

# The Number of Threshold Words on $n$ Letters Grows Exponentially for Every $n \geq 27$

James D. Currie\*, Lucas Mol, and Narad Rampersad†

Department of Mathematics and Statistics

The University of Winnipeg

515 Portage Ave.

Winnipeg, MB, Canada

R3B 2E9

{j.currie, l.mol, n.rampersad}@uwinnipeg.ca

## Abstract

For every  $n \geq 27$ , we show that the number of  $n/(n-1)^+$ -free words (i.e., threshold words) of length  $k$  on  $n$  letters grows exponentially in  $k$ . This settles all but finitely many cases of a conjecture of Ochem.

**MSC 2010:** 68R15

**Keywords:** threshold word; repetition threshold; exponential growth; Dejean word; Dejean's conjecture; Dejean's theorem

## 1 Introduction

Throughout, we use standard definitions and notations from combinatorics on words (see [13]). A *square* is a word of the form  $xx$ , where  $x$  is a nonempty word. A *cube* is a word of the form  $xxx$ , where  $x$  is a nonempty word. An *overlap* is a word of the form  $axaxa$ , where  $a$  is a letter and  $x$  is a (possibly

---

\*The work of James D. Currie is supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), [funding reference number 2017-03901].

†The work of Narad Rampersad is supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), [funding reference number 2019-04111].

empty) word. The study of words goes back to Thue, who demonstrated the existence of an infinite overlap-free word over a binary alphabet, and an infinite square-free word over a ternary alphabet (see [1]).

A language is a set of finite words over some alphabet  $A$ . The *combinatorial complexity* of a language  $L$  is the sequence  $C_L : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , where  $C_L(k)$  is defined as the number of words in  $L$  of length  $k$ . We say that a language  $L$  *grows* exactly as the sequence  $C_L(k)$  grows, be it exponentially, polynomially, etc. Since the work of Brandenburg [2], the study of the growth of languages has been a central theme in combinatorics on words. Given a language  $L$ , a key question is whether it grows exponentially (fast), or subexponentially (slow). Brandenburg [2] demonstrated that both the language of cube-free words over a binary alphabet, and the language of square-free words over a ternary alphabet, grow exponentially. On the other hand, Restivo and Salemi [19] demonstrated that the language of overlap-free binary words grows only polynomially.

Squares, cubes, and overlaps are all examples of *repetitions* in words, and can be considered in the same general framework. Let  $w = w_1w_2 \cdots w_k$  be a finite word, where the  $w_i$ 's are letters. A positive integer  $p$  is a *period* of  $w$  if  $w_{i+p} = w_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k - p$ . In this case, we say that  $|w|/p$  is an *exponent* of  $w$ , and the largest such number is called *the* exponent of  $w$ . For a real number  $r > 1$ , a finite or infinite word  $w$  is called  $r$ -free ( $r^+$ -free) if  $w$  contains no finite factors of exponent greater than or equal to  $r$  (strictly greater than  $r$ , respectively).

Throughout, for every positive integer  $n$ , let  $A_n$  denote the  $n$ -letter alphabet  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . For every  $n \geq 2$ , the *repetition threshold* for  $n$  letters, denoted  $\text{RT}(n)$ , is defined by

$$\text{RT}(n) = \inf\{r > 1: \text{there is an infinite } r^+\text{-free word over } A_n\}.$$

Essentially, the repetition threshold describes the border between avoidable and unavoidable repetitions in words over an alphabet of  $n$  letters. The repetition threshold was first defined by Dejean [7]. Her 1972 conjecture on the values of  $\text{RT}(n)$  has now been confirmed through the work of many authors [3–7, 14, 15, 17, 18]:

$$\text{RT}(n) = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } n = 2; \\ 7/4, & \text{if } n = 3; \\ 7/5, & \text{if } n = 4; \\ n/(n-1), & \text{if } n \geq 5. \end{cases}$$

The last cases of Dejean’s conjecture were confirmed in 2011 by the first and third authors [6], and independently by Rao [18]. However, probably the most important contribution was made by Carpi [3], who confirmed the conjecture in all but finitely many cases.

In this short note, we are concerned with the growth rate of the language of *threshold words* over  $A_n$ . For every  $n \geq 2$ , let  $T_n$  denote the language of all  $\text{RT}(n)^+$ -free words over  $A_n$ . We call  $T_n$  the *threshold language* of order  $n$ , and we call its members *threshold words* of order  $n$ . Threshold words are also called *Dejean words* by some authors. For every  $n \geq 2$ , the threshold language  $T_n$  is the minimally repetitive infinite language over  $A_n$ .

The threshold language  $T_2$  is exactly the language of overlap-free words over  $A_2$ , which is known to grow only polynomially [19].<sup>12</sup> However, Ochem made the following conjecture about the growth of threshold languages of all other orders.

**Conjecture 1** (Ochem [16]). For every  $n \geq 3$ , the language  $T_n$  of threshold words of order  $n$  grows exponentially.

Conjecture 1 has been confirmed for  $n \in \{3, 4\}$  by Ochem [16], for  $n \in \{5, 6, \dots, 10\}$  by Kolpakov and Rao [12], and for all odd  $n$  less than or equal to 101 by Tunev and Shur [23]. In this note, we confirm Conjecture 1 for every  $n \geq 27$ .

**Theorem 2.** *For every  $n \geq 27$ , the language  $T_n$  of threshold words of order  $n$  grows exponentially.*

The layout of the remainder of the note is as follows. In Section 2, we summarize the work of Carpi [3] in confirming all but finitely many cases of Dejean’s conjecture. In Section 3, we establish Theorem 2 with constructions that rely heavily on the work of Carpi. We conclude with a discussion of problems related to the rate of growth of threshold languages.

## 2 Carpi’s reduction to $\psi_n$ -kernel repetitions

In this section, let  $n \geq 2$  be a fixed integer. Pansiot [17] was first to observe that if a word over the alphabet  $A_n$  is  $(n - 1)/(n - 2)$ -free, then it can be

---

<sup>1</sup>Currently the best known bounds on  $C_{T_2}(k)$  are due to Jungers et al. [9].

<sup>2</sup>The threshold between polynomial and exponential growth for repetition-free binary words is known to be  $7/3$  [10]. That is, the language of  $7/3$ -free words over  $A_2$  grows polynomially, while the language of  $7/3^+$ -free words over  $A_2$  grows exponentially.

encoded by a word over the binary alphabet  $B = \{0, 1\}$ . For consistency, we use the notation of Carpi [3] to describe this encoding. Let  $\mathbb{S}_n$  denote the symmetric group on  $A_n$ , and define the morphism  $\varphi_n : B^* \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_n$  by

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_n(0) &= (1 \ 2 \ \cdots \ n-1); \text{ and} \\ \varphi_n(1) &= (1 \ 2 \ \cdots \ n).\end{aligned}$$

Now define the map  $\gamma_n : B^* \rightarrow A_n^*$  by

$$\gamma_n(b_1 b_2 \cdots b_k) = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k,$$

where

$$a_i \varphi_n(b_1 b_2 \cdots b_i) = 1$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . To be precise, Pansiot proved that if a word  $\alpha \in A_n^*$  is  $(n-1)/(n-2)$ -free, then  $\alpha$  can be obtained from a word of the form  $\gamma_n(u)$ , where  $u \in B^*$ , by renaming the letters.

Let  $u \in B^*$ , and let  $\alpha = \gamma_n(u)$ . Pansiot showed that if  $\alpha$  has a factor of exponent greater than  $n/(n-1)$ , then either the word  $\alpha$  itself contains a *short repetition*, or the binary word  $u$  contains a *kernel repetition* (see [17] for details). Carpi reformulated this statement so that both types of forbidden factors appear in the binary word  $u$ . Let  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ , and let  $v \in B^+$ . Then  $v$  is called a *k-stabilizing word* (of order  $n$ ) if  $\varphi_n(v)$  fixes the points  $1, 2, \dots, k$ . Let  $\text{Stab}_n(k)$  denote the set of  $k$ -stabilizing words of order  $n$ . The word  $v$  is called a *kernel repetition* (of order  $n$ ) if it has period  $p$  and a factor  $v'$  of length  $p$  such that  $v' \in \ker(\varphi_n)$  and  $|v| > \frac{np}{n-1} - (n-1)$ . Carpi's reformulation of Pansiot's result is the following.

**Proposition 3** (Carpi [3, Proposition 3.2]). *Let  $u \in B^*$ . If a factor of  $\gamma_n(u)$  has exponent larger than  $n/(n-1)$ , then  $u$  has a factor  $v$  satisfying one of the following conditions:*

- (i)  $v \in \text{Stab}_n(k)$  and  $0 < |v| < k(n-1)$  for some  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ ; or
- (ii)  $v$  is a kernel repetition of order  $n$ .

Now assume that  $n \geq 9$ , and define  $m = \lfloor (n-3)/6 \rfloor$  and  $\ell = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ . Carpi [3] defines an  $(n-1)(\ell+1)$ -uniform morphism  $f_n : A_m^* \rightarrow B^*$  with the following extraordinary property.

**Proposition 4** (Carpi [3, Proposition 7.3]). *Suppose that  $n \geq 27$ , and let  $w \in A_m^*$ . Then for every  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ , the word  $f_n(w)$  contains no  $k$ -stabilizing word of length smaller than  $k(n-1)$ .*

We note that Proposition 4 was proven by Carpi [3] in the case that  $n \geq 30$  in a computation-free manner. The improvement to  $n \geq 27$  stated here was achieved later by the first and third authors [4], using lemmas of Carpi [3] along with a significant computer check.

Proposition 4 says that for every word  $w \in A_m^*$ , no factor of  $f_n(w)$  satisfies condition (i) of Proposition 3. Thus, we need only worry about factors satisfying condition (ii) of Proposition 3, i.e., kernel repetitions. To this end, define the morphism  $\psi_n : A_m^* \rightarrow \mathbb{S}_n$  by  $\psi_n(v) = \varphi_n(f_n(v))$  for all  $v \in A_m^*$ . A word  $v \in A_m^*$  is called a  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetition if it has a period  $q$  and a factor  $v'$  of length  $q$  such that  $v' \in \ker(\psi_n)$  and  $(n-1)(|v|+1) \geq nq-3$ . Carpi established the following result.

**Proposition 5** (Carpi [3, Proposition 8.2]). *Let  $w \in A_m^*$ . If a factor of  $f_n(w)$  is a kernel repetition, then a factor of  $w$  is a  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetition.*

In other words, if  $w \in A_m^*$  contains no  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetitions, then no factor of  $f_n(w)$  satisfies condition (ii) of Proposition 3. Altogether, we have the following theorem, which we state formally for ease of reference.

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose that  $n \geq 27$ . If  $w \in A_m^*$  contains no  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetitions, then  $\gamma_n(f_n(w))$  is  $\text{RT}(n)^+$ -free.*

Finally, we note that the morphism  $f_n$  is defined in such a way that the kernel of  $\psi_n$  has a very simple structure.

**Lemma 7** (Carpi [3, Lemma 9.1]). *If  $v \in A_m^*$ , then  $v \in \ker(\psi_n)$  if and only if 4 divides  $|v|_a$  for every letter  $a \in A_m$ .*

### 3 Constructing exponentially many threshold words

In this section, let  $n \geq 27$  be a fixed integer, and let  $m = \lfloor (n-3)/6 \rfloor$  and  $\ell = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ , as in the previous section. Since  $n \geq 27$ , we have  $m \geq 4$ . In order to prove that the threshold language  $T_n$  grows exponentially, we construct

an exponentially growing language  $Z_m \subseteq A_m^*$  of words that contain no  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetitions. If  $n \geq 33$  (or equivalently, if  $m \geq 5$ ), then we define  $Z_m$  by modifying Carpi's construction of an infinite word  $\alpha$  over  $A_m$  that contains no  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetitions. If  $27 \leq n \leq 32$  (or equivalently, if  $m = 4$ ), then we define a 3-uniform substitution  $g: A_4^* \rightarrow 2^{A_4^*}$ , and let  $Z_4$  be the set of all factors of words obtained by iterating  $g$  on the letter 1.

### Case I: $n \geq 33$

We first recall the definition of  $\alpha$ , the infinite word over  $A_m$  defined by Carpi [3] that contains no  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetitions. First of all, define  $\beta = (b_i)_{i \geq 1}$ , where

$$b_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i \equiv 1 \pmod{3}; \\ 2, & \text{if } i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}; \\ b_{i/3}, & \text{if } i \equiv 0 \pmod{3}. \end{cases}$$

Now define  $\alpha = (a_i)_{i \geq 1}$ , where for all  $i \geq 1$ , we have

$$a_i = \begin{cases} \max\{a \in A_m : 4^{a-2} \text{ divides } i\}, & \text{if } i \text{ is even;} \\ b_{(i+1)/2}, & \text{if } i \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Note that if  $i \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ , then  $a_i = 2$ . Let  $Z_m$  be the set of all finite words obtained from a prefix of  $\alpha$  by exchanging any subset of these 2's for 1's. To be precise, if  $z = z_1 z_2 \cdots z_k$ , then  $z \in Z_m$  if and only if all of the following hold:

- $z_i \in \{1, 2\}$  if  $i \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ ;
- $z_i = \max\{a \in A_m : 4^{a-2} \text{ divides } i\}$  if  $i \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ ; and
- $z_i = b_{(i+1)/2}$  if  $i$  is odd.

Note in particular that if  $z = z_1 z_2 \cdots z_k$  is in  $Z_m$ , then  $z_i \geq 3$  if and only if  $i \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ .

We claim that no word  $z \in Z_m$  contains a  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetition. The proof is essentially analogous to Carpi's proof that  $\alpha$  contains no  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetitions. We begin with a lemma about the lengths of factors in  $Z_m$  that lie in  $\ker(\psi_n)$ .

**Lemma 8** (Adapted from Carpi [3, Lemma 9.3]). *Let  $z \in Z_m$ , and let  $v$  be a factor of  $z$ . If  $v \in \ker(\psi_n)$ , then  $4^{m-1}$  divides  $|v|$ .*

*Proof.* The statement is trivially true if  $v = \varepsilon$ , so assume  $|v| > 0$ . Set  $|v| = 4^b c$ , where  $4^b$  is the maximal power of 4 dividing  $|v|$ . Suppose, towards a contradiction, that  $b \leq m - 2$ . Since  $v \in \ker(\psi_n)$ , by Lemma 7, we see that 4 divides  $|v|$ , meaning  $b \geq 1$ .

Write  $z = z_1 z_2 \cdots z_{|z|}$ . Then we have  $v = z_i z_{i+1} \cdots z_{i+4^b c - 1}$  for some  $i \geq 1$ . By definition, for any  $j \geq 1$ , we have  $z_j \geq b + 2$  if and only if  $4^b$  divides  $j$ . (Since  $b \geq 1$ , we have  $b + 2 \geq 3$ , and hence  $z_j \geq b + 2$  implies  $j \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ .) Thus, we have that the sum  $\sum_{a=b+2}^m |v|_a$  is exactly the number of integers in the set  $\{i, i + 1, \dots, i + 4^b c - 1\}$  that are divisible by  $4^b$ , which is exactly  $c$ . Since  $v \in \ker(\psi_n)$ , by Lemma 7, we conclude that 4 divides  $c$ , contradicting the maximality of  $b$ .  $\square$

Now, using Lemma 8 in place of [3, Lemma 9.3], a proof strictly analogous to that of [3, Proposition 9.4] gives the following. The only tool in the proof that we have not covered here is [3, Lemma 9.2], which is a short technical lemma about the repetitions in the word  $\beta$ , and which can be used without any modification.

**Proposition 9.** *Suppose that  $n \geq 33$ . Then no word  $z \in Z_m$  contains a  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetition.*

## Case II: $27 \leq n \leq 32$

Define a substitution  $g : A_4^* \rightarrow 2^{A_4^*}$  by

$$\begin{aligned} g(1) &= \{112\} \\ g(2) &= \{114\} \\ g(3) &= \{113\} \\ g(4) &= \{123, 213\}. \end{aligned}$$

We extend  $g$  to  $2^{A_4^*}$  by  $g(W) = \bigcup_{w \in W} g(w)$ , which allows us to iteratively apply  $g$  to an initial word in  $A_4^*$ . Let  $Z_4 = \text{Fact}\{v : v \in g^n(1) \text{ for some } n \geq 1\}$ , i.e., we have that  $Z_4$  is the set of factors of all words obtained by iteratively applying  $g$  to the initial word 1. If a word  $w \in A_4^*$  has period  $p$  and the length  $p$  prefix of  $w$  is in  $\ker(\psi)$ , then we say that  $p$  is a *kernel period* of  $w$ .

**Proposition 10.** *Suppose that  $27 \leq n \leq 32$ . Then no word in  $Z_4$  contains a  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetition.*

*Proof.* Suppose otherwise that the word  $v_0 \in Z_4$  is a  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetition. Write  $v_0 = x_0y_0$ , where  $v_0$  has kernel period  $|x_0|$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that no extension of  $v_0$  that lies in  $Z_4$  has period  $|x_0|$ , i.e., that  $v_0$  is a maximal repetition in  $Z_4$ . From the definition of  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetition, we must have

$$(n-1)(|v_0|+1) \geq n|x_0| - 3,$$

or equivalently,

$$|x_0| \leq (n-1)|y_0| + n + 2.$$

Since  $n \leq 32$ , we certainly have

$$|x_0| \leq 31|y_0| + 34. \tag{1}$$

If  $|y_0| \leq 3$ , then we have  $|x_0| \leq 127$ , and hence  $|v_0| \leq 130$ . We eliminate this possibility by exhaustive search, so we may assume that  $|y_0| \geq 4$ .

We can write  $v_0 = s_0v'_0p_0$  for some suffix  $s_0$  of a word in  $g(A_4)$ , some prefix  $p_0$  of a word in  $g(A_4)$ , and some word  $v'_0 \in g(v_1)$ , where  $v_1 \in Z_4$ . By inspection, we see that if  $z$  is any factor of  $Z_4$  of length 3, and both  $\pi_1z$  and  $\pi_2z$  are prefixes of some word in  $Z_4$ , then  $|\pi_1| \equiv |\pi_2| \pmod{3}$ . Since both  $y_0$  and  $x_0y_0 = v_0$  are prefixes of  $v_0$ , and since  $|y_0| > 3$ , we conclude that  $|x_0|$  is a multiple of 3.

Recall that we have  $v_0 = s_0v'_0p_0$ , where  $v'_0 \in g(v_1)$  for some word  $v_1 \in Z_4$ . Since  $|s_0| \leq 2$  and  $|p_0| \leq 2$ , we have  $|v'_0| \geq |v_0| - 4 \geq |x_0|$ , and hence  $v'_0$  has kernel period  $|x_0|$ . Now write  $v_1 = x_1y_1$ , where  $3|x_1| = |x_0|$ . Evidently, we have  $3|y_1| + 4 \geq |y_0|$ . Note that  $v_1$  has period  $|x_1|$ . Further, since the frequency matrix of  $g$  is invertible modulo 4, we have  $x_1 \in \ker(\psi_n)$ , and hence  $|x_1|$  is a kernel period of  $v_1$ . Since  $v_0$  was a maximal repetition in  $Z_4$ , we see that  $v_1$  is also maximal.

We may now repeat the process described above. Eventually, for some  $r \geq 1$ , we reach a word  $v_r \in Z_4$  that can be written  $v_r = x_ry_r$ , where  $|x_r|$  is a kernel period of  $v_r$ , and  $|y_r| \leq 3$ . For all  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , one proves by induction that  $|x_0| = 3^i|x_i|$  and  $|y_0| \leq 3^i|y_i| + 4 \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} 3^j = 3^i|y_i| + 2(3^i - 1)$ . Thus, from (1), we obtain

$$3^i|x_i| \leq 31 [3^i|y_i| + 2(3^i - 1)] + 34$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . Dividing through by  $3^i$ , and then simplifying, we obtain

$$|x_i| \leq 31 [|y_i| + 2] - \frac{28}{3^i} \leq 31 [|y_i| + 2] \quad (2)$$

for all  $1 \leq i \leq r$ .

Since  $|y_r| \leq 3$ , we obtain  $|x_r| \leq 155$  from (2). By Lemma 7, the kernel period  $|x_r|$  of  $v_r$  is a multiple of 4, so in fact we have  $|x_r| \leq 152$ , and in turn  $|v_r| \leq 155$ . By exhaustive search of all words in  $Z_4$  of length at most 155, we find that  $v_r \in W$ , where  $W$  is a set containing exactly 200 words. Indeed, the set  $W$  contains

- 160 words with kernel period 76 and length 77,
- 36 words with kernel period 92 and length 93, and
- 4 words with kernel period 112 and length 114.

For every  $w \in W$ , let

$$E_w = \text{Fact}(\{g(awb) : a, b \in A_4, awb \in Z_4\}).$$

Evidently, we have  $v_{r-1} \in E_{v_r}$ . For every word  $w \in W$ , let  $p_w$  denote the kernel period of  $w$ , and let  $q_w$  denote the maximum length of a repetition with kernel period  $3p_w$  across all words in  $E_w$ . By exhaustive check, for every  $w \in W$ , we find  $3p_w > 31 [q_w - 3p_w + 2]$ . However, the word  $v_{r-1} = x_{r-1}y_{r-1}$  must be in  $E_{v_r}$ , and by (2), we have

$$3p_{v_r} = |x_{r-1}| \leq 31 [|y_{r-1}| + 2] \leq 31 [q_{v_r} - 3p_{v_r} + 2].$$

This is a contradiction. We conclude that the set  $Z_4$  contains no  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetitions.  $\square$

We now proceed with the proof of our main result.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* First suppose that  $n \geq 33$ . By Proposition 9, no word  $z \in Z_m$  contains a  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetition. From the definition of  $Z_m$ , one easily proves that

$$C_{Z_m}(k) = \Omega(2^{k/4}).$$

By Theorem 6, for every word  $z \in Z_m$ , the word  $\gamma_n(f_n(z))$  is in the threshold language  $T_n$  of order  $n$ . Moreover, the maps  $\gamma_n$  and  $f_n$  are injective, and

$|\gamma_n(f_n(z))|/|z| = (n-1)(\ell+1)$ , since  $f_n$  is  $(n-1)(\ell+1)$ -uniform and  $\gamma_n$  preserves length. It follows that

$$C_{T_n}(k) = \Omega\left(2^{k/4(n-1)(\ell+1)}\right).$$

Since  $n$ , and hence  $\ell$ , are fixed, the quantity  $(n-1)(\ell+1)$  is a constant, and we conclude that the language  $T_n$  grows exponentially.

Suppose now that  $27 \leq n \leq 32$ . By Proposition 10, no word  $z \in Z_4$  contains a  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetition. Since  $|g^4(a)| \geq 4$  for all  $a \in A_4$ , we have

$$C_{Z_4}(k) = \Omega\left(4^{k/81}\right).$$

By the same argument as above, we see that

$$C_{T_n}(k) = \Omega\left(4^{k/81(n-1)(\ell+1)}\right),$$

and we conclude that the language  $T_n$  grows exponentially.  $\square$

## 4 Conclusion

Conjecture 1 has now been established for all  $n \notin \{12, 14, \dots, 26\}$ . We remark that different techniques than those presented here will be needed to establish Conjecture 1 in all but one of these remaining cases. (It appears that the techniques presented here could potentially be used for  $n = 22$ , but we do not pursue this isolated case.) For example, let  $n = 26$ . Then we have  $m = 3$ . By computer search, for every letter  $a \in A_m$ , the word  $f_n(a3)$  contains a 15-stabilizing word of length 350, which is less than  $15(n-1) = 375$ . By another computer search, the longest word on  $\{1, 2\}$  avoiding  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetitions has length 15. So there are only finitely many words in  $A_m^*$  that avoid both  $\psi_n$ -kernel repetitions and the forbidden stabilizing words. Similar arguments lead to the same conclusion for all  $n \in \{12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24\}$ .

For a language  $L$ , the value  $\alpha(L) = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} (C_L(k))^{1/k}$  is called the *growth rate* of  $L$ . If  $L$  is factorial (i.e., closed under taking factors), then by an application of Fekete's Lemma, we can safely replace  $\limsup$  by  $\lim$  in this definition. If  $\alpha(L) > 1$ , then the language  $L$  grows exponentially, and in this case,  $\alpha(L)$  is a good description of how quickly the language grows.

For all  $n \geq 33$ , we have established that  $\alpha(T_n) \geq 2^{1/4(n-1)(\ell+1)}$ . However, this lower bound tends to 1 as  $n$  tends to infinity, and this seems far from best possible. Indeed, Shur and Gorbunova proposed the following conjecture concerning the asymptotic behaviour of  $\alpha(T_n)$ .

**Conjecture 11** (Shur and Gorbunova [22]). The sequence  $\{\alpha(T_n)\}$  of the growth rates of threshold languages converges to a limit  $\hat{\alpha} \approx 1.242$  as  $n$  tends to infinity.

A wide variety of evidence supports this conjecture – we refer the reader to [8, 20–22] for details. For a fixed  $n$ , there are efficient methods for determining upper bounds on  $\alpha(T_n)$  which appear to be rather sharp, even for relatively large values of  $n$  (see [22], for example). Establishing a sharp lower bound on  $\alpha(T_n)$  appears to be a more difficult problem. We note that a good lower bound on  $\alpha(T_3)$  is given by Kolpakov [11] using a method that requires some significant computation. For all  $n \in \{5, 6, \dots, 10\}$ , Kolpakov and Rao [12] give lower bounds for  $\alpha(T_n)$  using a similar method. They were then able to estimate the value of  $\alpha(T_n)$  with precision 0.005 using upper bounds obtained by the method of Shur and Gorbunova [22].

Thus, in addition to resolving the finitely many remaining cases of Conjecture 1, improving our lower bound for  $\alpha(T_n)$  when  $n \geq 27$  remains a significant open problem.

## References

- [1] J. Berstel, *Axel Thue's papers on repetitions in words: A translation*, Publications du LaCIM (Université du Québec à Montréal), vol. 20, 1995.
- [2] F. J. Brandenburg, *Uniformly growing  $k$ -th power-free homomorphisms*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **23** (1983), 69–82.
- [3] A. Carpi, *On Dejean's conjecture over large alphabets*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **385** (2007), 137–151.
- [4] J. D. Currie and N. Rampersad, *Dejean's conjecture holds for  $n \geq 27$* , RAIRO - Theor. Inform. Appl. **43** (2009), 775–778.
- [5] J. D. Currie and N. Rampersad, *Dejean's conjecture holds for  $n \geq 30$* , Theoret. Comput. Sci. **410** (2009), 2885–2888.
- [6] J. D. Currie and N. Rampersad, *A proof of Dejean's conjecture*, Math. Comp. **80** (2011), 1063–1070.

- [7] F. Dejean, *Sur un théorème de Thue*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **13** (1972), 90–99.
- [8] I. A. Gorbunova and A. M. Shur, On Pansiot words avoiding 3-repetitions, in *Proc. WORDS 2011*, Electron. Proc. Theor. Comput. Sci., vol. 63, 2012, pp. 138–146.
- [9] R. M. Jungers, V. Y. Protasov, and V. D. Blondel, *Overlap-free words and spectra of matrices*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **410** (2009), 3670–3684.
- [10] J. Karhumäki and J. Shallit, *Polynomial versus exponential growth in repetition-free binary words*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **105** (2004), 335–347.
- [11] R. Kolpakov, *Efficient lower bounds on the number of repetition-free words*, J. Integer Seq. **10** (2007), 1–16.
- [12] R. Kolpakov and M. Rao, *On the number of Dejean words over alphabets of 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 letters*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **412** (2011), 6507–6516.
- [13] M. Lothaire, *Algebraic combinatorics on words*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [14] M. Mohammad-Noori and J. D. Currie, *Dejean’s conjecture and Sturmian words*, European J. Combin. **28** (2007), 876–890.
- [15] J. Moulin-Ollagnier, *Proof of Dejean’s conjecture for alphabets with 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 letters*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **95** (1992), 187–205.
- [16] P. Ochem, *A generator of morphisms for infinite words*, RAIRO - Theor. Inform. Appl. **40** (2006), 427–441.
- [17] J. J. Pansiot, *A propos d’une conjecture de F. Dejean sur les répétitions dans les mots*, Discrete Appl. Math. **7** (1984), 297–311.
- [18] M. Rao, *Last cases of Dejean’s conjecture*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **412** (2011), 3010–3018.
- [19] A. Restivo and S. Salemi, Overlap free words on two symbols, in M. Nivat and D. Perrin, eds., *Automata on Infinite Words*, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., Vol. 192, Springer-Verlag, 1985, pp. 198–206.

- [20] A. M. Shur, *Growth properties of power-free languages*, Comput. Sci. Rev. **6** (2012), 187–208.
- [21] A. M. Shur, *Growth of power-free languages over large alphabets*, Theory Comput. Syst. **54** (2014), 224–243.
- [22] A. M. Shur and I. A. Gorbunova, *On the growth rates of complexity of threshold languages*, RAIRO - Theor. Inform. Appl. **44** (2010), 175–192.
- [23] I. N. Tunev and A. M. Shur, *On two stronger versions of Dejean’s conjecture*, in *Proc. 37th Internat. Conf. on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science: MFCS 2012*, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., vol. 7464, Springer, 2012, pp. 800–812.