

On the study of cellular automata on modulo-recurrent words

Moussa Barro

Département de Mathématiques, UFR-SEA

Université Nazi BONI

Bobo-Dioulasso, Burkina Faso

mous.barro@yahoo.com

01 BP 1091 Bobo-Dioulasso

K. Ernest Bognini

Centre Universitaire de Kaya (CU-Kaya)

Université Joseph KI-ZERBO

Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

ernestk.bognini@yahoo.fr

03 BP 7021 Ouagadougou

Boucaré Kientéga

Institut Universitaire Professionnnalisant, IUP

Université de Dédougou, Burkina Faso

kientega.boucare@gmail.com

BP 176 Dédougou

Abstract

In this paper, we study some class of cellular automata (CA) preserving modulo-recursive, stability by reflection and richness called stable cellular automata (SCA). After applying these automata on Sturmian words, we establish some combinatorial properties of these new words. Next, the classical and palindromic complexity functions of these words are also determined. Finally, we show that these words are 2-balanced and we establish their abelian complexity function.

Keywords: cellular automata (CA), modulo-recursive, Sturmian words, palindrome, complexity function.

2020 Mathematics Subject Clasification: 37B15, 68Q80, 68R15, 11B85

1 Introduction

A cellular automaton is a series of cells evolving into a precise set of rules, resulting in a new generation of cells. These automata were introduced in [19] with objective to realize some dynamic systems capable to model complex self-reproduction phenomena. Later, in the 1970s, the concept was popularized by the work of John Horton Conway with his famous *game of life* on two-dimensional cellular automata (CA). Thus, CA have become a multidisciplinary field of study going from physics to computer science and from biology to mathematics.

Modulo-recurrent words are recurrent words in which any factor appears in all positions modulo its length. For instance, we have Sturmian words and Champernowne word. They were introduced in [16] and intensively studied in [4, 9, 15].

A palindrome is a word which is the same when read left to right or from right to left. The study of palindromes in combinatorics on words allows the characterization of some infinite words (see [2, 11, 14]).

Given a finite or infinite word, the complexity function p of this word is the number of distinct factors of given length in this later. Their study allows to characterize some families

of infinite words [1]. This notion also allowed to establish many characterizations and various properties on Sturmian words (see [5, 6, 12, 13, 17, 18]). Depending on the specificity of the factors included in the word (finite or infinite), we distinguish several types of complexity functions: palindromic, abelian, etc. The palindromic complexity function computes the number of distinct palindromic factors of certain length in this word. As for the abelian complexity function, it counts the number of Parikh vectors for each given length in this word. It was intensively studied in [3, 4]. All these two notions allow us to characterize Sturmian words [10].

In this work, we study combinatorial properties of infinite words obtained by application of CA. It is organized as follows. After giving some definitions and notation, we recall some properties of Sturmian and modulo-recurrent words in Section 2. Next, we apply CA to infinite words and show that these automata preserve some properties such that modulo-recursive, periodicity in Section 3. In Section 4, we define a class of CA called stable cellular automata (SCA) and we establish that they preserve stability by reflection and richness. Lastly, we discuss the combinatorial study of words obtained by applying these SCA on Sturmian words in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Definitions and notation

An alphabet \mathcal{A} , is a finite set whose elements are called letters. A word is a finite or infinite sequence of elements over \mathcal{A} . We denote by \mathcal{A}^* , the set of finite words over \mathcal{A} and ε the empty word. For all $u \in \mathcal{A}^*$, $|u|$ denotes the length of u and $|u|_x$ for all x over \mathcal{A} , the number of occurrence of x in u . A word u of length n constituted by a single letter x is simply denoted $u = x^n$; by convention $x^0 = \varepsilon$. Let $u = u_1u_2 \cdots u_n$ be a finite word with $u_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. The word $\bar{u} = u_n \cdots u_2u_1$ is called the reflection of u . Given two finite words u and v then, we have $\overline{uv} = \bar{v} \bar{u}$. The word u is called palindrome if $\bar{u} = u$.

We denote by \mathcal{A}^ω (respectively, $\mathcal{A}^\infty = \mathcal{A}^* \cup \mathcal{A}^\omega$), the set of infinite (respectively, finite and infinite) words. An infinite word \mathbf{u} is ultimately periodic if there are two words $v \in \mathcal{A}^*$ and $w \in \mathcal{A}^+$ such that $\mathbf{u} = vw^\omega$. The word \mathbf{u} is said recurrent if each of its factors appears an infinitely. If moreover $v = \varepsilon$ then \mathbf{u} is said periodic. The n -th power for some finite word w is denoted by w^n .

Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^\infty$ and $v \in \mathcal{A}^*$. We say that v is a factor of \mathbf{u} if there exists $u_1 \in \mathcal{A}^*$ and $\mathbf{u}_2 \in \mathcal{A}^\infty$ such that $\mathbf{u} = u_1v\mathbf{u}_2$. In other words, we say that \mathbf{u} contains v . We also say that u_1 is a prefix of \mathbf{u} and we note $u_1 = \text{Pref}_{|u_1|}(\mathbf{u})$. If in particular $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^*$ then \mathbf{u}_2 is said suffix of \mathbf{u} .

Let w be a factor of an infinite word \mathbf{u} and x a letter over \mathcal{A} . Then, $L_n(\mathbf{u})$ denotes the set of factors of length n of \mathbf{u} and $L(\mathbf{u})$ that of all factors of \mathbf{u} . The letter x is said to be a left (respectively, right) extension of w if xw (respectively, wx) belongs to $L(\mathbf{u})$. Let us denote by ∂^-w (respectively, ∂^+w) the number of left (respectively, right) extension of w in \mathbf{u} . When $\partial^+w = k$ with $k \geq 2$, w is said to be right k -prolongeable. In the same way, we can define the notion of left k -prolongeable factor. A factor w of \mathbf{u} is said to be right (respectively, left) special if $\partial^+w > 1$ (respectively, $\partial^-w > 1$). Any factor that is both right and left special is called a bispecial factor.

Given an infinite word \mathbf{u} . Then the map of \mathbb{N} into \mathbb{N}^* defined by $p_{\mathbf{u}}(n) = \#L_n(\mathbf{u})$, is called complexity function of \mathbf{u} , where $\#L_n(\mathbf{u})$ denotes the cardinal of $L_n(\mathbf{u})$. This function is related

to the special factors by the relation (see [8]):

$$p_{\mathbf{u}}(n+1) - p_{\mathbf{u}}(n) = \sum_{w \in L_n(\mathbf{u})} (\partial^+(w) - 1).$$

We denote by $\text{Pal}_n(\mathbf{u})$, the set of palindromic factors of length n and by $\text{Pal}(\mathbf{u})$, the set of all palindromic factors in \mathbf{u} . The palindromic complexity function of \mathbf{u} , noted $p_{\mathbf{u}}^{al}$, is the map of \mathbb{N} into \mathbb{N} which counts the number of distinct palindromic factors of length n contained in \mathbf{u} :

$$p_{\mathbf{u}}^{al}(n) = \# \{w \in L_n(\mathbf{u}) : \bar{w} = w\}.$$

When for all $w \in L(\mathbf{u})$, we have $\bar{w} \in L(\mathbf{u})$. Then, \mathbf{u} is said stable by reflection.

Let w be a factor of an infinite word \mathbf{u} over an alphabet $\mathcal{A}_q = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q\}$. Then, the q -uplet $\chi(w) = (|w|_{a_1}, |w|_{a_2}, \dots, |w|_{a_q})$ is called the Parikh vector of w . The set of Parikh vectors of factor of length n in \mathbf{u} is denoted by:

$$\chi_n(\mathbf{u}) = \{\chi(w) : w \in L_n(\mathbf{u})\}.$$

The abelian complexity function of \mathbf{u} , is the map defined of \mathbb{N} into \mathbb{N}^* by:

$$\rho_{\mathbf{u}}^{ab}(n) = \#\chi_n(\mathbf{u}).$$

The window complexity function of \mathbf{u} is the map, $p_{\mathbf{u}}^f$ of \mathbb{N} into \mathbb{N}^* , defined by

$$p_{\mathbf{u}}^f(n) = \#\{u_{kn}u_{kn+1} \cdots u_{n(k+1)-1} : k \geq 0\}.$$

The shift S , is the application S on \mathcal{A}^ω which erases the first letter of some given word. For instance $S(\mathbf{u}) = u_1u_2u_3 \cdots$. A substitution φ is a map of \mathcal{A}^* into itself such that $\varphi(uv) = \varphi(u)\varphi(v)$, for any $u, v \in \mathcal{A}^*$.

2.2 Sturmian words and modulo-recurrent words

In this subsection, we recall some properties of Sturmian words and modulo-recurrent words that will be used in the following. In this part, the alphabet is $\mathcal{A}_2 = \{a, b\}$.

Definition 2.1. An infinite word \mathbf{u} over \mathcal{A}_2 is said to be Sturmian if for any integer n , $p_{\mathbf{u}}(n) = n + 1$.

The well-known Sturmian word is the famous Fibonacci word. It is the fixed point of the substitution φ defined over \mathcal{A}_2^* by:

$$\varphi(a) = ab \text{ and } \varphi(b) = a.$$

It is noted:

$$\mathbf{F} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \varphi^n(a).$$

Definition 2.2. A Sturmian word is said to be a -Sturmian (respectively, b -Sturmian) when it contains a^2 (respectively, b^2).

Definition 2.3. A word $\mathbf{u} = u_0u_1u_2 \cdots$ is said to be modulo-recurrent if any factor of \mathbf{u} appears in all positions modulo i , $i \geq 1$.

Definition 2.4. Let w be a factor of some infinite word \mathbf{u} . We say that w is a window factor when it appears in \mathbf{u} at a multiple position its length.

Proposition 2.1. [9] *Let \mathbf{u} be a modulo-recurrent word. Then, for all integers n , the set of window factors of length n in \mathbf{u} is equal to $L_n(\mathbf{u})$.*

Definition 2.5. An infinite word \mathbf{u} is said to be α -balanced if α is the smallest integer such that for any pair (v, w) of factors in \mathbf{u} of the same length and for all letter x over \mathcal{A} , we have:

$$||v|_x - |w|_x| \leq \alpha.$$

If $\alpha = 1$, then \mathbf{u} is said simply balanced.

The following theorem gives us some classical characterization of Sturmian words.

Theorem 2.1. [10, 11] *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite binary word. Then, the following assertions are equivalent:*

1. \mathbf{u} is Sturmian.
2. \mathbf{u} is non-ultimately periodic and balanced.
3. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\rho_{\mathbf{u}}^{ab}(n) = 2$.
4. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$p_{\mathbf{u}}^{al}(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 2.2. [18] *Let \mathbf{v} be an a -sturmian word over \mathcal{A}_2 . Then, there exists a sturmian sequence $(\epsilon_i)_{i \geq 1}$ over the alphabet $\{0, 1\}$ and integer l such that \mathbf{v} is written: $\mathbf{v} = a^{l_0}ba^{l+\epsilon_1}ba^{l+\epsilon_2}ba^{l+\epsilon_3}b \dots$ avec $l_0 \leq l + 1$.*

It is proved in [15] that Sturmian words are modulo-recurrent.

Theorem 2.3. [9] *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite recurrent word. Then, the following assertions are equivalent:*

1. \mathbf{u} is a modulo-recurrent word.
2. For all integers $n \geq 1$, $p_{\mathbf{u}}^f(n) = p_{\mathbf{u}}(n)$.

3 Cellular automata (CA)

In this section, we define a class of CA that we apply to infinite words. In all the rest of this paper, $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^\infty$ and F is a CA defined over \mathcal{A}^r .

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} be two alphabets, $r \geq 1$ and $f : \mathcal{A}^r \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, $w_i \mapsto x_i$ a morphism. We call CA, any map $F : \mathcal{A}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^*$ verifying:

$$\begin{cases} F(w) = \varepsilon & \text{if } |w| < r \\ F(xyz) = f(xy)F(yz) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{A}, |y| = r - 1, z \in \mathcal{A}^\infty. \end{cases}$$

From this definition, we have the following remarks:

Remark 3.1. 1. *The map F is a surjection.*

2. *For all finite word w , we have $|F(w)| = |w| - r + 1$ if $|w| \geq r$.*

3. *If $r = 1$ then F is a projection.*

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}^\infty$ and F be a CA. Then, we have:*

1. *If $u_1 \in L(\mathbf{u})$ then $F(u_1) \in L(F(\mathbf{u}))$.*

2. *If $L(\mathbf{u}) \subset L(\mathbf{v})$ then $L(F(\mathbf{u})) \subset L(F(\mathbf{v}))$.*

3. *$L(F(\mathbf{u})) = F(L(\mathbf{u}))$.*

Theorem 3.1. *For any infinite word \mathbf{u} , we have $p_{F(\mathbf{u})}(n) \leq p_{\mathbf{u}}(n + r - 1)$. Moreover if, F is an injection. Then, $p_{F(\mathbf{u})}(n) = p_{\mathbf{u}}(n + r - 1)$.*

Proof:

• By Remark 3.1, any factor of $F(\mathbf{u})$ of length n comes from some factor of \mathbf{u} of length $n + r - 1$. Moreover, as F is surjective, we have $\#L_n(F(\mathbf{u})) \leq \#L_{n+r-1}(\mathbf{u})$. Hence, $p_{F(\mathbf{u})}(n) \leq p_{\mathbf{u}}(n + r - 1)$.

• Now suppose that F is injective. Then each factor of $F(\mathbf{u})$ of length n comes from only one factor of \mathbf{u} of length $n + r - 1$. Thus, we obtain $\#L_n(F(\mathbf{u})) \geq \#L_{n+r-1}(\mathbf{u})$. Hence, $p_{F(\mathbf{u})}(n) = p_{\mathbf{u}}(n + r - 1)$. \square

Theorem 3.2. *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite word. Then, $F(\mathbf{u})$ is modulo-recurrent if and only if \mathbf{u} is modulo-recurrent.*

Proof: Suppose that \mathbf{u} is modulo-recurrent. Let $w \in L(F(\mathbf{u}))$. As F is surjective, there exists $u_1 \in L(\mathbf{u})$ such that $w = F(u_1)$. In addition, the factors u_1 and $F(u_1)$ appear in the same positions respectively in the words \mathbf{u} and $F(\mathbf{u})$. Furthermore, u_1 appears in all positions $\text{mod } |u_1|$ in \mathbf{u} . Hence, $F(u_1)$ appears also in all positions $\text{mod } |u_1|$ in $F(\mathbf{u})$. Since $|F(u_1)| \leq |u_1|$ then $F(u_1)$ appears in all positions $\text{mod } |F(u_1)|$ in $F(\mathbf{u})$. Therefore, $F(\mathbf{u})$ is modulo-recurrent.

Conversely suppose that $F(\mathbf{u})$ is modulo-recurrent. Let $u_1 \in L_{n+r-1}(\mathbf{u})$, then by Proposition 3.1, we have $F(u_1) \in L_n(F(\mathbf{u}))$. The word $F(\mathbf{u})$ being modulo-recurrent, then the factor $F(u_1)$ appears in all positions modulo n in $F(\mathbf{u})$. As u_1 and $F(u_1)$ are respectively at the same position in \mathbf{u} and $F(\mathbf{u})$, then u_1 appears in all positions modulo n in \mathbf{u} . It remains to show that u_1 appears at positions $i \text{ mod } (n + r - 1)$ with $i \in \{n + 1, \dots, n + r - 1\}$. Since $F(\mathbf{u})$ is in particular recurrent then there exists a factor $\delta \in L_{r-1}(F(\mathbf{u}))$ such that $F(u_1)\delta \in L_{n+r-1}(F(\mathbf{u}))$. Furthermore, u_1 and $F(u_1)\delta$ appear at respectively the same position in \mathbf{u} and $F(\mathbf{u})$. Since $F(\mathbf{u})$ is modulo-recurrent, so \mathbf{u} is modulo-recurrent. \square

Lemma 3.1. *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite word. Then the following assertions hold.*

1. *If \mathbf{u} is periodic then $F(\mathbf{u})$ is periodic.*

2. *If F is bijective and $F(\mathbf{u})$ periodic then \mathbf{u} is periodic.*

Proof:

1. Suppose that \mathbf{u} is periodic. Then, there exists a finite word u_1 such that $\mathbf{u} = u_1^\omega$. As a result,

$$\mathbf{u} = u_1^\omega \implies F(\mathbf{u}) = v_1^\omega,$$

where $v_1 = F(\text{Pref}_{|u_1|+r-1}(\mathbf{u})) = \text{Pref}_{|u_1|}(F(\mathbf{u}))$. Consequently, $F(\mathbf{u})$ is periodic.

2. Suppose that $F(\mathbf{u})$ is periodic. Then, there exists a factor v_1 in $F(\mathbf{u})$ such that $F(\mathbf{u}) = v_1^\omega$. Since F is bijective, so there exists a unique factor $w \in L_{|v_1|+r-1}$ such that $F(w) = v_1$. By putting $u_1 = \text{Pref}_{|v_1|}(w)$ then we get $\mathbf{u} = u_1^\omega$. Hence, \mathbf{u} is periodic. □

Remark 3.2. *If \mathbf{u} and $F(\mathbf{u})$ are two periodic words. Then, they have the same period.*

Theorem 3.3. *Let \mathbf{u} be a recurrent word and F a CA such that:*

$$\begin{cases} F(x_1y_1) = F(x_2y_2) & \text{if } x_1 = x_2 \\ F(x_1y_1) \neq F(x_2y_2) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{A}^{r-1}$. Then, $F(\mathbf{u})$ is balanced if and only if \mathbf{u} is balanced.

Proof: Suppose that \mathbf{u} is balanced and $F(\mathbf{u})$ is non-balanced. The word $F(\mathbf{u})$ being non-balanced, there exists a factor $v_1 \in L(F(\mathbf{u}))$ such that $x_1v_1x_1, x_2v_1x_2 \in L(F(\mathbf{u}))$. Since F is surjective, there are two factors $u_1, u_2 \in L(\mathbf{u})$ such that $x_1v_1x_1 = F(u_1)$ and $x_2v_1x_2 = F(u_2)$. Thus, we can write $u_1 = au_1'a\delta_1$ and $u_2 = bu_1'b\delta_2$ with $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in L_{r-1}(\mathbf{u})$ and for some finite word u_1' . As a result, we have $au_1'a, bu_1'b \in L(\mathbf{u})$. We get a contradiction because \mathbf{u} is balanced.

Reciprocally suppose that $F(\mathbf{u})$ is balanced and \mathbf{u} non-balanced. As \mathbf{u} non-balanced, there exists a factor $u_1 \in L(\mathbf{u})$ such that $au_1a, bu_1b \in L_n(\mathbf{u})$, for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. In addition, there are $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in L_{r-1}(\mathbf{u})$ such that $au_1a\delta_1, bu_1b\delta_2 \in L_{n+r-1}(\mathbf{u})$. Furthermore, $F(au_1a\delta_1) = x_1v_1x_1$ and $F(bu_1b\delta_2) = x_2v_1x_2$ are some factors of $L(F(\mathbf{u}))$. This contradicts our hypothesis.

From all the above, we obtain the desired equivalence. □

Theorem 3.4. *Let \mathbf{u} be a recurrent word and F a CA such that:*

$$\begin{cases} F(x_1y_1) = F(x_2y_2) & \text{if } x_1 = x_2 \\ F(x_1y_1) \neq F(x_2y_2) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $y_1, y_2 \in \mathcal{A}^{r-1}$. Then, any right (respectively, left) special factor of $F(\mathbf{u})$ comes from a right (respectively, left) special factor of \mathbf{u} .

Proof: Let v_1 be a right special factor of $F(\mathbf{u})$. Then, we have $v_1x_1, v_1x_2 \in L(F(\mathbf{u}))$ with $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. Since F is surjective, there exists $u_1', \delta_1, \delta_2 \in L(\mathbf{u})$ such that $v_1x_1 = F(u_1'a\delta_1)$ and $v_1x_2 = F(u_1'b\delta_2)$ with $|\delta_1| = |\delta_2| = r - 1$. Hence, $u_1'a\delta_1, u_1'b\delta_2 \in L(\mathbf{u})$; i.e, $u_1'a, u_1'b \in L(\mathbf{u})$. Whence, u_1' is right special in \mathbf{u} .

Let v_1 be a left special factor of $F(\mathbf{u})$. Then, we have $x_1v_1, x_2v_1 \in L(F(\mathbf{u}))$ with $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{A}$. As F is surjective, so there exists $u_1' \in L(\mathbf{u})$ such that $x_1v_1 = F(au_1')$ and $x_2v_1 = F(bu_1')$ with $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence, $au_1', bu_1' \in L(\mathbf{u})$. Consequently, u_1' is left special in \mathbf{u} . □

Corollary 3.1. *Any bispecial factor of $F(\mathbf{u})$ comes from a bispecial factor of \mathbf{u} .*

4 Stable cellular automata(SCA)

In this section, we study some class of cellular automata that we call stable cellular automata (SCA).

Definition 4.1. A cellular automaton $F : \mathcal{A}^r \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is invariant if for any infinite word \mathbf{u} , we have $F(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$.

The following proposition gives us a characterization of an invariant cellular automaton.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $F : \mathcal{A}^r \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$, be a CA. Then, the following assertions are equivalent.*

1. F is invariant.
2. $F(xy) = x$, for all $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and $y \in \mathcal{A}^{r-1}$.

Proof: Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite word in the form $\mathbf{u} = x_0x_1x_2 \cdots$. Then,

$$F(\mathbf{u}) = F(x_0x_1 \cdots x_{r-1})F(x_1x_2 \cdots x_r)F(x_2x_3 \cdots x_{r+1}) \cdots$$

As a result, we have the following equivalent.

$$\begin{aligned} F \text{ is invariant} &\iff F(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u} \\ &\iff F(x_0x_1 \cdots x_{r-1})F(x_1x_2 \cdots x_r)F(x_2x_3 \cdots x_{r+1}) \cdots = x_0x_1x_2x_3 \cdots \\ &\iff F(x_i x_{i+1} \cdots x_{i+r-1}) = x_i, \forall i \in \mathbb{N} \\ &\iff F(xy) = x, \forall x \in \mathcal{A}, y \in \mathcal{A}^{r-1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 4.1. *Let $F : \mathcal{A}_2^r \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_2$ be an invariant CA and E , the exchanges map defined over \mathcal{A}_2 . Then, $F \circ E = E \circ F$.*

Preuve: Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite word over \mathcal{A}_2 and $u_1 \in L(\mathbf{u})$. Then, we distinguish two cases:

Case 1: $|u_1| < r$. Then, we have $F(u_1) = \varepsilon$. As a result, $E(F(u_1)) = \varepsilon$. In addition, $|E(u_1)| < r$. Thus, $F(E(u_1)) = \varepsilon$. Hence, $F(E(u_1)) = \varepsilon = E(F(u_1))$.

Case 2: $|u_1| \geq r$. Let w be a factor of length r in u_1 . Then, without loss of generality, let us assume that the first letter of w is a . Thus, by Proposition 4.1, we have $F(E(w)) = b$. Furthermore, $F(w) = a$, i.e, $E(F(u_1)) = b$. As a result, we obtain $F(E(w)) = E(F(w))$. It follows that $F(E(u_1)) = E(F(u_1))$.

In all cases, $F \circ E = E \circ F$. □

Definition 4.2. Let F be a CA. Then, F is said stable if $F(\overline{w}) = F(w)$, for all $w \in \mathcal{A}^r$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite word and F a SCA. Then, for all $u_1 \in L(\mathbf{u})$, we have $F(\overline{u_1}) = \overline{F(u_1)}$.*

Proof: Let $u_1 \in L(\mathbf{u})$. Then, we distinguish two cases.

Case 1: $|u_1| < r$. Then, $F(u_1) = F(\overline{u_1}) = \varepsilon = \overline{F(u_1)}$.

Case 2: $|u_1| \geq r$. Then, we have $u_1 \in L_{n+r}(\mathbf{u})$ and $F(u_1) = F(w_0) \cdots F(w_n)$ where $w_i = \text{Pref}_r(S^i(u_1))$, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{F(u_1)} &= \overline{F(w_0)F(w_1) \cdots F(w_n)} \\ &= \overline{F(w_n)} \cdots \overline{F(w_1)} \overline{F(w_0)} \\ &= F(w_n) \cdots F(w_1)F(w_0), \text{ because } F(w_i) \in \mathcal{A}, \text{ for all } i \in \{0, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we have $F(\bar{u}_1) = F(\bar{w}_n) \cdots F(\bar{w}_1) F(\bar{w}_0)$. Since F is stable we have, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $F(w_i) = F(\bar{w}_i)$ with $w_i \in L_r(\mathbf{u})$. Thus, $F(\bar{u}_1) = F(w_n) \cdots F(w_1)F(w_0)$. Hence, $\overline{F(u_1)} = F(\bar{u}_1)$. \square

Theorem 4.1. *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite word and F a SCA. Then, $F(\mathbf{u})$ is stable by reflection if and only if u is.*

Proof: Suppose that \mathbf{u} is stable by reflection. Let $u_1 \in L_{n+r}(\mathbf{u})$. Then, by Proposition 3.1 we have $F(u_1) \in L_{n+1}(F(\mathbf{u}))$. By writing $F(u_1) = F(w_0)F(w_1) \cdots F(w_n)$ with $w_i = \text{Pref}_r(S^i(u_1))$, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$. Then, By Lemma 4.2, $\overline{F(u_1)} = F(\bar{u}_1)$. But, $F(\bar{u}_1) \in L(F(\mathbf{u}))$. Thus, $\overline{F(u_1)} \in L(F(\mathbf{u}))$. Hence, $F(\mathbf{u})$ is stable by reflection.

Conversely, suppose that $F(\mathbf{u})$ is stable by reflection. Let $v_1 \in L_{n+1}(F(\mathbf{u}))$ then, there exists $u_1 \in L_{n+r}(\mathbf{u})$ such that $v_1 = F(u_1)$. As a result, $F(u_1) \in L_{n+1}(F(\mathbf{u}))$ and $\overline{F(u_1)} \in L_{n+1}(F(\mathbf{u}))$ because F is stable. But, by Lemma 4.2, $\overline{F(u_1)} = F(\bar{u}_1)$, i.e, $F(\bar{u}_1) \in L(F(\mathbf{u}))$. Since F is surjective we have $\bar{u}_1 \in L(\mathbf{u})$. Hence, u is stable by reflection. \square

Corollary 4.1. *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite word stable by reflection and F an injective SCA. Then, any factor u_1 of \mathbf{u} is a palindromic factor if and only if $F(u_1)$ is.*

Proof: Suppose u_1 a palindromic factor of u . Then, By Lemma 4.2, we have $F(\bar{u}_1) = \overline{F(u_1)}$. In addition, $F(\bar{u}_1) = F(u_1)$. Hence, $\overline{F(u_1)} = F(u_1)$.

Reciprocally suppose that $\overline{F(u_1)} = F(u_1)$. As $F(\bar{u}_1) = \overline{F(u_1)}$, by Lemma 4.2 we get $F(\bar{u}_1) = F(u_1)$. From the injectivity of F , we deduce that $\bar{u}_1 = u_1$. \square

Corollary 4.2. *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite word stable by reflection and F an injective SCA. Then, for all integers n , we have:*

$$p_{F(\mathbf{u})}^{al}(n) = p_{\mathbf{u}}^{al}(n + r - 1).$$

Proof: Use Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 4.1. \square

Definition 4.3. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}^\infty$. We say that u is rich if any factor w of u , has exactly $|w| + 1$ distincts palindromes including the empty word.

The result below in [7] characterizes the rich words stable by reflection.

Theorem 4.2. *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite word such that the set of these factors is stable by reflection. Then, \mathbf{u} is rich if and only if for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$p_{\mathbf{u}}^{al}(n) + p_{\mathbf{u}}^{al}(n + 1) = p_{\mathbf{u}}(n + 1) - p_{\mathbf{u}}(n) + 2.$$

Theorem 4.3. *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite word stable by reflection and F an injective SCA. Then, $F(\mathbf{u})$ is rich if and only if \mathbf{u} is.*

Proof: As F is injective and stable, we have respectively by Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 4.2, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p_{F(\mathbf{u})}(n) = p_{\mathbf{u}}(n + r - 1)$ and $p_{F(\mathbf{u})}^{al}(n) = p_{\mathbf{u}}^{al}(n + r - 1)$. In addition, $p_{F(\mathbf{u})}(n + 1) - p_{F(\mathbf{u})}(n) = p_{\mathbf{u}}(n + r) - p_{\mathbf{u}}(n + r - 1)$. Moreover, \mathbf{u} being recurrent and reflection stable then, by Theorem 4.2, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u} \text{ riche} &\iff p_{\mathbf{u}}(n + r) - p_{\mathbf{u}}(n + r - 1) + 2 = p_{\mathbf{u}}^{al}(n + r) + p_{\mathbf{u}}^{al}(n + r - 1) \\ &= p_{F(\mathbf{u})}^{al}(n + 1) + p_{F(\mathbf{u})}^{al}(n), \text{ because } F \text{ is injective.} \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $p_{F(\mathbf{u})}(n + 1) - p_{F(\mathbf{u})}(n) + 2 = p_{F(\mathbf{u})}^{al}(n + 1) + p_{F(\mathbf{u})}^{al}(n)$, i.e, $F(\mathbf{u})$ is rich. \square

5 Cellular automata and sturmian words

In this section, we apply the CA to Sturmian words.

Definition 5.1. Let F be a CA. Then, F is said Sturmian if, for any sturmian word, the image by the map F is also Sturmian.

Moreover if, $F(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$ for any \mathbf{u} then, \mathbf{u} is said fixed point of F .

Example 5.1. Let us consider \mathbf{u} a Sturmian word over \mathcal{A}_2 . Then, for the CA defined by:

$$\begin{cases} \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{A}_2 \text{ and } |y| = r - 1 \\ H(xy) = x \\ G(xy) = E(x), \end{cases}$$

we have $H(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$ and $G(\mathbf{u}) = E(H(\mathbf{u})) = H(E(\mathbf{u})) = E(\mathbf{u})$ which are respectively fixed point and Sturmian.

Note that H and G are SCA.

5.1 Classical and window complexity

Let \mathbf{v} be a Sturmian word in the form $\mathbf{v} = a^{l_0}ba^{l+\epsilon_1}ba^{l+\epsilon_2}ba^{l+\epsilon_3}b \dots$ of Theorem 2.2.

Let us consider the SCA F defined over \mathcal{A}^{l+1} by:

$$F(w) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } w = a^{l+1} \\ b & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, we get:

$$F(\mathbf{v}) = \begin{cases} ab^{l_0+1}a^{\epsilon_1}b^{l+1}a^{\epsilon_2}b^{l+1}a^{\epsilon_3}b^{l+1}a^{\epsilon_4}b^{l+1} \dots & \text{if } l_0 = l + 1 \\ b^{l_0+1}a^{\epsilon_1}b^{l+1}a^{\epsilon_2}b^{l+1}a^{\epsilon_3}b^{l+1}a^{\epsilon_4}b^{l+1} \dots & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the following, we assume $n_0 = k_0(l + 1)$ where k_0 is the maximum power of $a^{l+\epsilon_i}b$ in \mathbf{v} . We study some combinatorial properties then classical and window complexity of the word $F(\mathbf{v})$ thus obtained.

Proposition 5.1. For all $n \geq 0$, $p_{F(\mathbf{v})}^f(n) = p_{F(\mathbf{v})}(n)$.

Proof: Since \mathbf{v} is modulo-recurrent, then it is the same for $F(\mathbf{v})$, by Theorem 3.2. Hence, $p_{F(\mathbf{v})}^f(n) = p_{F(\mathbf{v})}(n)$ by Theorem 2.3. \square

Lemma 5.1. Let v_1 be a factor of $F(\mathbf{v})$ such that $|v_1| > n_0$. Then, v_1 comes from a unique factor of \mathbf{v} .

Proof: Note that, any factor of $F(\mathbf{v})$ containing the letter a comes from only one factor of \mathbf{v} . Indeed, a has only one antecedent which is a^{l+1} . But, any factor of $F(\mathbf{v})$ of length strictly greater than n_0 contains at least one occurrence of a . Hence, it comes necessary of only one antecedent in \mathbf{v} . \square

Theorem 5.1. The classical complexity function of the word $F(\mathbf{v})$ is given by:

$$p_{F(\mathbf{v})}(n) = \begin{cases} n + 1 & \text{if } n \leq n_0 - l \\ 2n - n_0 + l + 1 & \text{if } n_0 - l < n \leq n_0 \\ n + l + 1 & \text{if } n > n_0. \end{cases}$$

Proof: Let us proceed by disjunction of cases according to the length n of the factors.

Case 1: $1 \leq n \leq n_0 - l$. Then, $L_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \{b^n, b^i ab^{n-i-1} \mid i = 0, \dots, n-1\}$. Therefore, $p_{F(\mathbf{v})}(n) = n + 1$, for all $n \leq n_0 - l$. Let us observe that for all $n \leq n_0 - l - 1$, b^n is the only right special factor of length n of $F(\mathbf{v})$. Similarly, the right special factor of length $n_0 - l$ in $F(\mathbf{v})$ are b^{n_0-l} and ab^{n_0-l-1} . Hence, we obtain the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{F(\mathbf{v})}(n_0 - l + 1) &= p_{F(\mathbf{v})}(n_0 - l) + 2 \\ &= (n_0 - l + 1) + 2 \\ &= n_0 - l + 3. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $n_0 - l + 1 \leq n \leq n_0$. Then:

$$L_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \left\{ b^n, b^i ab^{n-i-1}, b^j ab^{n_0-l-1} ab^{n-n_0+l-1-j} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1; 0 \leq j \leq n - n_0 + l - 1 \right\}.$$

As a result, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{F(\mathbf{v})}(n) &= 1 + n + (n - n_0 + l - 1 + 1) \\ &= 2n - n_0 + l + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Case 3: $n > n_0$. Then, any factor of $F(\mathbf{v})$ of length n comes from only one factor of length $n + r - 1$ in \mathbf{v} , by Lemma 5.1. By applying Theorem 3.1, we obtain the following equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} p_{F(\mathbf{v})}(n) &= p_{\mathbf{v}}(n + r - 1) \\ &= n + r \\ &= n + l + 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 5.1. 1. The complexity function $p_{F(\mathbf{v})}$ is continuous over \mathbb{N} .

2. The word $F(\mathbf{v})$ is a quasi-sturmian word.

3. The sets of return words for the letters a and b in $F(\mathbf{v})$ are respectively:

$$\{ab^{n_0-l-1}, ab^{n_0}\} \text{ and } \{b, ba\}.$$

5.2 Palindromic properties

In this subsection, we study the palindromic complexity function and the richness of $F(\mathbf{v})$.

Lemma 5.2. Any palindromic factor of length greater than n_0 of $F(\mathbf{v})$ comes from a palindromic factor of \mathbf{v} .

Proof: First, note that F satisfies the conditions of Theorem 4.1, i.e, $F(\mathbf{v})$ is stable by reflection. Let v_1 be a palindromic factor of $F(\mathbf{v})$ such that $|v_1| > n_0$. Then, by Lemma 5.1, v_1 comes from only one factor u_1 of \mathbf{v} . Thus, by Corollary 3.1, we deduce that u_1 is a palindrome. □

Theorem 5.2. The palindromic complexity function of the word $F(\mathbf{v})$ is given by:

1. If $n \leq n_0 - l$,

$$p_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{al}(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2. If $n_0 - l < n \leq n_0$,

- for n_0 even, we have: $p_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{al}(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } l \text{ and } n \text{ are even} \\ 2 & \text{if } l \text{ is odd} \\ 3 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$
- for n_0 odd, we have: $p_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{al}(n) = 2$.

3. If $n > n_0$,

$$p_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{al}(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n + l \text{ is even} \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof:

1. If $n \leq n_0 - l$, then we have:

$$L_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \{b^n, b^i ab^{n-i-1} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1\}.$$

Hence, the word $b^i ab^{n-i-1}$ is a palindromic factor of length n if and only if $i = n - i - 1$, i.e, $n = 2i + 1$. As a result, we obtain:

$$\text{Pal}_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \begin{cases} \{b^n\} & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ \{b^n; b^{\frac{n-1}{2}} ab^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2. If $n_0 - l < n \leq n_0$ then:

$$L_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \{b^n, b^i ab^{n-i-1}, b^j ab^{n_0-l-1} ab^{n-n_0+l-1-j} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1; 0 \leq j \leq n - n_0 + l - 1\}.$$

Hence, the word $b^j ab^{l+1} ab^{n-n_0+l-1-j}$ is a palindromic factor of length n of $F(\mathbf{v})$ if and only if $j = n - n_0 + l - 1 - j$. It follows that, $n + l = 2j + n_0 + 1$. Thus, let us now reason according to the parity of n_0 to ensure that the word $b^j ab^{l+1} ab^{n-n_0+l-1-j}$ be a palindromic factor of $F(\mathbf{v})$:

- for n_0 even, as $n + l = 2j + n_0 + 1$, we deduce that l and n are different parities. As a consequence, we obtain:

$$\text{Pal}_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \begin{cases} \{b^n\} & \text{if } l \text{ and } n \text{ are even} \\ \{b^n; b^{\frac{n-1}{2}} ab^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\} & \text{if } l \text{ and } n \text{ are odd} \\ \{b^n; b^{\frac{n-n_0+l-1}{2}} ab^{n_0-l-1} ab^{\frac{n-n_0+l-1}{2}}\} & \text{if } l \text{ is odd and } n \text{ is even} \\ \{b^n; b^{\frac{n-1}{2}} ab^{\frac{n-1}{2}}; b^{\frac{n-n_0+l-1}{2}} ab^{n_0-l-1} ab^{\frac{n-n_0+l-1}{2}}\} & \text{if } l \text{ is even and } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

- for n_0 odd, since $n + l = 2j + n_0 + 1$ then the integers n and l are different parities. Thus:

$$\text{Pal}_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \begin{cases} \{b^n; b^{\frac{n-1}{2}} ab^{\frac{n-1}{2}}\} & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ \{b^n; b^{\frac{n-n_0+l-1}{2}} ab^{n_0-l-1} ab^{\frac{n-n_0+l-1}{2}}\} & \text{if } n \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

3. If $n \geq n_0$. Then firstly, it is known that any factor of length n of $F(\mathbf{v})$ comes from a factor of length $n + l$ of \mathbf{v} . Secondly, by Lemma 5.2, any palindromic factor of $F(\mathbf{v})$ of length $n > n_0$ comes from only one palindromic factor of \mathbf{v} . In addition, by applying the Theorem 2.1, we deduce that $F(\mathbf{v})$ has a palindromic factor of length n if $n + l$ is even and two otherwise. □

Corollary 5.1. *The word $F(\mathbf{v})$ is rich.*

Proof: The proof follows from the Theorem 4.3. □

5.3 Abelian complexity function

In this subsection, we determine the balance, Parikh vectors and abelian complexity function of $F(\mathbf{v})$.

Proposition 5.2. [3] *Let \mathbf{u} be an infinite β -balanced word over $\{a, b\}$. Then, for all integers n , we have:*

$$\rho_{\mathbf{u}}^{ab}(n) \leq \beta + 1.$$

Lemma 5.3. *The word $F(\mathbf{v})$ is 2-balanced.*

Proof: Note that for all factors u_1 and u_2 of \mathbf{v} , we have:

$$|u_1| = |u_2| \implies ||u_1|_{a^{l+1}} - |u_2|_{a^{l+1}}| \leq 2 \quad \text{because } \mathbf{v} \text{ is Sturmian.}$$

Let $v_1, v_2 \in L_n(F(\mathbf{v}))$ then, there are two factors $u_1, u_2 \in L_{n+l}(\mathbf{v})$ such that $v_1 = F(u_1)$ and $v_2 = F(u_2)$. As $|u_1| = |u_2|$, we have $||u_1|_{a^{l+1}} - |u_2|_{a^{l+1}}| \leq 2$. This implies that $||F(u_1)|_a - |F(u_2)|_a| \leq 2$, i.e., $||v_1|_a - |v_2|_a| \leq 2$. Moreover, b^{n_0-l+1} , $ab^{n_0-l-1}a$, $b^{n_0}ab^{n_0-l+1}$ and $ab^{n_0}ab^{n_0-l-1}a$ are factors of $F(\mathbf{v})$. Hence, $F(\mathbf{v})$ is 2-balanced. □

Theorem 5.3. *The abelian complexity function of $F(\mathbf{v})$ is given for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ by:*

1. For $n \leq n_0 - l$, $\rho_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{ab}(n) = 2$.
2. For $n_0 - l + 1 \leq n \leq n_0$, $\rho_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{ab}(n) = 3$.
3. For $n > n_0$, $\rho_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{ab}(n) \in \{2, 3\}$.

Proof: We distinguish the following cases according to the length n of factors.

Case 1: $1 \leq n \leq n_0 - l$. Then, since $L_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \{b^n, b^i ab^{n-i-1} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, we obtain

$$\chi_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \{(0, n), (1, n-1)\}.$$

Hence, $\rho_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{ab}(n) = 2$.

Case 2: $n_0 - l + 1 \leq n \leq n_0$. Then, we have:

$$L_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \{b^n, b^i ab^{n-i-1}, b^j ab^{n_0-l-1} ab^{n-n_0+l-1-j} \mid i = 0, \dots, n-1; 0 \leq j \leq n - n_0 + l - 1\}.$$

It follows that, $\chi_n(F(\mathbf{v})) = \{(0, n), (1, n-1), (2, n-2)\}$. Consequently, $\rho_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{ab}(n) = 3$.

Case 3: Let us consider $n > n_0$. Then, by Theorem 5.1, the classical complexity function of $F(\mathbf{v})$ is unbound. Therefore, $F(\mathbf{v})$ is non-ultimately periodic. Thus, $\rho_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{ab}(n) \geq 2$. Moreover, by Lemma 5.3, the word $F(\mathbf{v})$ is 2-balanced. In addition, $F(\mathbf{v})$ being a binary word, we deduce by Proposition 5.2 that $\rho_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{ab}(n) \leq 3$. Hence, $\rho_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{ab}(n) \in \{2, 3\}$. □

Remark 5.2. *The sequence $(\rho_{F(\mathbf{v})}^{ab}(n))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is non-ultimately periodic.*

References

- [1] J. -P. Allouche, *Sur la complexité des suites infinies*. Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin 1 (1994) 133-143.
- [2] J. -P. Allouche, M. Baake, J. Cassaigne and D. Damanik, *Palindrome complexity*. Theoret. Comput. Sci. 292 (2003) 9-31.
- [3] M. Barro, I. Kaboré and T. Tapsoba, *Etude combinatoire des mots par insertion k à k d'une puissance de lettre dans les mots sturmiens*. AFMA, vol. 8 (2020), 97-112.
- [4] M. Barro, I. Kaboré and T. Tapsoba, *On the words by k to k insertion of a letter in sturmian words*. IJAM., vol. 30 No. 5 (2017), 387-400.
- [5] J. Berstel, *Sturmian and episturmian words (a survey of some recent resultats)*, in: Proceedings of CAI 2007, vol.4728 of Lect. Notes in Comput. Sci., Springer-Verlag, 2007.
- [6] V. Berthé, *Fréquences des facteurs des suites sturmiennes*. Theoret. Comput. Sci., 165 (1996) 295-309.
- [7] M. Bucci, A. De Luca, A. Glen, and L. Q. Zamboni, "A connection between palindromic and factor complexity using return words". Advances in Applied Mathematics, vol. 42, (2009a) no. 1, p. 60-74.
- [8] J. Cassaigne, *Complexité et facteurs spéciaux*. Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin 4 (1997) 67-88.
- [9] J. Cassaigne, I. Kaboré and T. Tapsoba, *On a new notion of complexity on infinite words*. Acta Univ. Sapientiae, Mathematica, 2 (2010), 127-136.
- [10] E. M. Coven and G. A. Hedlund, *Sequences with minimal block growth*. Math. Syst. Theory 7 (1973) 138-153.
- [11] X. Droubay and G. Pirillo, *Palindromes and Sturmian words*. Theoret. Comput. Sci., vol. 223, (1999), no. 1-2, p. 73-85.
- [12] S. Dulucq and D. Gouyou-Beauchamps, *Sur les facteurs des suites de Sturm*. Theoret. Comput. Sci. 71(1990) 381-400.
- [13] A. Glen and J. Justin, *Episturmian words: a survey*. RAIRO - Theoret. Inf. and Appl., 43 (2009), 402-433.
- [14] I. Kaboré, *About k to k insertion words of sturmian words*. IJPAM., vol. 79 No. 4 (2012), 561-572.
- [15] I. Kaboré and T. Tapsoba, *Combinatoire des mots récurrents de complexités $n + 2$* . RAIRO-Theo. Inf. Appl. 41 (2007) 425-446.
- [16] I. Kaboré and T. Tapsoba, *Complexité par fenêtre*, in: Proceeding of 6th International Conference on Words (WORDS 2007), pp. 184-188, Institut de Mathématiques de Luminy, Marseille (France), 2007.

- [17] M. Lothaire, *Algebraic combinatorics on words*. Cambridge University Press (2002).
- [18] F. Mignosi and P. Séébold, *Morphismes sturmiens et règles de Rauzy*. J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux 5 (1993) 221-233.
- [19] J. V. Neumann, *Collected works*. Design of computers theory of automata and numerical analysis, Volume V, 1951.