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ABSTRACT. A (one-sided) sequence or (two-sided) bisequence is irreducible provided it contains no block of the form BBb, where b is the initial symbol of the block B. Gottschalk and Hedlund [Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 15 (1964), 70-74] proved that the set of irreducible binary bisequences is the Morse minimal set $M$. Let $M^+$ denote the one-sided Morse minimal set, i.e. $M^+ = \{ x_0x_1x_2 \ldots : \ldots x_{-1}x_0x_1 \ldots \in M \}$. Let $P^+$ denote the set of all irreducible binary sequences. We establish a method for generating all $x \in P^+$. We also determine $P^+ - M^+$.

Considering $P^+$ as a one-sided symbolic flow, $P^+$ is not the countable union of transitive flows, thus $P^+$ is considerably larger than $M^+$. However $M^+$ is the $\omega$-limit set of each $x \in P^+$, and in particular $M^+$ is the nonwandering set of $P^+$.

0. Introduction. The Morse minimal set has been characterized [3] as the set of all doubly-infinite sequences on two symbols which have the property that they contain no block of the form BBb, where b is the initial symbol of the block B. Let us call (two-sided) bisequences, (one-sided) sequences and blocks (finite strings) which satisfy this property irreducible. What is the set of all irreducible sequences on two symbols? Is it the same as the one-sided version of the Morse minimal set? We shall develop a procedure to construct every irreducible sequence. We then use this to show that, not only does the set of all of them properly contain the one-sided Morse minimal set, but that there are uncountably many irreducible sequences for which no “tail” is in the one-sided Morse minimal set.

This problem of irreducibility was first considered by Axel Thue [8] in 1912. He was concerned with constructing bisequences which repeated in a uniformly minimal fashion. It is evident that every binary (i.e. using two symbols) sequence and bisequence must contain a block of the form BB, where each occurrence of B represents the same block. Thus there is no stronger nonrepetitive condition for binary sequences or bisequences which holds for blocks of all lengths than that they be irreducible. Thue constructed what is now known as the Morse-Thue bisequence and established its rôle in determining all irreducible binary bisequences.

Independently, Marston Morse constructed the Morse-Thue bisequence in 1917 while working on his dissertation. He first published it in 1921 in [6]. Later in 1944, Morse and Hedlund [7] proved the bisequence to be irreducible. Finally in 1964, Gottschalk and Hedlund [3] proved the aforementioned characterization of the Morse minimal set. It was not until after [3] had appeared in print that Thue’s
work, having appeared in a relatively obscure journal, became well known. For a
more complete history, see Hedlund [4].

Although the problem of determining all irreducible binary bisequences has been
of sufficient interest to have been solved at least twice, the analogous problem for
binary sequences (one-sided) has remained unsolved. We solve it here.

It is not always easy to decide whether or not a binary block is irreducible. To
illustrate, the 200-block

\[
\begin{align*}
001001101001100101100110010110011010011001011001101001101001101001100110100101100110100110011001011001101001100110100101100110100110011010010110011010011001101001011001101001100110100101100110100110011010010110011010011001101001011001101001100110100101100110100110011010010110011010011001101001011001101001100110100101100110100110011010010110011010011001101001011001101001100110100101100110100110011010010110011010011001101001011001101001100110100101100110100110011010010110011010011001101001011001101001100110100101100110100110011010010110011010011001101001011001
\end{align*}
\]

is not irreducible, but no block of the form \(BBb\) is readily recognizable.

In the solution to the two-sided problem, this recognition difficulty can be
avoided. Any block which appears in some irreducible bisequence must appear in a
special type of block called a Morse block (see §1), and Morse blocks are relatively
easy to recognize. Unfortunately, blocks which appear in irreducible sequences
need not appear in any Morse block. Thus a different approach is needed.

We establish a method for generating all irreducible binary sequences by
associating with each binary sequence a sequence on three symbols which we call
an algorithm sequence. (The algorithm sequence is actually used to generate the
binary sequence.) The existence of a block of the form \(BBb\) in the binary sequence
is reflected in the existence of an easily recognizable block in the algorithm
sequence. From the algorithm sequence we can also easily determine whether or
not an irreducible binary sequence can be extended to an irreducible binary
bisequence. There are, in fact, uncountably many irreducible binary sequences
which cannot be so extended.

The results of this paper are contained in the author's doctoral dissertation
written at Wesleyan University. The author is grateful to Professor Ethan M.
Coven for his valuable suggestions.

1. Preliminaries. A flow \((X, T)\) consists of a nonempty compact, metrizable space
\(X\) and a continuous map \(T\) of \(X\) into itself. A subset \(E\) of \(X\) is invariant provided
\(T(E) \subseteq E\). If \(X'\) is a nonempty, closed, invariant subset of \(X\), then \((X', T)\) is a
subflow of \((X, T)\). A flow \((X, T)\) is minimal provided it contains no subflows other
than itself.

If \(E\) is a nonempty subset of \(X\), then \((T^n E: n \geq 0)\) is called the orbit of \(E\) and is
denoted \(\mathcal{O}(E)\). The closure of \(\mathcal{O}(E)\) is denoted \(\text{Cl} \mathcal{O}(E)\) and is called the orbit-
closure of \(E\). If \(E\) is a nonempty subset of \(X\), then \((\text{Cl} \mathcal{O}(E), T)\) is a subflow of
\((X, T)\).

Let \(S^+\) denote the set of all binary sequences and \(S\) the set of all binary
bisequences. That is

\[
S^+ = \{ x = x_0 x_1 x_2 \ldots : x_i = 0 \text{ or } 1 \text{ for } i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \}
\]
and

$S = \{ x = \ldots x_{-1}x_0x_1 \ldots : x_i = 0 \text{ or } 1 \text{ for } i = \ldots , -1, 0, 1, \ldots \}$. \\
(As a reminder to the reader, throughout this paper we shall superscript sets of binary sequences with a +.) Given the product topology, $S$ and $S^+$ are compact, metrizable spaces homeomorphic to the Cantor set. A compatible metric for $S$ (for $S^+$) is given by $d(x, y) = 1/(k + 1)$ where $k$ is the largest nonnegative integer such that $x_i = y_i$ for $|i| < k$ (i < k). Let $\sigma: S \to S$ ($\sigma: S^+ \to S^+$) be defined by $[\sigma(x)]_i = x_{i+1}$ for $i = \ldots , -1, 0, 1, \ldots$ ($i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$). The map $\sigma$, called the shift transformation, is continuous. Any subflow of $(S, \sigma)$ or $(S^+, \sigma)$ is called a symbolic flow.

We shall have occasion to pass from bisequences to sequences. Thus if $x \in S$ we shall denote $x_0x_1x_2 \ldots$ by $x^+$. \\
An $n$-block is a string of $n$ consecutive 0's and 1's. Blocks are an essential tool in the study of symbolic flows in that they represent the cylinder sets which form a basis of open and closed sets of the topology, e.g. in place of the set $U_B = \{ x \in S^+: x_i \ldots x_{i+n-1} = b_1 \ldots b_n \}$, we consider the block $B = b_1 \ldots b_n$. Thus an arbitrary open set about a point $x$ can be taken to be a block which appears in $x$ starting at a specified place. The $n$-block $x_k \ldots x_{k+n-1}$ will often be denoted by $x[k; n]$. The length of a block $B$ will be denoted by $l(B)$, and the set of all blocks will be denoted by $\mathcal{B}$.

The dual block of $B = b_1 \ldots b_n$ is the block $B = \bar{b}_1 \ldots \bar{b}_n$ where $\bar{b}_i = 0$ if $b_i = 1$, and $\bar{b}_i = 1$ if $b_i = 0$. For example, if $B = 011011$, then $B = 100100$.

We define a sequence of blocks $A_0, A_1, A_2, \ldots$ inductively by letting $A_0 = 0$ and $A_{n+1} = A_nA_n$ for $n > 0$. Thus $A_1 = 01$, $A_2 = 0110$, and $A_3 = 0110100$. Notice that $A_n$ is a $2^n$-block. A block $B$ is a Morse block provided $B = A_n$ or $\bar{A}_n$ for some $n > 0$.

A block $C$ is reducible provided there is a block $B$ with initial symbol $b$ such that $BBb$ is a subblock of $C$, i.e. for some integer $i > 0$ and some integer $n > 1$, $c_{i+k} = c_{i+k+n}$ for all $0 < k < n$. A block which is not reducible is irreducible. Let $\mathcal{B} = \{ B \in \mathcal{B} : B \text{ is irreducible} \}$. It is evident that if $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and $C$ is a subblock of $B$, then $C \in \mathcal{B}$. Morse and Hedlund showed in [7] that every Morse block is an element of $\mathcal{B}$.

Let $P^+ = \{ x \in S^+: \text{no reducible block appears in } x \}$, equivalently $P^+ = \{ x \in S^+: x_i \ldots x_{i+n} \in \mathcal{B} \text{ for all } i, n > 0 \}$. Observe that $P^+$ is a nonempty, closed, invariant (under $\sigma$) subset of $S^+$; thus $(P^+, \sigma)$ is a subflow of $(S^+, \sigma)$.

We define $\mu \in S$ by $\mu_0 \ldots \mu_{2^n-1} = A_n$ for each $n > 0$, and $\mu_{-i} = \mu_{i-1}$ for each $i > 1$. $\mu$ is the Morse-Thue bisequence, and $\mu^+ = \mu_0 \mu_1 \mu_2 \ldots$ is the Morse-Thue sequence. Morse and Hedlund proved in [7] that no reducible block appears in $\mu$. Thus $\mu^+ \in P^+$.

Let $M^+ = \text{Cl } \emptyset(\mu^+)$ and $M = \text{Cl } \emptyset(\mu)$. Observe that $M^+$ is a collection of sequences, and $M$ is a collection of bisequences. The flow $(M, \sigma)$ is the (two-sided) Morse minimal set. (The Morse minimal set is usually defined as $\text{Cl}(\sigma^\mu_n: n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \ldots)$, however since $(M, \sigma)$ is minimal, nonnegative powers of $\sigma$ suffice.) The flow $(M^+, \sigma)$ is the one-sided Morse minimal set.
Remark 1.1. (i) $M^+ = \{ x^+ \in S^+: x \in M \}$.
(ii) $(M^+, \sigma)$ is a subflow of $(P^+, \sigma)$.

2. Algorithm sequences. We wish to establish a method for generating irreducible sequences. We shall do this by considering the problem of how to extend an irreducible block to the right to obtain an irreducible block of greater length. The following lemma, which is the one-sided analog of Lemma 4 of [3], states a minimal condition any extension must satisfy.

Lemma 2.1. Let $n > 0$ and $p > 0$. If $x \in P^+$ and if $x[p; 2^n] = A_n \bar{A}_n$, then for each $m > 0$, $x[p + m \cdot 2^n, 2^n] = A_n$ or $\bar{A}_n$.

In order to repeatedly apply this lemma to increasing values of $n$, we wish to extend a Morse block $DD$ to an irreducible block which ends in a Morse block twice as long. From the following tree, it is evident that there are only three such extensions.

Thus the only ways to extend $DD$ to an irreducible block which ends in a Morse block twice as long are

1. $DDDD$,
2. $DDDDDD$ and
3. $DDD$.

To make this process rigorous we introduce the following definitions.

Let $\mathcal{B}' = \{ B \in \mathcal{B}: B \text{ ends in 01 or 10} \}$.

The canonical decomposition of a block $B \in \mathcal{B}'$ is $B = CD\bar{D}$ where $D\bar{D}$ is the maximal terminal Morse block of $B$. It should be noted that $C$ might be the empty block. However $D$ is never empty since $B \in \mathcal{B}'$ if and only if the maximal terminal Morse block of $B$ has length at least 2. To illustrate, we list the canonical decomposition of three blocks (where the dots separate the blocks $C$, $D$ and $\bar{D}$).

01101001 = 0110 • 1001, 010110 = 01 • 01 • 10, 0100110 = 010 • 01 • 10.

Notice that in the first case, $C$ is the empty block.
Define three maps \( a^*_{1}, a^*_{2}, \) and \( a^*_{3}, \) each mapping \( \mathbb{B} \) into \( \mathbb{B} \), by
\[
\begin{align*}
a^*_{1}(CDD) &= CDDDD, \\
a^*_{2}(CDD) &= CDDDDDD, \\
a^*_{3}(CDD) &= CDDDD.
\end{align*}
\]
and
\[
\begin{align*}
a^*_{3}(CDD) &= CDDDDDDDD.
\end{align*}
\]
For example, recalling that 010 \( \cdot \) 01 \( \cdot \) 10 is the canonical decomposition of 0100110, we have
\[
\begin{align*}
a^*_{1}(0100110) &= 010 \cdot 01 \cdot 10 \cdot 01 \cdot 01 = 010011010110, \\
a^*_{2}(0100110) &= 010 \cdot 01 \cdot 10 \cdot 10 \cdot 01 = 01001101101001
\end{align*}
\]
and
\[
\begin{align*}
a^*_{3}(0100110) &= 010 \cdot 01 \cdot 10 \cdot 10 \cdot 01 = 01001101001.
\end{align*}
\]
To aid in remembering the evaluations of each of these maps, observe the following.

(i) If \( C \) is the empty block, then the evaluation of each \( a^*_i \) is precisely one of the irreducible extensions of \( D\bar{D} \) observed from the tree.

(ii) The \( a^*_i \)'s are subscripted in lexicographical order where \( D \) proceeds \( \bar{D} \).

(iii) The evaluation of each \( a^*_i \) ends in a block obtained from a Morse 4-block by substituting \( D \) and \( \bar{D} \) for 0 and 1.

It is convenient to think of these maps as algorithms for extending blocks in \( \mathbb{B} \), hence we call them \( \textit{algorithms} \). Composition of algorithms is read from right to left and is denoted by juxtaposition. Thus \( a^*_i a^*_j (B) \) means first apply \( a^*_i \) to \( B \) and then apply \( a^*_j \) to \( a^*_i (B) \).

The composition of \( n \) algorithms is called an \( \textit{algorithm n-block} \). The algorithm \( n \)-block \( B^* \) is subscripted with positive integers increasing from right to left, i.e. \( B^* = b^*_n \ldots b^*_1 \). (Of course since \( a^*_i, a^*_2 \) and \( a^*_3 \) have been designated as specific algorithms, an algorithm block such as \( a^*_1 a^*_2 a^*_3 \) is not at variance with this subscripting convention.)

Let \( \mathbb{B}^* \) denote the set of all nonempty algorithm blocks, and let \( \mathbb{P}^* = \{ B^* \in \mathbb{B}^* : B^*(01) \text{ is irreducible} \} \).

Since our objective is to generate sequences in \( S^+ \) as well as blocks in \( \mathbb{B} \), we shall also consider left sequences of algorithms called \( \textit{algorithm sequences} \). They will be denoted \( x^*, y^* \) or \( z^* \), subscripted, as in the case of algorithm blocks, from right to left with positive integers, e.g. \( x^* = \ldots x^*_3 x^*_2 x^*_1 \). The set of all algorithms sequences is denoted \( S^* \).

Let \( \mathbb{B}'' = \{ B \in \mathbb{B} : l(C) < 2l(D) \text{ where } CDD \text{ is the canonical decomposition of } B \} \).

The members of \( S^* \) may be thought of as maps from \( \mathbb{B}'' \) into \( S^+ \) as follows. \( x^*(B) = y = y_0y_1y_2 \ldots \), where for each \( n > 1 \), \( y[0; n] \) is the initial \( n \)-block of \( x^*_n \ldots x^*_1(B) \).

**Remark.** If \( B \in \mathbb{B}'' \) and \( n > 1 \), then \( x^*_n \ldots x^*_1(B) \) is an initial subblock of \( x^*_n+1 \ldots x^*_1(B) \). It follows that \( x^*(B) \) is well defined.

It is an easy exercise to show that \( \mu^+ = \ldots a^*_3 a^*_2 a^*_1(01) \).
Let \( P^* = \{ x^* \in S^* : x^*(01) \in P^+ \} \). We shall show that in order to study \( P^+ \), it is sufficient (in some sense) to consider \( P^* \) (Theorems 2.3 and 2.11).

The following lemma is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.1, and its proof is illustrated by the tree following Lemma 2.1.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \( x \in P^+ \) and let \( x[p, 2^{k+1}] = DD \) where \( D = A_k \) or \( \bar{A}_k \). Then there exists an integer \( r \geq 2^{k+2} \) and an algorithm \( b^* \) such that \( x[p ; r] = b^*(DD) \).

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( x \in S^+ \) where \( x_1 = \bar{x}_0 \). Then \( x \in P^+ \) if and only if there exists an algorithm sequence \( x^* \in P^* \) such that \( x^*(01) = x \) or \( \bar{x} \). Furthermore, if such an \( x^* \) exists, it is unique.

**Proof.** It suffices to prove \( \Rightarrow \). Let \( x \in P^+ \). Since \( \bar{x} \) is also in \( P^+ \), we may suppose that \( x_0x_1 = 01 \). By the definition of \( P^* \), it suffices to find an \( x^* \in S^* \) such that \( x = x^*(01) \).

Let \( k \) be the smallest positive integer such that \( x_0 \ldots x_k \) is not an initial subblock of \( B^*(01) \) for any \( B^* \in \mathcal{B}^* \).

If \( x_2x_3 = 00 \), then since \( x \in P^+ \), \( x_4 = 1 \). Thus \( x_0 \ldots x_4 = 01001 = a^*_1(01) \), so \( k > 5 \).

If \( x_2x_3 = 01 \), then since \( x \in P^+ \), \( x_4x_5 = 10 \). Thus \( x_0 \ldots x_5 = 010110 = a^*_2(01) \), so \( k > 6 \).

If \( x_2 = 1 \), then since \( x \in P^+ \), \( x_3 = 0 \). Thus \( x_0 \ldots x_3 = 0110 = a^*_3(01) \), so \( k > 4 \).

Therefore there exists an algorithm \( b^* \) and an integer \( r, 3 < r < k \), such that \( b^*(01) = x_0 \ldots x_r \).

Let \( B^* \) be the algorithm block of greatest length such that \( B^*(01) \) is an initial subblock of \( x_0 \ldots x_k \). By Lemma 2.2, there exists an integer \( t > 2l(DD) \) and an algorithm \( c^* \) such that \( x[0; t] = c^*(DD) \). Thus \( x[0; t + p] = c^*B^*(01) \). If \( t + p > k + 1 \), then \( x_0 \ldots x_k \) is an initial subblock of \( c^*B^*(01) \), contrary to the choice of \( k \).

If \( t + p < k + 1 \), then \( c^*B^*(01) \) is an initial subblock of \( x_0 \ldots x_k \), contrary to the choice of \( B^* \). Therefore \( x = x^*(01) \) for some \( x^* \in S^* \).

It is readily verified that \( x^* \) is unique. \( Q \square \)

The reader is invited to use the procedure indicated in the proof of Theorem 2.3 to verify that

\[ A_0\bar{A}_1A_2\bar{A}_3 \ldots = \ldots x_1^*x_2^*x_3^*(01). \]

It might also be instructive to express the 200-block in the introduction in terms of algorithms.

We may consider the elements of \( P^+ \) to be of two basic types—those which begin 01 or 10, and those which begin 001 or 110. Theorem 2.3 related those elements in \( P^+ \) of the former type to \( P^* \). Before considering the theorem relating those elements in \( P^+ \) of the latter type to \( P^* \) (Theorem 2.11), we shall need several facts concerning binary blocks and algorithm blocks.

Let \( \theta \) be the substitution \( \theta : 0 \rightarrow 01, 1 \rightarrow 10 \). Extend \( \theta \) to a map of \( \mathcal{B} \) into \( \mathcal{B} \) by \( \theta(b_1 \ldots b_n) = \theta(b_1) \ldots \theta(b_n) \). We shall use the following three properties of the substitution \( \theta \) without comment.
(i) If $C, D \in \mathfrak{S}$, then $\theta(CD) = \theta(C)\theta(D)$.

(ii) If $B \in \mathfrak{S}$, then $\theta(B) = \theta(B)$.

(iii) $\theta(A_n) = A_{n+1}$ for each $n \geq 0$.

We denote successive applications of $\theta$ by exponentiation. Thus $\theta^n(B)$ denotes $\theta(\theta^{n-1}(B))$ for all $n \geq 2$.

**Remark 2.4.** Let $B^* \in \mathfrak{S}^*$ and let $B \in \mathfrak{S}$. Then

(i) $\theta[B^*(B)] = B^*(\theta(B))$,

(ii) $\theta[B^*(01)] = B^*a^*_1(01)$.

**Proof.** (i): Observe that if $CD\overrightarrow{D}$ is the canonical decomposition of $B$, then $\theta(C) \cdot \theta(D) \cdot \theta(\overrightarrow{D})$ is the canonical decomposition of $\theta(B)$. The result then follows via induction on $l(B^*)$.

(ii): Note that $a^*_1(01) = \theta(01)$. □

**Lemma 2.5.** Let $x^* \in \mathfrak{S}^*$ and let $B \in \mathfrak{S}$. Then $\theta[x^*(B)] = x^*(\theta(B))$.

**Proof.** Use Remark 2.4. □

The following lemma and its proof are contained in the proof of Theorem 3.1 of [7].

**Lemma 2.6.** Let $B = b_0 \ldots b_t \in \mathfrak{S}$ have the property that for at least one of $k = 0$ or $k = 1$, $b_{k+2n+1} = \overrightarrow{b}_{k+2n}$ for all nonnegative integers $n$ such that $k + 2n + 1 < t$. Let $C$ be a block with initial symbol $c$ such that $CCc$ is a subblock of $B$. Then $l(C)$ is even.

**Proof.** Let $B$ be a binary $n$-block and let $\theta(B) = b_0 \ldots b_{2n-1}$. Then $b_{2j+1} = \overrightarrow{b}_{2j}$ for all $j$, $0 < j < n$.

**Proof.** See §12.29 of [2]. □

**Lemma 2.7.** Let $B^* \in \mathfrak{S}^*$ and let $B^*(01) = c_0 \ldots c_t$. Then

(i) There exists $k = 0$ or $1$ such that $c_{k+2n+1} = \overrightarrow{c}_{k+2n}$ for $0 < n < \frac{1}{2}(t - k - 1)$.

(ii) If $B$ is a block with initial symbol $b$ such that $BBb$ is a subblock of $B^*(01)$, then $l(B)$ is even.

**Proof.** (i): Let $B^* = b_0^* \ldots b_t^*$ and let $C^* = b_0^* \ldots b_q^*$. If $b_i^* = a_j^*$, then $B^*(01) = C^*(01001) = 0 \cdot [C^*(01101)] = 0 \cdot [C^*(\theta(10))] = 0 \cdot \theta[C^*(10)]$. Thus by Lemma 2.7, (i) holds with $k = 1$.

The proofs for $b_i^* = a_j^*$ and $b_i^* = a_j^*$ are analogous.

(ii): Apply Lemma 2.6 to part (i). □

**Lemma 2.9.** Let $B^* \in \mathfrak{S}^*$. Then

(i) $B^* \in \mathfrak{S}$ if and only if $\theta(B) \in \mathfrak{S}$,

(ii) $B^* \in \mathfrak{S}^*$ if and only if $B^*a^*_1 \in \mathfrak{S}^*$.

**Proof.** (i): ($\Rightarrow$) Let $\theta(B) = b_0 \ldots b_{2p-1}$ and let $B = b'_0 \ldots b'_{p-1}$. Then

$$b_{2i} = b'_i \quad \text{for all } 0 < i < p - 1. \tag{1}$$
Suppose \( \theta(B) \notin \mathcal{P} \). Then some subblock of \( \theta(B) \) has the form \( CCc \), where \( C \) is a block with initial symbol \( c \). By Lemma 2.6, \( \ell(C) \) is even, call it \( 2n \). Let
\[
b_k \ldots b_{k+4n} = CCc
\]
be the first subblock of \( \theta(B) \) of this type. (2)

Thus
\[
b_{k+i} = b_{k+2n+i} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq i < 2n.
\]
(3)

By Lemma 2.7 we have
\[
b_{2i+1} = \bar{b}_{2i} \quad \text{for each} \quad i, \quad 0 \leq i \leq p - 1.
\]
(4)

We show that \( k \) is even. Suppose \( k \) is odd. Then by (4) and (3), \( \bar{b}_{k-1} = b_k = b_{k+2n} = \bar{b}_{k+2n-1} \), that is \( b_{k-1} = b_{k+2n-1} \). Similarly \( b_{k+2n-1} = b_{k+4n-1} \). Thus
\[
b_{k-1} = b_{k+2n-1} = b_{k+4n-1}.
\]
(5)

Combining (3) and (5), we have \( b_{k-1+i} = b_{k-1+2n+i} \) for \( 0 \leq i < 2n \), i.e. for \( C' = b_{k-1} \ldots b_{k+2n-2} \), \( C'C'c' \) is a reducible subblock of \( \theta(B) \), contradicting (2).

Thus \( k \) is even; say \( k = 2m \).

Define \( D = d_0 \ldots d_{n-1} \) by \( d_i = b_{k+2i} \) for \( 0 \leq i < n - 1 \). Then by (1), \( D = b_kb_{k+2}b_{k+4} \ldots b_{k+2n-2} = b_{2m}b_{2m+2} \ldots b_{2m+2n-2} = b_{m}b_{m+1} \ldots b_{m+n-1} \). Thus \( DDd_0 \) is a subblock of \( B \). Therefore \( B \notin \mathcal{P} \).

(\( \Rightarrow \)) Suppose \( B \notin \mathcal{P} \). Then there exists a block \( C \) with initial symbol \( c \) such that \( CCc \) is a subblock of \( B \). Since \( c \) is the initial symbol of both \( \theta(C) \) and \( \theta(c) \), it follows that \( \theta(C) \theta(C)c \) is a subblock of \( \theta(B) \). Thus \( \theta(B) \notin \mathcal{P} \).

(ii): Combine (i) with Remark 2.4. \( \square \)

**Lemma 2.10.** \( x \in P^+ \) if and only if \( \theta(x) \in P^+ \).

**Theorem 2.11.** Let \( x \in S^+ \) with \( x_0 = x_1 = \bar{x}_2 \). Then \( x \in P^+ \) if and only if there exists an \( x^* \in P^* \) such that
\[
\text{(i) } x^*(001) = x \text{ or } \bar{x}
\]
and
\[
\text{(ii) } x^*a_2^* \in P^*.
\]

Furthermore if such an \( x^* \) exists, it is unique.

**Proof.** Without loss of generality we may suppose that \( x_0 = 0 \). Thus \( x_0x_1x_2 = 001 \).

(\( \Leftarrow \)) Suppose there exists an \( x^* \in S^* \) such that \( x^*(001) = x \) or \( \bar{x} \) and \( x^*a_2^* \in P^* \). By our assumption, \( x^*(001) = x \) rather than \( \bar{x} \). From Lemma 2.5,
\[
\theta(x) = \theta(x^*(001)) = x^*(\theta(001)) = x^*(010110) = x^*a_2^*(01).
\]

Since \( x^*a_2^* \in P^* \), \( \theta(x) \in P^+ \) and therefore by (2.10), \( x \in P^+ \).

(\( \Rightarrow \)) Suppose \( x \in P^+ \). Then \( ax \in P^+ \). Furthermore \( [ax][ax]_1 = 01 \). Thus by Theorem 2.3, there exists a unique \( x^* \in P^* \) such that \( x^*(01) = ax \). It then follows that
\[
x = 0 \cdot [ax] = 0 \cdot [x^*(01)] = x^*(001),
\]

thus proving (i). By Lemma 2.10, \( \theta(x) \in P^+ \). Now applying \( \theta \) to both sides of (i) and using Lemma 2.5, we have
\[
\theta(x) = \theta(x^*(001)) = x^*(\theta(001)) = x^*(010110) = x^*a_2^*(01).
\]
Hence \( x^*a_2^*(01) \in P^* \), that is \( x^*a_2^* \in P^* \), thus proving (ii). □

3. Determination of all irreducible sequences. From Theorems 2.3 and 2.11, in order to determine whether a binary sequence is irreducible, we only need to consider its algorithm sequence. Thus we now wish to determine which algorithm sequences are in \( P^* = \{ x^* \in S^*: x^*(01) \text{ is irreducible} \} \). We do this by first determining which algorithm blocks are in \( \mathcal{P}^* \) (Theorem 3.14), and then concluding that \( P^* \) consists of all sequences in \( S^* \) which have the property that every block lies in \( \mathcal{P}^* \) (Corollary 3.15).

We begin with a remark and a series of lemmas which provide useful information about algorithm blocks in \( \mathcal{P}^* \).

**Lemma 3.1.** If \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) and \( C^* \) is a subblock of \( B^* \), then \( C^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \).

**Proof.** Let \( C^* = b_1^* \ldots b_k^* \) and let \( CDD \) be the canonical decomposition of \( b_1^* \ldots b_k^*(01) \). (If \( k = 1 \), then \( C \) is the empty block and \( D = D = 01 \).) Now use Lemma 2.9 and the fact that \( D = A_{i-1}A_{i-1} = \theta^i(01) \) or \( D = A_{i-1}A_{i-1} = \theta^{i-1}(10) \). □

**Remark 3.2.** Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \). Then
\[
\begin{align*}
(i) & \quad B^*a^*(01) = 0 \cdot [B^*a^*_2(10)]. \\
(ii) & \quad B^*a^*_2(01) = 01 \cdot [B^*a^*_2(01)]. \\
(iii) & \quad l(B^*a^*_2(01)) = l(B^*a^*_1(01)) + 1. \\
(iv) & \quad \text{If } x_0 \ldots x_p = B^*a^*_2(01), \text{ then } p \text{ is odd and } x_{2n+1} = \overline{x}_{2n} \text{ for } n = 0, 1, \ldots, \frac{1}{2}(p - 1).
\end{align*}
\]

Proof of (iv): From (ii) and Remark 2.4,
\[
x_0 \ldots x_p = 01 \cdot [B^*a^*_2(01)] = \theta(0) \cdot \theta[B^*(01)] = \theta[0 \cdot [B^*(01)]]
\]
Therefore \( l(x_0 \ldots x_p) \) is even, i.e. \( p \) is odd. Now apply Lemma 2.7. □

**Lemma 3.3.** Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \). Then
\[
\begin{align*}
(i) & \quad \text{If } B^*a^*_1 \notin \mathcal{P}^*, \text{ then some initial subblock of } B^*a^*_1(01) \text{ is of the form } BBb. \\
(ii) & \quad \text{If } B^*a^*_2 \notin \mathcal{P}^*, \text{ then some initial subblock of } B^*a^*_2(01) \text{ is of the form } BBb.
\end{align*}
\]

Proof. (i): Suppose \( B^*a^*_1 \notin \mathcal{P}^* \), i.e. \( B^*a^*_1(01) = x_0 \ldots x_p \) is reducible. If no initial subblock of \( x_0 \ldots x_p \) is of the form \( BBb \), then \( x_1 \ldots x_p = B^*a^*_2(10) \) is reducible, i.e. \( B^*a^*_2 \notin \mathcal{P}^* \). But by Lemma 2.9 \( B^* \notin \mathcal{P}^* \), contrary to the hypothesis.

(ii): Let \( B^*a^*_2 \notin \mathcal{P}^* \) and let \( B^*a^*_2(01) = x_0 \ldots x_p \). Suppose that \( x_i \ldots x_{i+2k} \) is of the form \( BBb \), that is \( x_{i+j} = x_{i+j+k} \) for \( 0 < j < k \). By an argument similar to (i) we can show that \( i < 2 \).

Suppose \( i = 1 \). Then \( x_{i+j} = x_{i+j+k} \) for \( 0 < j < k \). By Lemma 3.2, \( p \) is odd and \( x_{2n+1} = \overline{x}_{2n} \) for \( 0 < n < \frac{1}{2}(p - 1) \). In particular, \( x_0 = \overline{x}_1 \) and \( x_{2k} = \overline{x}_{2k+1} \). Furthermore by Lemma 2.6, \( k \) is even, so \( x_k = \overline{x}_{k+1} \). Thus we have \( x_0 = \overline{x}_1 = \overline{x}_{k+1} = x_k \) and \( x_0 = \overline{x}_{k+1} = \overline{x}_{2k+1} = x_{2k} \), that is \( x_0 = x_k = x_{2k} \). Therefore \( x_j = x_{j+k} \) for \( 0 < j < k \); equivalently \( x_0 \ldots x_{2k} \) is an initial block of the form \( BBb \) as desired. □

**Lemma 3.4.** \( B^*a^*_1 \in \mathcal{P}^* \) if and only if \( B^*a^*_2 \in \mathcal{P}^* \).
PROOF. By Lemma 3.1, if $B^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$, and $B^*a_i^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$ and $B^*a_2^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$. So suppose $B^* \in \mathfrak{P}^*$.

Let $x_0 \ldots x_p = B^*a_2^*(01)$ and $y_0 \ldots y_q = B^*a_2^*(01)$. By Remark 3.2, $p$ is odd, $q = p - 1$ and

$$x_1 \ldots x_p = 1 \cdot [B^*a_2^*(01)] = 0 \cdot [B^*a_2^*(10)] = y_0 \ldots y_{p-1}.$$ 

Equivalently,

$$y_j = x_{j+1} \text{ for } 0 < j < p - 1. \quad (1)$$

($\Leftarrow$) If $B^*a_i^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$, it follows directly from (1) that $B^*a_2^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$.

($\Rightarrow$) Suppose $B^*a_i^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$. Then by Lemma 3.3 an initial subblock of $B^*a_2^*(01)$ is of the form $BBb$, i.e. there exists an integer $k > 1$ such that $x_i = x_{i+k}$ for $0 < i < k$. From (1), it follows that $y_i = x_{i+1} = x_{i+1+k} = y_{i+k}$ for $0 < i < k - 1$. Furthermore by Remark 3.2, $x_{2k} = x_{2k+1}$. Thus $y_{2k} = x_{2k+1} = 0$ and $y_{2k} = x_{2k} = x_0 = 0$. Since $y_0 = 0$, we have $y_0 = y_k = y_{2k}$. Therefore $y_i = y_{i+k}$ for $0 < i < k$, i.e. $y_0 \ldots y_{2k}$ is of the form $BBb$. Hence $B^*a_i^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$.

Lemma 3.5. Let $B^* \in \mathfrak{P}^*$. Then

(i) $B^*a_1^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$ if and only if $B^*a_2^*a_2^* \in \mathfrak{P}^*$,

(ii) $B^*a_2^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$ if and only if $B^*a_2^*a_2^*a_1^* \in \mathfrak{P}^*$.

PROOF. By Lemma 3.4, it suffices to prove (i), and by Lemma 3.1, (i) is valid if $B^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$. So suppose $B^* \in \mathfrak{P}^*$.

Let $x_0 \ldots x_p = B^*a_1^*(01)$ and $y_0 \ldots y_q = B^*a_2^*a_2^*a_1^*(01)$. Then $x_0 \ldots x_p = 0 \cdot [B^*(1001)]$ and

$$y_0 \ldots y_q = 0 \cdot [B^*a_2^*a_2^*(1001)] = 0 \cdot \theta^2[B^*(1001)]. \quad (1)$$

Hence

$$\theta^2(x_t) = y_{4t-3}y_{4t-2}y_{4t-1}y_{4t} \text{ for } 1 < t < p, \quad (2)$$

and therefore

$$x_t = y_{4t-3} \text{ for } 1 < t < p. \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, since $\theta^2(b) = bbbb$, (2) gives us

$$y_{4t-3} = y_{4t} \text{ for } 1 < t < p. \quad (4)$$

($\Rightarrow$) Suppose $B^*a_i^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$. By Lemma 3.3 there exists an integer $k > 1$ such that $x_0 \ldots x_{2k}$ is of the form $BBb$; equivalently

$$x_i = x_{i+k} \text{ for } 0 < i < k. \quad (5)$$

By (2) and (5) we have

$$y_{4j-3}y_{4j-2}y_{4j-1}y_{4j} = \theta^2(x_j) = \theta^2(x_{j+k}) = y_{4j+4k-3}y_{4j+4k-2}y_{4j+4k-1}y_{4j+4k} \text{ for } 1 < j < k, \text{ i.e. } y_i = y_{i+4k} \text{ for } 1 < i < 4k.$$

However by (3), (4) and (5), $y_0 = 0 = x_0 = x_k = y_{4k-3} = y_{4k}$. Thus $y_i = y_{i+4k}$ for $0 < i < 4k$. Therefore $y_0 \ldots y_{8k}$ is of the form $BBb$, and hence $B^*a_2^*a_2^*a_2^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$.

($\Rightarrow$) Suppose $B^*a_2^*a_2^*a_2^* \notin \mathfrak{P}^*$. By Lemma 3.3 there exists an integer $k > 1$ such
that \( y_0 \ldots y_{2k} \) is of the form \( BBb \), that is
\[
y_i = y_{i+k} \quad \text{for } 0 < i < k.  \tag{6}
\]

We show that \( k \) is a multiple of 4. Observe that
\[
y_0 \ldots y_8 = 010010110101101010110 \tag{7}
\]
is the initial 9-block. Observe that
\[
y_i = y_{i+k} \quad \text{for } 0 < i < k.  \tag{6}
\]

We show that \( k \) is a multiple of 4. Observe that
\[
y_0 \ldots y_8 = 010010110101101010110 \tag{7}
\]
is the initial 9-block of \( B^*a_3^*a_2^*a_1^*(01) \). By (1), \( B^*a_3^*a_2^*a_1^*(01) = 0 \cdot \theta^2[B^*(1001)] \)
and, since \( \theta^2(b) = bbbb \),
\[
y_{4i+1}y_{4i+2}y_{4i+3}y_{4i+4} = 0110 \text{ or } 1001 \text{ for } 0 < i < \frac{1}{2}(q - 4).  \tag{8}
\]
Now by Lemma 2.8, \( k \) is even, so if \( k = 4n + 2 \), then \( k + 3 = 4n + 5 = 4(n + 1) + 1 \). Consequently by (8),
\[
y_{k+3}y_{k+4}y_{k+5}y_{k+6} = 0110 \text{ or } 1001.
\]

But by (6) and (7),
\[
y_{k+3}y_{k+4}y_{k+5}y_{k+6} = y_3y_4y_5y_6 = 0110.
\]

Hence \( k = 4n \) for some \( n \). Furthermore from (7), \( n \neq 1 \) because \( y_0 \ldots y_8 \) is not of the form \( BBb \). Thus \( n > 2 \).

From (6) we have \( y_i = y_{i+4n} \) for \( 0 < i < 4n \), and in particular \( y_{4j-3} = y_{4j+4n-3} \) for \( 0 < j < n \). Thus by (3), \( x_j = y_{4j-3} = y_{4(j+n)-3} = x_{n+j} \) for \( 1 < j < n \). Furthermore from (6), (4) and (3), \( x_0 = y_0 = y_{4n} = y_{4n-3} = x_n \). Thus \( x_j = x_{j+n} \) for \( 0 < j < n \), i.e. \( x_0 \ldots x_{2n} \) is of the form \( BBb \). Therefore \( B^*a_1^* \notin \mathcal{P}^* \). \( \square \)

An inadmissible block is an algorithm block of the form \( b_{2n+3}^* \ldots b_n^* \) for \( n > 0 \) where
\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad b_i^* = a_1^* \text{ or } a_2^*, \\
(2) & \quad b_{2n+3}^*b_{2n+3}^* = a_1^*a_2^*, a_2^*a_3^* \text{ or } a_3^*a_1^*, \\
(3) & \quad b_i^* = a_1^* \text{ for each } i, 2 < i < 2n + 1.
\end{align*}
\]

Observe that \( b_q^* \ldots b_r^* \) is inadmissible if and only if \( b_q^*b_{q-1}^*b_r^* \) is inadmissible and \( b_q^* \) and \( b_r^* \) are separated by an even number of \( a_3^* \)'s. Thus each of the following is an inadmissible block:
\[
a_1^*a_2^*a_3^*, \quad a_1^*a_2^*a_3^*a_3^*a_3^*a_2^*a_1^* \quad \text{and} \quad a_3^*a_1^*a_3^*a_3^*a_3^*a_3^*a_3^*a_1^*.
\]

We shall show that \( \mathcal{P}^* \) consists of all algorithm blocks which contain no inadmissible subblocks (Theorem 3.14).

Lemma 3.6. If \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \), then no subblock of \( B^* \) is an inadmissible block.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, it suffices to show that if \( B^* = b_{2n+3}^* \ldots b_n^* \) is inadmissible, then \( B^* \notin \mathcal{P}^* \). Observe that
\[
\begin{align*}
a_1^*a_2^*a_3^*(01) &= 010011101011 \cdot 010011101011 \cdot 0, \\
a_2^*a_3^*a_1^*(01) &= 01001011 \cdot 01001011 \cdot 0 \cdot 01101001
\end{align*}
\]
and
\[
a_3^*a_1^*a_3^*(01) = 010011 \cdot 010011 \cdot 0 \cdot 010110
\]
each contain a block of the form \( BBb \) as indicated. The result now follows from Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 and induction on \( n \). \( \square \)
Lemma 3.7. Let \( B^* = b_n^* \ldots b_1^* \in \mathcal{B}^* \) be such that
(i) \( n > 3 \),
(ii) if \( C^* \) is a proper subblock of \( B^* \), then \( C^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) and
(iii) there exists a block \( B \) with initial symbol \( b \) such that \( BBb \) is an initial subblock of \( B^*(01) \).

Then \( b_{n-3}^* \ldots b_1^*(01) \) is a subblock of \( B \).

Proof. Use the fact that for any \( D^* = d_n^* \ldots d_1^* \in \mathcal{B}^* \),
\[
2^{k+1} < l(D^*(01)) < 2(2^{k+1} - 1)
\]
to show that if \( l(b_{n-3}^* \ldots b_1^*(01)) > l(B) \), then (ii) is not satisfied. \( \square \)

The main result of the section—the determination of \( \mathcal{P}^* \) is proved by induction on the length of the algorithm blocks. Lemma 3.8 begins the induction and Lemmas 3.9, 3.11–3.13 are the individual cases we shall need to consider in the inductive portion of the proof. There are 363 algorithm blocks of length less than or equal to 5, thus the verification of Lemma 3.8 was done by computer.

Lemma 3.8. Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{B}^* \) with \( l(B^*) < 5 \). Then \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) if and only if no inadmissible block appears in \( B^* \).

Lemma 3.9. Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) be such that
(i) \( l(B^*) > 3 \) and
(ii) every proper subblock of \( B^*a_1^*a_1^* \) is in \( \mathcal{P}^* \).

Then \( B^*a_1^*a_1^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \).

Proof. Let \( B^* = b_n^* \ldots b_1^* \). We first note that \( B^*a_1^*a_1^* \) cannot be inadmissible, for if \( C^* = B^*a_1^*a_1^* \), then \( c_2^* \neq a_3^* \).

If \( n = 3 \), then \( l(B^*a_1^*a_1^*) = 5 \), thus the lemma is valid by Lemma 3.8.

Let \( n > 3 \) and suppose \( B^*a_1^*a_1^* \notin \mathcal{P}^* \). By Lemma 3.3 there exists a block \( B \) with initial symbol \( b \) such that \( BBb \) is an initial subblock of \( B^*(01) \). By Lemma 3.7,
\[
a_1^*a_1^*(01) = A_0A_1A_2A_2 \quad \text{is an initial subblock of } B.
\]
Thus \( B^*a_1^*a_1^*(01) = B^*(A_0A_1A_2A_2) = A_0A_1[B^*(A_2A_2)] \).

Observe that \( b_1^* \neq a_3^* \), for otherwise, \( b_1^*a_1^*a_1^* = a_3^*a_1^*a_1^* \), which is inadmissible.

Let \( C^* = b_2^* \ldots b_1^* \). If \( b_1^* = a_1^* \), then
\[
B_1^*a_1^*(01) = A_0A_1 \cdot \left[ B^*(A_2A_2) \right] = A_0A_1 \cdot \left[ C^*a_1^*(A_2A_2) \right]
= A_0A_1 \cdot \left[ C^*(A_2A_2A_2A_2A_2) \right] = A_0A_1A_2 \cdot \left[ C^*(A_3A_3) \right].
\]
Similarly we have that if \( b_1^* = a_2^* \) then
\[
B_1^*a_1^*(01) = A_0A_1A_2A_2 \cdot \left[ C^*(A_3A_3) \right].
\]

Thus by (1), in each case the block \( B \), and hence the block \( a_1^*a_1^*(01) = A_0A_1A_2A_2 \), must appear in either \( C^*(A_3A_3) = \theta_3[C^*(01)] \) or \( C^*(A_3A_3) = \theta_3[C^*(10)] \). But \( \theta_3(0) = A_3 \) and \( \theta_3(1) = A_2 \), so \( C^*(A_3A_3) \) and \( C^*(A_3A_3) \) are each concatenations of \( A_3 \)'s and \( A_1 \)'s.
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Since \( l(A_0A_1A_2\bar{A}_2) = 11 < 16 = 2l(A_3) \), \( A_0A_1A_2\bar{A}_2 \) must appear in some \( D^{(1)}D^{(2)}D^{(3)} \) where each \( D^{(i)} \) is \( A_3 \) or \( \bar{A}_3 \). Furthermore since \( A_0A_1A_2\bar{A}_2 = 01001101001 \), it follows by inspection that the only appearance of \( A_3 \) or \( \bar{A}_3 \) in \( A_0A_1A_2\bar{A}_2 \) is as the terminal 8-block. Consequently \( A_0A_1A_2\bar{A}_2 \) must be a subblock of some \( D^{(1)}D^{(2)} \) where \( D^{(i)} = A_3 \) or \( \bar{A}_3 \). It is now easily shown that \( A_0A_1A_2\bar{A}_2 \) is not a subblock of \( A_3A_3, A_3A_3, \bar{A}_3A_3, \) or \( \bar{A}_3A_3 \). Therefore \( B^*a^*_i(01) \) contains no initial reducible blocks, and hence \( B^*a^*_i(01) \in \mathcal{P}^\ast \) \( \square \)

**Remark 3.10.** (i) For all \( n \geq 1 \), the canonical decomposition of \( A_0A_2A_3 \ldots A_n \) is \( CDD \) where \( C = A_0A_2A_3 \ldots A_{n-1} \) and \( D = \bar{A}_{n-1} \).

(ii) For all \( n \geq 1 \),

\[
a^*_1a^*_2 \ldots a^*_n(01) = A_0A_2A_3 \ldots A_{n+2}.
\]

(iii) For all \( n > 2 \), \( A_1A_0A_2A_3 \ldots A_n = A_{n+1} \).

**Lemma 3.11.** Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^\ast \) and suppose that each proper subblock of \( B^*a^*_2a^*_2a^*_1 \) is in \( \mathcal{P}^\ast \). Then \( B^*a^*_2a^*_2a^*_1 \in \mathcal{P}^\ast \).

**Proof.** Let \( B^* = b^*_n \ldots b^*_1 \) and let \( B = A_1A_0 \). By Remark 3.10, if \( b^*_i = a^*_2 \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), then \( B^*a^*_2a^*_2a^*_1(01) = A_0A_2A_3 \ldots A_{n+4} \). Hence again by Remark 3.10, \( B \cdot [B^*a^*_2a^*_2a^*_1(01)] = A_{n+5} \in \mathcal{P} \). Thus if \( B^* = a^*_2 \ldots a^*_2 \), then \( B^*a^*_2a^*_2a^*_1 \in \mathcal{P}^\ast \).

So suppose there exists an integer \( i, 1 \leq i \leq n \), such that \( b^*_i \neq a^*_2 \), and let \( r \) be the least such integer. Now \( b^*_r = a^*_2 \), for otherwise \( b^*_r = a^*_1 \), and then the inadmissible block \( a^*_1a^*_2a^*_2 \) would be a subblock of \( B^*a^*_2a^*_2a^*_1 \), which by Lemma 3.6 is not in \( \mathcal{P}^\ast \).

If \( r = n \), then by Remark 3.10,

\[
B \cdot [B^*a^*_2a^*_2a^*_1(01)] = B \cdot [a^*_2a^*_2 \ldots a^*_2a^*_1(01)] = B \cdot [a^*_2(A_0A_2A_3 \ldots A_{n+3})]
\]

\((n+1)\text{-times})

\[= BA_0A_2A_3 \ldots A_{n+2} \cdot [a^*_2(\bar{A}_{n+3})] = A_{n+3}A_{n+3}A_{n+3}.
\]

Since \( A_{n+3}A_{n+3}A_{n+3} \) is a subblock of \( A_{n+6} = A_{n+3}A_{n+3}A_{n+3}A_{n+3} \), it follows that \( B \cdot [B^*a^*_2a^*_2a^*_1(01)] \in \mathcal{P} \), so \( B^*a^*_2a^*_2a^*_1 \in \mathcal{P}^\ast \).

Suppose \( r < n \). Let \( C^* = b^*_n \ldots b^*_r+2 \). (If \( r = n-1 \), let \( C^* \) be the empty algorithm block.) Now \( b^*_{r+1} \neq a^*_2 \) for otherwise the following situations occur: if \( r = 1 \), then \( b^*_1b^*_2a^*_2 = a^*_2a^*_2a^*_2 \); and if \( r > 1 \), then \( b^*_{r+1}b^*_r = a^*_2a^*_2a^*_2a^*_2 \). In either case the inadmissible block \( a^*_2a^*_2a^*_2 \) appears. Therefore \( b^*_{r+1} = a^*_1 \) or \( a^*_2 \).

Suppose \( b^*_{r+1} = a^*_1 \). Then by Remark 3.10,
\[ B \cdot \left[ B^* a_2^* a_3^* a_t^*(01) \right] = B \cdot \left[ C^* a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* \ldots \hat{a}_t^*(01) \right] \]
\[ = B \cdot \left[ C^* a_1^* a_2^* (A_0 \tilde{A}_2 A_3 \ldots \tilde{A}_{r+3}) \right] \]
\[ = BA_0 \tilde{A}_2 A_3 \ldots \tilde{A}_{r+2} \cdot \left[ C^* a_1^* a_2^* (\tilde{A}_{r+3}) \right] \]
\[ = A_{r+3} \cdot \left[ C^* (A_{r+3} \tilde{A}_{r+3} \tilde{A}_{r+3} \tilde{A}_{r+3}) \right] \]
\[ = C^* (A_{r+3} \tilde{A}_{r+3} A_{r+3} \tilde{A}_{r+3} A_{r+3}) \]
\[ = C^* a_2^* (A_{r+3} \tilde{A}_{r+3}) = C^* a_2^* a_3^* \ldots a_t^*(01) . \]

Thus if \( B^* a_2^* a_3^* a_t^* \notin \mathcal{P}^* \), then
\[ C^* a_2^* a_3^* \ldots a_t^* \notin \mathcal{P}^* . \]

But by Lemma 2.9, we would then have \( C^* a_2^* \notin \mathcal{P}^* \), and hence by Lemma 3.4, \( C^* a_t^* \notin \mathcal{P}^* \). But \( C^* a_t^* = C^* b_{r+1} = b_{r+1}^* \ldots b_{r+1}^* \) which by the hypothesis is in \( \mathcal{P}^* \).

Therefore if \( b_{r+1}^* = a_t^* \), then \( B^* a_2^* a_3^* a_t^* \notin \mathcal{P}^* \).

By a similar argument, if \( b_{r+1}^* = a_t^* \) then \( B^* a_2^* a_3^* a_t^* \notin \mathcal{P}^* . \)

The following two lemmas are proved in a manner similar to that of the previous lemma.

**Lemma 3.12.** Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) and suppose that each proper subblock of \( B^* a_2^* a_3^* a_t^* \) is in \( \mathcal{P}^* \). Then \( B^* a_2^* a_3^* a_t^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \).

**Lemma 3.13.** Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) and suppose that each proper subblock of \( B^* a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* \) is in \( \mathcal{P}^* \). Then \( B^* a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \).

**Theorem 3.14.** Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \). Then \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) if and only if no inadmissible block appears in \( B^* \).

**Proof.** (\( \Rightarrow \)) See Lemma 3.6.

(\( \Leftarrow \)) The proof is by induction on \( l(B^*) \). Suppose \( B^* \) contains no inadmissible blocks. If \( l(B^*) < 5 \), then by Lemma 3.8, \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \).

Suppose that \( n > 5 \), and that if \( C^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \), where \( l(C^*) < n \), and \( C^* \) contains no inadmissible blocks, then \( C^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \). Let \( B^* = b_n^* \ldots b_1^* \).

Since \( B^* \) contains no inadmissible blocks, neither does \( b_n^* \ldots b_2^* \). So by the inductive hypothesis, \( b_n^* \ldots b_2^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \). If \( b_1^* = a_1^* \), then by Lemma 2.9, \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \).

So suppose \( b_1^* \neq a_1^* \). By Lemma 3.4, we may suppose \( b_1^* = a_t^* \).

Since \( B^* \) contains no inadmissible blocks, \( b_2^* b_3^* \neq a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* \) or \( a_2^* a_1^* \). If \( b_2^* = a_1^* \), then by Lemma 3.9, \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \). If \( b_2^* b_3^* = a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* \) or \( a_3^* a_1^* a_2^* \), then by Lemmas 3.11, 3.12 and 3.13 respectively, \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \). If \( b_2^* b_3^* = a_2^* a_3^* \), then by Lemma 3.5, \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) if and only if \( D^* = b_n^* \ldots b_2^* b_3^* b_1^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \). It is easy to check that no inadmissible block appears in \( D^* \). But \( l(D^*) = n - 2 < n \), so by the inductive hypothesis, \( D^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \). Therefore \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \).

The following corollary is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.14.
**Corollary 3.15.** Let \( x^* \in S^* \). Then \( x^* \in P^* \) if and only if no inadmissible blocks appear in \( x^* \).

**Remark 3.16.** A sufficient (although certainly not necessary) condition for an algorithm sequence \( x^* \) to be an element of \( P^* \) is that none of the blocks \( a_1^* a_2^*, a_2^* a_3^* \) or \( a_3^* a_1^* \) appear in \( x^* \). For example, \( \ldots a_1^* a_2^* a_1^* \in P^* \).

4. Determination of the one-sided Morse minimal set. Recall that the one-sided Morse minimal set \( M^+ \) is the set \( \{ x^+ \in S^+: x \in M \} \). In this section we show how to determine whether or not a binary sequence \( x = x^*(B) \) (where \( B = 01, 10, 001 \) or \( 110 \)) is an element of \( M^+ \) by considering \( x^* \).

Let \( \mathfrak{M} = \{ B \in \mathfrak{B} : B \text{ appears in } \mu^+ \} \); equivalently \( \mathfrak{M} = \{ B \in \mathfrak{B} : B \text{ appears in some Morse block} \} \). It is evident that if \( B \in \mathfrak{M} \), then every subblock of \( B \) is also in \( \mathfrak{M} \).

Let \( \mathfrak{M}^* = \{ B^* \in \mathfrak{B}^* : B^*(01) \in \mathfrak{M} \} \) and let \( M^* = \{ x^* \in S^* : x^*(01) \in M^+ \} \). Observe that \( \mathfrak{M} \subseteq \mathfrak{P} \), \( \mathfrak{M}^* \subseteq \mathfrak{P}^* \) and \( M^* \subseteq P^* \).

The correspondence between \( M^+ \) and \( M^* \) is analogous to that of \( P^+ \) and \( P^* \). This is reflected in the similarity of the statements of Lemmas 4.3, 4.4 and 4.12 to Theorems 2.3, 2.11 and Corollary 3.15, respectively. As in the case of \( P^* \), we first show that \( M^+ \subseteq \{ x^*(B) : x^* \in M^* \text{ and } B \in \mathfrak{B} \} \) (Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4). We then determine \( \mathfrak{M}^* \) (Theorem 4.11) and use \( \mathfrak{M}^* \) to determine \( M^* \) (Corollary 4.12).

**Lemma 4.1.** Let \( B \in \mathfrak{B} \). Then \( B \in \mathfrak{M} \) if and only if \( \theta(B) \in \mathfrak{M} \).

**Proof.** (\( \Rightarrow \)) Use the definition of \( \mathfrak{M} \) and the fact that \( \theta(A_n) = A_{n+1} \).

(\( \Leftarrow \)) If \( A_n = c_1 c_2 \ldots c_{2^n} \), then \( c_1 c_3 c_5 \ldots c_{2^n-1} = A_{n-1} \) and \( c_2 c_4 c_6 \ldots c_{2^n} = \bar{A}_{n-1} \). Thus if \( \theta(B) \) is a subblock of \( A_n \), then \( B \) is a subblock of \( A_{n-1} \) or \( \bar{A}_{n-1} \). □

Recalling that for \( y, z \in S^+ \), \( y \in \mathrm{Cl} \theta(z) \) if and only if every block which appears in \( y \) also appears in \( z \), the following is a direct consequence of Lemma 4.1.

**Lemma 4.2.** Let \( x \in S^+ \). Then \( x \in M^+ \) if and only if \( \theta(x) \in M^+ \).

**Lemma 4.3.** Let \( x \in S^+ \) with \( x_0 = \bar{x}_1 \). Then \( x \in M^+ \) if and only if there exists an algorithm sequence \( x^* \in M^* \) such that \( x^*(01) = x \) or \( \bar{x} \).

**Lemma 4.4.** Let \( x \in S^+ \) with \( x_0 = x_1 = \bar{x}_2 \). Then \( x \in M^+ \) if and only if there exists an algorithm sequence \( x^* \in M^* \) such that

(i) \( x^*(001) = x \) or \( \bar{x} \) and

(ii) \( x^*a_2^* \in M^* \).

**Proof.** The proof is analogous to that of Theorem 2.11. □

We shall show that each block in \( \mathfrak{M} \) has the property that it can be extended arbitrarily far to the left and still be in \( \mathfrak{M} \). We then employ this concept to determine which algorithm blocks map 01 to a block which can be extended arbitrarily far to the left to a block in \( \mathfrak{M} \) (Theorem 4.11).

Let \( B = b_1 \ldots b_n \in \mathfrak{B} \). The reverse block of \( B \) is the block \( B' = b_n \ldots b_1 \). Notice that \( (BC)' = C'B' \). In the case of Morse blocks, we have \( A_{2n} = A_{2n} \) and \( A_{2n+1}' = \bar{A}_{2n+1} \).
Lemma 4.5. Let \( B \in \mathfrak{R} \). Then

(i) If \( B \in \mathfrak{R} \), then \( B' \in \mathfrak{R} \).

(ii) If \( B \in \mathfrak{R} \) and \( k > 0 \), then there exists a \( k \)-block \( C \) such that \( CB \in \mathfrak{R} \).

(iii) If \( B \) is a \( 2^n \)-block such that \( BC \in \mathfrak{R} \) with \( C = \overline{A_n} \overline{A_n} \), \( \overline{A_n}A_n \) or \( \overline{A_n}A_n \), then \( B = A_n \) or \( \overline{A_n} \).

Proof. (i): Use the fact that \( A_{2n}^+ = A_{2n}^+ \) for each \( n > 0 \).

(ii): Extend \( B' \) to the right \( k \) places to a subblock \( B' C' \) of some \( A_n \). Then by (i), \( CB = (B'C')' \in \mathfrak{R} \).

(iii): By (i), \( C' \in \mathfrak{R} \), thus \( C' = \mu^+[k; 2^n+1] \) for some \( k > 0 \). By Lemma 2.2, \( B' = \mu[k + 2^n+1; 2^n] = A_n \) or \( \overline{A_n} \). Thus \( B = A_n \) or \( \overline{A_n} \). \( \square \)

Lemma 4.6. If \( B^* \in \mathfrak{R}^* \), then every subblock of \( B^* \) is in \( \mathfrak{R}^* \).

A pathological block is an algorithm block of the form \( b_{2n+2} \ldots b_1^* \) for \( n > 0 \) where

(i) \( b_i^* = a_i^* \) or \( a_i^* \),

(ii) \( b_{2n+2}^* = a_n^* \)

and if \( n > 1 \),

(iii) \( b_i^* = a_i^* \) for \( 2 < i < 2n + 1 \).

Observe that \( B^* = b_{2n+2}^* \ldots b_1^* \) is a pathological block if and only if \( b_q^* b_i^* = a_i^* a_i^* \) or \( a_i^* a_i^* \), and \( b_q^* \) and \( b_i^* \) are separated by an even number of \( a_i^* \)'s. Thus each of the following is a pathological block: \( a_i^* a_i^* \), \( a_i^* a_i^* a_i^* a_i^* \) and \( a_i^* a_i^* a_i^* a_i^* a_i^* a_i^* \).

We shall show that \( \mathfrak{R}^* \) consists of all algorithm blocks \( B^* \in \mathfrak{R}^* \) which contain no pathological blocks (Theorem 4.11).

Remark 4.7. Let \( n > 1 \). Then

(i) If \( n \) is even, then \( \theta^n(01) \) ends in \( 01 \).

(ii) If \( n \) is odd, then \( \theta^n(01) \) ends in \( 10 \).

Lemma 4.8. If \( B^* \in \mathfrak{R}^* \), then no subblock of \( B^* \) is a pathological block.

Proof. By Lemma 4.6, it suffices to show that if \( B^* \) is a pathological block, then \( B^* \in \mathfrak{R}^* \).

Let \( B^* = b_{2n+2}^* \ldots b_1^* \) be a pathological block and let \( C^* = b_{2n+2}^* \ldots b_2^* \). Observe that

\[ C^* = a_1^* a_2^* \ldots a_{2n}^*, \text{ 2n-times} \]

and that \( b_1^* = a_1^* \) or \( a_1^* \).

Suppose \( b_1^* = a_1^* \). Then by Remark 2.4,

\[ B^*(01) = C^* a_1^*(01) = C^*(01001) \]

\[ = 0 \cdot \left[ C^*(01001) \right] = 0 \cdot \left[ a_1^* a_3^* \ldots a_{2n}^*(01001) \right] \text{ 2n-times} \]

\[ = 0 \cdot \left[ a_1^*(\theta^{2n}(\overline{\overline{A}_1A_1})) \right] = 0 \cdot \left[ a_1^*(A_{2n+1}A_{2n+1}) \right] \]

\[ = 0 \cdot A_{2n+1}A_{2n+1} \overline{A}_{2n+1}A_{2n+1} = 0 \cdot A_{2n+1}A_{2n+2} \overline{A}_{2n+1}A_{2n+2}. \]
If $B^*(01) \in \mathcal{R}$, then by Lemma 4.5, there exists a $(2^{2n+1} - 1)$-block $D$ such that $D \cdot 0 \cdot A_{2n+1} = A_{2n+2}$ or $A_{2n+2}$. In particular $D \cdot 0$ must be $A_{2n+1} = \theta^{2n}(01)$. But by Remark 4.7, $\theta^{2n}(01)$ ends in 01. Hence there is no such block $D$. Therefore if $b_i^* = a_i^*$, then $B^* \notin \mathcal{R}^*$. Similarly if $b_i^* = a_2^*$, then $B^* \notin \mathcal{R}^*$. □

**Lemma 4.9.** Let $n > 2$, let $B^* = b_n^* \ldots b_1^* \in \mathcal{R}^*$ and let $CDD$ be the canonical decomposition of $B^*(01)$. Then

(i) If

$$B^* = a_3^* \ldots a_n^*, \quad \text{then} \quad C \text{ is the empty block.}$$

(ii) If $b_n^* = a_1^*$ or $a_2^*$, then there exists a block $E \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $EC = \overline{DD}$. (ii) If

$$B^* = a_3^* \ldots a_n^* \theta^{n-2k+1}(01) \ldots b_1^*$$

for some positive integer $k$ such that $2k - 1 < n$ and $b_{n-2k+1}^* \neq a_2^*$, then there exists a block $E \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $EC = \overline{D}$. (iv) If

$$B^* = a_3^* \ldots a_n^* \theta^{n-2k}(01) \ldots b_1^*$$

for some positive integer $k$ such that $k < 2n$ and $b_{n-2k}^* \neq a_2^*$, then there exists a block $E \in \mathcal{R}$ such that $EC = D$.

**Proof.** (i): Recall from Remark 2.4,

$$a_3^* \ldots a_n^*(01) = \theta^n(01) = A_n \overline{A_n}. \quad \text{n-times}$$

(ii)–(iv): The proof is by induction on $n$. Suppose $B^*$ is not of the form $a_3^* \ldots a_n^*$. (1)

If $n = 2$, (ii) and (iii) are readily verified, and (iv) is vacuously true.

Proceeding inductively on $n$, suppose that $n > 3$ and that (ii), (iii) and (iv) hold for all algorithm blocks of length less than $n$.

Let $B^* = b_n^* \ldots b_1^*$ satisfy the hypothesis of (ii), (iii) or (iv).

Let $C^* = b_{n-1}^* \ldots b_1^*$, and let $FGG$ be the canonical decomposition of $C^*(01)$. From the inductive hypothesis, it follows that one of three situations occurs: $F$ is the empty block, $F$ is a nonempty terminal block of $GG$, or $F$ is a nonempty terminal block of $G$. (Note that if $F$ is a terminal block of $G$, then $F$ is also a terminal block of $GG$.) We consider each of these three cases separately.

**Case 1.** Suppose that $F$ is the empty block. Observe that $G = A_{n-1}$ or $\overline{A_{n-1}}$. Furthermore, 01 is an initial block of $C^*(01)$, thus $G = A_{n-1}$. Now applying Remark 2.4,

$$C^*(01) = A_{n-1} \overline{A_{n-1}} = \theta^{n-1}(01) = a_3^* \ldots a_n^*(01).$$
If \( b_n^* = a_1^* \), then \( B^* = a_1^* \ldots a_n^* \), contrary to (1). So suppose \( b_n^* = a_1^* \) or \( a_2^* \).

If \( b_n^* = a_1^* \), then

\[
B^*(01) = b_n^*C^*(01) = a_1^*(GG) = GGGGG.
\]

Hence \( C = G \) and \( D = GG \). Thus for \( E = GGG \), \( EC = GGGG \cdot G = DD \).

If \( b_n^* = a_2^* \), then

\[
B^*(01) = b_n^*C^*(01) = a_2^*(GGG) = GGGGGGGG.
\]

Hence \( C = GGG \) and \( D = GG \). Thus for \( E = GGG \), \( EC = GGG \cdot GGG = DD \).

Therefore the lemma is valid for Case 1.

**Case 2.** Suppose \( F \) is a nonempty terminal block of \( GG \). Let \( H \in \mathcal{M} \) such that \( HF = GG \).

We claim that \( b_n^* \neq a_1^* \). For suppose \( b_n^* = a_1^* \). Since \( B^*(01) \in \mathcal{M} \), by Lemma 4.5, there exists a block \( K \in \mathcal{M} \) such that \( l(KF) = 2l(G) \) and \( K \cdot [B^*(01)] \in \mathcal{M} \).

Now

\[
K \cdot [B^*(01)] = K \cdot [b_n^*(FGG)] = K \cdot [a_1^*(FGG)] = K \cdot FGGGGGG,
\]

so by Lemma 4.5 we have that \( KF = GG \), \( GGG \), or \( GGG \). But \( F \) is a terminal block of \( GG \); thus \( KF \neq GG \) or \( GGG \). Furthermore \( KF \neq GG \), for otherwise the reducible block \( GGGG \) is an initial block of \( K \cdot [B^*(01)] \) contrary to \( K \cdot [B^*(01)] \in \mathcal{M} \). Similarly \( KF \neq GG \), for otherwise \( K \cdot [B^*(01)] = GGGGGGGGG \) which is reducible, again contrary to \( K \cdot [B^*(01)] \in \mathcal{M} \). Therefore there is no such \( K \in \mathcal{M} \).

Hence by Lemma 4.5, \( B^* \notin \mathcal{M} \), thus proving the claim.

If \( b_n^* = a_2^* \), then

\[
B^*(01) = b_n^*C^*(01) = a_2^*(FGG) = FGGGGGGG.
\]

Hence \( C = FGG \) and \( D = GG \). Thus for \( E = H \), \( EC = H \cdot FGG = GGGG \cdot G = DD \).

If \( b_n^* = a_2^* \), let \( t \) be the greatest integer such that \( b_t^* \neq a_2^* \). By (1), \( t \geq 1 \). By the inductive hypothesis, \((n - 1) - t \) cannot be odd, for then \( F \) would be a nonempty terminal block of \( G \) contrary to our supposition on \( F \). Thus \((n - 1) - t \) is even, and so \( n - t \) is odd. Furthermore

\[
B^*(01) = b_n^*C^*(01) = a_2^*(FGG) = FGGGGGGG.
\]

Hence \( C = F \) and \( D = GGG \). Thus for \( E = H \), \( EC = H \cdot F = GGG = DD \).

Therefore the lemma is valid for Case 2.

**Case 3.** If \( F \) is a nonempty terminal block of \( G \), the proof is similar to that of Case 2. \( \square \)

**Lemma 4.10.** Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \). Then

(i) \( a_n^*B^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \) and

(ii) \( a_n^*B^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \).

**Proof.** Use Lemma 4.9. \( \square \)

**Theorem 4.11.** Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \). Then \( B^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \) if and only if \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) and no pathological block appears in \( B^* \).
Binary sequences which contain no \( BBb \)

**Proof.** (\( \Rightarrow \)) Use Lemma 4.8 and the fact that \( \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \).

(\( \Leftarrow \)) Let \( B^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) and suppose no pathological block appears in \( B^* \). We prove that \( B^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \) by induction on \( l(B^*) \).

It is readily verified that

\[
B^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \quad \text{if} \quad l(B^*) = 1. \tag{1}
\]

Suppose that \( n \geq 2 \), that \( B^* = b_n^* \ldots b_1^* \) and that if \( C^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \) such that \( l(C^*) < n \) and no pathological block appears in \( C^* \), then \( C^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \).

Since no pathological block appears in \( B^* \), none appears in \( b_{n-1}^* \ldots b_1^* \). Furthermore, \( b_{n-1}^* \ldots b_1^* \in \mathcal{P}^* \). Therefore by the inductive hypothesis \( b_{n-1}^* \ldots b_1^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \).

Thus if \( b_n^* = a_2^* \) or \( a_2^* \), then by Lemma 4.10, \( B^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \).

So suppose \( b_n^* = a_1^* \). Since no pathological block appears in \( B^* \), \( b_{n-1}^* \neq a_1^* \) or \( a_2^* \), that is \( b_{n-1}^* = a_2^* \).

By Remark 2.4, if \( b_{n-1}^* \ldots b_1^* = a_2^* \ldots a_2^* \), then \( B^*(01) = a_1^*(\theta^{n-1}(01)) = \theta^{n-1}[a_1^*(01)] \). However by (1), \( a_1^*(01) \in \mathcal{M} \), thus by Lemma 4.1, \( \theta^{n-1}[a_1^*(01)] \in \mathcal{M} \). Hence \( B^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \).

If \( b_{n-1}^* \ldots b_1^* \neq a_2^* \ldots a_2^* \), let \( t \) be the greatest integer such that \( b_t^* \neq a_t^* \).

Thus

\[
b_n^* \ldots b_1^* = a_t^* a_t^* \ldots a_t^* a_t^* \text{ or } a_t^* a_t^* \ldots a_t^* a_t^*.
\]

Since no pathological block appears in \( B^* \), \( n - t - 1 \) is odd. Let \( CD\overline{D} \) be the canonical decomposition of \( b_{n-1}^* \ldots b_1^*(01) \). By Lemma 4.9 there is a block \( E \in \mathcal{M} \) such that \( EC = \overline{D} \). Thus

\[
D\overline{D}E \cdot [B^*(01)] = D\overline{D}E \cdot [a_t^*(CD\overline{D})] = D\overline{D}E \cdot CDDDDDDDD = D\overline{D}D\overline{D}D\overline{D}DD \in \mathcal{M}.
\]

Therefore \( B^* \in \mathcal{M}^* \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.12.** Let \( x^* \in S^* \). Then \( x^* \in M^* \) if and only if no inadmissible or pathological block appears in \( x^* \).

Since \( \ldots a_t^* a_t^* a_t^* \in P^* \) (see Remark 3.16), but \( \ldots a_t^* a_t^* a_t^* \notin M^* \), we have that \( M^* \not\subseteq P^* \). We are now able to conclude the following.

**Remark 4.13.** \( M^+ \) is a proper subset of \( P^+ \).

Finally, observe that algorithm sequences give an effective method for generating all elements in the one-sided Morse minimal set. The only other known way of doing this is to use Kakutani's procedure to generate bisequences in \( M \) (see 12.47-49 of [2]), and then discard their "negative halves".

**5. Comparison of \( P^+ \) and \( M^+ \).** Although we know that \( M^+ \neq P^+ \), we have yet to compare them. In this final section we investigate the size of the set \( P^+ - M^+ \) and some dynamical differences between the symbolic flows \( (P^+, \sigma) \) and \( (M^+, \sigma) \).

It is a simple exercise to establish how the shift transformation of a binary
sequence \( x = x^*(01) \) affects the algorithm sequence \( x^* \). If we were to do this, we would notice that, with the exception of the constantly-af algorithm sequence, the shift affects only finitely many algorithms. (This is due to the fact that if \( a^*_i \) or \( a^*_j \) appears in \( B^* \), and if \( CDD \) is the canonical decomposition of \( B^*(01) \), then \( C \) is not the empty block.)

Observe that in the sequence

\[
x = \ldots a^*_i a^*_i a^*_i(01) = A_0A_1A_2A_3\ldots,
\]

the pathological block \( a^*_i a^*_i \) appears arbitrarily far to the left. Thus no matter how many times we shift, we will still have pathological blocks remaining. Therefore not only is \( x \in M^+ \), but \( \theta(x) \cap M^+ = \emptyset \). The following theorem shows the abundance of such \( x \in P^+ \).

**Theorem 5.1.** There are uncountably many \( x \in P^+ \) such that \( \theta(x) \cap M^+ = \emptyset \).

**Proof.** Since \( \theta(x) \cap M^+ = \emptyset \) provided \( \sigma^n x \not\in M^+ \) for all \( n \), it suffices to find uncountably many algorithm sequences in \( P^* \) each of which has pathological blocks arbitrarily far to the left.

Let \( E^* = \{ \ldots B^*_i a^*_i a^*_i B^*_i a^*_i a^*_i : B^*_i = a^*_i a^*_i, a^*_i a^*_i \text{ or } a^*_i a^*_i \} \).

Clearly \( E^* \) is uncountable. Furthermore, since none of the blocks \( a^*_i a^*_i, a^*_i a^*_i \) or \( a^*_i a^*_i \) appear in any \( z^* \in E^* \), by Remark 3.16, \( E^* \subseteq P^* \). However the pathological block \( a^*_i a^*_i \) appears arbitrarily far to the left in each \( z \in E^* \). Thus for each \( z^* \in E^* \), \( \theta(z^*(01)) \cap M^+ = \emptyset \). □

We now turn to some dynamical aspects of \( (P^+, \sigma) \) and \( (M^+, \sigma) \).

**Lemma 5.2.** Let \( B = 01, 10, 001 \) or 110 and let \( x = x^*(B) \). Then for each \( n > 0 \) there exists an integer \( k \) such that \( \sigma^k x \) is an infinite concatenation of \( A_n^* \)'s and \( \overline{A_n}^* \)'s.

**Proof.** Let \( CDD \) be the canonical decomposition of \( x_n^* \ldots x_i^*(B) \). It is readily verified by induction on \( n \) that \( D = A_n \) or \( \overline{A_n} \). Let \( d \) be the initial symbol of \( D \), thus \( D = \sigma^k(d) \).

\[
x^*(B) = \ldots x^*_{n+2} x^*_{n+1}(CDD) = C \cdot [\ldots x^*_{n+2} x^*_{n+1} (D\overline{D})] = C \cdot \theta^n [\ldots x^*_{n+2} x^*_{n+1} (d\overline{d})].
\]

Let \( k = l(C) \), and the desired conclusion follows. □

Let \( x \in S^+ \). The \( \omega \)-limit set of \( x \) is the set \( \omega(x) = \{ y \in S^+ : \sigma^n x \rightarrow y \text{ for some sequence } n_i \rightarrow +\infty \} \). Note that \( y \in \omega(x) \) if and only if every block which appears in \( y \) also appears arbitrarily far to the right in \( x \). Furthermore note that for any positive integer \( k \), \( \omega(x) = \omega(\sigma^k x) \). Since \( S^+ \) is compact, we also have that \( (\omega(x), \sigma) \) is a subflow of \( (S^+, \sigma) \).

**Theorem 5.3.** Let \( x \in P^+ \). Then \( \omega(x) = M^+ \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 5.2, for each \( n > 0 \), \( A_n \) appears arbitrarily far to the right in \( x \). Since every block which appears in \( M^+ \) must appear in some \( A_n \), it follows that \( M^+ \subseteq \omega(x) \).
To prove $\omega(x) \subseteq M^+$, we show that if $y \not\in M^+$ then $y \not\in \omega(x)$. Suppose $y \not\in M^+$. Then there exists a block $B$ of $y$ such that $B$ appears in no $A_n$. Let $m$ be such that $l(B) < 2^m$. By Lemma 5.2 there exists an integer $k$ such that $\sigma^k(x)$ is an infinite concatenation of $A_{m}$'s and $\overline{A}_{m}$'s. By our choice of $m$, if $B$ appears in $\sigma^k(x)$, then $B$ appears in $A_mA_mA_mA_mA_mA_mA_mA_m$ or $\overline{A}_mA_m$. But all four of these appear in $A_{m+3} = A_mA_mA_mA_mA_mA_mA_mA_mA_m$. Thus $B$ does not appear in $\sigma^k(x)$. Hence $y \not\in \omega(\sigma^k(x)) = \omega(x)$. □

**Corollary 5.4.** $(M^+, \sigma)$ is the unique minimal subflow of $(P^+, \sigma)$.

Let $(X, \sigma)$ be a subflow of $(S^+, \sigma)$. A point $x \in X$ is nonwandering provided that for every open neighborhood $U$ of $x \in X$, $\{n > 0: \sigma^n(U) \cap U \neq \emptyset\}$ is infinite. Equivalently, we have that $x$ is nonwandering if and only if for each initial block $B$ of $x$ and for each positive integer $N$, there exists $y \in X$ and an integer $n > N$ such that $B$ is an initial block of both $y$ and $\sigma^y$.

Let $\Omega(X)$ denote the set of nonwandering points of $X$. We remark that $(\Omega(x), \sigma)$ is a subflow of $(X, \sigma)$.

**Theorem 5.5.** $\Omega(P^+) = M^+$.

**Proof.** Use Lemma 5.2 and Corollary 5.4. □

**Corollary 5.6.** (i) The topological entropy of $(P^+, \sigma)$ is zero.

(ii) $(P^+, \sigma)$ is uniquely ergodic.

**Proof.** Invariant measures and topological entropy are concentrated on the nonwandering set (see pp. 35 and 138 of [1]). Klein has shown in [5] that the topological entropy of $(M^+, \sigma)$ is zero and that $(M^+, \sigma)$ is uniquely ergodic. The result now follows from Theorem 5.5. □

We see from 5.3–5.6 that the “dynamically interesting” part of $P^+$ is $M^+$. Theorem 5.5 shows that $P^+ - M^+$ is in some sense “small”. Our final result shows that it is in some sense “large”.

**Theorem 5.7.** There is no countable set $E$ such that $P^+ = \cup x \in E \sigma(x)$.

**Proof.** By Theorem 5.3, for each $x \in P^+$, $\omega(x) = M^+$. Thus for each $x \in P^+$, $\sigma(x) \subseteq M^+$. Since $\sigma(x)$ is countable for each $x \in E$, $E$ must be uncountable. □
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