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An automaton is synchronizing if there is a word that maps all states onto the same state. Černý’s conjecture on the length of the shortest such word is probably the most famous open problem in automata theory. We consider the closely related question of determining the minimum length of a word that maps $k$ states onto a single state.

For synchronizing automata, we improve the upper bound on the minimum length of a word that sends some triple to a a single state from $0.5n^2$ to $\approx 0.19n^2$. We further extend this to an improved bound on the length of such a word for 4 states and 5 states.

In the case of non-synchronizing automata, we give an example to show that the minimum length of a word that sends $k$ states to a single state can be as large as $\Theta(n^{k-1})$.

1 Introduction

A (deterministic, finite) automaton $\Omega$ consists of a finite set of states (usually labelled $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$) and a finite set of transition functions, which are functions from the set of states to itself.

We shall be interested in the results of applying a sequence of transition functions to the set of states. We call such a sequence of transition functions a word of the automaton. The words of the automaton form a monoid, generated by the transition functions, which acts on the set of states.

We say that a word $w$ of the automaton is a reset word if it sends every state to the same point; that is if $w(i) = w(j)$ for all $i, j$. We call an automaton synchronizing if it has a reset word. Probably the most famous and long-standing open problem on synchronizing automata is Černý’s conjecture.

Conjecture 1 (Černý’s Conjecture [Cer64]). Suppose an automaton on $n$ states is synchronizing. Then the automaton has a reset word of length at most $(n - 1)^2$. 

---
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This conjecture comes from a particular family of automata, which we shall refer to as the Černý automata. For each \( n \geq 2 \), we define an automata with states \( \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) and two transition functions \( f \) and \( g \), defined as follows:

\[
f(i) = i + 1 \pmod{n} \quad \quad g(i) = \begin{cases} 
2 & \text{if } i = 1 \\
 i & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

Figure 1 shows the Černý automaton for \( n = 4 \), which has shortest reset word \( gfffgfffg \). It is not too hard to check that the shortest reset word for the Černý automaton on \( n \) states has length \( (n-1)^2 \). Thus if Černý’s conjecture were true it would be best possible.

![Figure 1: The Černý automaton for \( n = 4 \).](image)

Černý’s conjecture has been shown to hold for certain classes of automata, including orientable automata [Epp90], automata where one transition function is a cyclic permutation of the states [Dub98], and automata where the underlying digraph is Eulerian [Kar03]. For a survey of these and other results see [Vol08]. It remains open to prove the conjecture for all automata.

One can easily obtain a naive upper bound on the length of a shortest reset word by observing that for any pair of states there is some word sending them to a single state, and the shortest such word will never pass through the same pair of states twice. Thus the shortest word sending a given pair of states to a single state is of length at most \( \binom{n}{2} \).

Applying this repeatedly gives a reset word of length at most \( (n-1)\binom{n}{2} \).

An improved upper bound for the length of a minimal reset word comes from a result due to Frankl and Pin [Fra82] [Pin83]. Rather than only considering the shortest word sending a given pair to a singleton, this instead bounds the length of the shortest word sending a given \( k \)-set to a \( (k-1) \)-set.

**Theorem 1** (Frankl–Pin). Consider a synchronizing automaton with state set \( \Omega \) of size \( n \). Let \( S \subseteq \Omega \) be a set of size \( k \) where \( k \geq 2 \). There exists a word \( w \) of length at most \( \binom{n-k+2}{2} \) such that \( |w(S)| < k \).

Applying Theorem 1 repeatedly, we get

**Corollary 2** (Frankl–Pin). An \( n \)-state synchronizing automaton has a reset word of length \( \leq \sum_{i=2}^{n} \binom{n-i+2}{2} = \frac{n^3-n}{6} \).

This was the best known upper bound until relatively recently. Slight improvements to the constant factor have now been found: Szykula [Szy18] obtained an upper bound
of \( \approx \frac{114}{585}n^3 + O(n^2) \) and Shitov \cite{Shi19} refines this method to obtain an upper bound of \( \approx 0.1654n^3 + o(n^3) \).

Let \( \Omega \) be an automaton on \([n]\). The transition graph \( T(\Omega) \) has vertices the non-empty subsets of \([n]\), and for each set \( S \) and each transition function \( f \) a directed edge from \( S \) to \( f(S) \) with label \( f \). Figure 2 shows the transition graph for the Černý automaton in figure 1. The subsets of size \( k \) form the \( k \)th layer of the transition graph, written \( L_k \).

Figure 2: The transition graph for the Černý automaton on 4 vertices.

Now Černý’s conjecture can be restated in terms of the transition graph:

**Conjecture 1** (Černý’s conjecture). Let \( \Omega \) be an automaton on \([n]\). If the transition graph \( T(\Omega) \) contains a path from \([n]\) to a vertex in \( L_1 \), then there exists such a path of length at most \((n - 1)^2\).

This formulation of Černý’s conjecture suggests the more general question of determining the length of the shortest path taking a \( k \)-set to a singleton. This was introduced by Gonze and Jungers \cite{GJ16} as the \( k \)-set rendezvous time and will be our focus in the first half of this paper.

**Question 2.** What is the minimal value of \( \text{rdv}(k, n) \) such for any synchronizing automaton \( \Omega \) on \([n]\) there is a path in the transition graph \( T(\Omega) \) from \( L_k \) to \( L_1 \) of length at most \( \text{rdv}(k, n) \)?

**Question 3.** What is the minimal value of \( \text{RDV}(k, n) \) such for any synchronizing automaton \( \Omega \) on \([n]\) and for any \( k \)-set \( S \) there is a path in the transition graph \( T(\Omega) \) from \( S \) to \( L_1 \) of length at most \( \text{RDV}(k, n) \)?

Given an automaton \( \Omega \) and a set of states \( S \), we call \( S \) *synchronizable* if there exists a path from \( S \) to a singleton in the transition graph \( T(\Omega) \). Let the weight \( t(S) \) of a set \( S \) be the shortest path from \( S \) to a singleton if \( S \) is synchronizable and \( \infty \) otherwise. We
define
\[
m(k, \Omega) = \min\{t(S) : S \in L_k\} \\
M(k, \Omega) = \max\{t(S) : S \in L_k, S \text{ synchronizable}\}.
\]

Then \(rdv(k, n)\) is the maximum of \(m(k, \Omega)\) taken over all synchronizing automata and \(RDV(k, n)\) is the maximum of \(M(k, \Omega)\) again taken over all synchronizing automata. It is clear that \(rdv(k, n) \leq RDV(k, n)\) and \(rdv(k, n) \leq 1 + RDV(k - 1, n)\).

Answering either of these questions in the case \(k = n\) is equivalent to answering Černý’s conjecture. Note that finding a lower bound on \(rdv(k, n)\) or \(RDV(k, n)\) requires a construction of a suitable automaton with all \(k\)-sets having large weight or one \(k\)-set having large weight respectively; while finding an upper bound on \(rdv(k, n)\) or \(RDV(k, n)\) requires an argument about all synchronizing automata.

It is easy to see that \(rdv(2, n) = 1\). We have \(RDV(2, n) = \binom{n}{2}\), where the example of a pair of weight \(\binom{n}{2}\) is the pair \((2, \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil + 2)\) in the Černý automaton on \([n]\).

The Černý automaton also gives lower bounds for general \(k\). We have that the minimum weight \(k\)-set is \([1, 2, \ldots, k]\) with weight \((k-2)n+1\) and so \(rdv(k, n) \geq (k-2)n+1\). Using the fact that (after the first time) it takes \(n\) moves to get two states one step closer to each other on the cycle, a \(k\)-set with states equally spaced around the circle has weight \(\geq n \left\lceil \frac{(k-1)n}{k} \right\rceil - 1\) and so \(RDV(k, n) \geq \frac{k-1}{k} n^2 - 2n\).

Gonze and Jungers [GJ16] give a construction showing that \(rdv(3, n) \geq n + 3\) for odd \(n \geq 9\), which means in particular that the Černý automaton is not extremal for the triple rendezvous time for such \(n\).

For upper bounds on \(rdv(k, n)\) we can apply Theorem 1, which gives \(rdv(n, k) \leq 1 + \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} \binom{n-i+2}{2} = \frac{k-2}{2} n^2 + O(n)\) and \(RDV(n, k) \leq \sum_{i=2}^{k} \binom{n-i+2}{2} = \frac{k-1}{2} n^2 + O(n)\).

Our main result on these questions is an improved upper bound for the triple rendezvous time \(rdv(3, n)\) of \(\frac{3-\sqrt{3}}{4} n^2 + \frac{5-\sqrt{3}}{4} n \approx 0.19098 n^2 + O(n)\). This appears to be the first improvement over the trivial \(\binom{n}{2}\) bound (there is a claimed bound of \(n^2/4\) in [GJ16] but we believe this to be incorrect). We prove this upper bound in Section 2 together with a simple argument almost halving the upper bound on \(rdv(k, n)\) given by Frankl–Pin. We will also apply the techniques used on \(rdv(3, n)\) to further improve the upper bound for \(rdv(4, n)\) and \(rdv(5, n)\).

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{lower bound} & \text{upper bound} \\
rdv(3, n) & n + 3 & \frac{3-\sqrt{3}}{4} n^2 + O(n) \\
rDV(k, n) & (k-2)n + 1 & \frac{1}{2} \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rfloor n^2 + O(n) \\
RDV(k, n) & \frac{k-1}{k} n^2 - 2n & \frac{k-1}{2} n^2 + O(n) \\
\end{array}
\]

Table 1: Upper and lower bounds on \(rdv(k, n)\) and \(RDV(k, n)\).
Table 1 summarises what is known about \( \text{rdv}(3, n) \), \( \text{rdv}(k, n) \) and \( \text{RDV}(k, n) \), with the new results highlighted in red.

We can also ask similar questions over all automata, not just synchronizing automata, and this will be our focus in the second half of the paper.

**Question 4.** What is the minimal value of \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) \) such that for any automaton \( \Omega \) on \([n]\), if the transition graph \( T(\Omega) \) contains a path from \( L_k \) to \( L_1 \), then there exists such a path of length at most \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) \)?

**Question 5.** What is the minimal value of \( \text{RDV}^*(k, n) \) such that for any automaton \( \Omega \) on \([n]\) and for any \( k \)-set \( S \), if there is a path from \( S \) to \( L_1 \), then there is such a path of length at most \( \text{RDV}^*(k, n) \)?

In particular, \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) \) is the maximum of \( m(k, \Omega) \) taken over all automata \( \Omega \) with at least one synchronizable \( k \)-set, and \( \text{RDV}^*(k, n) \) is the maximum of \( M(k, \Omega) \) over the same collection of automata.

Again we have that answering either question in the case \( k = n \) is again equivalent to Černý’s conjecture. Note that \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) \leq \text{RDV}^*(k, n) \) and \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) \leq 1 + \text{RDV}^*(k - 1, n) \).

A naive upper bound on \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) \) is \( 1 + \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} \binom{n}{i} \), since a shortest word down to a singleton will take a set through each set of size \( k \) at most once.

A very slightly improved upper bound can be obtained by noting that an automaton \( \Omega \) is synchronizing if and only if for every pair of states \( u, v \) there is a word \( w \) with \( w(u) = w(v) \). If the automaton is synchronizing then we can use the Frankl–Pin bound. If not, then there is pair \( u, v \) that cannot be sent to the same state and any set containing both \( u \) and \( v \) is not synchronizable. The shortest path will not pass through any of these sets and so \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) \leq 1 + \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} \binom{n}{i} - \binom{n-2}{i-2} \). In either case, for fixed \( k \) we have \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) = O(n^{k-1}) \) and by the same argument \( \text{RDV}^*(k, n) = O(n^k) \).

In Section 3 we show that this is, surprisingly, best possible — that is, if \( k \) is fixed then the answer to Question 4 is \( \Theta(n^{k-1}) \). Since \( \text{RDV}^*(k, n) \geq \text{rdv}^*(k + 1, n) - 1 \), we also get that \( \text{RDV}^*(k, n) = O(n^k) \). The non-synchronizing case therefore exhibits very different behaviour to the synchronizing case, which implies that any approach to Černý’s conjecture using rendezvous times must use the condition that the automata is synchronizing in a critical way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>lower bound</th>
<th>upper bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{rdv}^*(3, n) )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{8}n^2 )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2}n(n - 1) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) )</td>
<td>( \frac{4}{3} \left( \frac{n}{4k} \right)^{k-1} ) ( \binom{n}{k-1} ) + ( O(n^{k-2}) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{RDV}^*(k, n) )</td>
<td>( \frac{4}{3} \left( \frac{n}{4(k+1)} \right)^{k} - 1 ) ( \binom{n}{k} ) + ( O(n^{k-1}) )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Upper and lower bounds on \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) \) and \( \text{RDV}^*(k, n) \).
Table 2 summarises what is known about \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) \) and \( \text{RDV}^*(k, n) \). The new contributions are highlighted in red.

## 2 Upper Bounds on the Rendezvous Time

Frankl–Pin gives trivially that for \( 2 \leq k \leq n \), the \( k \)-rendezvous time \( \omega \) is at most
\[
1 + \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} \left( \frac{n-i+2}{2} \right).
\]
The following simple adaptation of Frankl–Pin’s result improves on this bound for \( k \geq 4 \).

**Theorem 3.** For all \( n \) and all \( 2 \leq k \leq n \) the \( k \)-set rendezvous time \( \text{rdv}(k, n) \) is at most
\[
\left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \sum_{i=1}^{\left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor} \left( \frac{i+1}{2} \right) + \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil - 1 \sum_{i=1}^{\left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor} \left( \frac{n-i+1}{2} \right).
\]
In particular, for fixed \( k \) and \( n \) sufficiently large given \( k \) we have that
\[
\text{rdv}(k, n) < \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rfloor \frac{n^2}{2}.
\]

**Proof.** By Frankl–Pin, there exists a word \( w \) that takes \([n]\) to a set \( S \) of size \( n - \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \) of length at most
\[
\sum_{i=n-\left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor+1}^{n} \left( \frac{n-i+2}{2} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor} \left( \frac{i+1}{2} \right).
\]
By the pigeonhole principle, there are at least \( n - 2 \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \) points in \( S \) with exactly one point in their preimage under \( w \). Take \( T \) to be \( n-k \) such points and let \( R = S \setminus T \). We have \( |R| = \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor \) and \( |w^{-1}(R)| = n - |w^{-1}(T)| = n - |T| = k \).

By Frankl–Pin again, we can find a word \( w' \) that takes \( R \) to a singleton of length at most
\[
\sum_{i=2}^{\left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor} \left( \frac{n-i+2}{2} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor} \left( \frac{n-i+1}{2} \right).
\]
Concatenating \( w'w \) gives the required word. \( \square \)

We can also obtain an improved rendezvous bound for \( k = 3, 4 \) and \( 5 \). The triple rendezvous time \( \text{rdv}(3, n) \) was studied in particular by Gonze and Jungers [GJ16].

**Theorem 4.** For all \( n \geq 3 \), we have \( \text{rdv}(3, n) \leq \frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{4} n^2 + \frac{3}{2} n \).

Note that \( \frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{4} \approx 0.19098 \), so this does significantly better than the \( 1 + \left( \frac{n}{2} \right) \) given by Frankl–Pin, as well as the \( \frac{n^2}{4} \) claimed by Gonze and Jungers. The proof introduces ideas that will be further built on to improve the bounds for \( \text{rdv}(4, n) \) and \( \text{rdv}(5, n) \).
Proof. First, note that if \( n = 3 \) then the triple rendezvous time is at most 4 and the result is trivially true. Thus we may assume that \( n \geq 4 \).

The rank of a word \( w \) is the number of points in the image \( \text{Im} w = w([n]) \). Let \( r \) be the minimum rank over all words of length at most \( n \). Note that by Frankl–Pin there is a word of length \( 4 = \left( \frac{n}{2} \right) + \left( \frac{n}{2} \right) \) that takes \([n]\) to a set of size \( n - 2 \). Since \( n \geq 4 \) we thus have that \( r \leq n - 2 \).

Let \( w \) be a word of length \( \leq n \) of minimal rank \( r \). If \( r < \frac{n}{2} \) then by the pigeonhole principle there must be some triple sent to a singleton by \( w \) and so we have triple rendezvous time at most \( n \). We may therefore assume that \( r \geq \frac{n}{2} \geq 2 \).

Claim 4.1. There exists a word of length \( \leq n + \left( \frac{r + 2}{2} \right) \) that takes some triple to a singleton.

Proof of Claim. Let \( w \) be a word of length \( \leq n \) of minimal rank \( r \). If there is some triple which \( w \) sends to a singleton then we are done, so we can assume that \( w \) sends at most two points to the same point.

Let \( S = \{ x : \exists y \neq z \text{ with } w(y) = w(z) = x \} \) be the set of points with two pre-images under \( w \). Let \( T = \text{Im} w - S \) be the set of all points with a unique pre-image under \( w \). We have that \( |S| + |T| = r \) and \( 2|S| + |T| = |w^{-1}([n])| = n \), from which we obtain \( |S| = n - r \).

By Frankl–Pin there exists a word \( w' \) of length \( \leq \frac{n - (n - r) + 2}{2} = \left( \frac{r + 2}{2} \right) \) such that \( |w'(S)| < |S| \). In particular, there exist \( x \neq y \) in \( S \) with \( w'(x) = w'(y) = z \). Take \( u, v \) with \( w(u) = w(v) = x \) and \( s, t \) with \( w(s) = w(t) = y \). The word \( w'w \) has length at most \( n + \left( \frac{r + 2}{2} \right) \) and \( w'w(\{u, v, s, t\}) = w'(\{x, y\}) = \{z\} \) so in this case \( w'w \) sends some 4-set to a single point.

Claim 4.2. There exists a word of length \( \leq n + \frac{(n-r)n}{2} \) that takes some triple to a singleton.

Proof of Claim. Let \( C \) be the minimal non-empty set such that \( f(C) \subseteq C \) for all transition functions \( f \). In particular, if \( w \) is any synchronizing word and \( x \) is the vertex with \( w([n]) = x \) then \( C = \{ y : \exists w' \text{ with } w'(x) = y \} \). Note that \( C \) is strongly connected, by which we mean that for any pair of points \( u, v \in C \) we can find a word that sends \( u \) to \( v \) and a word that sends \( v \) to \( u \). Let \( m = |C| \) and let \( E = \{(u, v) : u, v \in C, u \neq v\} \) be the set of pairs of points in \( C \).

We call an pair \( (u, v) \in E \) good if there exists a word \( w_{uv} \) of length \( \leq n \) with \( |w_{uv}^{-1}(\{u, v\})| \geq 3 \). We will count the number of good pairs, splitting into three cases depending on the value of \( m \).

First, suppose that \( m > n - r + 1 \). We can find a point \( z \in C \) and a transition function \( f \) with \( |f^{-1}(z)| \geq 2 \). Since \( C \) is strongly connected, for each \( v \in C \) there is some word \( w_v \) of length \( \leq m - 1 \) with \( w_v(z) = v \). In particular, \( (w_v f)^{-1}(v) \supseteq f^{-1}(z) \) where \( w_v f \) is a word of length \( \leq m \). For all \( a \in (\text{Im} (w_v f) - v) \cap C \) the pair \( (v, a) \) is good.

Since \( w_v f \) is a word of length \( \leq m \leq n \), the rank of \( w_v f \) is \( \geq r \) and so \( (\text{Im} (w_v f) - v) \cap C \geq r - 1 - (n - m) > 0 \). Every vertex in \( C \) is in at least \( m - 1 - n + r \) good pairs and so the number of good pairs is at least \( \frac{(m-1-n+r)m}{2} > 0 \).
The number of pairs in $E$ that are not good is at most $\binom{m}{2} - \frac{(m-1-n+r)m}{2} = \frac{(n-r)m}{2}$.

We conclude that there is some word $w$ of length at most $\frac{(n-r)m}{2}$ that sends some good pair $(u, v)$ to a singleton $x$, where the worst case scenario is having to pass through every not good pair in $C$ first.

By definition of good, we can find a word $w_{uv}$ of length $\leq n$ with $|w_{uv}^{-1}(\{u, v\})| \geq 3$.

Then $ww_{uv}$ is a word of length at most $n + \frac{(n-r)m}{2}$ where $(ww_{uv})^{-1}(x) \supseteq w_{uv}^{-1}(\{u, v\})$ has size at least 3. In particular, the claim holds when $m > n - r + 1$.

Now, suppose that $2 \leq m \leq n - r + 1 \leq n - 1$. There must be some $y \notin C$ and some transition function $f$ such that $f(y) \in C$. We have that $f(C \cup \{y\}) \subseteq C$ and so by the pigeonhole principle there is some $x$ in $C$ with two pre-images under $f$. If $x$ is the only point in $\text{Im } f \cap C$ then $f^{-1}(x) \supseteq C \cup \{y\}$ has size $m + 1 \geq 3$, and we get that $f$ takes a triple down to the single point $x$. Otherwise, there is another point $y$ in $\text{Im } f \cap C$.

We can find a word $w$ of length at most $\binom{m}{2}$ that takes $(x, y)$ to a singleton, where the worst case scenario is having to pass through every other pair in $C$. Now $wf$ is a word of length at most $1 + \binom{m}{2}$ that takes some triple to a singleton.

Finally, suppose $m = 1$, so $C = \{x\}$ for some point $x$. Note that $f(x) = x$ for all $f$. There is some point $y \neq x$ and some transition function $f$ such that $f(y) = x$. The rank of $f$ is at least $r$, so there is some point $z$ in $\text{Im } f - x$ and some word $w$ of length at most $n - r + 1$ with $w(z) = x$, where the worst case scenario is having to pass through every point in $[n] \setminus \text{Im } f$. Now $wf$ is a word of length at most $2 + n - r$ that takes some triple to the singleton $x$.

To summarise, we can find a word taking some triple to a singleton of the following length:

$$\begin{cases} m + \frac{(n-r)m}{2} & \text{if } m > n - r + 1 \\ 1 + \binom{m}{2} & \text{if } 2 \leq m \leq n - r + 1 \\ 2 + n - r & \text{if } m = 1 \end{cases}$$

each of which is at most $n + \frac{(n-r)n}{2}$ as required.

Combining the results of these two claims, we have that the triple rendezvous time is at most $\min \left\{ n + \binom{r+2}{2}, n + \frac{(n-r)n}{2} \right\}$. The former is increasing in $r$ while the latter is decreasing in $r$ and so to find the maximum we look for the $r$ where they are equal. This is when $(r + 2)(r + 1) = (n - r)n$, which occurs when $r = \frac{-3 + \sqrt{5n^2 + 6n + 1}}{2}$ (subject to $r \geq 0$).

Substituting this in gives that the triple rendezvous time is at most

$$n + \frac{3n + 3 - \sqrt{5n^2 + 6n + 1}}{4} n \leq n + \frac{3n + 3 - \sqrt{5}}{4} \left( n + \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \right) n$$

$$= n + \frac{((3 - \sqrt{5})n + 2)}{4} n$$

$$= 3 - \frac{\sqrt{5}}{4} n^2 + \frac{3}{2} n.$$
In a similar way we can improve the upper bounds on the 4-set and 5-set rendezvous times.

**Theorem 5.** For all \( n \geq 4 \), we have

\[
\text{rdv}(4, n) \leq \text{rdv}(3, n) + (2 - \sqrt{3})n^2 + 2n - 1 \leq \left( \frac{11 - \sqrt{3} - 4\sqrt{3}}{4} \right) n^2 + \frac{7}{2} n - 1.
\]

Note that \( \frac{11 - \sqrt{3} - 4\sqrt{3}}{4} \approx 0.4589 \), so this is again an improvement on the \( 4 + \binom{n}{2} \) given by Theorem 3.

**Theorem 6.** For all \( n \geq 5 \), we have

\[
\text{rdv}(5, n) \leq \text{rdv}(4, n) + \frac{4 - \sqrt{7}}{4} n^2 + \frac{3}{2} n - 1 \leq \left( \frac{15 - \sqrt{3} - 4\sqrt{3} - \sqrt{7}}{4} \right) n^2 + 5n - 2.
\]

Note that \( \frac{15 - \sqrt{3} - 4\sqrt{3} - \sqrt{7}}{4} \approx 0.7975 \), so this is again an improvement on the bound of \( 4 + \left( \binom{n}{2} + \binom{n}{3} \right) \) given by Theorem 3.

To prove both Theorems 5 and 6 we will need two lemmas. In the case \( k = 2 \) the lemmas correspond precisely to claims 4.1 and 4.2 in the proof of Theorem 4 and we prove each lemma in an analogous way.

**Lemma 7.** Fix \( 2 \leq k \leq n - 1 \) and \( l \geq 1 \). Let \( r \) be the minimal rank over all words of length \( \leq l \). Suppose that \( r \leq \frac{n-2\left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil}{\left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil} \geq 2 \). Then

\[
\text{rdv}(k + 1, n) \leq l + \left( \frac{n - s + 2}{2} \right).
\]

**Proof.** Let \( w \) be a word of length \( \leq l \) of minimal rank \( r \). If there is some \((k + 1)\)-set which \( w \) sends to a singleton then we are done, so we can assume that \( w \) sends at most \( k \) points to the same point.

Let \( S = \{ x : |w^{-1}(x)| \geq \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil \} \) be the set of points with at least \( \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil \) pre-images under \( w \). Let \( T = \text{Im} \ w - S \) be the set of points with \( \leq \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil \) pre-images under \( w \). We have that \( |S| + |T| = r \). We also have that \( n = |w^{-1}(m)| = |w^{-1}(S)| + |w^{-1}(T)| \leq k|S| + \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil |T| \). Putting these together, we have \( k|S| + \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil (r - |S|) \leq n \) and so \( |S| \geq \frac{n - \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil r}{\left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil} \geq 2 \).

By Frankl–Pin there exists a word \( w' \) of length \( \leq \binom{n-|S|+2}{2} \) such that \( |w'(S)| < |S| \). In particular, there exist \( x \neq y \) in \( S \) with \( w'(x) = w'(y) = z \). We have that \( |(w'w)^{-1}(z)| = |w^{-1}(x, y)| \geq 2 \left\lceil \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rceil \), so \( w'w \) sends some \((k + 1)\)-set to a single point.

The length of the word \( w'w \) is \( l + \binom{n-|S|+2}{2} \leq l + \binom{n-s+2}{2} \) where \( s = \frac{n - \left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil r}{\left\lceil \frac{k}{2} \right\rceil} \). \( \Box \)

**Lemma 8.** Fix \( n \geq 4 \) and \( k \leq n - 1 \). Let \( r \) be the minimal rank over all words of length \( \leq \text{rdv}(k, n) + n - 1 \). Then \( \text{rdv}(k+1, n) \leq \text{rdv}(k, n) + n - 1 + \left\lceil \frac{n-r}{2} \right\rceil \).
Proof. Let $C$ be the minimal non-empty set such that $f(C) \subseteq C$ for all transition functions $f$. Note that since $C$ is minimal it must be strongly connected. Let $m = |C|$ and let $E = \{(u, v) : u, v \in C, u \neq v\}$ be the set of pairs of points in $C$.

Let $\text{rdv}(k, n) = l$. We call an pair $(u, v) \in E$ good if there exists a word $w_{uv}$ of length $\leq l + n - 1$ with $|w_{uv}^{-1}(\{u, v\})| \geq k + 1$. We will count the number of good pairs, splitting into two cases depending on the value of $m$.

Case 1: $m > n - r + 1$.

There is a word $\omega$ of length $l = \text{rdv}(k, n)$ that sends some $k$-set to a singleton $x$. We can then find a word $\omega'$ of length at most $n - m$ that sends $x$ to a point $z \in C$. In particular, $(\omega'\omega)^{-1}(z) \geq k$ where $\omega'\omega$ is a word of length $\leq l + n - m$.

Since $C$ is strongly connected, for each $v \in C$ there is some word $\omega_v$ of length $\leq m - 1$ with $\omega_v(z) = v$. In particular, $(\omega_v\omega'\omega)^{-1}(v) \supseteq (\omega'\omega)^{-1}(z)$ where $\omega_v\omega'\omega$ is a word of length $\leq l + n - 1$. For all $a \in (\text{Im}(\omega_v\omega'\omega) - v) \cap C$ the pair $(v, a)$ is good.

Since $\omega_v\omega'\omega$ is a word of length $\leq l + n - 1$, the rank of $\omega_v\omega'\omega$ is $\geq r$ and so $(|\text{Im}(\omega_v\omega'\omega) - v) \cap C| \geq r - 1 - (n - m) > 0$. Every vertex in $C$ is in at least $m - 1 - n + r$ good pairs and so the number of good pairs is at least \[
\frac{(m - 1 - n + r)m}{2} > 0.
\]

The number of pairs in $E$ that are not good is at most \[
\frac{(m - 1 - n + r)m}{2} - \frac{(m - 1 - n + r)m}{2} = \frac{(n - r)m}{2}.
\]

We conclude that there is some word $w$ of length at most $\frac{(n - r)m}{2}$ that sends some good pair $(u, v)$ to a singleton $x$, where the worst case scenario is having to pass through every not good pair in $C$ first.

By definition of good, we can find a word $w_{uv}$ of length $\leq n$ with $|w_{uv}^{-1}(\{u, v\})| \geq k + 1$. Then $ww_{uv}$ is a word of length at most $l + n - 1 + \frac{(n - r)m}{2}$ where $(ww_{uv})^{-1}(x) \supseteq w_{uv}^{-1}(\{u, v\})$ has size at least $k + 1$. In particular, the claim holds when $m > n - r + 1$.

Case 2: $m \leq n - r + 1$.

We will show that there is a word of length $\leq l + 2(n - m) + \left(\begin{array}{c}m \\ 2\end{array}\right)$ that takes some $(k + 1)$-set to a singleton.

As before, we can find a point $z \in C$ and a word $w$ of length $\leq l + (n - m)$ with $|(w)^{-1}(z)| \geq k$. If $z$ is the only point in $\text{Im}(w)$ then $w$ is a synchronizing word sending $n \geq k + 1$ points down to a singleton.

So suppose $\text{Im}(w) - z$ is non-empty and take some $v \in \text{Im}(w), v \neq z$. We can find a word $w'$ of length $\leq n - m$ that takes $v$ to a vertex $y \in C$.

If $w'(z) = y$ then the word $w'w$ of length $\leq l + 2(n - m)$ has $|(w'w)^{-1}(y)| = |w^{-1}(z, v)| \geq k + 1$.

Else, $w'(z)$ are two distinct vertices in $C$ and we can find a word $w''$ of length at most $\left(\begin{array}{c}m \\ 2\end{array}\right)$ that takes $\{y, w'(z)\}$ to a singleton. Then $w''w'w$ is a word of length $\leq l + 2(n - m) + \left(\begin{array}{c}m \\ 2\end{array}\right)$ that has takes some $(k + 1)$-set to a singleton.

We have that there is a word of length $\leq l + 2(n - m) + \left(\begin{array}{c}m \\ 2\end{array}\right)$ taking some $(k + 1)$-set to a singleton. To prove that the bound as stated in the lemma holds, it suffices to show that the following quantity is positive.

\[
\left(n - 1 + \frac{(n - r)n}{2}\right) - \left(2(n - m) + \left(\begin{array}{c}m \\ 2\end{array}\right)\right) = \frac{n(n - r - 2) - m^2 + 5m - 2}{2}
\]
Note that by Frankl–Pin there is some word of length \( \leq \binom{2}{2} + \binom{3}{2} = 4 \) of rank \( n - 2 \). Since \( l + n - 1 \geq 4 \), this implies that \( r \leq n - 2 \), and so \( n - r - 2 \geq 0 \).

If \(-m^2 + 5m - 2 \geq 0\) then we are done, so in particular we are done if \( m \leq 4 \). If \( m \geq 5 \), then we have

\[
\frac{n(n-r-2) - m(m-5) - 2}{2} \geq \frac{(m+r-1)(m-3) - m^2 + 5m - 2}{2} = \frac{(m-3)r + m + 1}{2} \geq 0
\]

We use these lemmas to prove the Theorems.

Proof of Theorem \( \text{[3]} \) Fix \( n \geq 4 \). Let \( l = \text{rdv}(3,n) + n - 1 \) and let \( r \) be the minimal rank of a word of length at most \( l \).

Applying the \( k = 3 \) case of Lemmas \( \text{[7]} \) and \( \text{[8]} \) we get

\[
\text{rdv}(4,n) \leq \begin{cases} 
 l + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{n+r}{2} + 2 \right) \left( \frac{n+r}{2} + 1 \right) & \text{if } r \leq n-4 \\
 l + \frac{1}{2}(n-r)n & \text{for all } r
\end{cases}
\]

If \( r > n-4 \) then \( \frac{1}{2}(n-r)n < 2n \).

If \( r \leq n-4 \), the first bound is increasing with \( r \) (for \( r \geq 0 \)) and the second is decreasing with \( r \) so the maximum is obtained where the two are equal, that is when \( \left( \frac{n+r}{2} + 2 \right) \left( \frac{n+r}{2} + 1 \right) = (n-r)n \). Rearranging gives \( r^2 + 6(n+1)r - (3n^2 - 6n - 8) = 0 \). Solving for \( r \), we get that the maximum is obtained when

\[
r = -3(n+1) + \sqrt{12n^2 + 12n + 1}
\]

Thus we have that the maximum is

\[
\frac{(n-r)n}{2} = \left( \frac{4n + 3 - \sqrt{12n^2 + 12n + 1}}{2} \right) n 
\leq \left( 2n + \frac{3}{2} - \sqrt{3} \left( n + \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}} \right) \right) n
\]

\[= (2 - \sqrt{3})n^2 + n\]

Putting this together with the bound on \( \text{rdv}(3,n) \) from Theorem \( \text{[4]} \) we get the final bound

\[
\text{rdv}(4,n) \leq \left( \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{4} + 2 - \sqrt{3} \right) n^2 + \frac{7}{2}n - 1.
\]

\[\square\]
Proof of Theorem 6. Fix \( n \geq 5 \). Let \( l = \text{rdv}(4, n) + n - 1 \) and let \( r \) be the minimal rank of a word of length at most \( l \).

Applying the \( k = 4 \) case of Lemmas 7 and 8 we get

\[
\text{rdv}(5, n) \leq \begin{cases} 
    l + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{n+2r}{2} + 2 \right) \left( \frac{n+2r}{2} + 1 \right) & \text{if } r \leq \frac{n-4}{2} \\
    l + \frac{1}{2}(n - r)n & \text{for all } r
\end{cases}
\]

If \( r > \frac{n-4}{2} \) then \( \frac{1}{2}(n - r)n < \frac{1}{4}n^2 + n \).

If \( r \leq \frac{n-4}{2} \), the first bound is increasing with \( r \) (for \( r \geq 0 \)) and the second is decreasing with \( r \) so the maximum is obtained where the two are equal, that is when \( \left( \frac{n+2r}{2} + 2 \right) \left( \frac{n+2r}{2} + 1 \right) = (n-r)n \). Rearranging gives \( r^2 + (2n+3)r - \left( \frac{3}{4}n^2 - \frac{3}{2}n - 2 \right) = 0 \).

Solving for \( r \), we get that the maximum is obtained when

\[
r = \frac{-(2n + 3) + \sqrt{7n^2 + 6n + 1}}{2}
\]

Thus we have that the maximum is

\[
\frac{(n-r)n}{2} = \frac{\left( 4n + 3 - \sqrt{7n^2 + 6n + 1} \right) n}{4}
\]

\[
\leq \frac{\left( 4n + 3 - \sqrt{7} \left( n + \frac{1}{\sqrt{7}} \right) \right) n}{4}
\]

\[
= \frac{4 - \sqrt{7}}{4}n^2 + \frac{1}{2}n
\]

Putting this together with the bound on \( \text{rdv}(4, n) \) from Theorem 4 we get the final bound.

\[\square\]

It is clear that we could continue applying this method in the way we have here to obtain upper bounds on \( \text{rdv}(k, n) \) for larger \( k \). However, as it stands the method does not give an improvement on the bound \( \text{rdv}(k, n) < \left\lfloor \frac{k-1}{2} \right\rfloor \frac{n^2}{2} \) given by Theorem 3 for larger \( k \). We remain hopeful that the method could be improved upon to give results for larger \( k \). One approach might be to alter Lemma 7 to allow one to go directly from a result about \( \text{rdv}(k, n) \) to a result about \( \text{rdv}(k + c, n) \) for \( c \) larger than 1.

3 Non-synchronizing Automata with Large Rendezvous Time

We now turn to the second half of the paper, which concerns rendezvous times in non-synchronizing automata. We will prove a lower bound on \( \text{rdv}^*(k, n) \) via a construction of a suitable automaton. To introduce the main idea of the construction we give the simpler \( k = 3 \) case first.

**Theorem 9.** For \( n \) sufficiently large, \( \text{rdv}^*(3, n) > \frac{n^2}{8} \).
Proof. We will construct an automaton on \([n]\) where the minimal weight of a \(k\)-set is greater than \(n^2/8\).

Partition \([n]\) into \(A\) and \(X\), where \(|A| = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor\).

Label the vertices of \(A\) by \(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_{|A|}\) and label the vertices of \(X\) by \(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{|X|}\).

Take two functions \(f\) and \(g\) as follows, as shown in figure 3 where \(f\) is drawn in blue and \(g\) in red.

\[
\begin{align*}
  f(x_t) &= x_{(t+1 \mod |X|)} \\
  f(a_{|A|}) &= a_1 \\
  f(a_j) &= x_j \text{ for } j \neq |A| \\
  g(x_t) &= \begin{cases} 
    x_{t+1} & \text{if } 1 \leq t \leq |A| - 1 \\
    x_{t-|A|+1} & \text{if } t = |A| \\
    x_t & \text{otherwise} 
  \end{cases} \\
  g(a_j) &= a_{(j+1 \mod |A|)}
\end{align*}
\]

![Diagram](Figure%203.png)

Figure 3: An example of the automaton used in the proof of Theorem 9 for \(n = 21\), where \(f\) is drawn in blue and \(g\) in red.

Note that \(f\) and \(g\) restricted to \(X\) are permutations on \(X\) and so any set containing more than one vertex in \(X\) cannot be synchronized. Moreover, any set containing three vertices in \(A\) cannot be synchronized: the image of such a set under \(g\) still has three vertices in \(A\), and the image under \(f\) contains two vertices in \(X\).

It follows that a synchronizable triple must contain two vertices in \(A\) and one vertex in \(X\). Fix such a triple \(S\) and consider a word that synchronizes this set acting on it. We will obtain that the triple of minimal weight is in fact \(\{x_{|X|}, a_1, a_{|A|}\}\).
Note that for a shortest word from a triple to a singleton the first step must map a triple to a pair. In particular, the first map of the shortest word must be \( f \), as \( g \) is a permutation. The triple \( S \) must contain two points in \( A \), one of which must be \( a_{|A|} \) else applying \( f \) gives two points in \( X \). Let the other be \( a_t \), where \( 1 \leq t \leq |A| - 1 \). After applying \( f \), we have the points \( a_1 \) and \( x_t \), which must be the only point in \( X \).

Note that
\[
fg^{l-1}(a_1) = \begin{cases} 
    a_1 & \text{if } l \equiv 0 \pmod{|A|} \\
   x_{(t \mod |A|)} & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]
and for \( 1 \leq t \leq |A| - 1 \),
\[
fg^{l-1}(x_t) = \begin{cases} 
    x_{|A|+1} & \text{if } t + l - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{|A|} \\
   x_{(t+l \mod |A|)} & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

This means that applying \( fg^{l-1} \) gives two points in \( X \) for any \( l \neq 0 \pmod{|A|} \). Thus the next step must be to apply \( fg^{l-1} \) where \( l \) is some multiple of \(|A|\). This sends \( a_1 \) and \( x_t \) to themselves unless \( t = 1 \), in which case \( x_t \) is sent to \( x_{|A|+1} \).

To further reduce the size of the set, we must map \( x_{|A|+1} \) and \( a_1 \) to the same point. To do this, we must move the vertex in position \( x_{|A|+1} \) round through \( x_{|A|+2}, x_{|A|+3}, \ldots \) until we reach \( x_{|X|} \), without moving the second vertex that is currently in \( A \) into \( X \) as we do so.

Suppose we have just applied \( f \), and we now want to move \( x_s \) to \( x_{s+1} \) without adding any extra vertices into \( X \) (where \( s \) is some value not in \( \{|X|, 1, 2, 3, \ldots, |A|\} \)). Since we have just applied \( f \), the vertex in \( A \) must be at position \( a_1 \) (having just come from position \( a_{|A|} \)). We need to apply \( f \) to move \( x_s \), but we can only apply \( f \) when the vertex in \( A \) is at position \( a_{|A|} \) and so we must first apply \( g^{|A|-1} \) to move the vertex at \( a_1 \) to be at \( a_{|A|} \). Only then can we apply \( f \), and so the shortest word moving \( x_s \) to \( x_{s+1} \) is \( fg^{|A|-1} \).

Repeatedly applying this, we have that the shortest word squashing a triple to a singleton is \( f (fg^{|A|-1})^{(|X|-|A|+1)} fg^{|A|-1} f \) which has length
\[
1 + (|X| - |A|)|A| + 1 = \left( n - 2 \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor \right) \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor + 2 > \frac{n^2}{8}.
\]
\[\square\]

The general case extends the construction given in Theorem 9. We still have two transition functions and a set of states \( X \) on which both transition functions act as permutations, meaning that any synchronizable set has at most one vertex in \( X \). Rather than having a single gadget \( A \) we will need \( k - 2 \) gadgets \( A_0, A_1, A_{k-3} \), each with the same structure as \( A \) but of coprime sizes.

To synchronize a \( k \)-set we will need to apply a transition function \( f \) to move a vertex around \( X \). As before, we will not be able to apply \( f \) without first applying the other transition function \( g \) several times to move the vertex in in each \( A_i \) from \( a_1^{(i)} \) to \( a_0^{(i)} \). Because we chose the \( A_i \) to have coprime sizes, each such move will necessitate many applications of \( g \).
Theorem 10. Let $k \geq 3$. For $n$ sufficiently large, $\text{rdv}^*(k, n) \geq \frac{4}{3} \left( \frac{n}{3k} \right)^{k-1}$.

Proof. Fix the integer $k$. We will construct an automaton on $[n]$ where the minimal weight of a $k$-set is $\frac{4}{3} \left( \frac{n}{3k} \right)^{k-1}$.

Partition $[n]$ into $A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_{k-3}$ and $X$, where $\frac{n}{4k} \leq |A_i| \leq \frac{n}{3k}$ and $\gcd\{A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_{k-3}\} = 1$. This is possible for $n$ sufficiently large, for example by the prime number theorem.

Label the vertices in each $A_i$ by $a_1^{(i)}, a_2^{(i)}, a_3^{(i)}, \ldots$ and label the vertices of $X$ by $x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots$. Let $q = \left\lceil \frac{2n}{3k} \right\rceil$.

Take two functions $f$ and $g$ as follows, as shown in figure 4 where $f$ is drawn in blue and $g$ in red.

$$f(x_t) = x_{(t+1) \mod |X|}$$
$$f(a_j^{(i)}) = \begin{cases} a_1^{(i)} & \text{if } j = |A_i| \\ x_{iq+j} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$g(x_t) = \begin{cases} x_{t+1} & \text{if } iq + 1 \leq t \leq iq + |A_i| - 1 \text{ for some } i \\ x_{t-|A_i|+1} & \text{if } t = iq + |A_i| \text{ for some } i \\ x_t & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
$$g(a_j^{(i)}) = a_{(j+1) \mod |A_i|}^{(i)}$$

Note that $f$ and $g$ restricted to $X$ are permutations on $X$ and so any set containing more than one vertex in $X$ cannot be synchronized.

Moreover, any set containing three vertices in some $A_i$ cannot be synchronized: the image of such a set under $g$ still has three vertices in $A_i$, and the image under $f$ contains two vertices in $X$. Similarly, any set containing two vertices in $A_i$ and two vertices in $A_j$ for some distinct $i$ and $j$ also cannot be synchronized.

It follows that a synchronizable set of size $k$ must contain two vertices in some $A_i$, one vertex in every other $A_j$ and one vertex in $X$. Fix such a set $S$ and consider a word that synchronizes this set acting on it.

For a shortest word from a triple to a singleton the first step must map a triple to a pair and so the first map must be $f$. The set $S$ contains two points in $A_i$, one of which must be $a_1^{(i)}$; else applying $f$ gives two points in $X$. Let the other be $a_{t}^{(i)}$, where $1 \leq t \leq |A_i| - 1$. After applying $f$, we have the points $a_1^{(i)}$ and $x_{iq+t}$, which must be the only point in $X$.

Note that
$$fg^{l-1}(a_1^{(i)}) = \begin{cases} a_1^{(i)} & \text{if } l \equiv 0 \pmod{|A_i|} \\ x_{iq+(l \mod |A_i|)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
and
$$fg^{l-1}(x_{iq+t}) = \begin{cases} x_{iq+|A_i|+1} & \text{if } t + l - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{|A_i|} \\ x_{iq+(t+l \mod |A_i|)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$
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Since $1 \leq t \leq |A_i| - 1$ this means that applying $fg^{l-1}$ gives two points in $X$ for any $l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{|A_i|}$. Thus the next step must be to apply $fg^{l-1}$ where $l$ is some multiple of $|A_i|$. This sends $a_1^{(i)}$ and $x_{iq+t}$ to themselves unless $t = 1$, in which case $x_{iq+t}$ is sent to $x_{iq+|A_i|+1}$.

To further reduce the size of the set, we must map the vertex in $X$ and some vertex in some $A_j$ to the same point. To do this, we must move the vertex $x_{iq+|A_i|+1}$ in $X$ round to be in $\{x_{jq}, x_{jq+1}, \ldots, x_{jq+|A_j|-2}\}$, without adding extra vertices to $X$ as we do so.

Suppose we have just applied $f$, and we now want to move $x_s$ to $x_{s+1}$ without adding any extra vertices into $X$ (where $s$ is some value not in $\{x_{jq+1}, x_{jq+2}, \ldots, x_{jq+|A_j|-1}\}$ for any $j$). Since we have just applied $f$, the vertex in each $A_j$ must be at position $a_1^{(j)}$ (having just come from position $a_1^{(j)}$). We must apply $f$ to move $x_s$, but we can only apply $f$ when for each $A_j$, the vertex in $A_j$ is at position $a_1^{(j)}$. Thus we must use $g$ to move the vertex at $a_1^{(j)}$ to be at $a_1^{(j)}_{|A_j|}$ for each $j$.

The number of times $g$ is applied must be congruent to $-1$ modulo $|A_j|$ for all $j$. Since $|A_0|, |A_1|, \ldots, |A_{k-3}|$ are coprime, the smallest such number is $\prod_{j=0}^{k-3} |A_j| - 1$. This is followed by an application of $f$ and so it takes at least $\prod_{j=0}^{k-3} |A_j|$ steps to move $x_s$ to $x_{s+1}$.

Applying this repeatedly, we see that the length of a word taking the vertex in $X$ from $x_{iq+|A_i|+1}$ to some vertex of the form $\{x_{jq}, x_{jq+1}, \ldots, x_{jq+|A_j|-2}\}$ without introducing a
second vertex to $X$ must be at least
\[
(q - (|A_i| - 1)) \prod_{j=0}^{k-3} |A_j| \geq \left( \frac{2n}{3k} - \frac{n}{3k} \right) \left( \frac{n}{4k} \right)^{k-2} = \frac{4}{3} \left( \frac{n}{4k} \right)^{k-1}.
\]

Theorem 10 together with the observation that a minimal length path from some $k$-set to a singleton passes through each set of size $< k$ at most once, tells us that $\text{rdv}^*(k, n) = \Theta \left( \frac{n^{k-1}}{k} \right)$ for fixed $k$. Since $\text{RDV}^*(k, n) \geq \text{rdv}^*(k, n) - 1$ we have an immediate consequence that $\text{RDV}^*(k, n) = \Theta \left( \frac{n^{k-1}}{k} \right)$.

These results are, perhaps surprisingly, very different from the situation for synchronizing automata. One thing we learn therefore is that any bound on the $k$-set rendezvous time $\text{rdv}(k, n)$ must use the fact that the automata are synchronizing as a crucial part. In particular, this impacts any attempt at a proof or improved bound for Černý’s conjecture that relies on bounding the $k$-set rendezvous time — such a proof must use somewhere that all pairs (and all sets) are synchronizable.

4 Open Questions

As mentioned at the end of Section 2, it may be possible that the tools used to prove Theorems 4, 5 and 6 could be extended further and combined with new ideas to give improved upper bounds on $\text{rdv}(k, n)$ for $k > 3$. To do so, one would have to strengthen Lemma 7 and/or Lemma 8.

We believe something stronger may be true, at least for $k = 3$. Theorem 4 says that the triple rendezvous time $\text{rdv}(3, n) \leq \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{4} n^2$. However, the best known lower bound to $\text{rdv}(3, n)$ is $n + 3$, due to Gonze and Jungers [GJ16]. Given the lack of any examples to the contrary, we conjecture that the triple rendezvous time is in fact linear in $n$.

Conjecture 6. There exists some constant $c$ such that $\text{rdv}(3, n) \leq cn$ for all $n$.

Any techniques involved in the proof of Conjecture 6 may well generalise to give improved bounds on the $k$-set rendezvous time $\text{rdv}(k, n)$ and potentially $\text{rdv}(n, n)$, the Černý bound itself.

We can also ask about improved bounds on $\text{RDV}(3, n)$, which is known to be between $\frac{5}{2} n^2 + O(n)$ and $n^2 + O(n)$.

Question 7. Is there some constant $c < 1$ such that $\text{RDV}(3, n) \leq cn^2 + O(n)$?

A positive answer to this question would give an improvement to to the Frankl–Pin bound for the length of a shortest reset word from $\frac{n^3}{6}$ to $c'n^3$ for some constant $c' < \frac{1}{6}$. The reason for this is that for $k \geq 3$ we would have from any $k$-set there is a path to a $(k - 2)$-set of length $\leq cn^2$. This is an improvement on the Frankl–Pin bound $\left( \frac{n}{2} + k + 2 \right) + \left( \frac{n}{2} + k + 3 \right)$ for $k < (1 - \sqrt{c})n$, that is, a linear proportion of all $k$.

There is nothing special about triples here: an improved upper bound on $\text{RDV}(k, n)$ for any fixed $k$ would give an improvement on the Frankl–Pin bound in a similar way.
We also don’t have to be restricted to paths from $k$-sets to singletons — one can ask the same questions about the shortest path from a $k$-set to an $l$-set for any $k > l$ and draw similar conclusions from any improved bounds.

Theorem 10 shows that for fixed $k$ we have $\operatorname{rdv}^*(k, n) = \Theta \left( n^{k-1} \right)$. A natural question to ask is what are the correct asymptotics for $\operatorname{rdv}^*(k, n)$? In the case $k = 3$ we have $\frac{n^2}{8} \leq \operatorname{rdv}^*(k, n) \leq \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{n}{2} - 1$.

**Question 8.** Is there an automaton which attains $\operatorname{rdv}^*(3, n) = \left( \frac{1}{2} + o(1) \right)n^2$?

An upper bound on the minimum weight of a triple $\operatorname{rdv}^*(3, n)$ is the total number of synchronizable pairs plus one. To get a minimum weight triple of weight $\left( \frac{1}{2} + o(1) \right)n^2$ we would need the automaton to be almost synchronizing in the sense that all but an arbitrarily small proportion of pairs are synchronizable.

Consider the construction given in the proof of Theorem 9. We know that a pair of vertices both in $X$ is not synchronizable. In fact, it is straightforward to check that only pairs of the following forms are synchronizable:

- $\{a_i, x_s\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, |A|\}$ and $s \not\in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, |A|\}$,
- $\{a_i, x_i\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, |A|\}$,
- $\{a_1, x_{|A|}\}$ and $(a_i, x_{i-1})$ for $i \in \{2, 3, \ldots, |A|\}$, and
- $\{a_i, a_{(i+1) \mod |A|}\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, |A|\}$.

In particular, the automaton has $|A|(|X| - |A|) + 3|A| = \frac{n^2}{8} + O(n)$ synchronizable pairs. We have that number of synchronizable pairs and the minimum weight of a triple are asymptotically equal in this example. Is it possible to construct an automaton with this same property where a larger proportion of pairs are synchronizable?
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