10356}$ |
| June 2010 | Kropitz | (6.2)-TM: $s > 7.4 \times 10^{38034}$, $\sigma > 3.4 \times 10^{18267}$ |
| March 2014 | “Wythagoras” | (7,2)-TM: $s > \sigma > 10^{10^{10^{10^{10^{10^{10}}}}}}$ |

Table 3: Busy Beaver Competition since 2007
but it seems that the oldest reports are no longer available. From 2004, most results have been announced by sending them by email to several people (for example, the new machines with 6 states and 2 symbols found by Terry and Shawn Ligocki in November and December 2007 were sent by email to six persons: Allen H. Brady, Grégory Lafitte, Heiner Marxen, Pascal Michel, Christophe Papazian and Myron P. Souris). Storing results have been made on web pages (see websites list after the references). Brady has stored results on machines with 3 states and 3 symbols on his own website. Both Marxen and Michel have kept account of all results on their websites. Moreover, Marxen has held simulations, with four variants, of each discovered machine. Michel has held theoretical analyses of many machines.

4 Historical survey

4.1 Turing machines with 2 states and 2 symbols

- Rado (1963) claimed that $\Sigma(2,2) = 4$, but that $S(2,2)$ was yet unknown.
- The value $S(2,2) = 6$ was probably set by Lin in 1963. See http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simTM22_bb.html for a study of the winner by H. Marxen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>$S(2,2)$</th>
<th>$\Sigma(2,2)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Rado, Lin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner and some other good machines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1RB</th>
<th>1LA</th>
<th>1LB</th>
<th>1RH</th>
<th>$s(M)$</th>
<th>$\sigma(M)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Turing machines with 3 states and 2 symbols

- Soon after the definition of the functions $S$ and $\Sigma$, by Rado (1962), it was conjectured that $S(3,2) = 21$, and $\Sigma(3,2) = 6$.
- Lin (1963) proved this conjecture and this proof was eventually published by Lin and Rado (1965). See studies by Heiner Marxen of the winners for the $S$ function in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simTM32_bbS.html and for the $\Sigma$ function in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simTM32_bbO.html

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>$S(3,2)$</th>
<th>$\Sigma(3,2)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Rado, Lin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winners and some other good machines:
4.3 Turing machines with 4 states and 2 symbols

- Brady (1964,1965,1966) found a machine $M$ such that $s(M) = 107$ and $\sigma(M) = 13$. See study by H. Marxen in

http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simTM42_bb.html

Brady conjectured that $S(4,2) = 107$ and $\Sigma(4,2) = 13$.

- Brady (1974,1975) proved this conjecture, and the proof was eventually published in Brady (1983).

- Independently, Machlin and Stout (1990) published another proof of the same result, first reported by Kopp (1981) (Kopp is the maiden name of Machlin).

- Independently, Weimann, Casper and Fenzl (1973) claimed that they proved this conjecture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1964</th>
<th>Brady</th>
<th>$s = 107$</th>
<th>$\sigma = 13$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>$S(4,2) = 107$</td>
<td>$\Sigma(4,2) = 13$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The winner and some other good machines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A0</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>B0</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>C0</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>D0</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>$s(M)$</th>
<th>$\sigma(M)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>1LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>0LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>0LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Turing machines with 5 states and 2 symbols

- Green (1964) found a machine $M$ with $\sigma(M) = 17$.

- Lynn (1972) found machines $M$ and $N$ with $s(M) = 435$ and $\sigma(N) = 22$. 
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• Weimann (1973) found a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 556$ and $\sigma(M) = 40$.

• Lynn, cited by Brady (1983), found in 1974 machines $M$ and $N$ with $s(M) = 7,707$ and $\sigma(N) = 112$.

• Uwe Schult, cited by Ludewig et al. (1983) and by Dewdney (1984a), found, in August 1982, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 134,467$ and $\sigma(M) = 501$. This machine was analyzed independently by Ludewig (in Ludewig et al. (1983)), by Robinson (cited by Dewdney (1984b)), and by Michel (1993).

• George UHING, cited by Dewdney (1985a,b), found, in December 1984, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 2,133,492$ and $\sigma(M) = 1,915$. This machine was analyzed by Michel (1993).

• George UHING, cited by Brady (1988), found, in February 1986, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 2,358,064$ (and $\sigma(M) = 1,471$). This machine was analyzed by Michel (1993). Machine 7 in Marxen bb-list, in
  
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/bb-list
  
  can be obtained from UHING’s one, as given by Brady (1988), by the permutation of states (A D B E). See study by H. Marxen in
  
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simmbL5_7.html

• Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock found, in August 1989, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 11,798,826$ and $\sigma(M) = 4,098$. This machine was cited by Marxen and Buntrock (1990), and by Machlin and Stout (1990), and was analyzed by Michel (1993). See study by H. Marxen in
  
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simmbL5_2.html

• Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock found, in September 1989, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 23,554,764$ (and $\sigma(M) = 4,097$). This machine was cited by Machlin and Stout (1990), and was analyzed by Michel (1993). See study by H. Marxen in
  
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simmbL5_3.html
  
  and analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.2.2.

• Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock found, in September 1989, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 47,176,870$ and $\sigma(M) = 4,098$. This machine was cited by Marxen and Buntrock (1990), and was analyzed by Buro (1990) and by Michel (1993). See study by H. Marxen in
  
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simmbL5_1.html

  analysis by Buro in (p. 64-67)

  https://skatgame.net/mburo/ps/diploma.pdf

  and analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.2.1. It is the current record holder.

• Marxen gives a list of machines $M$ with high values of $s(M)$ and $\sigma(M)$ in
  
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/bb-list
The study of Turing machines with 5 states and 2 symbols is still going on. Marxen and Buntrock (1990), Skelet, and Hertel (2009) created programs to detect never halting machines, and manually proved that some machines, undetected by their programs, never halt. In each case, about a hundred holdouts were resisting computer and manual analyses. See Skelet’s study in

http://skelet.ludost.net/bb/index.html

The number of holdouts is gradually shrinking, due to the work of many people. See the 42 holdouts of Skelet in

http://skelet.ludost.net/bb/nreg.html

and the study of 14 of them in

http://googology.wikia.com/wiki/Forum:Sigma_project

Daniel briggs did some work: see

https://web.archive.org/web/20121026023118/protect\vrule width0pt\protect\href{http://web.mit.edu/~dbriggs/www}{http://web.mit.edu/~dbriggs/www}

Norbert Bátfai, allowing transitions where the head can stand still, found, in August 2009, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 70,740,810$ and $\sigma(M) = 4098$. Note that this machine does not follow the current rules of the busy beaver competition. See Bátfai’s study in

http://arxiv.org/abs/0908.4013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>$s$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Weimann</td>
<td>7,707</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1982</td>
<td>Schult</td>
<td>134,467</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1984</td>
<td>Uhing</td>
<td>2,133,492</td>
<td>1,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1986</td>
<td>Uhing</td>
<td>2,358,064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1990</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>47,176,870</td>
<td>4,098</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The record holder and some other good machines:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A0</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>B0</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>C0</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>D0</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>E0</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>(s(M))</th>
<th>(\sigma(M))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>0LE</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>47,176,870</td>
<td>4098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>0LD</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1RE</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>23,554,764</td>
<td>4097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0LD</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>11,821,234</td>
<td>4097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0LD</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>11,821,220</td>
<td>4097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0LC</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>11,821,190</td>
<td>4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>0RD</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1RE</td>
<td>0LE</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>11,815,076</td>
<td>4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0LD</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>11,811,040</td>
<td>4097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0LD</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>11,811,026</td>
<td>4097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0LC</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>11,804,940</td>
<td>4097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0LE</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>11,804,926</td>
<td>4097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>0RD</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1RE</td>
<td>0LE</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>11,804,910</td>
<td>4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>0RD</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1RE</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>11,804,896</td>
<td>4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0LE</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>0LE</td>
<td>11,798,826</td>
<td>4098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>11,798,796</td>
<td>4097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>11,792,724</td>
<td>4097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>11,792,698</td>
<td>4097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>0LC</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>0LE</td>
<td>1RE</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2,358,065</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>0RE</td>
<td>0LD</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2,358,064</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>0LD</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1RE</td>
<td>0RD</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>2,133,492</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>0LC</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>0RE</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>134,467</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(All these machines can be found in Buro (1990), pp. 69-70. The machines \(M\) with \(\sigma(M) > 1471\) were discovered by Marxen and Buntrock. The machine with the transition \((A, 0) \rightarrow (0, R, B)\) was discovered by Buro, the next two ones were by Uhing, and the last one was by Schult. Heiner Marxen says there are no other \(\sigma\) values within the \(\sigma\) range above).

### 4.5 Turing machines with 6 states and 2 symbols

- Green (1964) found a machine \(M\) with \(\sigma(M) = 35\).
- Lynn (1972) found a machine \(M\) with \(s(M) = 522\) and \(\sigma(M) = 42\).
- Brady (1983) found machines \(M\) and \(N\) with \(s(M) = 13,488\) and \(\sigma(N) = 117\).
- Uwe Schult, cited by Ludewig et al. (1983) and by Dewdney (1984a), found, in December 1982, a machine \(M\) with \(s(M) = 4,208,824\) and \(\sigma(M) = 2,075\).
- Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock found, in January 1990, a machine \(M\) with \(s(M) = 13,122,572,797\) and \(\sigma(M) = 136,612\). This machine was cited by Marxen and Buntrock (1990). See study by H. Marxen in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simmbL6_1.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simmbL6_1.html).
- Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock found, in January 1990, a machine \(M\) with \(s(M) = 8,690,333,381,690,951\) and \(\sigma(M) = 95,524,079\). This machine was posted on the web (Google groups) on September 3, 1997. See machine 2 in Marxen’s bb-list in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/bb-list](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/bb-list).
See study by H. Marxen in:
http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simmbL6_2.html
See analysis by R. Munafo in his website:
http://mrob.com/pub/math/ln-notes1-4.html#mb-bb-1
and in Section 5.3.8

- Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock found, in July 2000, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 5.3 \times 10^{42}$ and $\sigma(M) > 2.5 \times 10^{21}$. This machine was posted on the web (Google groups) on August 5, 2000. See machine 3 in Marxen’s bb-list:
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/bb-list
and machine k in Marxen’s bb-6list:
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/bb-6list
See study by H. Marxen in:
http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simmbL6_3.html

- Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock found, in August 2000, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 6.1 \times 10^{119}$ and $\sigma(M) > 1.4 \times 10^{69}$. This machine was posted on the web (Google groups) on October 23, 2000. See machine o in Marxen’s bb-6list in:
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/bb-6list
See study by H. Marxen in:
http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simmbL6_o.html
See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.3.7

- Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock found, in August 2000, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 6.1 \times 10^{225}$ and $\sigma(M) > 6.4 \times 10^{462}$. This machine was posted on the web (Google groups) on October 23, 2000. See machine q in Marxen’s bb-6list in:
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/bb-6list
See study by Marxen in
http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simmbL6_q.html
See analyses by R. Munafo, the short one in
http://mrob.com/pub/math/ln-notes1-5.html#mb6q
or the long one in
http://mrob.com/pub/math/ln-mb6q.html
and see analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.3.6

- Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock found, in February 2001, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 3.0 \times 10^{1730}$ and $\sigma(M) > 1.2 \times 10^{865}$. This machine was posted on the web (Google groups) on March 5, 2001. See machine r in Marxen’s bb-6list in
  http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/bb-6list
See study by Marxen in
• Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in November 2007, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 8.9 \times 10^{1762}$ and $\sigma(M) > 2.5 \times 10^{881}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig62_a.html

See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.3.4.

• Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in December 2007, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 2.5 \times 10^{2879}$ and $\sigma(M) > 4.6 \times 10^{1439}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig62_b.html

See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.3.3.

• Pavel Kropitz found, in May 2010, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 3.8 \times 10^{21132}$ and $\sigma(M) > 3.1 \times 10^{10566}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simKro62_a.html

See analysis in Section 5.3.2.

• Pavel Kropitz found, in June 2010, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 7.4 \times 10^{36534}$ and $\sigma(M) > 3.5 \times 10^{18267}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simKro62_b.html

See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.3.1. It is the current record holder.

• Marxen gives a list of machines $M$ with high values of $s(M)$ and $\sigma(M)$ in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/bb-6list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>$s$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>$s = 522$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 42$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>$s = 13.488$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 117$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1982</td>
<td>Schult</td>
<td>$s = 4,208,824$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2,075$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1990</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>$s = 13,122,572,797$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 136,612$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1997</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>$s = 8,690,333,381,690,951$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 95,524,079$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2000</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>$s &gt; 5.3 \times 10^{142}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 2.5 \times 10^{24}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2000</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>$s &gt; 6.1 \times 10^{725}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 6.4 \times 10^{692}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2001</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>$s &gt; 3.0 \times 10^{1770}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 1.2 \times 10^{965}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2007</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>$s &gt; 8.9 \times 10^{1762}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 2.5 \times 10^{981}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>$s &gt; 2.5 \times 10^{2879}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 4.6 \times 10^{1439}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>Kropitz</td>
<td>$s &gt; 3.8 \times 10^{1432}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 3.1 \times 10^{10566}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2010</td>
<td>Kropitz</td>
<td>$s &gt; 7.4 \times 10^{36534}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 3.5 \times 10^{18267}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The record holder and some other good machines:
4.6 Turing machines with 7 states and 2 symbols

- Green (1964) found a machine $M$ with $\sigma(M) = 22,961$.

- This machine was superseded by the machine with 6 states and 2 symbols found in January 1990 by Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock.

- “Wythagoras” found, in March 2014, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > \sigma(M) > 10^{10^{10^{18.705.352}}}$.

This machine comes from the (6,2)-TM found by Pavel Kropitz in June 2010, as follows: A seventh state G is added, with the transition (G,0) $\rightarrow$ (1,L,E). This state G becomes the initial state. Then the machine is normalized by swapping Left and Right and by the circular permutation of states (A C F E B D G). See http://googology.wikia.com/wiki/User_blog:Wythagoras/A_good_bound_for_S(7)%3F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Marxen, Buntrock</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2014</td>
<td>“Wythagoras”</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The record holder:

- A0 A1 B0 B1 C0 C1 D0 D1 E0 E1 F0 F1 G0 G1
- 1RB 1RC 0LG 1LD 1RB 1LF 1LE 1RH 1LF 1RG 0LD 1LB 0RF

4.7 Turing machines with 2 states and 3 symbols

- Brady (1988) found a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 38$ See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simTM23_cb.html

- This machine was found independently by Michel (2004), who gave $\sigma(M) = 9$ and conjectured that $S(2,3) = 38$ and $\Sigma(2,3) = 9$.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>S(2,3) = 38</td>
<td>$\Sigma(2,3) = 9$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The winner and some other good machines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A0</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B0</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>s(M)</th>
<th>σ(M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>0RA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 Turing machines with 3 states and 3 symbols

- Korfhage (1966) (p. 114) claimed that $S(3,3) \geq 57$ and $\Sigma(3,3) \geq 12$. He did not give a machine. He gave a list of authors (C.Y. Lee, Tibor Rado, Shen Lin, Patrick Fischer, Milton Green and David Jefferson) without specifying who found this result. Note that the definition of $\Sigma(3,3)$ used in this book could be different from the current definition (i.e., number of non-blank symbols).

- Michel (2004) found machines $M$ and $N$ with $s(M) = 40,737$ and $\sigma(N) = 208$.

- Brady found, in November 2004, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 29,403,894$ and $\sigma(M) = 5600$. See http://www.cse.unr.edu/~al/BusyBeaver.html
  See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simAB3Y_b.html

- Brady found, in December 2004, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 92,649,163$ and $\sigma(M) = 13,949$. See http://www.cse.unr.edu/~al/BusyBeaver.html
  See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simAB3Y_c.html
  See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.4.8

- Myron P. Souris found, in July 2005 (M.P. Souris said: actually in 1995, but then no one seemed to care), machines $M$ and $N$ with $s(M) = 544,884,219$ and $\sigma(N) = 36,089$. See study of $M$ by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simMS33_b.html
  and study of $N$ by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simMS33_a.html
  See analysis of $M$ by P. Michel in Section 5.4.6
  and analysis of $N$ by P. Michel in Section 5.4.7

- Grégory Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in August 2005, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 4,939,345,068$ and $\sigma(M) = 107,900$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf33_b.html
  See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.4.5
Grégory Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in September 2005, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 987,522,842,126$ and $\sigma(M) = 1,525,688$. See study by H. Marxen in
http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf33_d.html
See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.4.3.

Grégory Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in April 2006, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 4,144,465,135,614$ and $\sigma(M) = 2,950,149$. See study by H. Marxen in
http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf33_e.html
See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.4.3.

Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in August 2006, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 4,345,166,620,336,565$ and $\sigma(M) = 95,524,079$. See study by H. Marxen in
http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig33_a.html
See analysis in Section 5.4.2.

Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in November 2007, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 119,112,334,170,342,540$ and $\sigma(M) = 374,676,383$. See study by H. Marxen in
http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig33_b.html
See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.4.1.
It is the current record holder.

Brady gives a list of machines with high values of $s(M)$ in
http://www.cse.unr.edu/~al/BusyBeaver.html

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cited by Korfhage</th>
<th>$s$</th>
<th>$\sigma'$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2004</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td>$s = 40,737$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 208$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2004</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>$s = 29,403,894$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 5,600$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2004</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>$s = 92,649,163$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 13,949$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td>Souris</td>
<td>$s = 544,884,219$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 36,089$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2005</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>$s = 4,939,345,068$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 107,900$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>$s = 987,522,842,126$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 1,525,688$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2006</td>
<td>Lafitte, Papazian</td>
<td>$s = 4,144,465,135,614$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2,950,149$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2006</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>$s = 4,345,166,620,336,565$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 95,524,079$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2007</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>$s = 119,112,334,170,342,540$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 374,676,383$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The record holder and some other good machines:
4.9 Turing machines with 4 states and 3 symbols

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in April 2005, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 250,096,776$ and $\sigma(M) = 15,008$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig43_a.html

- This machine was superseded by the machines with 3 states and 3 symbols found in July 2005 by Myron P. Souris.

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in October 2007, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 1.5 \times 10^{1426}$ and $\sigma(M) > 1.1 \times 10^{713}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig43_b.html

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found successively, in November 2007, machines $M$ with
  - $s(M) > 7.7 \times 10^{1618}$ and $\sigma(M) > 1.6 \times 10^{809}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig43_c.html
  - $s(M) > 3.7 \times 10^{1973}$ and $\sigma(M) > 8.0 \times 10^{886}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig43_d.html
  - $s(M) > 3.9 \times 10^{7721}$ and $\sigma(M) > 4.0 \times 10^{3860}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig43_e.html
  - $s(M) > 3.9 \times 10^{9122}$ and $\sigma(M) > 2.5 \times 10^{4561}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig43_f.html

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found successively, in December 2007, machines $M$ with
  - $s(M) > 7.9 \times 10^{9663}$ and $\sigma(M) > 8.9 \times 10^{4931}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig43_g.html
  - $s(M) > 5.3 \times 10^{12608}$ and $\sigma(M) > 4.2 \times 10^{66034}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig43_h.html

(The first two machines were discovered by Terry and Shawn Ligocki, the next five ones were by Lafitte and Papazian, the next three ones were by Souris, and the last four ones were by Brady).
• Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in January 2008, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 1.0 \times 10^{14072}$ and $\sigma(M) > 1.3 \times 10^{7036}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig24_a.html

It is the current record holder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 2005</th>
<th>T. and S. Ligocki</th>
<th>$s = 250,096,776$</th>
<th>$\sigma = 15,008$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td>Souris</td>
<td>$s &gt; 1.5 \times 10^{1426}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 1.1 \times 10^{143}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2007</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>$s &gt; 7.7 \times 10^{4618}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 1.6 \times 10^{3999}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2007</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>$s &gt; 3.7 \times 10^{1973}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 8.0 \times 10^{986}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>$s &gt; 3.9 \times 10^{7721}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 4.0 \times 10^{3860}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2008</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>$s &gt; 7.9 \times 10^{4633}$</td>
<td>$\sigma &gt; 8.9 \times 10^{3991}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The record holder and the past record holders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A0</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B0</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C0</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D0</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>$s(M)$</th>
<th>$\sigma(M)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RC</td>
<td>2LC</td>
<td>2RD</td>
<td>0LC</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0RA</td>
<td>1RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>2RC</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0RA</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>&gt; 5.3 \times 10^{12068}</td>
<td>&gt; 4.2 \times 10^{3034}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>2LC</td>
<td>2LD</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>0RD</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LD</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2LC</td>
<td>2RC</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>2LD</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>&gt; 3.9 \times 10^{9122}</td>
<td>&gt; 2.5 \times 10^{3661}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>2LC</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>0RD</td>
<td>2LC</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>&gt; 3.9 \times 10^{7721}</td>
<td>&gt; 4.0 \times 10^{3860}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RC</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2LC</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>2LD</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>0RC</td>
<td>0RD</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>0RA</td>
<td>&gt; 3.7 \times 10^{1973}</td>
<td>&gt; 8.9 \times 10^{486}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>0LC</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2LC</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LD</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>&gt; 7.8 \times 10^{4651}</td>
<td>&gt; 8.9 \times 10^{486}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1RD</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LC</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>&gt; 1.5 \times 10^{1426}</td>
<td>&gt; 1.1 \times 10^{1713}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.10 Turing machines with 2 states and 4 symbols

• Brady (1988) found a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 7,195$.

• This machine was found independently and analyzed by Michel (2004), who gave $\sigma(M) = 90$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simTM24_b.html

See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.5.2

• Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in February 2005, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 3,932,964$ and $\sigma(M) = 2,050$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig24_a.html

See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.5.1

It is the current record holder. There is no machine between the first two ones (Ligocki, Brady). There is no machine such that $3,932,964 < s(M) < 200,000,000$ (Ligocki, September 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1988</th>
<th>Brady</th>
<th>$s = 7,195$</th>
<th>$\sigma = 90$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>$s = 3,932,964$</td>
<td>$\sigma = 2,050$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The record holder and some other good machines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A0</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>B0</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>s(M)</th>
<th>σ(M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>3,932,964</td>
<td>2,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>7,195</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>6,445</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>6,445</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11 Turing machines with 3 states and 4 symbols

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in April 2005, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 262,759,288$ and $\sigma(M) = 17,323$. See study by H. Marxen in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_a.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_a.html)

- This machine was superseded by the machines with 3 states and 3 symbols found in July 2005 by Myron P. Souris.

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in September 2007, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 5.7 \times 10^{22}$ and $\sigma(M) > 2.4 \times 10^{26}$. See study by H. Marxen in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_b.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_b.html)

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found successively, in October 2007, machines $M$ with
  - $s(M) > 4.3 \times 10^{281}$ and $\sigma(M) > 6.0 \times 10^{140}$. See study by H. Marxen in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_c.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_c.html)
  - $s(M) > 7.6 \times 10^{868}$ and $\sigma(M) > 4.6 \times 10^{434}$. See study by H. Marxen in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_d.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_d.html)
  - $s(M) > 3.1 \times 10^{1256}$ and $\sigma(M) > 2.1 \times 10^{628}$. See study by H. Marxen in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_e.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_e.html)

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found successively, in November 2007, machines $M$ with
  - $s(M) > 8.4 \times 10^{2601}$ and $\sigma(M) > 1.7 \times 10^{1301}$. See study by H. Marxen in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_f.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_f.html)
  - $s(M) > 3.4 \times 10^{4710}$ and $\sigma(M) > 1.4 \times 10^{2355}$. See study by H. Marxen in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_g.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_g.html)
  - $s(M) > 5.9 \times 10^{4744}$ and $\sigma(M) > 2.2 \times 10^{2372}$. See study by H. Marxen in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_h.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_h.html)

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in December 2007, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 5.2 \times 10^{13036}$ and $\sigma(M) > 3.7 \times 10^{6518}$. See study by H. Marxen in [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_i.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig34_i.html)

It is the current record holder.
Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in February 2005, machines \( M \) and \( N \) with \( s(M) = 16,268,767 \) and \( \sigma(N) = 4,099 \). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig25_a.html

Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in April 2005, a machine \( M \) with \( s(M) = 148,304,214 \) and \( \sigma(M) = 11,120 \). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig25_c.html

Grégoire Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in August 2005, a machine \( M \) with \( s(M) = 8,619,024,596 \) and \( \sigma(M) = 90,604 \). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_a.html

Grégoire Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in September 2005, a machine \( M \) with \( \sigma(M) = 97,104 \) (and \( s(M) = 7,543,673,517 \)). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_c.html

Grégoire Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in October 2005, a machine \( M \) with \( s(M) = 233,431,192,481 \) and \( \sigma(M) = 458,357 \). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_d.html

Grégoire Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in October 2005, a machine \( M \) with \( s(M) = 912,594,733,606 \) and \( \sigma(M) = 1,957,771 \). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_f.html

See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.6.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Record Holders</th>
<th>( s )</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>262,759,288</td>
<td>17,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2005</td>
<td>Souris</td>
<td>5.7 \times 10^{52}</td>
<td>2.4 \times 10^{26}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2007</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>4.3 \times 10^{881}</td>
<td>6.0 \times 10^{430}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2007</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>7.6 \times 10^{568}</td>
<td>4.6 \times 10^{434}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2007</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>3.1 \times 10^{1256}</td>
<td>2.1 \times 10^{628}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>T. and S. Ligocki</td>
<td>8.4 \times 10^{2661}</td>
<td>1.7 \times 10^{1301}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12 Turing machines with 2 states and 5 symbols

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in February 2005, machines \( M \) and \( N \) with \( s(M) = 16,268,767 \) and \( \sigma(N) = 4,099 \). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig25_a.html
- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in April 2005, a machine \( M \) with \( s(M) = 148,304,214 \) and \( \sigma(M) = 11,120 \). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig25_c.html
- Grégoire Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in August 2005, a machine \( M \) with \( s(M) = 8,619,024,596 \) and \( \sigma(M) = 90,604 \). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_a.html
- Grégoire Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in September 2005, a machine \( M \) with \( \sigma(M) = 97,104 \) (and \( s(M) = 7,543,673,517 \)). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_c.html
- Grégoire Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in October 2005, a machine \( M \) with \( s(M) = 233,431,192,481 \) and \( \sigma(M) = 458,357 \). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_d.html
- Grégoire Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in October 2005, a machine \( M \) with \( s(M) = 912,594,733,606 \) and \( \sigma(M) = 1,957,771 \). See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_f.html

See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.6.6.
• Grégory Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in December 2005, a machine \( M \) with 
\[ s(M) = 924,180,005,181 \text{ and } \sigma(M) = 1,137,477. \]
See study by H. Marxen in
\[ \text{http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_g.html} \]
See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.6.3.

• Grégory Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in May 2006, a machine \( M \) with 
\[ s(M) = 3,793,261,759,791 \text{ and } \sigma(M) = 2,576,467. \]
See study by H. Marxen in
\[ \text{http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_h.html} \]
See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.6.4.

• Grégory Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in June 2006, a machine \( M \) with 
\[ s(M) = 14,103,258,269,249 \text{ and } \sigma(M) = 4,848,239. \]
See study by H. Marxen in
\[ \text{http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_i.html} \]
See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.6.3.

• Grégory Lafitte and Christophe Papazian found, in July 2006, a machine \( M \) with 
\[ s(M) = 26,375,397,569,930 \text{ and } \sigma(M) = 143. \]
See comments in Section 5.8.

• Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in August 2006, a machine \( M \) with
\[ s(M) = 7,069,449,877,176,007,352,687 \]
and \( \sigma(M) = 172,312,766,455. \)
See study by H. Marxen in
\[ \text{http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig25_j.html} \]
See analysis in Section 5.6.2.

• Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in October 2007, a machine \( M \) with \( s(M) > 5.2 \times 10^{61} \)
and \( \sigma(M) > 9.3 \times 10^{30}. \)
See study by H. Marxen in
\[ \text{http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig25_k.html} \]

• Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in October 2007, two machines \( M \) and \( N \) with
\[ s(M) = 1.6 \times 10^{211} \text{ and } \sigma(M) = \sigma(N) > 5.2 \times 10^{165}. \]
See study by H. Marxen of \( M \) in
\[ \text{http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig25_l.html} \]
and study by H. Marxen of \( N \) in
\[ \text{http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig25_m.html} \]

• Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in November 2007, a machine \( M \) with \( s(M) > 1.9 \times 10^{704} \)
and \( \sigma(M) > 1.7 \times 10^{552}. \)
See study by H. Marxen in
\[ \text{http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig25_n.html} \]
See analysis by P. Michel in Section 5.6.1
It is the current record holder.
February 2005  T. and S. Ligocki  $s = 16,268,767$  $\sigma = 4,099$
April 2005 T. and S. Ligocki  $s = 148,304,214$  $\sigma = 11,120$
August 2005 Lafitte, Papazian  $s = 8,619,024,596$  $\sigma = 90,604$
September 2005 Lafitte, Papazian  $\sigma = 97,104$
October 2005 Lafitte, Papazian  $s = 233,431,192,481$  $\sigma = 458,357$
          $s = 912,594,733,606$  $\sigma = 1,957,771$
December 2005 Lafitte, Papazian  $s = 924,160,005,181$
May 2006 Lafitte, Papazian  $s = 3,793,261,759,791$  $\sigma = 2,576,467$
June 2006 Lafitte, Papazian  $s = 14,103,258,269,249$  $\sigma = 4,848,239$
July 2006 Lafitte, Papazian  $s = 26,375,397,569,930$
August 2006 T. and S. Ligocki  $s > 7.0 \times 10^{24}$  $\sigma = 172,312,766,455$
October 2007 T. and S. Ligocki  $s > 5.2 \times 10^{51}$  $\sigma > 9.3 \times 10^{49}$
          $s > 1.6 \times 10^{211}$  $\sigma > 5.2 \times 10^{105}$
November 2007 T. and S. Ligocki  $s > 1.9 \times 10^{704}$  $\sigma > 1.7 \times 10^{602}$

Note: Two machines were discovered by T. and S. Ligocki in February 2005 with $s(M) = 16,268,767$, and two were in October 2007 with $s(M) > 1.6 \times 10^{211}$.

The record holder and some other good machines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A0</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B0</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>$s(M)$</th>
<th>$\sigma(M)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>$&gt; 1.9 \times 10^{704}$</td>
<td>$&gt; 1.7 \times 10^{352}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>$&gt; 1.6 \times 10^{211}$</td>
<td>$&gt; 5.2 \times 10^{105}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>$&gt; 1.6 \times 10^{211}$</td>
<td>$&gt; 5.2 \times 10^{105}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>4LB</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>$&gt; 5.2 \times 10^{61}$</td>
<td>$&gt; 9.3 \times 10^{30}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>$&gt; 7.0 \times 10^{21}$</td>
<td>172,312,766,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>4LB</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>91,791,666,497,368,316</td>
<td>620,966,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>4LB</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>37,718,251,406,088,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>9,392,084,729,807,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>4RB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>37,718,251,406,088,46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The machines were discovered by Terry and Shawn Ligocki).

Previous record holders and some other good machines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A0</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B0</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>$s(M)$</th>
<th>$\sigma(M)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>0RA</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>26,375,397,569,930</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>4LB</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>14,103,258,269,249</td>
<td>4,848,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>4RB</td>
<td>4RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>3,793,261,759,791</td>
<td>2,576,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>4LB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>924,180,005,181</td>
<td>1,137,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>4LB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>4LB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>912,594,733,606</td>
<td>1,957,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RH</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>469,121,946,088,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>4LB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>233,431,192,481</td>
<td>458,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>4RB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>8,619,024,596</td>
<td>90,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RH</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>4RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>0RH</td>
<td>4RB</td>
<td>7,543,673,517</td>
<td>97,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>7,021,292,621</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RH</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>4RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>4,561,535,855</td>
<td>64,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>16,268,767</td>
<td>3,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>4RB</td>
<td>3LB</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>15,754,273</td>
<td>4,099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The first eleven machines were discovered by Lafitte and Papazian, and the last three ones were by T. and S. Ligocki).

### 4.13 Turing machines with 2 states and 6 symbols

- Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in February 2005, machines $M$ and $N$ with $s(M) = 98,364,599$ and $\sigma(N) = 10,574$. See study by H. Marxen in
Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in April 2005, a machine $M$ with $s(M) = 493,600,387$ and $\sigma(M) = 15,828$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig26_c.html

This machine was superseded by the machine with 2 states and 5 symbols found in August 2005 by Grégory Lafitte and Christophe Papazian.

Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in September 2007, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 2.3 \times 10^{54}$ and $\sigma(M) > 1.9 \times 10^{27}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig26_d.html

This machine was superseded by the machine with 2 states and 5 symbols found in October 2007 by Terry and Shawn Ligocki.

Terry and Shawn Ligocki found successively, in November 2007, machines $M$ with

- $s(M) > 4.9 \times 10^{1643}$ and $\sigma(M) > 8.6 \times 10^{821}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig26_e.html
- $s(M) > 2.5 \times 10^{9863}$ and $\sigma(M) > 6.9 \times 10^{4931}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig26_f.html

Terry and Shawn Ligocki found, in January 2008, a machine $M$ with $s(M) > 2.4 \times 10^{9866}$ and $\sigma(M) > 1.9 \times 10^{4933}$. See study by H. Marxen in http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLig26_g.html

It is the current record holder.

| February 2005 | T. and S. Ligocki | $s = 98,364,599$ | $\sigma = 10,574$ |
| April 2005 | T. and S. Ligocki | $s = 493,600,387$ | $\sigma = 15,828$ |
| August 2005 | Lafitte, Papazian | superseded by a (2,5)-TM |
| September 2007 | T. and S. Ligocki | $s > 2.3 \times 10^{54}$ | $\sigma > 1.9 \times 10^{27}$ |
| October 2007 | T. and S. Ligocki | superseded by a (2,5)-TM |
| November 2007 | T. and S. Ligocki | $s > 4.9 \times 10^{1643}$ | $\sigma > 8.6 \times 10^{821}$ |
| | | $s > 2.5 \times 10^{9863}$ | $\sigma > 6.9 \times 10^{4931}$ |
| January 2008 | T. and S. Ligocki | $s > 2.4 \times 10^{9866}$ | $\sigma > 1.9 \times 10^{4933}$ |

The record holder and the past record holders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A0</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>A5</th>
<th>B0</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>B5</th>
<th>$s(M)$</th>
<th>$\sigma(M)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>&gt; 2.4 \times 10^{54}</td>
<td>&gt; 1.9 \times 10^{4933}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>4RB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>5RA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>&gt; 2.5 \times 10^{9863}</td>
<td>&gt; 6.9 \times 10^{4931}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>&gt; 4.9 \times 10^{1643}</td>
<td>&gt; 8.6 \times 10^{821}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>5LA</td>
<td>5LA</td>
<td>5LA</td>
<td>5LA</td>
<td>5LA</td>
<td>5LA</td>
<td>5LA</td>
<td>5LA</td>
<td>5LA</td>
<td>&gt; 2.3 \times 10^{54}</td>
<td>&gt; 1.9 \times 10^{27}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>4LB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>98,364,599</td>
<td>10,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>493,600,387</td>
<td>15,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>94,842,383</td>
<td>10,574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Behaviors of busy beavers

5.1 Introduction

How do good machines behave? We give below the tricks that allow them to reach high scores.

A configuration of the Turing machine $M$ is a description of the tape. The position of the tape head and the state are indicated by writing together between parentheses the state and the symbol currently read by the tape head.

For example, the initial configuration on a blank tape is:

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \]

We denote by $a^k$ the string $a \ldots a$, $k$ times. We write $C \vdash_t (t) D$ if the next move function leads from configuration $C$ to configuration $D$ in $t$ computation steps.

5.2 Turing machines with 5 states and 2 symbols

5.2.1 Marxen and Buntrock’s champion

This machine is the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 5 states and 2 symbols, since 1990.

It was analyzed by Buro (1990) (p. 64-67), and independently by Michel (1993).

\[
\begin{array}{c|cc}
            & 0 & 1 \\
---&---&---
A & 1RB & 1LC \\
B & 1RC & 1RB \\
C & 1RD & 0LE \\
D & 1LA & 1LD \\
E & 1RH & 0LA \\
---&---&---
\end{array}
\]

Marxen and Buntrock (1990)
$s(M) = 47, 176, 870 =? S(5, 2)$
$\sigma(M) = 4098 =? \Sigma(5, 2)$

Let $C(n) = \ldots 0(A0)1^n0 \ldots$.

Then we have, for all $k \geq 0$,

\[
\begin{align*}
C(3k) & \vdash (5k^2 + 19k + 15) & C(5k + 6) \\
C(3k + 1) & \vdash (5k^2 + 25k + 27) & C(5k + 9) \\
C(3k + 2) & \vdash (6k + 12) & \ldots 01(H0)1(001)^{k+1}10 \ldots
\end{align*}
\]
So we have:

\[
\begin{align*}
0(A0)0 & = C(0) \vdash (15) \\
C(6) & \vdash (73) \\
C(16) & \vdash (277) \\
C(34) & \vdash (907) \\
C(64) & \vdash (2,757) \\
C(114) & \vdash (7,957) \\
C(196) & \vdash (22,777) \\
C(334) & \vdash (64,407) \\
C(564) & \vdash (180,307) \\
C(946) & \vdash (504,027) \\
C(1,584) & \vdash (1,403,967) \\
C(2,646) & \vdash (3,906,393) \\
C(4,416) & \vdash (10,861,903) \\
C(7,366) & \vdash (30,196,527) \\
C(12,284) & \vdash (24,576) \\
01(H0)1(001)^{4095} & \ldots \\
\end{align*}
\]

5.2.2 Marxen and Buntrock’s runner-up

Marxen and Buntrock (1990)
\(s(M) = 23,554,764\)
\(\sigma(M) = 4097\)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
& 0 & 1 \\
\hline
A & 1RB & 0LD \\
B & 1LC & 1RD \\
C & 1LA & 1LC \\
D & 1RH & 1RE \\
E & 1RA & 0RB \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Let \(C(n) = \ldots 0(A0)1^n0 \ldots\)

Then we have, for all \(k \geq 0\),

\[
\begin{align*}
C(3k) & \vdash (10k^2 + 10k + 4) & C(5k + 3) \\
C(3k + 1) & \vdash (3k + 3) & \ldots 01(110)^k 11(H0)0 \ldots \\
C(3k + 2) & \vdash (10k^2 + 26k + 12) & C(5k + 7)
\end{align*}
\]

So we have:
\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots = \\
C(0) \vdash (4) \\
C(3) \vdash (24) \\
C(8) \vdash (104) \\
C(17) \vdash (392) \\
C(32) \vdash (1,272) \\
C(57) \vdash (3,804) \\
C(98) \vdash (11,084) \\
C(167) \vdash (31,692) \\
C(282) \vdash (89,304) \\
C(473) \vdash (250,584) \\
C(792) \vdash (699,604) \\
C(1,323) \vdash (1,949,224) \\
C(2,208) \vdash (5,424,324) \\
C(3,683) \vdash (15,087,204) \\
C(6,142) \vdash (6,144) \]

\[ \ldots 01(110)204711(H0)0 \ldots \]

5.3 Turing machines with 6 states and 2 symbols

5.3.1 Kropitz’s machine found in June 2010

This machine is the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 6 states and 2 symbols, since June 2010.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
& 0 & 1 \\
\hline
A & 1RB & 1LE \\
B & 1RC & 1RF \\
C & 1LD & 0RB \\
D & 1RE & 0LC \\
E & 1LA & 0RD \\
F & 1RH & 1RC \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Kropitz (2010)
\[ s(M) \text{ and } S(6, 2) > 7.4 \times 10^{36534} \]
\[ \sigma(M) \text{ and } \Sigma(6, 2) > 3.5 \times 10^{18267} \]

Let \( C(n) = \ldots 0(A0)1^n0 \ldots \)

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0, \)

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (29) \]
\[ C(3k + 1) \vdash (3k + 3) \]
\[ C(9k + 9) \vdash ((125 \times 16^{k+2} + 325 \times 4^{k+2} + 228k - 2289)/27) \]
\[ C((50 \times 4^{k+1} - 11)/3) \]
\[ C((50 \times 4^{k+1} + 1)/3) \]
So we have:

\[ 0(A0)_0 \ldots \vdash (29) \]
\[ C(9) \vdash (1293) \]
\[ C(63) \vdash (19, 884, 896, 677) \]
\[ C(273063) \vdash (125 \times 16^{30341} + 325 \times 4^{30341} + 6, 916, 380)/27) \]
\[ C(50 \times 4^{30340} + 1)/3 \vdash (50 \times 4^{30340} + 7)/3 \]
\[ \ldots 0111(011)^p(H0)_0 \ldots \]

with \( p = (50 \times 4^{30340} - 2)/9 \).

So the total time is \( s(M) = (125 \times 16^{30341} + 1750 \times 4^{30340} + 15)/27 + 19, 885, 154, 163, \)
and the final number of 1 is \( \sigma(M) = (25 \times 4^{30341} + 23)/9 \).

Some configurations take a long time to halt. For example, \( C(2) \vdash (t) \) END with \( t > 10^{19^{10^{10^{18,705,352}}} \ldots} \).

A proof of this fact is given by “Cloudy176” in
http://googology.wikia.com/wiki/User_blog:Cloudy176/Proving_the_bound_for_S(7)

This property was used by “Wythagoras”, in March 2014, to define a (7,2)-TM that
extends the present (6,2)-TM and enters this configuration \( C(2) \) in two steps. See
http://googology.wikia.com/wiki/User_blog:Wythagoras/A_good_bound_for_S(7)?%3F

See detailed analysis in Michel (2015), Section 6.

### 5.3.2 Kropitz’s machine found in May 2010

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 6
states and 2 symbols, from May 2010 to June 2010.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
A & 1RB & 0LD \\
B & 1RC & 0RF \\
C & 1LC & 1LA \\
D & 0LE & 1RH \\
E & 1LA & 0RB \\
F & 0RC & 0RE \\
\end{array}
\]

Analysis adapted from Shawn Ligocki:

Let \( C(n, k) = \ldots 010^a 1(C1)1^{3k}0 \ldots \)

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0 \), all \( n \geq 0 \),

\[ \ldots 0(A0)_0 \ldots \vdash (47) \]
\[ C(0, k) \vdash (3) \quad \ldots 01(H0)_1^{3k+10} \ldots \]
\[ C(1, k) \vdash (3k + 37) \quad C(3k + 2, 2) \]
\[ C(2, k) \vdash (12k + 44) \quad C(4, k + 2) \]
\[ C(3, k) \vdash (3k + 57) \quad C(3k + 8, 2) \]
\[ C(n + 4, k) \vdash (27k^2 + 105k + 112) \quad C(n, 3k + 5) \]

29
So we have (the final configuration is reached in 22158 transitions):

\[
\cdots 0(A0)0\cdots \vdash (47)
\]
\[
C(5, 2) \vdash (430)
\]
\[
C(1, 11) \vdash (70)
\]
\[
C(35, 2) \vdash (430)
\]
\[
C(31, 11) \vdash (4, 534)
\]
\[
C(27, 38) \vdash (43, 090)
\]
\[
C(23, 119) \vdash (70)
\]
\[
C(35, 2) \vdash (430)
\]
\[
C(31, 11) \vdash (4, 534)
\]
\[
C(27, 38) \vdash (43, 090)
\]
\[
C(23, 119) \vdash (70)
\]
\[
C(35, 2) \vdash (430)
\]
\[
C(31, 11) \vdash (4, 534)
\]
\[
C(27, 38) \vdash (43, 090)
\]
\[
C(23, 119) \vdash (70)
\]
\[
C(35, 2) \vdash (430)
\]
\[
C(31, 11) \vdash (4, 534)
\]
\[
C(27, 38) \vdash (43, 090)
\]
\[
C(23, 119) \vdash (70)
\]
\[
C(35, 2) \vdash (430)
\]
\[
C(31, 11) \vdash (4, 534)
\]
\[
C(27, 38) \vdash (43, 090)
\]
\[
C(23, 119) \vdash (70)
\]
\[
\cdots
\]

Note that \( C(4n + r, 2) \vdash (t_n) C(r, u_n) \), with \( u_n = (3^{n+2} - 5)/2 \), and \( t_n = (3 \times 9^{n+3} - 80 \times 3^{n+3} + 584n - 27)/32 \).

Some configurations take a long time to halt. For example, \( C(1, 9) \vdash (t) \) END with \( t > 10^{10^{10^{10^{3520}}}} \).

See detailed analysis in Michel (2015), Section 7.

### 5.3.3 Ligockis’ machine found in December 2007

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 6 states and 2 symbols, from December 2007 to May 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>0LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>0RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>0RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>0LF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1LE</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terry and Shawn Ligocki (2007)

\[
s(M) > 2.5 \times 10^{2879}
\]
\[
\sigma(M) > 4.6 \times 10^{1439}
\]

Let \( C(n, p) = \cdots 0(A0)(10)^n R(bin(p))0\ldots \), where \( R(bin(p)) \) is the number \( p \) written in binary in reverse order, so that \( C(n, 4m + 1) = C(n + 1, m) \). The number of transitions between configurations \( C(n, p) \) is infinite, but only 18 transitions are used in the computation.
on a blank tape. For all $m \geq 0$, all $k \geq 0$,

\[
\begin{align*}
C(k, 4m + 3) & \vdash (4k + 6) & C(k, 2m) & \vdash (6k + 2, m) \\
C(2k + 1, 4m) & \vdash (6k^2 + 52k + 98) & C(3k + 8, m) & \vdash (6k + 2, 2m + 1) \\
C(4k, 4m) & \vdash (24k^2 + 36k + 13) & C(k + 2, m) & \vdash (4k + 14) \\
C(4k + 2, 4m) & \vdash (24k^2 + 60k + 27) & C(6k + 2, 128m + 1) & \vdash (6k^2 + 64k + 160) \\
C(k, 8m + 2) & \vdash (4k + 13) & C(6k + 2, 128m + 86) & \vdash (24k^2 + 36k + 29) \\
C(2k + 1, 32m + 22) & \vdash (6k^2 + 64k + 160) & C(6k + 2, 2m + 1) & \vdash (24k^2 + 60k + 43) \\
C(4k, 32m + 22) & \vdash (24k^2 + 36k + 29) & C(6k + 4, m) & \vdash (2k + 61) \\
C(4k + 2, 32m + 22) & \vdash (24k^2 + 60k + 43) & C(6k + 2, 1024m + 342) & \vdash (4k + 30) \\
C(k, 64m + 46) & \vdash (6k + 30) & C(k + 4, m) & \vdash (2k + 61) \\
C(k + 1, 128m + 6) & \vdash (8k + 66) & C(k + 6, 2m + 1) & \vdash (6k^2 + 64k + 172) \\
C(2k, 256m + 14) & \vdash (6k^2 + 64k + 172) & C(3k + 11, m) & \vdash (24k^2 + 84k + 89) \\
C(4k + 1, 256m + 14) & \vdash (24k^2 + 108k + 127) & C(6k + 8, 2m + 1) & \vdash (24k^2 + 156k + 173) \\
C(4k + 3, 256m + 14) & \vdash (24k^2 + 156k + 173) & C(6k + 8, 128m + 86) & \vdash (24k^2 + 60k + 57) \\
C(4k, 512m + 30) & \vdash (24k^2 + 60k + 57) & C(6k + 11, m) & \vdash (24k^2 + 60k + 89) \\
C(4k + 2, 512m + 30) & \vdash (24k^2 + 60k + 89) & C(6k + 2, 16384m + 11134) & \vdash (24k^2 + 36k + 109) \\
C(4k, 131072m + 11134) & \vdash (24k^2 + 36k + 109) & C(6k + 2, 4194304m + 2848638) & \vdash (2k + 61) \\
C(4k, 131072m + 56126) & \vdash (2k + 61) & C(6k + 10, m) & \vdash (0(10)^k1(H0)1110110101R(bin(m))0... \\
C(k + 1, 512m + 94) & \vdash (2k + 61) & \vdash (2k + 61) & \vdash (0(10)^k1(H0)1110110101R(bin(m))0...
\end{align*}
\]

So we have (the final configuration is reached in 11026 transitions):

\[
\begin{align*}
& \vdash 0(40)0\ldots = \\
& C(0, 0) \vdash (13) \\
& C(3, 0) \vdash (156) \\
& C(11, 0) \vdash (508) \\
& C(23, 0) \vdash (1396) \\
& C(41, 0) \vdash (3538) \\
& C(68, 0) \vdash (7, 561) \\
& C(105, 0) \vdash (19, 026) \\
& C(164, 0) \vdash (41, 833) \\
& C(249, 0) \vdash (98, 802) \\
& C(380, 0) \vdash (220, 033) \\
& C(573, 0) \vdash (505, 746) \\
& C(866, 0) \vdash (1, 132, 731) \\
& C(1298, 86) \vdash (2, 538, 907) \\
& C(1946, 2390) \vdash (5, 697, 907) \\
& C(2918, 76118) \vdash (12, 798, 367) \\
& C(4376, 2435414) \vdash (1, 034, 066, 333) \\
& C(6568, 76106) \vdash (26, 286) \\
& C(6570, 19027) \vdash (26, 286) \\
& C(6572, 4756) \vdash (64, 845, 937) \\
& C(9860, 2379) \vdash (39, 446) \\
& C(9862, 594) \vdash (39, 462) \\
& C(9867, 2) \vdash (39, 482) \\
& \ldots
\end{align*}
\]
5.3.4 Ligockis’ machine found in November 2007

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 6 states and 2 symbols, from November to December 2007.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
& 0 & 1 \\
A & 1RB & 0RF \\
B & 0LB & 1LC \\
C & 1LD & 0RC \\
D & 1LE & 1RH \\
E & 1LF & 0LD \\
F & 1RA & 0LE \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Terry and Shawn Ligocki (2007)

\[
s(M) > 8.9 \times 10^{1762}
\]

\[
\sigma(M) > 2.5 \times 10^{881}
\]

Let \( C(n, p) = \ldots 0(F0)(10)^nR(bin(p))0\ldots \), where \( R(bin(p)) \) is the number \( p \) written in binary in reverse order, so that \( C(n, 4m + 1) = C(n + 1, m) \). The number of transitions between configurations \( C(n, p) \) is infinite, but only 12 transitions are used in the computation on a blank tape. For all \( m \geq 0 \), all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0\ldots \vdash (6) \quad C(0, 15) \\
C(k, 4m + 3) \vdash (4k + 6) \quad C(k + 2, m) \\
C(2k, 4m) \vdash (30k^2 + 20k + 15) \quad C(5k + 2, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k + 1, 4m) \vdash (30k^2 + 40k + 25) \quad C(5k + 2, 32m + 20) \\
C(k, 8m + 2) \vdash (8k + 20) \quad C(k + 3, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k, 16m + 6) \vdash (30k^2 + 40k + 23) \quad C(5k + 2, 32m + 20) \\
C(2k + 1, 16m + 6) \vdash (30k^2 + 80k + 63) \quad C(5k + 7, 2m + 1) \\
C(k, 32m + 14) \vdash (4k + 18) \quad C(k + 3, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k, 128m + 94) \vdash (30k^2 + 40k + 39) \quad C(5k + 2, 256m + 84) \\
C(2k + 1, 128m + 94) \vdash (30k^2 + 80k + 79) \quad C(5k + 9, m) \\
C(k, 256m + 190) \vdash (4k + 34) \quad C(k + 5, m) \\
C(k, 512m + 30) \vdash (2k + 43) \ldots 0(10)^k1(H0)10100101R(bin(m))0\ldots
\]
So we have (the final configuration is reached in 3346 transitions):

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (6) \\
C(0, 15) \vdash (6) \\
C(2, 3) \vdash (14) \\
C(4, 0) \vdash (175) \\
C(13, 0) \vdash (1,345) \\
C(32, 20) \vdash (8,015) \\
C(82, 11) \vdash (334) \\
C(84, 2) \vdash (692) \\
C(88, 0) \vdash (58,975) \\
C(223, 0) \vdash (374,095) \\
C(557, 20) \vdash (2,329,665) \\
C(1392, 180) \vdash (14,546,415) \\
C(3482, 91) \vdash (13,934) \\
C(3484, 22) \vdash (91,106,623) \\
C(8712, 52) \vdash (569,329,215) \\
C(21784, 6) \vdash (3,559,505,623) \\
C(54462, 20) \vdash (22,246,365,465) \\
C(136157, 11) \vdash (544,634) \\
C(136159, 2) \vdash (1,089,292) \\
C(136163, 0) \vdash (139,053,400,095) \\
C(340407, 20) \vdash (869,078,644,415) \\
\ldots
\]

See detailed analysis in Michel (2015), Section 8.

5.3.5 Marxen and Buntrock’s machine found in March 2001

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 6 states and 2 symbols, from March 2001 to November 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marxen and Buntrock (2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(M) &gt; 3.0 \times 10^{1730}</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\sigma(M) &gt; 1.2 \times 10^{865}</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0RC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1LD</td>
<td>1RE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0LE</td>
<td>0LD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0RA</td>
<td>1RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let \(C(n, p) = \ldots 0(A0)(01)^n R(\text{bin}(p))0 \ldots\), where \(R(\text{bin}(p))\) is the number \(p\) written in binary in reverse order, so that \(C(n, 4m + 2) = C(n + 1, m)\). The number of transitions between configurations \(C(n, p)\) is infinite, but only 20 transitions are used in the computation.
on a blank tape. For all $m \geq 0$, all $k \geq 0$,

\[
\begin{align*}
C(2k, 4m) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 9) & C(3k + 1, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k, 16m + 1) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 17) & C(3k + 2, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k, 4m + 3) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 9) & C(3k + 1, 2m) \\
C(2k, 64m + 53) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 25) & C(3k + 3, 2m) \\
C(2k, 256m + 9) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 29) & C(3k + 4, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k, 1024m + 57) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 33) & C(3k + 2, 128m + 104) \\
C(2k, 1024m + 85) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 41) & C(3k + 5, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k + 1, 16m) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 21) & C(3k + 3, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k + 1, 4m + 1) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 13) & C(3k + 1, 8m + 4) \\
C(2k + 1, 64m + 4) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 29) & C(3k + 4, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k + 1, 64m + 3) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 25) & C(3k + 1, 128m + 104) \\
C(2k + 1, 1024m + 104) & \vdash (9k^2 + 43k + 75) & C(3k + 7, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k + 1, 16m + 12) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 21) & C(3k + 3, 2m) \\
C(2k + 1, 16m + 7) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 17) & C(3k + 1, 32m + 16) \\
C(2k + 1, 256m + 15) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 29) & C(3k + 1, 512m + 416) \\
C(2k + 1, 64m + 52) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 29) & C(3k + 4, 2m) \\
C(2k + 1, 256m + 20) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 37) & C(3k + 5, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k + 1, 4096m + 420) & \vdash (9k^2 + 43k + 89) & C(3k + 8, 2m + 1) \\
C(2k + 1, 256m + 211) & \vdash (9k^2 + 25k + 33) & C(3k + 1, 512m + 168) \\
C(2k + 1, 16m + 11) & \vdash (9k^2 + 13k + 10) & \ldots 0(10)^{3k+1}11(H0)10R(bin(m))0\ldots
\end{align*}
\]
So we have (the final configuration is reached in 4911 transitions):

\[
\ldots 0(40)0\ldots = \\
C(0,0) ⊢ (9) \\
C(1,1) ⊢ (13) \\
C(1,4) ⊢ (29) \\
C(4,1) ⊢ (103) \\
C(8,1) ⊢ (261) \\
C(14,1) ⊢ (633) \\
C(23,1) ⊢ (1,377) \\
C(34,4) ⊢ (3,035) \\
C(52,3) ⊢ (6,743) \\
C(79,0) ⊢ (14,685) \\
C(120,1) ⊢ (33,917) \\
C(182,1) ⊢ (76,821) \\
C(275,1) ⊢ (172,359) \\
C(412,4) ⊢ (387,083) \\
C(619,3) ⊢ (867,079) \\
C(928,104) ⊢ (1,949,273) \\
C(1393,53) ⊢ (4,377,157) \\
C(2089,108) ⊢ (9,835,545) \\
C(3135,12) ⊢ (22,138,597) \\
C(4704,0) ⊢ (49,845,945) \\
C(7057,1) ⊢ (112,109,269) \\
C(10585,4) ⊢ (252,179,705) \\
\ldots
\]

**Note:** Clive Tooth posted an analysis of this machine on Google Groups (sci.math), on June 28, 2002. He used the configurations \( S(n, x) = \ldots 0101(B1)010(01)^n x 0 \ldots \) His analysis can be easily connected to the present one, by noting that

\[
C(n, p) ⊢ (15) S(n - 2, R(bin(p))).
\]

### 5.3.6 Marxen and Buntrock’s second machine

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 6 states and 2 symbols, from October 2000 to March 2001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marxen and Buntrock (2000)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s(M) &gt; 6.1 \times 10^{925} )</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>IRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma(M) &gt; 6.4 \times 10^{462} )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1LE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Let $C(n) = \ldots 01^n(B0)0\ldots$.

Then we have, for all $k \geq 0$,

\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots 0(A0)0\ldots & \vdash (1)\quad C(1) \\
C(3k) & \vdash (54 \times 4^k + 1 - 27 \times 2^k + 26k + 86)\quad C(9 \times 2^k + 1 - 8) \\
C(3k + 1) & \vdash (2048 \times (4^k - 1)/3 - 3 \times 2^k + 26k + 792)\quad C(2^{k+5} - 8) \\
C(3k + 2) & \vdash (3k + 8)\quad \ldots 01(H1)(011)^k(0101)0\ldots
\end{align*}
\]

So we have:

\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots 0(A0)0\ldots & \vdash (1)\quad C(1) \vdash (408) \\
C(24) & \vdash (14, 100, 774) \\
C(4600) & \vdash (2048 \times (4^{1533} - 1)/3 - 3 \times 2^{1540} + 40650) \\
C(2^{1538} - 8) & \vdash (2^{1538} - 2) \\
\ldots 01(H1)(011)^p(0101)0\ldots
\end{align*}
\]

with $p = (2^{1538} - 10)/3$.

So the total time is $T = 2048 \times (4^{1533} - 1)/3 - 11 \times 2^{1538} + 14141831$, and the final number of 1 is $2 \times (2^{1538} - 10)/3 + 4$.

Note that

\[
C(6k + 1) \vdash (\quad) C(3m) \vdash (\quad) C(6p + 4) \vdash (\quad) C(3q + 2) \vdash (\quad) END,
\]

with $m = (2^{2k+5} - 8)/3$, $p = 3 \times 2^m - 2$, $q = (2^{2p+6} - 10)/3$.

So all configurations $C(n)$ lead to a halting configuration. Those taking the most time are $C(6k + 1)$. For example:

\[
C(7) \vdash (t) END \quad \text{with} \quad t > 10^{3.9 \times 10^{12}}.
\]

More generally:

\[
C(6k + 1) \vdash (t(k)) END \quad \text{with} \quad t(k) > 10^{10^{10^{(3k+2)/5}}}.
\]

See also the analyses by Robert Munafo: the short one in

http://mrob.com/pub/math/ln-notes1-4.html#mb6q

and the detailed one in

http://mrob.com/pub/math/ln-mb6q.html

See detailed analysis in Michel (2015), Section 9.

### 5.3.7 Marxen and Buntrock’s third machine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marxen and Buntrock (2000)

- $s(M) > 6.1 \times 10^{119}$
- $\sigma(M) > 1.4 \times 10^{90}$

Marxen and Buntrock (2000)

\[
\begin{align*}
s(M) & > 6.1 \times 10^{119} \\
\sigma(M) & > 1.4 \times 10^{90}
\end{align*}
\]
Let $C(n, x) = \ldots 0(E0)1000(10)^n x 0 \ldots$, so that $C(n, 10y) = C(n + 1, y)$. The number of transitions between configurations $C(n, x)$ is infinite, but only 9 transitions are used in the computation on a blank tape. For all $k \geq 0$,

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots & \vdash (18) & C(1, 01) \\
C(2k, 01^n) & \vdash (6k^2 + 22k + 15) & C(3k + 1, 01^{n+1}) \\
C(2k, 11) & \vdash (6k^2 + 34k + 41) & C(3k + 4, 01) \\
C(2k, 111) & \vdash (6k^2 + 34k + 45) & C(3k + 5, 01) \\
C(2k, 1111) & \vdash (6k^2 + 28k + 25) & \ldots 01^{6k+11}(H0)0 \ldots \\
C(2k + 1, 0) & \vdash (6k^2 + 34k + 43) & C(3k + 4, 0) \\
C(2k + 1, 01) & \vdash (6k^2 + 22k + 27) & C(3k + 4, 01) \\
C(2k + 1, 01^{n+2}) & \vdash (6k^2 + 22k + 23) & C(3k + 4, 1^n) \\
C(2k + 1, 11^{n+2}) & \vdash (6k^2 + 34k + 41) & C(3k + 4, 01^n) \\
\end{array}
\]

So we have (the final configuration is reached in 337 transitions):

\[
\begin{array}{lllll}
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots & \vdash (18) & C(1, 01) & \vdash (27) \\
C(4, 01) & \vdash (83) & C(7, 011) & \vdash (143) \\
C(13, 0) & \vdash (463) & C(22, 0) & \vdash (983) \\
C(34, 01) & \vdash (2, 123) & C(52, 011) & \vdash (4, 643) \\
C(79, 0111) & \vdash (10, 007) & C(122, 0) & \vdash (23, 683) \\
C(184, 01) & \vdash (52, 823) & C(277, 011) & \vdash (117, 323) \\
C(418, 0) & \vdash (266, 699) & C(628, 01) & \vdash (598, 499) \\
C(943, 011) & \vdash (1, 341, 431) & C(1417, 0) & \vdash (3, 031, 699) \\
C(2128, 0) & \vdash (6, 815, 999) & C(3193, 01) & \vdash (15, 318, 435) \\
C(4792, 01) & \vdash (34, 497, 623) & C(7189, 011) & \vdash (77, 580, 107) \\
C(10786, 0) & \vdash (174, 625, 355) & \ldots
\end{array}
\]

Note that, if $C(n, m) = \ldots 0(E0)1000(10)^n R(bin(m))0 \ldots$, where $R(bin(m))$ is the number $m$ written in binary in reverse order, so that $C(n, 4m + 1) = C(n + 1, m)$, then we have...
also, for all $k, m \geq 0$,

\[ \ldots 0(40)0 \ldots \vdash (18) \quad C(1, 2) \]

\[ C(2k, 2m) \vdash (6k^2 + 22k + 15) \quad C(3k + 1, 4m + 2) \]
\[ C(2k, 32m + 3) \vdash (6k^2 + 34k + 41) \quad C(3k + 4, 4m + 2) \]
\[ C(2k, 128m + \beta) \vdash (6k^2 + 34k + 45) \quad C(3k + 5, 4m + 2) \]
\[ C(2k, 32m + 15) \vdash (6k^2 + 28k + 25) \quad \ldots 01^{6k+11}(H0)R(bin(m))0 \ldots \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 4m) \vdash (6k^2 + 34k + 43) \quad C(3k + 4, 2m) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 32m + 2) \vdash (6k^2 + 22k + 27) \quad C(3k + 4, 4m + 2) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 8m + 6) \vdash (6k^2 + 22k + 23) \quad C(3k + 4, m) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 4m + 3) \vdash (6k^2 + 34k + 41) \quad C(3k + 4, 2m) \]

5.3.8 Another Marxen and Buntrock’s machine

This machine was discovered in January 1990, and was published on the web (Google groups) on September 3, 1997. It was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 6 states and 2 symbols up to July 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marxen and Buntrock (1997)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s(M) = 8, 690, 333, 381, 690, 951$</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma(M) = 95, 524, 079$</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0RF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0LA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the likeness to the machine $N$ with 3 states and 3 symbols discovered, in August 2006, by Terry and Shawn Ligocki, and studied in Section 5.4.2. For this machine $N$, we have $s(N) = 4, 345, 166, 620, 336, 565$ and $\sigma(N) = 95, 524, 079$, that is, same value of $\sigma$, and almost half the value of $s$. See analysis of this similarity in Section 5.9.

**Analysis by Robert Munafo**

Let $C(n) = \ldots 0(D0)1^*0 \ldots$

Then we have, for all $k \geq 0$,

\[ \ldots 0(40)0 \ldots \vdash (3) \quad C(2) \]
\[ C(4k) \vdash (8k + 6) \quad \ldots 01(H0)(10)^{2k}110 \ldots \]
\[ C(4k + 1) \vdash (20k^2 + 56k + 30) \quad C(10k + 9) \]
\[ C(4k + 2) \vdash (20k^2 + 56k + 33) \quad C(10k + 9) \]
\[ C(4k + 3) \vdash (20k^2 + 68k + 51) \quad C(10k + 12) \]
So we have:

\[
\ldots 0(40)0 \ldots \vdash (3) \\
C(2) \vdash (33) \\
C(9) \vdash (222) \\
C(29) \vdash (1,402) \\
C(79) \vdash (8,563) \\
C(202) \vdash (52,833) \\
C(509) \vdash (329,722) \\
C(1,279) \vdash (2,056,963) \\
C(3,202) \vdash (12,844,833) \\
C(8,009) \vdash (80,272,222) \\
C(20,029) \vdash (501,681,402) \\
C(50,079) \vdash (3,135,358,563) \\
C(125,202) \vdash (19,595,552,833) \\
C(313,009) \vdash (122,471,892,222) \\
C(782,529) \vdash (765,448,543,902) \\
C(1,956,329) \vdash (4,784,051,443,102) \\
C(4,890,829) \vdash (29,900,316,628,602) \\
C(12,227,079) \vdash (186,876,942,247,563) \\
C(30,567,702) \vdash (1,167,980,782,060,333) \\
C(76,419,259) \vdash (7,299,879,658,619,323) \\
C(191,048,152) \vdash (382,096,310) \\
\ldots 0(1(H0)(10)^{95524076}110) \ldots 
\]

5.4 Turing machines with 3 states and 3 symbols

5.4.1 Ligockis’ champion

This machine is the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 3 states and 3 symbols, since November 2007.

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
\text{Terry and Shawn Ligocki (2007)} & 0 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline
s(M) = 119, 112, 334, 170, 342, 540 =? S(3,3) & A & 1RB & 2LA \\
\sigma(M) = 374, 676, 383 =? \Sigma(3,3) & B & 0LA & 2RB \\
\end{array}
\]

Let \( C(n) = \ldots 0(40)2^n0 \ldots \)

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0, \)

\[
\ldots 0(40)0 \ldots \vdash (3) \\
C(8k + 1) \vdash (112k^2 + 116k + 13) \\
C(8k + 2) \vdash (112k^2 + 144k + 38) \\
C(8k + 3) \vdash (112k^2 + 172k + 54) \\
C(8k + 4) \vdash (112k^2 + 200k + 74) \\
C(8k + 5) \vdash (112k^2 + 228k + 97) \\
C(8k + 6) \vdash (112k^2 + 256k + 139) \\
C(8k + 7) \vdash (112k^2 + 284k + 169) \\
C(8k + 8) \vdash (112k^2 + 312k + 203)
\]

\( C(1) \)

\( C(14k + 3) \)

\( C(14k + 7) \)

\( C(14k + 8) \)

\( C(14k + 9) \)

\( C(14k + 14) \)

\( C(14k + 15) \)

\( C(14k + 16) \)
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So we have (in 34 transitions):

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (3) 
\]

\[ C(1) \vdash (13) \]

\[ C(3) \vdash (54) \]

\[ C(8) \vdash (203) \]

\[ C(16) \vdash (627) \]

\[ C(30) \vdash (1915) \]

\[
\ldots
\]

\[ C(122, 343, 306) \vdash (26, 193, 799, 261, 043, 238) \]

\[ C(214, 100, 789) \vdash (80, 218, 511, 093, 348, 089) \]

\[
\ldots 01(H1)2^{37,467}6^{38}0 \ldots 
\]

See detailed analysis in Michel (2015), Section 3.

### 5.4.2 Ligockis’ machine found in August 2006

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 3 states and 3 symbols, from August 2006 to November 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terry and Shawn Ligocki (2006)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s(M) = 4,345,166,620,336,565 )</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RC</td>
<td>1LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma(M) = 95,524,079 )</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>1LC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note the likeness to the machine \( N \) with 6 states and 2 symbols discovered, in January 1990, by Heiner Marxen and Jürgen Buntrock, and studied in Section 5.3.8. For this machine \( N \), we have \( s(N) = 8,690,333,381,690,951 \) and \( \sigma(N) = 95,524,079 \), that is, same value of \( \sigma \), and almost twice the value of \( s \). See analysis of this similarity in Section 5.9.

**Analysis by Shawn Ligocki:**

Let \( C(n, 0) = \ldots 0(A0)12^00 \ldots \),

and \( C(n, 1) = \ldots 0(C0)12^00 \ldots \).

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[
C(2k, 0) \vdash (40k^2 + 32k + 5) 
\]

\[
C(2k + 1, 0) \vdash (40k^2 + 82k + 42) 
\]

\[
C(2k + 1, 1) \vdash (40k^2 + 52k + 19) 
\]

\[
C(2k + 2, 1) \vdash (40k^2 + 92k + 53) 
\]

\[
C(5k + 1, 1) 
\]

\[
C(5k + 3, 1) 
\]

\[
C(5k + 5, 0) 
\]

\[
\ldots 01(H1)2^{37,467}6^{38}0 \ldots 
\]
So we have:

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0\ldots = \]
\[ C(0, 0) \vdash (5) \]
\[ C(1, 1) \vdash (19) \]
\[ C(3, 1) \vdash (111) \]
\[ C(8, 1) \vdash (689) \]
\[ C(20, 0) \vdash (4, 325) \]
\[ C(51, 1) \vdash (26, 319) \]
\[ C(128, 1) \vdash (164, 609) \]
\[ C(320, 0) \vdash (1, 029, 125) \]
\[ C(801, 1) \vdash (6, 420, 819) \]
\[ C(2003, 1) \vdash (40, 132, 111) \]
\[ C(5008, 1) \vdash (250, 830, 689) \]
\[ C(12520, 0) \vdash (1, 567, 704, 325) \]
\[ C(31301, 1) \vdash (9, 797, 713, 819) \]
\[ C(78253, 1) \vdash (61, 235, 789, 611) \]
\[ C(195633, 1) \vdash (382, 723, 880, 691) \]
\[ C(489083, 1) \vdash (2, 392, 024, 743, 391) \]
\[ C(1222708, 1) \vdash (14, 950, 155, 868, 889) \]
\[ C(3056770, 0) \vdash (93, 438, 477, 237, 325) \]
\[ C(7641926, 1) \vdash (582, 990, 375, 746, 317) \]
\[ C(19104815, 0) \vdash (3, 649, 939, 963, 043, 376) \]
\[ \ldots 01^{95524079}(H0)0\ldots \]

5.4.3 Lafitte and Papazian’s machine found in April 2006

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 3 states and 3 symbols, from April to August 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lafitte and Papazian (2006)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s(M) = 4, 144, 465, 135, 614 )</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma(M) = 2, 950, 149 )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>2RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>2RC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let \( C(n, 0) = \ldots 0(A0)1^n0\ldots \),

and \( C(n, 1) = \ldots 0(A0)1^n210\ldots \).

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0 \) (note the likeness to Brady’s machine of Section 5.4.3),

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0\ldots \vdash (16) \]
\[ C(6, 0) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 0) \vdash (4k + 5) \]
\[ \ldots 01(H2)2^{2k}10\ldots \]
\[ C(2k + 2, 0) \vdash (10k^2 + 27k + 23) \]
\[ C(5k + 6, 1) \]
\[ C(2k, 1) \vdash (10k^2 + 27k + 18) \]
\[ C(5k + 5, 1) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 1) \vdash (10k^2 + 51k + 60) \]
\[ C(5k + 12, 0) \]
So we have:

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (16) \]
\[ C(6, 0) \vdash (117) \]
\[ C(16, 1) \vdash (874) \]
\[ C(45, 1) \vdash (6, 022) \]
\[ C(122, 0) \vdash (37, 643) \]
\[ C(306, 1) \vdash (238, 239) \]
\[ C(770, 1) \vdash (1,492, 663) \]
\[ C(1930, 1) \vdash (9, 338, 323) \]
\[ C(4830, 1) \vdash (58, 387, 473) \]
\[ C(12080, 1) \vdash (364, 979, 098) \]
\[ C(30205, 1) \vdash (2,281, 474, 302) \]
\[ C(75522, 0) \vdash (14, 259, 195, 543) \]
\[ C(188806, 1) \vdash (89, 121, 812, 989) \]
\[ C(472020, 1) \vdash (557, 013, 573, 288) \]
\[ C(1180055, 1) \vdash (3, 481, 348, 698, 727) \]
\[ C(2950147, 0) \vdash (5, 900, 297) \]
\[ \ldots 01(H2)^{2H200146}10 \ldots \]

Note that we have also, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (133) \]
\[ C(2k, 1) \vdash (10k^2 + 27k + 18) \]
\[ C(4k + 1, 1) \vdash (290k^2 + 737k + 468) \]
\[ C(4k + 3, 1) \vdash (40k^2 + 162k + 158) \]
\[ \ldots 01(H2)^{2H2+k+16}10 \ldots \]

5.4.4 Lafitte and Papazian’s machine found in September 2005

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 3 states and 3 symbols, from September 2005 to April 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lafitte and Papazian (2005)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s(M) = 987,522,842,126 )</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma(M) = 1,525,688 )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1RC</td>
<td>2RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let \( C(n, 0) = \ldots 0(A0)2^n0 \ldots \),
and \( C(n, 1) = \ldots 0(A0)2^n10 \ldots \).

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[ C(4k, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 16k + 5) \quad C(7k + 2, 1) \]
\[ C(4k + 1, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 30k + 15) \quad C(7k + 5, 0) \]
\[ C(4k + 2, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 30k + 15) \quad C(7k + 5, 0) \]
\[ C(4k + 3, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 44k + 35) \quad C(7k + 9, 1) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 1) \vdash (4k + 3) \quad \ldots 01(12)^k01(H0)^0 \ldots \]
\[ C(4k, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 26k + 11) \quad C(7k + 4, 0) \]
\[ C(4k + 2, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 40k + 29) \quad C(7k + 8, 1) \]
So we have:

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0\ldots = \\
C(0, 0) \vdash (5) \\
C(2, 1) \vdash (29) \\
C(8, 1) \vdash (119) \\
C(18, 0) \vdash (359) \\
C(33, 0) \vdash (1, 151) \\
C(61, 0) \vdash (3, 615) \\
C(110, 0) \vdash (11, 031) \\
C(194, 0) \vdash (33, 711) \\
C(341, 0) \vdash (103, 715) \\
C(600, 0) \vdash (317, 405) \\
C(1052, 1) \vdash (975, 215) \\
C(1845, 0) \vdash (2, 989, 139) \\
C(3232, 0) \vdash (9, 153, 029) \\
C(5658, 1) \vdash (28, 048, 133) \\
C(9906, 1) \vdash (85, 927, 133) \\
C(17340, 1) \vdash (263, 203, 871) \\
C(30349, 0) \vdash (806, 103, 591) \\
C(53114, 0) \vdash (2, 468, 672, 331) \\
C(92951, 0) \vdash (7, 560, 436, 829) \\
C(162668, 1) \vdash (23, 154, 325, 799) \\
C(284673, 0) \vdash (70, 910, 514, 191) \\
C(498181, 0) \vdash (217, 164, 134, 715) \\
C(871820, 0) \vdash (665, 064, 835, 635) \\
C(1525687, 1) \vdash (3, 051, 375) \\
\ldots 01(12)^{762843}01(H0)0\ldots
\]

5.4.5 Lafitte and Papazian’s machine found in August 2005

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 3 states and 3 symbols, from August to September 2005.

Lafitte and Papazian (2005)

\[s(M) = 4,939,345,068\]
\[\sigma(M) = 107,900\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>0LB</td>
<td>1RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2LC</td>
<td>1RC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let \(C(n, 0) = \ldots 0(C0)2^n0\ldots\),
and \(C(n, 1) = \ldots 0(C0)2^n10\ldots\)
Then we have, for all $k \geq 0$,

$$
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (3)
\quad C(1, 1)
\quad C(4k, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 16k + 5) \quad C(7k + 2, 1)
\quad C(4k + 1, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 22k + 7) \quad C(7k + 3, 0)
\quad C(4k + 2, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 30k + 15) \quad C(7k + 5, 0)
\quad C(4k + 3, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 36k + 23) \quad C(7k + 7, 1)
\quad C(2k, 1) \vdash (2k + 2) \quad \ldots 01(21)^k(H0)0 \ldots
\quad C(4k + 1, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 20k + 9) \quad C(7k + 3, 1)
\quad C(4k + 3, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 34k + 21) \quad C(7k + 6, 0)
\quad C(4k + 1, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 20k + 9) \quad C(7k + 3, 1)
\quad C(4k + 3, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 36k + 23) \quad C(7k + 7, 1)
\quad C(2k, 1) \vdash (2k + 2) \quad \ldots 01(21)^k(H0)0 \ldots
\quad C(4k + 1, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 20k + 9) \quad C(7k + 3, 1)
\quad C(4k + 3, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 34k + 21) \quad C(7k + 6, 0)
\quad C(4k + 1, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 20k + 9) \quad C(7k + 3, 1)
\quad C(4k + 3, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 36k + 23) \quad C(7k + 7, 1)
\quad C(2k, 1) \vdash (2k + 2) \quad \ldots 01(21)^k(H0)0 \ldots
\quad C(4k + 1, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 20k + 9) \quad C(7k + 3, 1)
\quad C(4k + 3, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 36k + 23) \quad C(7k + 7, 1)
\quad C(2k, 1) \vdash (2k + 2) \quad \ldots 01(21)^k(H0)0 \ldots
\quad C(4k + 1, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 20k + 9) \quad C(7k + 3, 1)
\quad C(4k + 3, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 36k + 23) \quad C(7k + 7, 1)
\quad C(2k, 1) \vdash (2k + 2) \quad \ldots 01(21)^k(H0)0 \ldots
\quad C(4k + 1, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 20k + 9) \quad C(7k + 3, 1)
\quad C(4k + 3, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 36k + 23) \quad C(7k + 7, 1)
\quad C(2k, 1) \vdash (2k + 2) \quad \ldots 01(21)^k(H0)0 \ldots
\quad C(4k + 1, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 20k + 9) \quad C(7k + 3, 1)
\quad C(4k + 3, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 36k + 23) \quad C(7k + 7, 1)
\quad C(2k, 1) \vdash (2k + 2) \quad \ldots 01(21)^k(H0)0 \ldots
\quad C(4k + 1, 1) \vdash (14k^2 + 20k + 9) \quad C(7k + 3, 1)
\quad C(4k + 3, 0) \vdash (14k^2 + 36k + 23) \quad C(7k + 7, 1)
\quad C(2k, 1) \vdash (2k + 2) \quad \ldots 01(21)^k(H0)0 \ldots
$$

So we have:

$$
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (3)
\quad C(1, 1) \vdash (9)
\quad C(3, 1) \vdash (21)
\quad C(6, 0) \vdash (59)
\quad C(12, 0) \vdash (179)
\quad C(23, 1) \vdash (541)
\quad C(41, 0) \vdash (1, 627)
\quad C(73, 0) \vdash (4, 939)
\quad C(129, 0) \vdash (15, 047)
\quad C(227, 0) \vdash (45, 943)
\quad C(399, 1) \vdash (140, 601)
\quad C(699, 0) \vdash (430, 151)
\quad C(1225, 1) \vdash (1, 317, 033)
\quad C(2145, 1) \vdash (4, 032, 873)
\quad C(3755, 1) \vdash (12, 349, 729)
\quad C(6572, 0) \vdash (37, 818, 579)
\quad C(11503, 1) \vdash (115, 816, 521)
\quad C(20131, 0) \vdash (354, 675, 511)
\quad C(35231, 1) \vdash (1, 086, 184, 945)
\quad C(61655, 0) \vdash (3, 326, 402, 857)
\quad C(107898, 1) \vdash (107, 900)
\quad \ldots 01(21)^{53949}(H0)0 \ldots
$$

5.4.6 Souris’s machine for $S(3, 3)$

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for $S(3, 3)$, from July to August 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Souris (2005)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s(M) = 544, 884, 219$</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma(M) = 32, 213$</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>2RC</td>
<td>1LC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let $C(n, 0) = \ldots 0(A0)1^n0 \ldots$, and $C(n, 1) = \ldots 0(A0)1^n20 \ldots$. 
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Then we have, for all $k \geq 0$,

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (4)\quad \text{\(C(3,0)\)}
\]
\[
C(3k + 2, 0) \vdash (21k^2 + 43k + 19) \ldots 011(H2)2^{7k+10}\ldots
\]
\[
C(3k + 3, 0) \vdash (21k^2 + 43k + 24) \quad \text{\(C(7k + 7, 0)\)}
\]
\[
C(3k + 4, 0) \vdash (21k^2 + 43k + 26) \quad \text{\(C(7k + 7, 1)\)}
\]
\[
C(3k + 1, 1) \vdash (21k^2 + 61k + 35) \ldots 011(H2)2^{7k+30}\ldots
\]
\[
C(3k + 2, 1) \vdash (21k^2 + 61k + 42) \quad \text{\(C(7k + 9, 0)\)}
\]
\[
C(3k + 3, 1) \vdash (21k^2 + 61k + 46) \quad \text{\(C(7k + 9, 1)\)}
\]

So we have:

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (4)
\]
\[
C(3, 0) \vdash (24)
\]
\[
C(7, 0) \vdash (90)
\]
\[
C(14, 1) \vdash (622)
\]
\[
C(37, 0) \vdash (3, 040)
\]
\[
C(84, 1) \vdash (17, 002)
\]
\[
C(198, 1) \vdash (92, 736)
\]
\[
C(464, 1) \vdash (507, 472)
\]
\[
C(1087, 0) \vdash (2, 752, 290)
\]
\[
C(2534, 1) \vdash (15, 010, 582)
\]
\[
C(5917, 0) \vdash (81, 666, 440)
\]
\[
C(13804, 1) \vdash (444, 833, 917)
\]
\[
\ldots 011(H2)2^{32210}\ldots
\]

5.4.7 Souris’s machine for $\Sigma(3, 3)$

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for $\Sigma(3, 3)$, from July to August 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Souris (2005)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s(M) = 310, 341, 163$</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma(M) = 36, 089$</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>1LC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let $C(n, 0) = \ldots 0(C0)1^n0\ldots$, and $C(n, 1) = \ldots 0(C0)1^n210\ldots$.

Then we have, for all $k \geq 0$,

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (4)\quad \text{\(C(1,1)\)}
\]
\[
C(2k + 2, 0) \vdash (5k^2 + 32k + 17) \quad \text{\(C(5k + 5, 0)\)}
\]
\[
C(2k + 3, 0) \vdash (5k^2 + 32k + 21) \quad \text{\(C(5k + 4, 1)\)}
\]
\[
C(2k + 1, 1) \vdash (5k^2 + 32k + 15) \quad \text{\(C(5k + 4, 0)\)}
\]
\[
C(2k + 2, 1) \vdash (5k^2 + 37k + 30) \ldots 012^{5k+5}(H2)10\ldots
\]

So we have:
...0(A0)0... $\vdash (4)$  \[ C(1,1) \vdash (15) \\
C(4,0) \vdash (54) \\
C(10,0) \vdash (225) \\
C(25,0) \vdash (978) \\
C(59,1) \vdash (5,148) \\
C(149,0) \vdash (29,002) \\
C(369,1) \vdash (175,183) \\
C(924,0) \vdash (1,077,374) \\
C(2310,0) \vdash (6,695,525) \\
C(5775,0) \vdash (41,737,353) \\
C(14434,1) \vdash (260,620,302) \\
...012360851(H2)10... \\

Note that we have also, for all $k \geq 0$,  
\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots0(A0)0\ldots & \vdash (6) & C(0,1) \\
C(2k+1,0) & \vdash (4k+5) & \ldots01(H2)2^{2k}10... \\
C(2k+2,0) & \vdash (10k^2+15k+10) & C(5k+3,1) \\
C(2k+1,1) & \vdash (10k^2+27k+18) & C(5k+5,1) \\
C(2k+1,1) & \vdash (10k^2+51k+60) & C(5k+12,0) 
\end{align*}
\]

### 5.4.8 Brady’s machine

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 3 states and 3 symbols, from December 2004 to July 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brady (2004)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s(M) = 92,649,163$</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma(M) = 13,949$</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1LC</td>
<td>2RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let $C(n,0) = \ldots0(A0)1^n0\ldots$, and $C(n,1) = \ldots0(A0)1^n210\ldots$

Then we have, for all $k \geq 0$,  
\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots0(A0)0\ldots & \vdash (6) & C(0,1) \\
C(2k+1,0) & \vdash (4k+5) & \ldots01(H2)2^{2k}10... \\
C(2k+2,0) & \vdash (10k^2+15k+10) & C(5k+3,1) \\
C(2k+1,1) & \vdash (10k^2+27k+18) & C(5k+5,1) \\
C(2k+1,1) & \vdash (10k^2+51k+60) & C(5k+12,0) 
\end{align*}
\]
So we have:

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (6) \quad C(0, 1) \vdash (18) \quad C(5, 1) \vdash (202) \quad C(22, 0) \vdash (1, 160) \quad C(53, 1) \vdash (8, 146) \quad C(142, 0) \vdash (50, 060) \quad C(353, 1) \vdash (318, 796) \quad C(892, 0) \vdash (1, 986, 935) \quad C(13947, 0) \vdash (27, 897) \]

\[ \ldots 01(H2)^{18946}10 \ldots \]

Note that we have also, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (6) \quad C(2k, 1) \vdash (10k^2 + 27k + 18) \quad C(5k + 1, 1) \]
\[ C(4k + 1, 1) \vdash (290k^2 + 677k + 395) \quad C(25k + 28, 1) \]
\[ C(4k + 3, 1) \vdash (40k^2 + 162k + 158) \quad \ldots 01(H2)^{10k+16}10 \ldots \]

\[ \ldots 013(5k+2)1(H1)0 \ldots \]

5.5 Turing machines with 2 states and 4 symbols

5.5.1 Ligockis’ champion

This machine is the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 2 states and 4 symbols, since February 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terry and Shawn Ligocki (2005)</th>
<th>( s(M) = 3,932,964 =? S(2, 4) )</th>
<th>( \sigma(M) = 2,050 =? \Sigma(2, 4) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s(M) ) 3,932,964 =? ( s(2, 4) )</td>
<td>( \sigma(M) = 2,050 =? \Sigma(2, 4) )</td>
<td>( \sigma(M) = 2,050 =? \Sigma(2, 4) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let \( C(n, 1) = \ldots 0(A0)2^n10 \ldots \),

and \( C(n, 2) = \ldots 0(A0)2^n110 \ldots \)

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (6) \quad C(3k, 1) \vdash (15k^2 + 9k + 3) \quad C(5k + 1, 1) \]
\[ C(3k + 1, 1) \vdash (15k^2 + 24k + 13) \quad \ldots 013^{5k+2}1(H1)0 \ldots \]
\[ C(3k + 2, 1) \vdash (15k^2 + 29k + 17) \quad C(5k + 2, 1) \]
\[ C(3k + 2, 1) \vdash (15k^2 + 21k + 7) \quad C(5k + 3, 1) \]
\[ C(3k + 2, 1) \vdash (15k^2 + 36k + 23) \quad \ldots 013^{5k+4}1(H1)0 \ldots \]
So we have:

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (6) \]
\[ C(1, 2) \vdash (7) \]
\[ C(3, 1) \vdash (27) \]
\[ C(6, 1) \vdash (81) \]
\[ C(11, 1) \vdash (239) \]
\[ C(19, 2) \vdash (673) \]
\[ C(33, 1) \vdash (1, 917) \]
\[ C(56, 1) \vdash (5, 399) \]
\[ C(94, 2) \vdash (15, 073) \]
\[ C(158, 1) \vdash (42, 085) \]
\[ C(264, 2) \vdash (117, 131) \]
\[ C(441, 2) \vdash (325, 755) \]
\[ C(736, 2) \vdash (905, 527) \]
\[ C(1228, 1) \vdash (2, 519, 044) \]
\[ \ldots 013^{2047}1(H1)0 \ldots \]

See detailed analysis in Michel (2015), Section 4.

### 5.5.2 Brady’s runner-up

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 2 states and 4 symbols, from 1988 to February 2005.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brady (1988)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s(M) = 7, 195 )</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LA 1RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma(M) = 90 )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2LA 1RH</td>
<td>3RA 3RB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let \( C(n, 0) = \ldots 0(A0)3^n0 \ldots \),

and \( C(n, 1) = \ldots 0(A0)3^n20 \ldots \).

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[ C(3k, 0) \vdash (15k^2 + 7k + 3) \quad C(3k + 1, 1) \]
\[ C(3k + 1, 0) \vdash (15k^2 + 22k + 11) \quad \ldots 013^{5k+1}(H0)0 \ldots \]
\[ C(3k + 2, 0) \vdash (15k^2 + 27k + 13) \quad C(5k + 4, 0) \]
\[ C(3k + 1, 1) \vdash (15k^2 + 28k + 16) \quad \ldots 013^{5k+3}(H0)0 \ldots \]
\[ C(3k + 1, 1) \vdash (15k^2 + 33k + 19) \quad C(5k + 5, 0) \]
\[ C(3k + 2, 1) \vdash (15k^2 + 43k + 33) \quad C(5k + 7, 1) \]

So we have:

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots = \]
\[ C(0, 0) \vdash (3) \]
\[ C(1, 1) \vdash (19) \]
\[ C(5, 0) \vdash (55) \]
\[ C(9, 0) \vdash (159) \]
\[ C(16, 1) \vdash (559) \]
\[ C(30, 0) \vdash (1, 573) \]
\[ C(51, 1) \vdash (4, 827) \]
\[ \ldots 013^{881}(H0)0 \ldots \]
5.6 Turing machines with 2 states and 5 symbols

5.6.1 Ligockis’ champion

This machine is the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 2 states and 5 symbols, since November 2007.

Terry and Shawn Ligocki (2007) 
$s(M)$ and $S(2,5) > 1.9 \times 10^{704}$
$\sigma(M)$ and $\Sigma(2,5) > 1.7 \times 10^{352}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>2LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0LA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let $C(n,1) = \ldots 013^n(B0)0\ldots$, and $C(n,2) = \ldots 023^n(B0)0\ldots$, and $C(n,3) = \ldots 03^n(B0)0\ldots$, and $C(n,4) = \ldots 04113^n(B0)0\ldots$, and $C(n,5) = \ldots 04123^n(B0)0\ldots$, and $C(n,6) = \ldots 0413^n(B0)0\ldots$, and $C(n,7) = \ldots 0423^n(B0)0\ldots$, and $C(n,8) = \ldots 043^n(B0)0\ldots$.

Then we have, for all $k \geq 0$,

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0\ldots \vdash (1) \quad C(0,1) \]
\[ C(2k,1) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 4) \quad C(3k + 1,1) \]
\[ C(2k + 1,1) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 4) \quad C(3k + 1,2) \]
\[ C(2k, 2) \vdash (3k^2 + 14k + 9) \quad C(3k + 2,1) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 2) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 4) \quad C(3k + 2,3) \]
\[ C(2k, 3) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 2) \quad C(3k,1) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 3) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 22) \quad C(3k + 1,4) \]
\[ C(2k, 4) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 8) \quad C(3k + 3,1) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 4) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 4) \quad C(3k + 1,5) \]
\[ C(2k, 5) \vdash (3k^2 + 14k + 13) \quad C(3k + 4,1) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 5) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 4) \quad C(3k + 2,6) \]
\[ C(2k, 6) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 6) \quad C(3k + 2,1) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 6) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 4) \quad C(3k + 1,7) \]
\[ C(2k, 7) \vdash (3k^2 + 14k + 11) \quad C(3k + 3,1) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 7) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 4) \quad C(3k + 2,8) \]
\[ C(2k, 8) \vdash (3k^2 + 8k + 4) \quad C(3k + 1,1) \]
\[ C(2k + 1, 8) \vdash (3k^2 + 5k + 3) \quad \ldots 01(H2)2^{3k}0\ldots \]
So we have:

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (1) \]
\[ C(0,1) \vdash (4) \]
\[ C(1,1) \vdash (4) \]
\[ C(1,2) \vdash (4) \]
\[ C(2,3) \vdash (13) \]
\[ C(3,1) \vdash (15) \]
\[ C(4,2) \vdash (49) \]
\[ C(8,1) \vdash (84) \]
\[ C(13,1) \vdash (160) \]
\[ C(19,2) \vdash (319) \]
\[ C(29,3) \vdash (722) \]
\[ C(43,4) \vdash (1495) \]
\[ C(64,5) \vdash (3533) \]
\[ C(100,1) \vdash (7904) \]
\[ \ldots \]

See detailed analysis in Michel (2015), Section 5.

5.6.2 Ligockis’ machine found in August 2006

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 2 states and 5 symbols, from August 2006 to October 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terry and Shawn Ligocki (2006)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s(M) = 7,069,449,877,176,007,352,687 )</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>0RB</td>
<td>4RA</td>
<td>2LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma(M) = 172,312,766,455 )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>3RB</td>
<td>4RA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis by Shawn Ligocki:

Let \( C(n,1) = \ldots 03^n(B0)0 \ldots \),

and \( C(n,2) = \ldots 013^n(B0)0 \ldots \),

and \( C(n,3) = \ldots 01403^n(B0)0 \ldots \),

and \( C(n,4) = \ldots 01413^n(B0)0 \ldots \).

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[ \ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (1) \]
\[ C(2k,1) \vdash (5k^2 + 14k + 3) \]
\[ C(2k + 1,1) \vdash (5k^2 + 14k + 7) \]
\[ C(2k,2) \vdash (5k^2 + 14k + 3) \]
\[ C(2k + 1,2) \vdash (5k^2 + 14k + 11) \]
\[ C(2k,3) \vdash (5k^2 + 14k + 3) \]
\[ C(2k + 1,3) \vdash (5k^2 + 14k + 9) \]
\[ C(2k,4) \vdash (5k^2 + 14k + 3) \]
\[ C(2k + 1,4) \vdash (5k^2 + 9k + 4) \]
\[ \ldots 011(H1)2^{5k+2}0 \ldots \]
So we have (in 30 transitions):

\[\ldots 0(A0)0\ldots \vdash (1)\]
\[C(0, 2) \vdash (3)\]
\[C(1, 1) \vdash (7)\]
\[C(3, 2) \vdash (30)\]
\[C(7, 3) \vdash (96)\]
\[C(19, 1) \vdash (538)\]
\[\ldots \]
\[C(4411206821, 1) \vdash (24, 323, 432, 041, 896, 588, 247)\]
\[C(11028017053, 2) \vdash (152, 021, 450, 201, 199, 582, 755)\]
\[C(27570042632, 3) \vdash (950, 134, 063, 605, 862, 157, 707)\]
\[C(68925106581, 4) \vdash (5, 938, 337, 896, 640, 612, 100, 114)\]
\[\ldots 011(H1)2^{1723127664520}\ldots \]

5.6.3 Lafitte and Papazian’s machine found in June 2006

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for \(\Sigma(2, 5)\), from June to August 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(s(M) = 14, 103, 258, 209, 249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma(M) = 4, 848, 239)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\begin{array}{c|cccc}
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
A & 1RB & 3LB & 4LB & 4LA & 2RA \\
B & 2LA & 1RH & 3RB & 4RA & 3RB \\
\end{array}\]

Let \(C(n, 1) = \ldots 0132^n 33(B0)0\ldots\),
and \(C(n, 2) = \ldots 01342^n 33(B0)0\ldots\),
and \(C(n, 3) = \ldots 0142^n 33(B0)0\ldots\),
and \(C(n, 4) = \ldots 012^n 33(B0)0\ldots\).

Then we have, for all \(k \geq 0\),

\[\ldots 0(A0)0\ldots \vdash (10)\]
\[C(0, 1) \vdash (10)\]
\[C(2k, 1) \vdash (3k^2 + 12k + 15)\]
\[C(2k + 1, 1) \vdash (3k^2 + 12k + 11)\]

...
So we have (in 36 transitions):

\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots 0(A0)0 &\vdash (10) \\
C(0, 1) &\vdash (15) \\
C(2, 2) &\vdash (24) \\
C(5, 1) &\vdash (47) \\
C(8, 3) &\vdash (105) \\
C(14, 4) &\vdash (244) \\
C(957674, 2) &\vdash (687, 860, 363, 760) \\
C(1436513, 1) &\vdash (1, 547, 683, 663, 691) \\
C(2154770, 3) &\vdash (3, 482, 288, 243, 304) \\
C(3232157, 4) &\vdash (7, 835, 138, 850, 959) \\
\ldots &\vdash (148^{48}4823620) \\
\end{align*}
\]

5.6.4 Lafitte and Papazian’s machine found in May 2006

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 2 states and 5 symbols, from May to June 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(s(M) = 3,793, 261, 759, 791)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma(M) = 2,576, 467)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let \(C(n, 1) = \ldots 014^n(B0)0\ldots\),

and \(C(n, 2) = \ldots 034^n(B0)0\ldots\).

Then we have, for all \(k \geq 0\),

\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots 0(A0)0 &\vdash (1) \\
C(3k, 1) &\vdash (4k^2 + 17k + 11) \\
C(3k + 1, 1) &\vdash (4k^2 + 25k + 20) \\
C(3k + 2, 1) &\vdash (4k^2 + 17k + 13) \\
C(3k, 2) &\vdash (4k^2 + 17k + 11) \\
C(3k + 1, 2) &\vdash (4k^2 + 25k + 20) \\
C(3k + 2, 2) &\vdash (4k^2 + 21k + 24) \\
\ldots &\vdash (H2)23^{4k+320}20\ldots \\
\end{align*}
\]
So we have (in 45 transitions):

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0\ldots \vdash (1) \\
C(0, 1) \vdash (11) \\
C(3, 1) \vdash (32) \\
C(7, 1) \vdash (86) \\
C(12, 1) \vdash (143) \\
C(19, 1) \vdash (314) \\
\ldots \\
C(815207, 1) \vdash (295, 364, 260, 408) \\
C(1086943, 2) \vdash (525, 094, 796, 254) \\
C(1449260, 1) \vdash (933, 496, 546, 059) \\
C(1932347, 2) \vdash (1, 659, 550, 059, 339) \\
\ldots 01(H2)23^{2576463}20\ldots
\]

Note that we have also, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0\ldots \vdash (1) \\
C(3k, 1) \vdash (4k^2 + 17k + 11) \\
C(3k + 1, 1) \vdash (4k^2 + 25k + 20) \\
C(9k + 2, 1) \vdash (100k^2 + 151k + 45) \\
C(9k + 5, 1) \vdash (100k^2 + 239k + 120) \\
C(9k + 8, 1) \vdash (100k^2 + 279k + 186) \\
\ldots 01(H2)23^{16k+15}20\ldots
\]

Note: The machine obtained by replacing \( B4 \rightarrow 2LB \) by \( B4 \rightarrow 3LB \) has the same behavior but final configuration \( \ldots 01(H3)3^{2576464}20\ldots \).

### 5.6.5 Lafitte and Papazian’s machine found in December 2005

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for \( S(2, 5) \), from December 2005 to May 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Lafitte and C. Papazian (2005)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s(M) = 924,180,005,181 )</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma(M) = 1,137,477 )</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>4LB</td>
<td>3RA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let \( C(n, 1) = \ldots 012^n(B0)0 \ldots \), and \( C(n, 2) = \ldots 032^n(B0)0 \ldots \).

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0\ldots \vdash (69) \\
C(2k + 1, 1) \vdash (15k^2 + 37k + 31) \\
C(2k + 2, 1) \vdash (15k^2 + 32k + 19) \\
C(2k + 2, 2) \vdash (15k^2 + 32k + 19) \\
C(2k + 1, 2) \vdash (15k^2 + 62k + 70) \\
C(8, 1) \vdash (5k + 3, 2) \\
C(5k + 3, 1) \\
C(5k + 9, 1)
\]

53
So we have:

\[
\begin{align*}
0(\mathcal{A}0)0 \ldots & \vdash (69) \\
C(8, 1) & \vdash (250) \\
C(18, 2) & \vdash (1, 522) \\
C(48, 1) & \vdash (8, 690) \\
C(118, 2) & \vdash (54, 122) \\
C(298, 1) & \vdash (333, 315) \\
C(743, 2) & \vdash (2, 087, 687) \\
C(1864, 1) & \vdash (13, 031, 226) \\
C(4658, 2) & \vdash (81, 438, 162) \\
C(11648, 1) & \vdash (508, 796, 290) \\
C(29118, 2) & \vdash (3, 179, 933, 122) \\
C(72798, 1) & \vdash (19, 873, 380, 815) \\
C(181993, 2) & \vdash (124, 209, 722, 062) \\
C(454989, 1) & \vdash (776, 311, 217, 849) \\
\ldots & 01221(\mathcal{H}1)113747120 \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

Note that we have also, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[
\begin{align*}
0(\mathcal{A}0)0 \ldots & \vdash (69) \\
C(2k + 1, 1) & \vdash (15k^2 + 37k + 31) \quad \ldots 01221(\mathcal{H}1)^{15k+120} \ldots \\
C(4k + 2, 1) & \vdash (435k^2 + 524k + 166) \quad C(25k + 14, 1) \\
C(4k + 4, 1) & \vdash (435k^2 + 884k + 453) \quad C(25k + 23, 1)
\end{align*}
\]

5.6.6 Lafitte and Papazian’s machine found in October 2005

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for \( \Sigma(2, 5) \), from October 2005 to May 2006.

G. Lafitte and C. Papazian (2005)

\[
\begin{array}{c|cccc}
\multicolumn{1}{c}{s(M)} & 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\hline
\sigma(M) = 1,957,771 & 1RB & 3LB & 1RH & 1LA & 1LA \\
\multicolumn{1}{c}{A} & 2LA & 3RB & 4LB & 4LB & 3RA \\
\multicolumn{1}{c}{B}
\end{array}
\]

Let \( C(n, 1) = \ldots 0(\mathcal{A}0)^n20 \ldots \),

and \( C(n, 2) = \ldots 0(\mathcal{A}0)^n40 \ldots \),

and \( C(n, 3) = \ldots 0(\mathcal{A}0)^n320 \ldots \).

Then we have, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[
\begin{align*}
0(\mathcal{A}0)0 \ldots & \vdash (11) \\
C(2k + 1, 1) & \vdash (5k^2 + 28k + 26) \quad C(5k + 6, 1) \\
C(2k + 2, 1) & \vdash (5k^2 + 18k + 11) \quad C(5k + 3, 2) \\
C(2k, 2) & \vdash (5k^2 + 18k + 11) \quad C(5k + 3, 1) \\
C(2k + 1, 2) & \vdash (5k^2 + 18k + 13) \quad C(5k + 3, 3) \\
C(2k + 1, 3) & \vdash (5k^2 + 18k + 9) \quad C(5k + 3, 1) \\
C(2k + 2, 3) & \vdash (5k^2 + 23k + 17) \quad \ldots 013^{5k+4}1(\mathcal{H}0)0 \ldots
\end{align*}
\]
So we have:

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (11)
\]

\[
C(3, 1) \vdash (59)
\]

\[
C(11, 1) \vdash (291)
\]

\[
C(31, 1) \vdash (1, 571)
\]

\[
C(81, 1) \vdash (9, 146)
\]

\[
C(206, 1) \vdash (53, 867)
\]

\[
C(513, 2) \vdash (332, 301)
\]

\[
C(1283, 3) \vdash (2, 065, 952)
\]

\[
C(3208, 1) \vdash (12, 876, 910)
\]

\[
C(8018, 2) \vdash (80, 432, 578)
\]

\[
C(20048, 1) \vdash (502, 483, 070)
\]

\[
C(3208, 1) \vdash (12, 876, 910)
\]

\[
C(8018, 2) \vdash (80, 432, 578)
\]

\[
C(20048, 1) \vdash (502, 483, 070)
\]

\[
C(3208, 1) \vdash (12, 876, 910)
\]

\[
C(8018, 2) \vdash (80, 432, 578)
\]

\[
C(20048, 1) \vdash (502, 483, 070)
\]

\[
C(3208, 1) \vdash (12, 876, 910)
\]

\[
C(8018, 2) \vdash (80, 432, 578)
\]

\[
C(20048, 1) \vdash (502, 483, 070)
\]

Note that we have also, for all \( k \geq 0 \),

\[
\ldots 0(A0)0 \ldots \vdash (11)
\]

\[
C(3k + 1, 1) \vdash (5k^2 + 28k + 26) \quad C(5k + 6, 1)
\]

\[
C(2k + 2, 1) \vdash (5k^2 + 18k + 11) \quad C(5k + 3, 2)
\]

\[
C(2k, 2) \vdash (5k^2 + 18k + 11) \quad C(5k + 3, 1)
\]

\[
C(4k + 1, 2) \vdash (145k^2 + 176k + 45) \quad C(25k + 8, 1)
\]

\[
C(4k + 3, 2) \vdash (145k^2 + 321k + 167) \quad \ldots 013^{1957769}1(H0)0 \ldots
\]

### 5.7 Collatz-like problems

Sameness of behaviors of the Turing machines above is striking. Their behaviors depend on transitions in the following form:

\[
C(ak + b) \vdash (c) \quad C(ck + d),
\]

where \( a, c \) are fixed, and \( b = 0, \ldots, a-1 \). Sometimes, another parameter is added: \( C(ak+b, p) \).

These transitions can be compared to the following problem. Let \( T \) be defined by

\[
T(x) = \begin{cases} 
  x/2 & \text{if } x \text{ is even}, \\
  (3x + 1)/2 & \text{if } x \text{ is odd}.
\end{cases}
\]

This can also be written

\[
T(2m) = m \\
T(2m + 1) = 3m + 2
\]

When \( T \) is iterated over positive integers, do we always reach the loop: \( T(2) = 1, T(1) = 2 ? \) This question is a famous open problem in mathematics, called \( 3x + 1 \) problem, or Collatz problem.

A similar question can be asked about iterating transitions of configurations \( C(ak + b, p) \) on positive integers. Do the iterated transitions always reach a halting configuration? For
all the machines above (except for the machine with 6 states and 2 symbols in Section 5.3.6), this question is presently an open problem in mathematics. Because of likeness to Collatz problem, these problems are called Collatz-like problems. Thus, for each machine above (except for the machine with 6 states and 2 symbols in Section 5.3.6), the halting problem (that is, on what inputs does this machine stop?) depends on an open Collatz-like problem.

5.8 Non-Collatz-like behaviors

Some Turing machines run a large number of steps on a small piece of tape. Such machines do not seem to be Collatz-like. We list below some interesting machines with this sort of behavior.

5.8.1 Turing machines with 3 states and 3 symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. H. Brady (November 2004)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s(M) = 2,315,619$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma(M) = 31$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>1LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>2RB</td>
<td>1RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2LA</td>
<td>0LC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brady called this machine “Surprise-in-a-Box”.

See also the simulation by Heiner Marxen:
http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simAB3Y_SB.html

5.8.2 Turing machines with 2 states and 5 symbols

(a) First machine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Lafitte and C. Papazian (July 2006)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s(M) = 26,375,397,569,930$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma(M) = 143$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>1RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>0RA</td>
<td>0RB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This machine was the record holder for $S(2,5)$, from July to August 2006.

See also the simulation by Heiner Marxen:
http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/simLaf25_j.html

(b) Second machine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Lafitte and C. Papazian (July 2006)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$s(M) = 7,021,292,621$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma(M) = 37$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1RB</td>
<td>4LA</td>
<td>1LA</td>
<td>1RH</td>
<td>2RB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2LB</td>
<td>3LA</td>
<td>1LB</td>
<td>2RA</td>
<td>0RB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.9 Turing machines in distinct classes with similar behaviors

In this section, we give examples of machines that have similar behaviors, but not the same numbers of states and symbols.
5.9.1 (2,4)-TM and (3,3)-TM

Terry and Shawn Ligocki (2005)

\[ s(M) = 3,932,964 =? S(2,4) \]
\[ \sigma(M) = 2,050 =? \Sigma(2,4) \]

This machine is the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 2 states and 4 symbols, since February 2005.

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
A & 1RB & 2LA & 1RA \\
B & 1LB & 1LA & 3RB & 1RH \\
\end{array}
\]

There is a step-by-step correspondence between the configurations of these machines.

5.9.2 (6,2)-TM and (3,3)-TM


\[ s(M) = 3,932,964 \]
\[ \sigma(M) = 2,050 \]

This machine was discovered in January 1990, and was published on the web (Google groups) on September 3, 1997. It was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 6 states and 2 symbols up to July 2000.

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
A & 1RB & 1LC & 1RH \\
B & 1LA & 1LC & 2RB \\
C & 1RB & 2LC & 1RC \\
\end{array}
\]

There is a step-by-step correspondence between the configurations of these machines.

This machine was the record holder in the Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 3 states and 3 symbols, from August 2006 to November 2007.

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccc}
A & 1RB & 1RA \\
B & 1LC & 1LB \\
C & 0RF & 1LD \\
D & 1RA & 0LE \\
E & 1RH & 1LF \\
F & 0LA & 0LC \\
\end{array}
\]

Note that these machines have same \( \sigma \) value, and the \( s \) value of the first one is almost twice the \( s \) value of the second one.

The behaviors of these machines can be related as follows.

Given the analyses of the (6,2)-TM in Section 5.3.8 and the (3,3)-TM in Section 5.4.2, the following functions \( f \) and \( g \) can be defined:
\[
\begin{align*}
  f(4k) &= \text{undefined}, \\
  f(4k + 1) &= 10k + 9, \\
  f(4k + 2) &= 10k + 9, \\
  f(4k + 3) &= 10k + 12. \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
  g(2k, 0) &= (5k + 1, 1), \\
  g(2k + 1, 0) &= \text{undefined}, \\
  g(2k, 1) &= (5k, 0), \\
  g(2k + 1, 1) &= (5k + 3, 1). \\
\end{align*}
\]

Now, let \( h \) be defined by

\[
\begin{align*}
  h(n, 0) &= 10n + 2, \\
  h(n, 1) &= 10n - 1. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Then: \( h \circ g = f \circ h \).

There is no step-by-step correspondence between these machines, but there is a phase correspondence, according to functions \( f \) and \( g \).

6 Properties of the busy beaver functions

6.1 Growth properties

\begin{itemize}
  \item Rado (1962) defined \( S(n) \) and \( \Sigma(n) \), that are denoted in this article \( S(n, 2) \) and \( \Sigma(n, 2) \).
  \item These functions grow faster than any computable function. Formally, for any computable function \( f \), there is an integer \( N \) such that, for any integer \( n > N \),
    \[
    S(n) > \Sigma(n) > f(n)
    \]
    This was proved by Rado (1962) who defined these functions in order to get noncomputable functions.
  \item It is easy to prove that the two variables functions \( S(n, k) \) and \( \Sigma(n, k) \) are increasing with the number \( n \) of states if the number \( k \) of symbols is constant. Formally, for any integer \( k \geq 2 \), if \( n > m \), then
    \[
    S(n, k) > S(m, k) \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma(n, k) > \Sigma(m, k)
    \]
  \item As Harland (2016b) noticed, the same result for the number of symbols, with a constant number of states, is far from obvious, and still unproven. Petersen (2017) proved that functions \( S(n, k) \) and \( \Sigma(n, k) \) are increasing with the number \( k \) of symbols if the number \( n \) of states is sufficiently large. The proof uses introspective encoding, a tool developed by Ben-Amram and Petersen (2002).
\end{itemize}

6.2 Relations between the busy beaver functions

\begin{itemize}
  \item Rado (1962) proved that
    \[
    S(n) < (n + 1)\Sigma(5n)2^{\Sigma(5n)}.
    \]
\end{itemize}
• Julstrom (1993) proved that
  \[ S(n) < \Sigma(28n). \]
• Julstrom (1992) proved that
  \[ S(n) < \Sigma(20n). \]
• Wang and Xu (1995) proved that
  \[ S(n) < \Sigma(10n). \]
• In an unpublished technical report in German, Buro (1990) (p. 5-6) proved that
  \[ S(n) < \Sigma(9n). \]
• Yang, Ding and Xu (1997) proved that
  \[ S(n) < \Sigma(8n), \]
  and that there is a constant \( c \) such that
  \[ S(n) < \Sigma(3n + c). \]
• Ben-Amram, Julstrom and Zwick (1996) proved that
  \[ S(n) < \Sigma(3n + 6), \]
  and
  \[ S(n) < (2n - 1)\Sigma(3n + 3). \]
• Ben-Amram and Petersen (2002) proved that there is a constant \( c \) such that
  \[ S(n) < \Sigma(n + 8n / \log_2 n + c). \]
7 Variants of busy beavers

7.1 Busy beavers defined by 4-tuples

The Turing machines used for regular busy beavers are based on 5-tuples. For example, the initial transition is

\[(A,0) \rightarrow (1,R,B)\]

and generally a transition is

\[(\text{state, scanned symbol}) \rightarrow (\text{new written symbol, move of the head, new state})\]

Instead of both writing a symbol and moving the head in one transition, these actions can be split up into two transitions, in the form of a 4-tuple:

\[(\text{state, scanned symbol}) \rightarrow (\text{new written symbol or move of the head, new state})\]

This alternative definition was introduced by Post in 1947 (Recursive unsolvability of a problem of Thue, The Journal of Symbolic Logic, Vol. 12, 1-11). So Turing machines defined by 4-tuples are also called Post machines, or Post-Turing machines.

A busy beaver competition for such machines was studied by Oberschelp, Schmidt-Göttsch and Todt (1988), who defined two busy beaver functions, for the number of non-blank symbols, and for the number of steps, and gave some values and lower bounds for these functions.

The busy beaver competition for such machines are also studied by P. Machado and F. Pereira, see http://fmachado.dei.uc.pt/publications
and B. van Heuveln and his team, see http://www.cogsci.rpi.edu/~heuveb/Research/BB/index.html

In their book, Boolos and Jeffrey (1974) used the 4-tuples variant to display the busy beaver problem.

Harland (2016b) tackled 4-tuples machines in

http://arxiv.org/abs/1610.03184

He gave a proof of the following theorem:

**Theorem.** For any \(n\)-state, \(m\)-symbol, 4-tuples machine \(M\), halting on a blank tape, there exists a \(n\)-state, \(m\)-symbol, 5-tuples machine \(N\), halting on a blank tape, such that \(\sigma(N) = \sigma(M)\), that is, with the same number of non-blank symbols written on the tape when it halts.

Moreover, the proof provides a simple algorithm that transforms a 4-tuples machine into an equivalent 5-tuples machine. So Harland concludes that searching for 5-tuples machines subsumes searching for 4-tuples machines.

7.2 Busy beavers whose head can stand still

In the definition of the Turing machines used for regular busy beavers, the tape head has to move one cell right or left at each step, and cannot stand still. If we allow the tape head to stand still, new machines come into the competition, and they can beat the current champions.
So Norbert Bátfai found, in August 2009, a Turing machine $M$ with 5 states and 2 symbols with $s(M) = 70,740,810$ and $\sigma(M) = 4098$. See http://arxiv.org/abs/0908.4013
This machine beats the current champion for the number of steps ($s = 47,176,870$). It seems that relaxing this condition on moves does not allow us to obtain machines with behaviors different from those of regular busy beavers. But the study is still to be done.

### 7.3 Busy beavers on a one-way infinite tape

In the definition of the Turing machines used for regular busy beavers, the tape is infinite on both left and right sides. Walsh (1982) considered Turing machines with one-way infinite tape. Initially, the tape head scans the first (leftmost) tape cell. A Turing machine halts either by entering a halting state or by falling off the left end of the tape, that is, moving left from cell 1. If a Turing machine $M$ halts when it starts from a blank tape, its score is defined to be $k$ if the rightmost tape cell ever visited by $M$’s head is the $k$th cell from the left. $\Sigma(n, m)$ is defined as the largest score of all halting $n$-state, $m$-symbol Turing machines. Walsh proved that, with this definition, $\Sigma(2, 3) = 6$.

### 7.4 Two-dimensional busy beavers

The Turing machines used for regular busy beavers have a one-dimensional tape. Turing machines with two-dimensional or higher-dimensional tapes were first defined by Hartmanis and Stearns in 1965 (On the computational complexity of algorithms, Transactions of the AMS, Vol. 117, 285-306).

Brady (1988) launched the busy beaver competition for two-dimensional Turing machines. He also defined, first, “TurNing machines”, where the head reorients itself at each step, and, second, machines that work on a triangular grid.

Tim Hutton resumed the search for two-dimensional busy beavers. See https://github.com/GollyGang/ruletablerepository/wiki/TwoDimensionalTuringMachines He gave the following results:

For $S_2(k, n)$: ($k$ states, $n$ symbols)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>3 symbols</th>
<th>2 states</th>
<th>4 states</th>
<th>5 states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>4632 ?</td>
<td>25,772,988,638 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4632 ?</td>
<td>25,772,988,638 ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For $\Sigma_2(k, n)$: ($k$ states, $n$ symbols)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>3 symbols</th>
<th>2 states</th>
<th>4 states</th>
<th>5 states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>244 ?</td>
<td>935,508,401 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>244 ?</td>
<td>935,508,401 ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that

$S_2(3, 2) = 32 > S(3, 2) = 21,$
and
\[ \Sigma_2(3, 2) = 11 > \Sigma(3, 2) = 6. \]

Tim Hutton also studied higher-dimensional machines and found that, for all \( n > 0 \),
\[ S_n(2, 2) = 6 \text{ and } \Sigma_n(2, 2) = 4. \]
He also studied one-dimensional and higher-dimensional Turing machines with relative movements, that is, where the head has an orientation and reorients itself at each step.

8 The methods

The machines presented in this paper were discovered by means of computer programs. These programs contain procedures that achieve the following tasks:

1. To enumerate Turing machines without repetition.
2. To simulate Turing machines efficiently.
3. To recognize non-halting Turing machines.

Note that these procedures are often mixed together in real programs as follows: A tree of transition tables is generated, and, as soon as some transitions are defined, the corresponding Turing machine is simulated. If the definition of a new transition is necessary, the tree is extended. If the computation seems to loop, a proof of this fact is provided.

If the purpose is to prove a value for the busy beaver functions, then all Turing machines in a class have to be studied. The machines that pass through the three procedures above are either halting machines, from which the better one is selected, or holdouts waiting for better programs or for hand analyses.

If the purpose is to find lower bounds, a systematic enumeration of machines is not necessary. Terry and Shawn Ligocki said they used simulated annealing to find some of their machines.

The following references can be consulted for more information:

- Brady (1983) and Machlin and Stout (1990) for (4,2)-TM,
- Marxen and Buntrock (1990) and Hertel (2009) for (5,2)-TM,
- Lafitte and Papazian (2007) for (2,3)-TM,
- Page about Macro Machines on Marxen’s website. See http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/macro.html
- Harland (2016a) and Harland (2016b).
9 Busy beavers and unprovability

9.1 The result

Let \( S(n) = S(n, 2) \) be Rado’s busy beaver function. We know that \( S(2) = 6, S(3) = 21, S(4) = 107 \), and we can hope to prove that \( S(5) = 47, 176, 870 \). As we will see below, the fact that the busy beaver function \( S \) is not computable implies that it is not possible to prove that, for any natural number \( n \), \( S(n) \) has its true value.

Formally, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem.** Let \( T \) be a well-known mathematical theory such as Peano arithmetic (PA) or Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory with axiom of choice (ZFC). Then there exist numbers \( N \) and \( L \) such that \( S(N) = L \), but the sentence “\( S(N) = L \)” is not provable in \( T \).

This theorem is an easy consequence of the following proposition.

**Proposition.** Let \( T \) be a well-known mathematical theory such as PA or ZFC. Then there exists a Turing machine with two symbols \( M \) that does not stop when it is launched on a blank tape, but the fact that it does not stop is not provable in \( T \).

**Proof of the theorem from the proposition.** Let \( M \) be the Turing machine given by the proposition, let \( N \) be the number of states of \( M \), and let \( L = S(N) \). Then, to prove that “\( S(N) = L \)”, we have to prove that \( M \) does not stop. But, by the proposition, such a proof does not exist.

Note that, if “\( S(N) = L \)” is a true sentence unprovable in theory \( T \), then, for all \( m > L \), “\( S(N) < m \)” is also a true sentence unprovable in theory \( T \).

In the following, we consider many kinds of proofs of the proposition and of the theorem.

9.2 A direct proof

This proposition is well-known and a one line proof can be given, as follows.

**Proof.** If all non-halting machines were provably non-halting, then an algorithm that gives simultaneously the computable enumeration of the halting machines and the computable enumeration of the provably non-halting machines would solve the halting problem on a blank tape.

We give a detailed proof for nonspecialist readers.

**Detailed proof.** Let \( M_1, M_2, \ldots \) be a computably enumerable sequence of all Turing machines with two symbols. Such a sequence can be obtained as follows: we list machines according to their number of states, and, inside the set of machines with \( n \) states, we list the machines according to the alphabetical order of their transition tables.

Let \( T_1, T_2, \ldots \) be a computably enumerable sequence of the theorems of the theory \( T \). The existence of such a sequence is the main requirement that theory \( T \) has to satisfy in order that the proposition holds, and of course such a sequence exists for well-known mathematical theories such as PA or ZFC.

Now consider the following algorithms \( A \) and \( B \).

**Algorithm A.** We launch the machines \( M_1 \) on the blank tape as follows:

- one step of computation of \( M_1 \),
2 steps of computation of $M_1$, 2 steps of computation of $M_2$,

3 steps of computation of $M_1$, 3 steps of computation of $M_2$, 3 steps of computation of $M_3$,

... 

When a machine $M_i$ stops, we add it to a list of machines that stop when they are launched on a blank tape.

Note that, given a machine $M$, by running Algorithm $A$ we will know that $M$ stops if $M$ stops, but we will never know that $M$ doesn’t stop if $M$ doesn’t stop.

**Algorithm B.** We launch the algorithm that provides the computably enumerable sequence of theorems of theory $T$, and each time we get a theorem $T_i$, we look and see if this is a theorem of the form “The Turing machine $M$ does not stop when it is launched on a blank tape”. If that is the case, we add $M$ to a list of Turing machines that provably do not stop on a blank tape.

Note that, given a machine $M$, by running Algorithm $B$ we will know that $M$ is provably non-halting if $M$ is provably non-halting, but we will never know that $M$ is not provably non-halting if $M$ is not provably non-halting.

Now we have two algorithms, $A$ and $B$, and

- Algorithm $A$ gives us a computably enumerable list of the Turing machines that stop when they are launched on a blank tape.

- Algorithm $B$ gives us a computably enumerable list of the Turing machines that provably do not stop on a blank tape.

We mix together these two algorithms, by a procedure called dovetailing, to get Algorithm $C$, as follows.

**Algorithm C.**

- one step of Algorithm $A$, one step of Algorithm $B$,

- 2 steps of Algorithm $A$, 2 steps of Algorithm $B$,

- 3 steps of Algorithm $A$, 3 steps of Algorithm $B$,

... 

Algorithm $C$ gives us simultaneously both the computably enumerable lists provided by Algorithm $A$ and Algorithm $B$.

So Algorithm $C$ gives us both the list of halting Turing machines and the list of provably non-halting Turing machines (on a blank tape).

Now we are ready to prove the proposition. If all non-halting Turing machines were provably non-halting, then Algorithm $C$ would give us the list of halting Turing machines and the list of non-halting Turing machines (on a blank tape). So, given a Turing machine $M$, by running Algorithm $C$, we would see $M$ appearing in one of the lists, and we could settle the halting problem for machine $M$ on a blank tape. So Algorithm $C$ would give us a computable procedure to settle the halting problem on a blank tape. But it is known that such a computable procedure does not exist. Thus, there exists a non-halting Turing machine that is not provably non-halting on a blank tape.
9.3 The proposition as a special case of a general result

The proposition is a special case of the following theorem.

**Theorem.** Let $A$ be a set of natural numbers that is computably enumerable but not computable, and let $T$ be a well-known mathematical theory such as PA or ZFC. Then there exists a natural number $n$ such that the sentence “$n$ is not a member of $A$” is true but not provable in theory $T$.

**Proof.** Since $A$ is computably enumerable, there exists an algorithm that enumerates the natural numbers in $A$. If all natural numbers not in $A$ were provably not in $A$, then, by enumerating the proofs of theorems of theory $T$, we would get an algorithm that enumerates the natural numbers not in $A$. By running simultaneously both these algorithms, we could get a procedure that decides membership in $A$, contradicting the fact that $A$ is not computable.

The proposition is obtained from this theorem by numbering the list of Turing machines, and by defining $A$ as the set of numbers of Turing machines that stop on a blank tape.

9.4 Some theoretical examples of Turing machines that satisfy the proposition

Consider the Turing machine $M$ given by the proposition: $M$ does not stop when it is launched on a blank tape, but this fact is not provable in theory $T$. Can we get an idea of what such a machine $M$ looks like? We give below some examples of such a Turing machine.

9.4.1 Example 1: Using Gödel’s Second Incompleteness Theorem

Let $M$ be a machine that enumerates the theorems of theory $T$, and stops when it finds a contradiction (such as $0 = 1$ if $T$ is Peano arithmetic).

Then a proof within theory $T$ that $M$ does not stop would be a proof within theory $T$ of the consistency of $T$, which is impossible by Gödel’s Second Incompleteness Theorem (if theory $T$ is consistent).

9.4.2 Example 2: Using Gödel’s First Incompleteness Theorem

Another example can be given using Gödel’s First Incompleteness Theorem. If $T$ is PA or ZFC, supposed to be consistent, the proof of this theorem provides a formula $F$ that asserts its own unprovability. Thus $F$ is true, but unprovable within theory $T$.

Consider the machine $M$ that enumerates the theorems of theory $T$, and stops when it finds formula $F$. Machine $M$ does not stop, since $F$ is unprovable, but a proof that it does not stop would be a proof that $F$ is unprovable, so, since $F$ is “$F$ is unprovable”, a proof of $F$, which is impossible, since $F$ is unprovable.

9.4.3 Example 3: Using the Recursion Theorem

As a third example, consider the machine $M$ that enumerates the theorems of theory $T$ (PA or ZFC, supposed to be consistent), and stops when it finds a formula $F$ that says that $M$ itself does not stop. Such a machine can be proved to exist by applying the Recursion
Theorem to the function $f$ such that machine $M_{f(x)}$ stops if it finds a proof that machine $M_x$ does not stop.

Then $F$ is true, because, if $F$ were false, then $M$ would stop, so $F$ would be a theorem of $T$, so $F$ would be true. But $F$ is unprovable, because since $F$ is true, $M$ does not stop, so $F$ is not a theorem of theory $T$. So the fact that $M$ does not stop is true and unprovable.

9.5 Some explicit examples of Turing machines that satisfy the proposition

Since May 2016, there are explicit constructions of Turing machines whose behaviors are independent of ZFC. These machines never halt on a blank tape, but this fact cannot be proved in ZFC.

9.5.1 Example 1: Yedidia and Aaronson’s machine

Adam Yedidia and Scott Aaronson gave, in May 2016, a Turing machine with 7910 states and two symbols such as it cannot be proved in ZFC that it never halts. They note that enumerating the theorems of ZFC would need a big number of states. They use a graph theoretic statement that Harvey Friedman proved to be equivalent to the consistency of a theory that implies the consistency of ZFC. By using a new high-level language that is easily compiled down to Turing machine description, they build a machine that would halt if it finds a counterexample to Friedman’s statement. See Yedidia and Aaronson (2016).

9.5.2 Example 2: O’Rear’s machine

S. O’Rear improved the number of states to 1919, in September 2016. His machine enumerates the theorems of a formal system which has the same power as ZFC. See https://github.com/sorear/metamath-turing-machines

For a general presentation, see also Scott Aaronson’s blog, available at http://www.scottaaronson.com/blog/?p=2725

9.6 A proof using Kolmogorov complexity

There is another proof of unprovability, based on Kolmogorov complexity. The Kolmogorov complexity of a number is the length of the shortest program from which a universal Turing machine can output this number. By Chaitin’s Incompleteness Theorem, for any well-known mathematical theory $T$, there exists a number $n(T)$ such that, for all numbers of complexity greater than $n(T)$, the fact that they have complexity greater than $n(T)$ is true but unprovable within theory $T$.

Chaitin’s theorem also applies to the complexity defined as follows: The complexity of a number $k$ is the smallest number $n$ of states of a Turing machine with $n$ states and two symbols that outputs this number $k$, written as a string of $k$ symbols 1, when the machine is launched on a blank tape.

So there exists a number $n(T)$ such that, for any number $k$ of complexity greater than $n(T)$, the sentence “the complexity of $k$ is greater than $n(T)$” is true but unprovable within
theory $T$. But “$k > \Sigma(n(T))$” implies “the complexity of $k$ is greater than $n(T)$”, so, for any number $k > \Sigma(n(T))$, the sentence “$k > \Sigma(n(T))$” is true but unprovable within theory $T$.

For more details, see Chaitin (1987), Boolos, Burgess and Jeffrey (2002), p. 230, who note that $n(T) < 10 \uparrow\uparrow 10$, a stack of 10 powers of 10, and Lafitte (2009).

Acknowledgments

This historical survey would not have been possible without the contributions of many people. In particular, many thanks to Norbert Bátfai, Allen Brady, Daniel Briggs, Serge Grigorieff, James Harland, Tim Hutton, Grégory Lafitte, Shawn Ligocki, Terry Ligocki, Maurice Margenstern, Heiner Marxen, Armando Matos, Robert Munafo, Christophe Papazian, Holger Petersen, Myron Souris, H.J.M. Wijers, and Hector Zenil.

References

   A note on busy beavers and other creatures

   Improved bounds for functions related to busy beavers

   Computability and Logic, 4th Ed.

   Computability and Logic

5. Brady A.H. (1964)
   Solutions to restricted cases of the halting problem

   Solutions of restricted cases of the halting problem used to determine particular values
   of a non-computable function (abstract)

   The conjectured highest scoring machines for Rado’s $\Sigma(k)$ for the value $k = 4$


   The solution to Rado’s busy beaver game is now decided for $k = 4$ (abstract)
The determination of the value of Rado’s noncomputable function $\Sigma(k)$ for four-state Turing machines

The busy beaver game and the meaning of life

Ein Beitrag zur Bestimmung von Rados $\Sigma(5)$ oder Wie fängt man fleißige Biber? (German)
[A contribution to the determination of Rado’s $\Sigma(5)$, or: How to catch a busy beaver?]
Technical Report 146, Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule, Aachen, November 1990

Computing the busy beaver function

Computer recreations

Computer recreations

Computer recreations

17. Dewdney A.K. (1985b)
Computer recreations
*Scientific American* **252** (4), April 1985, 16.

18. Green M.W. (1964)
A lower bound on Rado’s sigma function for binary Turing machines

Busy beaver machines and the observant otter heuristic
20. Harland J. (2016a)
   Busy beaver machines and the observant otter heuristic (or how to tame dreadful dragons)

   Generating candidate busy beaver machines (or how to build the zany zoo)

   Computing the uncomputable Rado sigma function

   Recursive undecidability – an exposition

   A bound on the shift function in terms of the busy beaver function

   Noncomputability and the busy beaver problem

   The busy beaver problem

   Logic and Algorithms: With applications to the computer and information sciences

   Busy beavers gone wild

   The fabric of small Turing machines

30. Lin S. (1963)
   Computer studies of Turing machine problems
Computer studies of Turing machine problems  

Chasing the busy beaver. Notes and observations on a competition to find the 5-state busy beaver  
Forschungsberichte des Fachbereiches Informatik Nr 159, Universität Dortmund, 1983 (63 pages)  
(available at [http://elib.uni-stuttgart.de/bitstream/11682/8466/1/lud20.pdf](http://elib.uni-stuttgart.de/bitstream/11682/8466/1/lud20.pdf)).

33. Lynn D.S. (1972)  
New results for Rado’s sigma function for binary Turing machines  
*IEEE Transactions on Computers* C-21 (8), August 1972, 894–896.

The complex behavior of simple machines  

35. Marxen H. and Buntrock J. (1990)  
Attacking the Busy Beaver 5  
*Bulletin of the EATCS* No 40, February 1990, 247–251  
(available at [http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/mabu90.html](http://www.drb.insel.de/~heiner/BB/mabu90.html)).

Busy beaver competition and Collatz-like problems  

Small Turing machines and generalized busy beaver competition  

Homology of groups and third busy beaver function  

Problems in number theory from busy beaver competition  
*Logical Methods in Computer Science* **11** (4:10), 2015, 1–35  

Betti numbers of finitely presented groups and very rapidly growing functions  

Castor quadruplorum  
*Archive for Mathematical Logic* **27** (1), 1988, 35–44.
   Computable lower bounds for busy beaver Turing machines

   Busy beaver scores and alphabet size

44. Rado T. (1962)
   On non-computable functions

45. Rado T. (1963)
   On a simple source for non-computable functions

   Computability and recursion

   Computability and incomputability

   Turing oracle machines, online computing, and three displacements in computability theory

   The busy beaver on a one-way infinite tape

   New relation between the shift function and the busy beaver function

51. Weimann B. (1973)
   Untersuchungen über Rado’s Sigma-Funktion und eingeschränkte Halteprobleme bei Turingmaschinen (German)
   [Studies about Rado’s Sigma function and limited halting problems of Turing machines]

52. Weimann B., Casper K. and Fenzl W. (1973)
   Untersuchungen über haltende Programme für Turing-Maschinen mit 2 Zeichen und

71
bis zu 5 Befehlen (German)
[Studies about halting programs for Turing machines with 2 symbols and up to 5
(Karlsruhe, October 1972), Lecture Notes In Economics and Mathematical Systems,

Some better results estimating the shift function in terms of busy beaver function

A relatively small Turing machine whose behavior is independent of set theory
Complex Systems 25 (4), 2016, 297–327

Websites

   (how to write big numbers with few symbols).

2. Joan Baez: https://johncarlosbaez.wordpress.com/2016/05/21/the-busy-beaver-game
   (a blog).

   (Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 3 states and 3 symbols).

4. Georgi Gochev (Skelet): http://skelet.ludost.net/bb
   (Busy Beaver Competition for machines with 5 states and 2 symbols, and for reversal
   machines).

5. Googology-wiki: http://googology.wikia.com/wiki/Busy_beaver_function
   (a good introduction).

   (definitions of some inverse functions for the busy beaver functions).

   TwoDimensionalTuringMachines
   (two-dimensional and higher-dimensional Turing machines)

   (Turing machines defined by 4-tuples).

   (the top web reference on busy beavers).

    (from which the present paper is written).
   (Turing machines defined by 4-tuples).

    (a comprehensive bibliography).

    (a good introduction).

    (many lower bounds of $\Sigma(n, m)$ for high values of $n$ and $m$).

    http://mathrix.org/zenil/
    (demonstration on the Wolfram Demonstrations Project, and website).