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1 Introduction

The notion of palindromic length of a finite word as well as an infinite word was first introduced by Frid, Puzynina and Zamboni [FPZ13]. They conjectured that if the palindromic length of an infinite word is bounded, then this sequence is eventually periodic. This conjecture is widely studied by [FPZ13] [Fri18] [AP18], and the palindromic length of some specific sequences are studied as well: Frid [Fri18] showed that Sturmian words have an unbounded palindromic length $PL_u$ and Ambrož [AP18] showed that $PL_u$ grows arbitrarily slowly. [AKMP19] studied palindromic lengths of fixed points of a specific class of morphisms and gave upper bounds for the Fibonacci word and the Thue-Morse word. In this article, we give a formal expression of the palindromic length of Thue-Morse sequence and find all sequences which have the same palindromic length as Thue-Morse’s. After writing a first version of this paper, we found that some results in the same direction were obtained by Frid [Fri19] for Thue-Morse sequences. However, we will indicate how our results can be applied for a type of generalization of Thue-Morse sequences.

2 Definitions and notation

Let $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence and let us define a (finite) word, or a factor, of a sequence to be a (finite) string of the sequence. Let $w_a(x, y)$ denote the factor of the sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ beginning at the position $a_x$ of length $y$, in other words $w_a(x, y) = a_xa_{x+1}...a_{x+y-1}$.

Let $\tilde{w}$ denote the reversal of $w$, that is to say, if $w = w_0w_1...w_k$ then $\tilde{w} = w_kw_{k-1}...w_0$, we say a word $w$ is palindromic if $w = \tilde{w}$. Let us denote by $Pal$ the set of all palindromic words.

We define the palindromic length of a word $w$, which will be denoted by $|w|_{pal}$, to be:

$$|w|_{pal} = \min \{ k | w = p_1p_2...p_k, p_i \in Pal, \forall i \in [1, k] \},$$

in this case we say $w = p_1p_2...p_k, p_i$ is an optimal palindromic decomposition of $w$.

Let us define the palindromic length sequence $(pl_a(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the sequence $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be

$$pl_a(n) = |w_a(0, n)|_{pal},$$
in other words, \( pl_a(n) \) is the palindromic length of the word \( a_0a_1...a_{n-1} \).

Now let us define a class of infinite sequences \( C \) which can be considered as an generalization of the Thue-Morse sequence:

Let \( \Sigma \) be an alphabet which contains at least two letters and let \( a \in \Sigma \).
Let \( F \) be the set of bijections over \( \Sigma \).
Let \( (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a sequence over \( F \) and \( (w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a sequence of finite words over \( \Sigma \) which are defined recursively as:

\[
    f_i \in F \text{ such that } f_i(w_i) \neq w_i \forall n \geq 0,
\]

and

\[
    \begin{align*}
        w_0 &= a \\
        w_n &= w_{n-1}f_{n-1}(w_{n-1})f_{n-1}(w_{n-1})w_{n-1}, \forall n > 0.
    \end{align*}
\]

Let \( f(a) \) be the limit of the sequence \( (w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) which exists because of the definition.

The class \( C \) is the set of all infinite limits defined as above. It is easy to see that, if the size of \( \Sigma \) is equal to 2, say \( \Sigma = \{a, b\} \), then all sequences in \( C \) are Thue-Morse sequences, they may be written as

\[
    a, b, b, a, b, a, a, b, b, a, a, b, a, b, b, a...
\]

and the one by changing \( a \) to \( b \) and \( b \) to \( a \). Let \( (pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be the palindromic length sequence of Thue-Morse, the first elements of this sequence are

\[
    1, 2, 2, 1, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 4, 3, 2, 3, 3, 2, 1...
\]

3 Palindromic length of sequences in \( C \)

In this section we will study palindromic lengths of sequences in \( C \) and prove that they all have the same palindromic length, as the one of Thue-Morse.

Let \((a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) be a sequence in \( C \), we will begin with some properties of palindromic factors of this sequence.

**Lemma 1** For any integer \( x \), \( w_a(4x, 4) \) is of type abba such that \( a \neq b \).

As a corollary, \( a(2n + 1) \neq a(2n) \).

**Proof** This lemma is trivial because of the definition.

**Lemma 2** Let \( w_a(x, y) \) be a palindromic factor of Thue-Morse sequence such that \( y \) is odd, then \( y \) is either 1 or 3.

**Proof** If \( w_a(x, y) \) is of size larger than 3, then it contains at least one palindromic word in the center of size 5, however a word of size 5 should be inside of a word of type \( xyyxxyyx \) or \( xyx^yf(x)f(y)f(y)f(x) \), where \( f \) is a bijection over the alphabet defined as above, but none of them contains a palindromic word of such size.

**Lemma 3** Let \( w_a(x, y) \) be a palindromic word of \((a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) such that \( y \) is even, then either there exist \( z, r \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( w_a(x, y) \) is embedded into the center of palindromic word \( w_a(4z, 4r) \) or \( x \equiv 3 \mod 4 \) and \( y \equiv 2 \mod 4 \).
The center of palindromic word of type \( w \) decomposition of \( w \) where \( i \) are palindromic decomposition such that for all \( i \) are both palindromic and uniquely defined by respectively a prefix or a suffix of \( w \). Let us consider a factor of \( w \) cases, the word \( w \) factor is palindromic. It is easy to see that \( w \) is either a palindromic word of length \( i \) is odd, otherwise \( x + y/2 - 1 = 2t \) and \( x + y/2 = 2t + 1 \) for some \( t \), so that \( a_{2t} = a_{2t+1} \) contradicts to Lemma 1. This fact implies that

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{if } x \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \text{ then } x + y - 1 & \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \\
\text{if } x \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \text{ then } x + y - 1 & \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \\
\text{if } x \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \text{ then } x + y - 1 & \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \\
\text{if } x \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \text{ then } x + y - 1 & \equiv 0 \pmod{4}.
\end{align*}
\]

For the last case, we have \( x \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \) and \( y \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \). Now let us check that, for other cases, the word \( w_0(0, s) \) can be embedded into the center of a palindromic word of type \( w_0(4z, 4r) \). Let \( w_0(4z, 4r) \) be the shortest factor of above type including \( w_0(x, y) \), here we prove that this factor is palindromic. It is easy to see that \( w_0(x, y) \) is at the center of \( w_0(4z, 4r) \) and the word \( w_0(4(z+1), 4(r-1)) \) is palindromic because of the palindromicity of \( w_0(x, y) \); furthermore we have the fact that \( w_0(4z, 4) = \overline{w_0}(4(z+r-1), 4) \) when \( x \neq 3 \) \( \pmod{4} \), because these two words of length 4 are both palindromic and uniquely defined by respectively a prefix or a suffix of \( w_0(x, y) \) of size smaller than 4 but larger than 1. In conclusion, the word \( w_0(4z, 4r) \) is palindromic.

**Lemma 4** Let \( w_0(0, s) \) be a prefix of \( (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) in \( C \), and let \( w_0(x, y) = p_1p_2...p_r \) be an optimal palindromic decomposition such that for all \( i : 1 \leq i \leq r \), \( p_i \) is either singleton or can be embedded into the center of palindromic word of type \( w_0(4z, 4r) \), then there exists at least one optimal palindromic decomposition of \( w_0(0, s) \) of following forms:

\[
\begin{align*}
w_0(0, s) &= q_1q_2...q_r; s \equiv 0 \pmod{4}; \\
w_0(0, s) &= q_1q_2...q_{r-1}l_1; s \equiv 1 \pmod{4}; \\
w_0(0, s) &= q_1q_2...q_{r-2}t_1t_2; s \equiv 2 \pmod{4}; \\
w_0(0, s) &= q_1q_2...q_{r-2}t_1t_2l_1; s \equiv 3 \pmod{4}; \\
w_0(0, s) &= q_1q_2...q_{r-3}t_1t_2l_1; s \equiv 2 \pmod{4};
\end{align*}
\]

where \( q_i \) are palindromes of length \( 4k_i \), \( t_i \) are singletons and \( l_i \) are palindromes of length \( 2p_i \).

**Proof** Let us consider a factor of \( (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) of type \( rq_1q_2...q_{2l} \) where \( 1 \leq |r| \leq 2 \) beginning at some position \( 4x \) where \( q_i \) are palindromic words of even size and can be embedded into the center of palindromic word of type \( w_0(4z, 4r) \). Here we prove that there exists an other palindromic decomposition of same length such that

\[
\begin{align*}
rq_1q_2...q_{2l} &= q'_1q'_2...q'_{2l}r,
\end{align*}
\]

where all \( q'_i \) are of size \( 4k_i \).

As \( q_1 \) is palindromic, because of Lemma 3, \( rq_1\overline{r} \) is also palindromic, let us denote such word by \( q'_1 \), its size is multiple of 4. By excluding the case that \( |r| = |q_2| = 2 \), \( q_2 \) can be written as \( \overline{r}q'_2r \), where \( q'_2 \) is either a palindromic word of size \( 4m \) or empty, so we have the equality \( rq_1q_2 = q'_1q'_2r \) and the last \( r \) begins at some position \( 4x \). We do it recursively and we end up with the expression \( rq_1q_2...q_{2l} = q'_1q'_2...q'_{2l}r \).

In such a way we can accumulate the singletons in the decomposition \( w_0(0, s) = p_1p_2...p_r \) and push them to the end. An easy observation is that there are at most two singletons in an optimal
decomposition, since once there are three singletons, they will meet each other by the above algorithm in a block $w_a(4k, 4l)$ hence two of them will create a palindromic word of length 2 which contradicts the optimality. The above process ends up with five possibilities:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & w_a(0, s) = q_1q_2...q_r; \\
& w_a(0, s) = q_1q_2...q_r-1t_1; \\
& w_a(0, s) = q_1q_2...q_r-2t_1t_2; \\
& w_a(0, s) = q_1q_2...q_r-2t_1l_1; \\
& w_a(0, s) = q_1q_2...q_r-3t_1t_2l_1; \}
\end{align*}
\]

where $q_i$ are palindromes whose length are multiple of 4, $t_i$ are singletons and $l_i$ are palindromes whose length are multiple of 2.

The first case leads to $s \equiv 0 \mod 4$; second one leads to $s \equiv 1 \mod 4$ and the third one leads to $s \equiv 2 \mod 4$; for the fourth one we can check that $|t_1| \neq 0 \mod 4$ because of Lemma 3, so that $s \equiv 3 \mod 4$; the fifth case, $|t_1|$ must be a multiple of 4, so $s \equiv 2 \mod 4$.

**Corollary 1** Let $(pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the palindromic length of a sequence in $\mathcal{C}$ such that all its prefixes admit an optimal palindromic decomposition satisfying the constrains listed as in the previous lemma, then for all $k \geq 0$:

\[
pl(4k + i) \geq pl(4k + 3) + 1 \text{ for } i = 1, 2 \text{ and } pl(4k) \geq pl(4k + 3).
\]

**Proof** For $i = 0$, $w_a(0, 4k + 1)$ is of the form $q_1q_2...q_r t_1$. Using Lemma 1 we have $w_a(0, 4k + 4) = q_1q_2...q_r q$ is a palindromic decomposition, not necessarily optimal, with $q = w_a(4k, 4)$, so $pl(4k + 3) \leq r + 1 = pl(4k)$.

For $i = 1$, there are 2 cases: if $w_a(0, 4k + 2)$ is of the form $q_1q_2...q_r t_1 t_2$, then once more using Lemma 1 we have $w_a(0, 4k + 4) = q_1q_2...q_r q$ is a palindromic decomposition, with $q = w_a(4k, 4) = t_1t_2t_3t_1$; if $w_a(0, 4k + 2)$ is of the form $q_1q_2...q_r t_1 t_2 l_1$, using the hypothesis we have $w_a(0, 4k + 4) = q_1q_2...q_r q$ is a palindromic decomposition, with $q = t_1t_2t_3t_1$.

For $i = 2$, $w_a(0, 4k + 3) = q_1q_2...q_r t_1 l_1$, using the hypothesis we have $w_a(0, 4k + 4) = q_1q_2...q_r q$ is a palindromic decomposition, with $q = t_1t_2t_1$.

So all inequalities as above are proved.

**Lemma 5** Let $w_a(0, k)$ be a prefix of $(a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, then there is an optimal decomposition $w_a(0, k) = p_1p_2...p_s$ such that none of these palindromes is of length 3, furthermore, if $p_i$ is of even size then it can be embedded into the center of palindromic word of type $w_a(4z, 4r)$.

**Proof** Let us suppose that $k$ is the smallest number such that $w_a(0, k)$ does not satisfy one of the two constrains above, then either the last palindromic factor in all optimal compositions is of length 3, or it can not be embedded into the center of palindromic word of type $w_a(4z, 4r)$. If it is in the first case, then the last factor can be found either at position $a_{4t-1}a_{4t}a_{4t+1}$ or $a_{4t-2}a_{4t-1}a_{4t}$. If $k = 4t + 2$, then optimal decompositions of $w_a(0, k)$ are of the form $w_a(0, 4t + 2) = w_a(0, 4t + 1) p$, so that the palindromic length is $pl(4t + 1) = 1 + pl(4t - 2)$, otherwise, if we decompose the word as $w_a(0, 4t + 2) = w_a(0, 4t)a_{4t}a_{4t+1}$, we have a length $pl(4t - 1) + 2$, so that

\[
pl(4t + 1) = 1 + pl(4t - 2) < pl(4t - 1) + 2;
\]

similarly for the case that $k = 4t + 1$, by considering the decomposition $w_a(0, 4t + 1) = w_a(0, 4t)a_{4t}$, we have

\[
pl(4k) = 1 + pl(4k - 3) < pl(4k - 1) + 1,
\]
both inequalities contradict the previous corollary.

If the last factor cannot be embedded into the center of a palindromic word of type \( w_n(4z, 4r) \), then because of Lemma 3 it can be found at some position \( u_{4t}a_{4t-1}a_{4t} \), so the optimal decomposition is \( w_n(0, 4t) = w_n(0, 4t - 1)u_{4t-1}a_{4t}a_{4t}a_{4t} \). However, if we consider another composition \( w_n(0, 4t) = w_n(0, 4t)a_{4t}a_{4t}a_{4t-1}a_{4t} \), we have

\[
pl(4t - 2) + 1 < pl(4t - 1) + 2,
\]

contradicts the previous corollary.

**Corollary 2** Corollary 1 is valid for all sequences in \( \mathcal{C} \).

**Lemma 6** The palindromic length sequence \((pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) satisfies for \( k \geq 0 \):

\[
pl(4k + i) \leq pl(4k + 3) + 2,
\]

when \( i = 0 \) or \( 1 \); and

\[
pl(4k + 2) \leq pl(4k + 3) + 1.
\]

**Proof** Let \( w_n(0, 4k + 4) = p_1p_2...p_s \) be an optimal palindromic decomposition such that all \( p_j \) are of size \( 4r_j \) which exists because of Lemma 5.

If the size of \( p_s \) is larger than 4, then for \( i = 1, 2 \) or 3, we can write \( p_s = ab\tilde{a} \) where \( a \) is the prefix of \( p_s \) of length \( 4 - i \) so in this case

\[
w_n(0, 4k + i) = p_1p_2...p_{s-1}ab
\]

and \( |a|_{pat} = 2 \) when \( i = 3 \) and \( |a|_{pat} = 1 \) otherwise.

If the size of \( p_s \) is 4, then for \( i = 1, 2 \) or 3, we can write \( p_s = ab \) where \( a \) is the prefix of \( p_s \) of length \( i \) so in this case

\[
w_n(0, 4k + i) = p_1p_2...p_{s-1}a
\]

and \( |a|_{pat} = 1 \) when \( i = 1 \) and \( |a|_{pat} = 2 \) otherwise. In both cases the above inequalities hold.

**Lemma 7** Let \( (a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a sequence in \( \mathcal{C} \) defined over the alphabet \( \sum^4 \), let \( f \) be a bijection from \( \sum^4 \) to a new alphabet \( \sum' \), then the sequence \((b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) defined as

\[
b_n = f(a_{4n}a_{4n+1}a_{4n+2}a_{4n+3}) \forall n \in \mathbb{N}
\]

is also in \( \mathcal{C} \). As a consequence, \( w_n(0, 4t) = p_1p_2...p_k \) is an optimal palindromic decomposition of \( w_n(0, 4t) \) if and only if \( w_n(0, t) = f(p_1)f(p_2)...f(p_k) \) is an optimal palindromic decomposition of \( w_n(0, t) \) and the palindromic length sequence \((pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) satisfies for \( k \geq 0 \):

\[
pl(4k + 3) = pl(k)
\]

**Proof** The first part is easy to check by induction. For the second part, applying the algorithm introduced in Lemma 3 to \( w_n(0, 4k + 4) \), we get an optimal decomposition such that all palindromic words in the optimal decomposition are of size \( 4k \) and begin at some position \( 4r_i \). Applying \( f \) to \( w_n(0, 4k + 4) \) as well as each palindromic factor, we get a decomposition of a word of length \( k + 1 \), which is a prefix of the sequence \((b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\), this decomposition is optimal because of the bijectivity of \( f \).
Corollary 3 The palindromic length sequence \((pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) satisfies for \(k \geq 0\):
\[
pl(4k + 3) = pl(k);
\]
\[
pl(4k + 2) = pl(4k + 3) + 1;
\]
\[
pl(4k + 1) = pl(4k + 3) + 1 \text{ or } pl(4k + 3) + 2;
\]
\[
pl(4k) = pl(4k + 3), pl(4k + 3) + 1 \text{ or } pl(4k + 3) + 2.
\]

Proposition 1 The palindromic length sequence \((pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) satisfies for \(k \geq 0\):
\[
pl(4k + 1) = pl(4k + 3) + 1 \text{ if } k \equiv 0 \mod 4;
\]
\[
pl(4k + 1) = pl(4k + 3) + 2 \text{ if } k \equiv 2, 3 \mod 4;
\]
\[
pl(4k + 1) - pl(4k + 3) = pl(k + 1) - pl(k + 3) \text{ if } k \equiv 1 \mod 4;
\]
\[
pl(4k) = pl(k - 1) + 1.
\]

Proof If \(k \equiv 0 \mod 4\), applying the bijection introduced in Lemma 7, the optimal decomposition of \(w_a(0,4k+4)\) is \(w_a(0,4k)\overline{a_{4k+1}a_{4k+2}a_{4k+3}}\), so that \(w_a(0,4k+2) = w_a(0,4k)\overline{a_{4k+1}}\) is a decomposition of \(w_a(0,4k+2)\). As a result, \(pl(4k + 1) \leq pl(4k - 1) + 2 = pl(4k + 3) + 1\).

If \(k \equiv 2, 3 \mod 4\), it is enough to prove that the last factor in any optimal palindromic decompositions of \(w_a(0,4k+4)\) is of length larger than 4. This is trivial by applying the bijection \(f\) to \(w_a(0,4k+4)\) and concluding by the classification in Lemma 4.

If \(k \equiv 1 \mod 4\), applying the bijection introduced in Lemma 7 and Lemma 4, the optimal decomposition of \(w_a(0,4k+4)\) is either of type \(p_1p_2...p_kt_1t_2\) or of type \(p_1p_2...p_kt_1t_2l\), with \(p_i\) and \(l\) of length \(16r_i\) and \(t_i\) of length 4. The first case implies \(pl(4k + 1) - pl(4k + 3) = 1\) while the second case implies \(pl(4k + 1) - pl(4k + 3) = 2\). However, if we apply \(f\) to \(w_a(0,4k+4)\) we get a word of length \(k+1\) and \(pl(k+1) - pl(k+3) = 1\) in the first case and \(pl(k+1) - pl(k+3) = 2\) in the second case.

The last equality is a consequence of Lemma 4 and Lemma 7.

Proposition 2 All sequences in \(C\) share the same palindromic length sequence \((pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\). Furthermore, it is 4-regular.

Proof The 4-kernel of \((pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) is generated by elements in
\[
\{(pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (pl(n - 1))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (pl(n + 1))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (pl(n + 3))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (1)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\}
\]

Remark Lemma 7 and Proposition 1 are critical in the proof because they show the importance of the hypothesis that \(f_a(w_n) \neq w_n\). Because of this hypothesis, we can guarantee that the set \(C\) is closed under bijections (and their inverses) defined in Lemma 5, and do not have factors like \(aaaa\) in the sequence. So that we can apply some inductive properties by saying that \(w_a(0,4k+4)\) and \(w_b(0,k+1)\) share the “same” optimal palindromic decomposition, which is the key point to make Proposition 1 work.

Corollary 4 \(pl(n) + 1 \geq pl(n + 1)\);
if there exists an integer \(n\) satisfying \(pl(n) + 2 = pl(n + 1) + 1 = pl(n + 2)\), then \(n \equiv 3 \mod 4\);
if \(pl(4k) = pl(4k + 3)\) then \(pl(4k + 1) = pl(4k + 2) = pl(4k + 3) + 1\);
if \(pl(4k) = pl(4k + 1)\) then \(pl(4k) = pl(4k + 1) = pl(4k + 3) + 2\).
**Proof** The first statement is trivial because of a decomposition \( w_n(0, n + 2) = w_n(0, n + 1) a_{n+1} \).

For the second statement, remarking the fact that \( pl(4k + 3) = pl(4k + 2) - 1 \), we have either \( n \equiv 3 \mod 4 \) or \( n + 3 \equiv 3 \mod 4 \), but if it is the last case, then \( pl(n) + 2 = pl(n+2) = pl(n+3) + 1 \) so that \( pl(n+3) > pl(n) \) which contradicts Corollary 3.

For the last two statements, \( pl(4k) = pl(4k + 3) \) implies that the last palindromic factor in optimal decompositions of \( w_n(0, 4k+4) \) is \( a_{4k} a_{4k+1} a_{4k+2} a_{4k+3} \) which proves \( pl(4k+1) = pl(4k+2) = pl(4k+3) + 1 \). On the contrary, if \( pl(4k) = pl(4k + 1) \) then \( pl(4k) \neq pl(4k + 3) \), so that the last palindromic factor in optimal decompositions of \( w_n(0, 4k+4) \) is of length larger than 4, which leads to the fact \( pl(4k) = pl(4k + 1) = pl(4k + 3) + 2 \).

4 **All sequences sharing \((pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\)**

In this section, we are going to prove that all sequences sharing the same palindromic length \((pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) defined in the previous section are exactly the functions in \( C \).

**Lemma 8** Let \((b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) be a sequence such that all words \( w_b(4k, 4) \) are of form \( xyyx \), then

1) if \( w_b(a, b) \) is a palindromic word and \( b \) is odd, then \( b \leq 3 \), furthermore, if \( b = 3 \), then \( a \equiv 3, 0 \mod 4 \).

2) if \( w_b(a, b) \) is a palindromic word and \( b \) is even, then \( a + b/2 - 1 \) is odd.

**Proof** It is analogous to Lemma 2 and Lemma 3.

**Lemma 9** Let \((b_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\) be a sequence such that its palindromic length sequence coincides with \((pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}\), then all words \( w_b(4k, 4) \) are of form \( xyyx \) with \( x \neq y \).

**Proof** We prove the statement by induction:

Firstly the statement holds for \( s = 0 \). Supposing that this statement is true for all \( s \leq s_0 \), we will prove it for \( s = s_0 + 1 \).

Let us consider a decomposition \( w_b(0, 4s_0 + 4) = p_1 p_2 ... p_r \) such that \( r = pl(4s_0 + 4) \), and let us denote by \( n \) the length of \( p_r \).

Firstly \( n \) can not be too small: if \( n < 4 \) then \( pl(4s_0 + 3) = 1 + pl(4s_0 + 3 - n) > pl(4s_0 + 3) \) which contradicts Corollary 2.

Secondly, if \( n \) is odd then it can not be too large: if \( n = 2n_0 + 1 \) and \( n_0 > 4 \) then \( w_b(4s_0 + 6 - 2n_0, 2n_0 - 7) \) is a palindrome of odd size larger or equal to 3 and finishing at the position \( 4s_0 - 1 \), which does not exist because of the Lemma 8.

Thirdly, if \( n \) is even and large enough: if \( n = 2n_0 \) and \( n_0 \geq 4 \), then, because of Lemma 8, \( n \) is a multiple of 4 and \( w_b(4s_0 - 1, 4) \) is the inverse of some words \( xyyx \).

So there are 5 other cases to study: \( n = 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 \).

When \( n = 4 \), \( w_b(4s_0, 4) \) is either of type \( xxxx \) or \( xyyx \), and \( pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1 = pl(4s_0 + 3) \), if \( w_b(4s_0, 4) \) is of type \( xxxx \) then \( w_b(0, 4s_0 + 3) = w_b(0, 4s_0)xxxx \) so \( pl(4s_0 + 2) \leq pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1 = pl(4s_0 + 3) \), contradicts Corollary 2.
When $n = 5$ or 6, $pl(4s_0 + 3) = pl(4s_0 + 3 - n) + 1 > pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1$, however, $pl(4s_0 + 3) ≤ pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1$, contradiction.

When $n = 7$, $pl(4s_0 + 3) = pl(4s_0 - 4) + 1 = pl(4s_0 - 5) + 2$. On the other hand, $pl(4s_0 - 1) ≤ pl(4s_0 - 5) + 1$ and $pl(4s_0 + 3) ≤ pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1$, so

$$pl(4s_0 + 3) = pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1 = pl(4s_0 - 5) + 2. (*)$$

After Corollary 4, $4s_0 - 4 ≡ 0 \mod 16$ and

$$pl(4s_0 + 7) = pl(4s_0 + 3) or pl(4s_0 + 7) = pl(4s_0 + 3) - 1 (**) .$$

If we write $w_b(0, 4s_0 + 4) = w_b(0, 4s_0 - 4)abbaaabb$ let us consider the last palindromic factor of $w_b(0, 4s_0 + 8)$:

1) The length can not be smaller than 4, otherwise $pl(4s_0 + 7) = pl(4s_0 + i) + 1 > pl(4s_0 + 7)$ with $3 < i < 6$, contradicts Corollary 3.

2) The length can not be 4, 5, 6, 7, otherwise $pl(4s_0 + 7) = pl(4s_0 + i) + 1$ with $-1 < i ≤ 3$, but $pl(4s_0 + i) ≥ pl(4s_0 + 3)$, so that $pl(4s_0 + 7) > pl(4s_0 + 3) + 1$, contradicts (**) .

3) The length can not be 8, otherwise $w_b(0, 4s_0 + 8) = w_b(0, 4s_0 - 4)abbaabbabbax$ and $pl(4s_0 + 7) = pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1 = pl(4s_0 + 3).$ But on the other hand, $pl(4s_0 + 4) = pl(4s_0 + 3) + 1$ and $pl(4s_0 + 6) = pl(4s_0 + 7) + 1 = pl(4s_0 + 3) + 1$ because of Proposition 1; $pl(4s_0 + 5) = pl(4s_0 + 3) + 1$ because of the decomposition $w_b(0, 4s_0 + 6) = w_b(0, 4s_0 + 4)bb$ so that $pl(4s_0 + 4) = pl(4s_0 + 5) = pl(4s_0 + 6)$ which contradicts Corollary 4.

4) The length can not be 9, 10, otherwise $pl(4s_0 + 7) = pl(4s_0 - i) + 1$ with $i = 2, 3$, but $pl(4s_0 - i) ≥ pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1$ so that $pl(4s_0 + 7) > pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1 = pl(4s_0) + 3$, contradicts (**). 

5) The length can not be 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, because the last factor can not be palindromic.

6) The length can not be 15, otherwise, $w_b(0, 4s_0 + 8) = w_b(0, 4s_0 - 8)cdcdabbaabbacdd$, with $a ≠ b, c ≠ d$. Let us check a decomposition $w_b(0, 4s_0 + 5) = w_b(0, 4s_0 - 4)abbaabba$, so that $pl(4s_0 + 4) ≤ pl(4s_0 - 5) + 1$, but $pl(4s_0 + 4) = pl(4s_0 + 3) + 1$ which implies $pl(4s_0 + 3) ≤ pl(4s_0 - 5)$, contradicts (***).

7) The length can not be an odd number larger than 15, otherwise, there is a palindromic factor of odd size larger than 3 in $w_a(0, 4s_0)$ finishing at position $4s_0 - 1$, contradicts to Lemma 8.

8) The length can not be an even number larger than 14, otherwise, because of Lemma 8, the length is a multiple of 4, which implies the factor $w_a(4s_0, 4)$ is the symmetry of some words $w_a(4x, 4)$, by hypothesis, it is of type $abba$ but not $xabb$, 

In conclusion, the last palindromic factor of $w_b(0, 4s_0 + 4)$ can not be 7.

When $n = 9$, $pl(4s_0 + 3) = pl(4s_0 - 6) + 1 = pl(4s_0 - 5) + 2 ≥ pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1$. On the other hand, $pl(4s_0 + 3) ≤ pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1$, so $pl(4s_0 + 3) = pl(4s_0 - 1) + 1$; another observation is that $pl(4s_0 + 2) ≤ pl(4s_0 - 5) + 1$ because $b_{4s_0-4}, b_{4s_0-3}, b_{4s_0-2}, b_{4s_0-1}, b_{4s_0+1}, b_{4s_0+2}$ is palindromic, but $pl(4s_0 + 2) = pl(4s_0 + 3) + 1$ so $pl(4s_0 + 3) + 2 ≤ pl(4s_0 - 5) + 2 = pl(4s_0 + 3)$, contradiction.

In conclusion, for all possible cases $w_b(4s_0, 4)$ is of type $xyyx$.

**Proposition 3** Let $w$ be a finite word of length $4^k$, such that its palindromic length sequence coincides with a prefix of $(pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, then $w$ is a prefix of a sequence in $C$. 
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Proof Let us prove it by induction. The statement is trivially true when $k = 0$. Now suppose the statement is true for $k = s_0$, let us consider the case $k = s_0 + 1$:

Remarking that Lemma 2, 3, 4, 5 work under the weaker condition of sequences announced as in previous proposition, we can apply the same results to prove each prefix of $w$ of length $4k$ admits an optimal palindromic decomposition of type $p_1 p_2 . . p_r$ such that the length of all this factors are multiples of 4. Using Lemma 7 there is another alphabet $\Sigma_1$ and a bijection $f : \Sigma^4 \rightarrow \Sigma_1$ such that $f(w)$ is still a word which palindromic length sequence coincides with a prefix of $(pl(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, however the length of $f(w)$ is $4^{s_0}$, using the hypothesis of induction, it is a prefix of a sequence in $C$, so $w$ is also a prefix of a sequence in $C$, by applying the inverse of $f$.

Theorem 1 All sequences such that their palindromic length sequences coincide with the one of Thue-Morse’s are in $C$.
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