

On a faithful representation of Sturmian morphisms

Jana Lepšová^{a,b}, Edita Pelantová^b, Štěpán Starosta^{c,*}

^a*Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, Bordeaux INP, LaBRI, UMR 5800, Bordeaux, F-33400, Talence, France*

^b*Department of Mathematics, FNSPE, Czech Technical University in Prague, Trojanova 13, Prague, 12000, Czech Republic*

^c*Department of Applied Mathematics, FIT, Czech Technical University in Prague, Thákurova 9, Prague, 16000, Czech Republic*

Abstract

The set of morphisms mapping any Sturmian sequence to a Sturmian sequence forms together with composition the so-called monoid of Sturm. For this monoid, we define a faithful representation by (3×3) -matrices with integer entries. We find three convex cones in \mathbb{R}^3 and show that a matrix $R \in SI(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$ is a matrix representing a Sturmian morphism if the three cones are invariant under multiplication by R or R^{-1} . This property offers a new tool to study Sturmian sequences. We provide alternative proofs of four known results on Sturmian sequences fixed by a primitive morphism and a new result concerning the square root of a Sturmian sequence.

Keywords: Sturmian sequence, Sturmian morphism, square root of Sturmian sequence, faithful representation

2000 MSC: 68R15

1. Introduction

Representation of objects by linear operators is a tool helping to understand the behaviour of algebraic structures, which often serve as a model of physical phenomena. Representations of algebraic structures bring order into their description. Particle physics offers the most spectacular example: the classification of elementary particles is based on an irreducible representation of certain Lie algebras [8]. In this article we demonstrate an application of the representation theory in combinatorics on words. More specifically, we show that a representation of the special Sturmian monoid provides a handy tool for proving some results on Sturmian sequences fixed by primitive morphisms.

Sturmian sequences were introduced more than 80 years ago by Morse and Hedlund [12] and belong to the most explored objects in combinatorics on words. In this article we focus on the Sturmian monoid, i.e. on the set of Sturmian morphisms, which are morphisms that map any Sturmian sequence to a Sturmian sequence. This set together with composition of morphisms forms a monoid. Association of each morphism with its

*corresponding author

Email address: stepan.starosta@fit.cvut.cz (Štěpán Starosta)

incidence matrix forms a representation of this monoid. This representation maps the Sturmian monoid to a monoid of (2×2) -matrices with integer entries. In Section 5, we define a new representation \mathcal{R} of the special Sturmian monoid \mathcal{M} by (3×3) -matrices. Unlike the representation by incidence matrices, our representation is faithful, i.e., \mathcal{R} is injective. In Section 6, we show that the matrices assigned by \mathcal{R} to Sturmian morphisms form a submonoid of the group $Sl(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$ and the submonoid is characterized by three convex cones in \mathbb{R}^3 . Using the new representation \mathcal{R} , we provide new proofs of four known results in Section 7. A new result on square roots of Sturmian sequences, introduced in [13], is obtained in Section 8. More specifically, we show that the fixing morphism of the square root of a Sturmian sequence \mathbf{u} can be found among the conjugates of small powers of the morphism fixing the \mathbf{u} .

2. Preliminaries

Let \mathcal{A} be an *alphabet*, a finite set of *letters*. A (*finite*) *word* w is a finite sequence of elements of \mathcal{A} : $w = w_0w_1 \dots w_{n-1}$ with $w_i \in \mathcal{A}$. The length of w , denoted $|w|$, equals n . The *empty word*, which is the unique word of length 0, is denoted ε . If $w = pfs$, i.e., the word w is a concatenation of 3 words p , f and s , we say that p is a *prefix* of w , f is a *factor* of w and s is a *suffix* of w . The set of all words over \mathcal{A} is denoted \mathcal{A}^* .

Let $\mathbf{s} = (s_i)_{i=0}^{+\infty}$ be a sequence over \mathcal{A} , that is, $s_i \in \mathcal{A}$ for all i . Similarly, if $\mathbf{s} = pfs'$, where p and f are finite words and \mathbf{s}' a sequence over \mathcal{A} , we say that p is a *prefix* of \mathbf{s} and f is a *factor* of \mathbf{s} . A factor f of \mathbf{s} is said to be *left special* if af and bf are also factors of \mathbf{s} for two distinct letters $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$.

The *frequency of a letter* $a \in \mathcal{A}$ in the sequence \mathbf{s} equals $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{|\text{pref}_i(\mathbf{s})|_a}{i}$, if the limit exists, where $\text{pref}_i(\mathbf{s})$ is the prefix of \mathbf{s} of length i and $|w|_a$ is the number of a 's in the word w .

A mapping $\mu : \mathcal{A}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^*$ is a *morphism* if for all $u, v \in \mathcal{A}^*$ we have $\mu(uv) = \mu(u)\mu(v)$. A morphism μ is *primitive* if there exists k such that every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is a factor of $\mu^k(b)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{A}$.

Morphisms naturally act on infinite sequences in the following manner. Considering a sequence $\mathbf{s} = (s_i)_{i=0}^{+\infty}$ over \mathcal{A} , the image of \mathbf{s} by the morphism μ is the sequence $\mu(\mathbf{s}) = \mu(s_0)\mu(s_1)\mu(s_2) \dots$ over \mathcal{A} . We say that a sequence \mathbf{s} is a *fixed point* of μ if $\mu(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{s}$.

3. Sturmian sequences

Sturmian sequences allow many equivalent definitions, see for instance [9] and [7]. We present a definition relying on mechanical sequences. Let $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and δ be real numbers. The sequences $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}$ and $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha, \delta}$ defined by

$$\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}(n) := \lfloor \alpha(n+1) + \delta \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha n + \delta \rfloor \quad \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

and

$$\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha, \delta}(n) := \lceil \alpha(n+1) + \delta \rceil - \lceil \alpha n + \delta \rceil \quad \text{for each } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

are called the *lower* and the *upper*, respectively, *mechanical sequences* with the *slope* α and the *intercept* δ .

It is easy to see that the sequences $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}$ and $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}$ have elements in the set $\{0, 1\}$. If α is an irrational number, then $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}(n)$ is a *lower Sturmian sequence* and $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}(n)$ is an *upper Sturmian sequence*.

Moreover, $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}(n) = 0$ if the fractional part of $\alpha n + \delta$ belongs to $[0, 1 - \alpha)$, otherwise $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}(n) = 1$. Similarly, $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}(n) = 0$ if the fractional part of $\alpha n + \delta$ belongs to $(0, 1 - \alpha]$, otherwise $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}(n) = 1$. This property leads to an equivalent definition of Sturmian sequences, which relies on the two interval exchange transformation.

For given parameters $\ell_0, \ell_1 > 0$, we consider two intervals of length ℓ_0 and ℓ_1 . To define a lower Sturmian sequence, we use the left-closed right-open intervals $I_0 = [0, \ell_0)$ and $I_1 = [\ell_0, \ell_0 + \ell_1)$, to define an upper Sturmian sequence, we use the left-open right-closed intervals $I_0 = (0, \ell_0]$ and $I_1 = (\ell_0, \ell_0 + \ell_1]$. The *two interval exchange transformation* (2iet) $T : I_0 \cup I_1 \rightarrow I_0 \cup I_1$ is defined by

$$T(x) = \begin{cases} x + \ell_1 & \text{if } x \in I_0, \\ x - \ell_0 & \text{if } x \in I_1. \end{cases}$$

If we take an initial point $\rho \in I_0 \cup I_1$, the sequence $\mathbf{u} = u_0 u_1 u_2 \cdots \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ defined by

$$u_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } T^n(\rho) \in I_0, \\ 1 & \text{if } T^n(\rho) \in I_1, \end{cases}$$

i.e., a coding of the trajectory of the point ρ , is a *2iet sequence* with the *parameters* ℓ_0, ℓ_1, ρ . We shall use the following notation for this fact:

$$\vec{v}(\mathbf{u}) = (\ell_0, \ell_1, \rho)^\top,$$

and refer to $(\ell_0, \ell_1, \rho)^\top$ as a *vector of parameters of \mathbf{u}* .

Clearly, collinear triples $(\ell_0, \ell_1, \rho)^\top$ and $c(\ell_0, \ell_1, \rho)^\top$ produce the same infinite sequence for any constant $c > 0$.

The set of all 2iet sequences with an irrational slope α coincides with the set of all Sturmian sequences, see [9]. The slope of the sequence \mathbf{u} with the vector of parameters $(\ell_0, \ell_1, \rho)^\top$ equals $\alpha = \frac{\ell_1}{\ell_0 + \ell_1}$. The language of a Sturmian sequence depends only on the slope α and does not depend on the intercept δ . The following lemma summarizes the relation between the slope and intercept of Sturmian sequences and the assigned vectors of parameters.

Lemma 1. *Each lower Sturmian sequence $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}$ is generated by the transformation T exchanging the intervals $I_0 = [0, 1 - \alpha)$ and $I_1 = [1 - \alpha, 1)$; each upper Sturmian sequence $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}$ is generated by the transformation T exchanging the intervals $I_0 = (0, 1 - \alpha]$ and $I_1 = (1 - \alpha, 1]$.*

Moreover,

A) if $\delta \in (0, 1)$, then

$$\vec{v}(\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}) = \vec{v}(\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}).$$

B) if $\delta = 0$, then

$$\vec{v}(\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,0}) = (1 - \alpha, \alpha, 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{v}(\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,0}) = (1 - \alpha, \alpha, 0).$$

Among all Sturmian sequences with a fixed irrational slope $\alpha = \frac{\ell_1}{\ell_0 + \ell_1}$, the sequence with the vector of parameters $\vec{v}(\mathbf{u}) = (\ell_0, \ell_1, \ell_1)^\top$ plays a special role. Such a sequence is called a *characteristic Sturmian sequence* and it is usually denoted by \mathbf{c}_α . A Sturmian sequence $\mathbf{u} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is characteristic if both sequences $0\mathbf{u}$ and $1\mathbf{u}$ are Sturmian. Equivalently, a Sturmian sequence \mathbf{u} is characteristic, if every prefix of \mathbf{u} is left special.

4. Sturmian morphisms

A morphism ψ is a *Sturmian morphism* if $\psi(\mathbf{u})$ is a Sturmian sequence for any Sturmian sequence \mathbf{u} . The set of Sturmian morphisms together with composition forms the so-called *monoid of Sturm*, or *Sturmian monoid*, which is in [9] denoted by St . The monoid was described in [11]. Here we work with a submonoid of St generated by the following Sturmian morphisms:

$$G : \begin{cases} 0 \rightarrow 0 \\ 1 \rightarrow 01 \end{cases} \quad \tilde{G} : \begin{cases} 0 \rightarrow 0 \\ 1 \rightarrow 10 \end{cases} \quad D : \begin{cases} 0 \rightarrow 10 \\ 1 \rightarrow 1 \end{cases} \quad \tilde{D} : \begin{cases} 0 \rightarrow 01 \\ 1 \rightarrow 1 \end{cases} . \quad (1)$$

The submonoid $\mathcal{M} = \langle G, \tilde{G}, D, \tilde{D} \rangle$ is also called the *special Sturmian monoid*. Any lower (resp. upper) mechanical sequence is mapped by a morphism from \mathcal{M} to a lower (resp. upper) mechanical sequence. The monoid \mathcal{M} does not contain the Sturmian morphism $E : 0 \mapsto 1, 1 \mapsto 0$. This morphism maps a lower (resp. upper) mechanical sequence to an upper (resp. lower) mechanical sequence. Extending the generating set of \mathcal{M} by the morphism E gives already the generating set of the whole Sturmian monoid St .

Note that $DE = EG$, $\tilde{D}E = E\tilde{G}$ and $E^2 = \text{id}$. Hence $St = EM \cup \mathcal{M} = ME \cup \mathcal{M}$. In particular, $\psi^2 \in \mathcal{M}$ for each Sturmian morphism ψ . See also Remark 10 below.

The relation between the parameters of a Sturmian sequence and its image under a Sturmian morphism can be found in [9, Lemmas 2.2.17 and 2.2.18]:

$$G(\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}) = \mathbf{s}_{\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}, \frac{\delta}{1+\alpha}}, \quad \tilde{G}(\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}) = \mathbf{s}_{\frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}, \frac{\alpha+\delta}{1+\alpha}} \quad \text{and} \quad E(\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}) = \mathbf{s}'_{1-\alpha, 1-\delta}. \quad (2)$$

The next lemma rephrases these identities. Figure 1 illustrates the action of the morphism G on a Sturmian sequence and provides a geometrical proof of the first identity in (2). Taking $x \in I_0$ in Figure 1 for T and T' , we see that $T(x) = T'(x)$, while if $x \in I_1$, we have $T(x) = T'^2(x)$, $T'(x) \in I'_1$ and $T'(x) \notin I_0 \cup I_1$. It follows that if \mathbf{u} is produced by the transformation T , then $G(\mathbf{u})$ is produced by the transformation T' .

Lemma 2. *Let \mathbf{u} be a lower (resp. upper) mechanical sequence with parameters $\ell_0 > 0$, $\ell_1 > 0$ and $\rho \in [0, \ell_0 + \ell_1)$ (resp. $\rho \in (0, \ell_0 + \ell_1]$). The lower (resp. upper) mechanical sequence*

- $G(\mathbf{u})$ has the parameters $\ell_0 + \ell_1$, ℓ_1 and ρ ;




Figure 1: Illustration of the relation of parameters of \mathbf{u} and $G(\mathbf{u})$: the upper part of the figure depicts 2iet transformation T with the partition $[0, \ell_0)$ and $[\ell_0, \ell_0 + \ell_1)$ which produces the sequence \mathbf{u} . The lower part contains 2iet transformation T' with the partition $I'_0 = [0, \ell_0 + \ell_1)$ and $I'_1 = [\ell_0 + \ell_1, 2\ell_0 + \ell_1)$ producing the sequence $G(\mathbf{u})$.

- $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{u})$ has the parameters $\ell_0 + \ell_1$, ℓ_1 and $\rho + \ell_1$;
- $D(\mathbf{u})$ has the parameters ℓ_0 , $\ell_0 + \ell_1$ and $\rho + \ell_0$;
- $\tilde{D}(\mathbf{u})$ has the parameters ℓ_0 , $\ell_0 + \ell_1$ and ρ .

5. A representation of the special Sturmian monoid

A *representation* of the monoid \mathcal{M} (over \mathbb{R}) is a monoid homomorphism $\mu : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. A representation is *faithful* if μ is injective.

A traditional representation of the monoid \mathcal{M} (and in general, of a monoid of morphisms) assigns to a morphism $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}$ its *incidence matrix* $M_\varphi \in \mathbb{N}^{2 \times 2}$ defined by

$$(M_\varphi)_{i,j} = |\varphi(j)|_i \quad \text{for } i, j \in \{0, 1\},$$

i.e., the entry of M at the position (i, j) equals the number of occurrences of the letter i in the word $\varphi(j)$. It is easy to verify that $M_{\varphi \circ \psi} = M_\varphi M_\psi$ for every pair $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{M}$, hence $\varphi \mapsto M_\varphi$ is a representation of the special Sturmian monoid \mathcal{M} .

However, the matrices assigned to \tilde{G} and G coincide. The same is true for the matrices assigned to \tilde{D} and D . In other words, the representation $\varphi \mapsto M_\varphi$ is not injective and hence it is not faithful.

Let us recall that the special Sturmian monoid \mathcal{M} is not free: for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$GD^k\tilde{G} = \tilde{G}\tilde{D}^kG \quad \text{and} \quad DG^k\tilde{D} = \tilde{D}\tilde{G}^kD. \quad (3)$$

Theorem 2.3.14 in [9] says that (3) is the presentation of the monoid \mathcal{M} , i.e., no other non-trivial independent relation can be found.

Lemma 2 is the core of the faithful representation of \mathcal{M} we construct below. It says that the action of a Sturmian morphism on Sturmian sequences corresponds to an action of a linear operator on vectors from \mathbb{R}^3 . To specify a faithful representation of the monoid \mathcal{M} we assign to each element of $\{G, \tilde{G}, D, \tilde{D}\}$ one matrix:

$$R_{\tilde{G}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_{\tilde{D}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad R_D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

These matrices preserve the presentation of the special Sturmian monoid (3).

Claim 3. *If $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then*

$$R_{\tilde{G}}R_{\tilde{D}}^kR_G = R_GR_D^kR_{\tilde{G}} \quad \text{and} \quad R_{\tilde{D}}R_{\tilde{G}}^kR_D = R_DR_G^kR_{\tilde{D}}. \quad (5)$$

Proof. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$R_{\tilde{G}}^k = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & k & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & k & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_G^k = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & k & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_{\tilde{D}}^k = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ k & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad R_D^k = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ k & 1 & 0 \\ k & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence,

$$R_{\tilde{G}}R_{\tilde{D}}^kR_G = \begin{pmatrix} k+1 & k+2 & 0 \\ k & k+1 & 0 \\ k & k+1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = R_GR_D^kR_{\tilde{G}} \quad \text{and} \quad R_{\tilde{D}}R_{\tilde{G}}^kR_D = \begin{pmatrix} k+1 & k & 0 \\ k+2 & k+1 & 0 \\ k+1 & k & 1 \end{pmatrix} = R_DR_G^kR_{\tilde{D}}. \quad \square$$

We can now assign a matrix to any element of \mathcal{M} .

Definition 4. *Let $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ be defined for $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$ by*

$$\mathcal{R}(\psi) = R_{\varphi_1}R_{\varphi_1} \cdots R_{\varphi_n},$$

where $\psi = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2 \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_n$ and $\varphi_i \in \{G, \tilde{G}, D, \tilde{D}\}$ for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

Let us note that the definition is correct. It does not depend on the decomposition of ψ into the elements of $\{G, \tilde{G}, D, \tilde{D}\}$ since by Claim 3 the relations (3) of the presentation of \mathcal{M} are preserved in the monoid $\langle R_G, R_{\tilde{G}}, R_D, R_{\tilde{D}} \rangle = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M})$.

Our choice of the four matrices in (4) enables the following matrix reformulation of Lemma 2.

Claim 5. Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$ be the vector of parameters of a Sturmian sequence \mathbf{u} . The vector $\mathcal{R}(\varphi)\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$ is the vector of parameters of the Sturmian sequence $\varphi(\mathbf{u})$.

Proof. Let $\varphi = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2 \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_n$ and $\varphi_i \in \{G, \tilde{G}, D, \tilde{D}\}$ for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$. We proceed by induction on n . For $n = 0$, the claim trivially holds. Set $\varphi_2 \circ \varphi_3 \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_n = \varphi'$ and assume that $\mathcal{R}(\varphi')\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$ is the vector of parameters of $\varphi'(\mathbf{u})$. Since $\varphi_1 \in \{G, \tilde{G}, D, \tilde{D}\}$, then $R_{\varphi_1}(\mathcal{R}(\varphi')\vec{v}(\mathbf{u}))$ is the vector of parameters of $\varphi_1(\varphi'(\mathbf{u}))$ by Lemma 2. The proof is finished by noticing $R_{\varphi_1}\mathcal{R}(\varphi') = \mathcal{R}(\varphi)$. \square

As already mentioned, the traditionally used representation of the Sturmian monoid which maps a morphism to its incidence matrix is not faithful. Nevertheless, this representation has a strong connection to the representation \mathcal{R} . By definition of the matrices in (4), \mathcal{R} maps the morphism ψ to the matrix $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ of the form

$$\mathcal{R}(\psi) = \begin{pmatrix} m_{00} & m_{01} & 0 \\ m_{10} & m_{11} & 0 \\ E & F & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } \begin{pmatrix} m_{00} & m_{01} \\ m_{10} & m_{11} \end{pmatrix} = M_\psi \quad \text{and} \quad E, F \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (6)$$

In other words, the incidence matrix of ψ is the top left submatrix of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$.

Proposition 6. The mapping \mathcal{R} is a faithful representation of the monoid \mathcal{M} .

Proof. Claim 3 and the presentation of \mathcal{M} by (3) imply that \mathcal{R} is a representation of \mathcal{M} . To show injectivity of \mathcal{R} , we assume $\mathcal{R}(\psi) = \mathcal{R}(\varphi)$, for $\psi, \varphi \in \mathcal{M}$. Let \mathbf{u} be a lower Sturmian sequence. By Claim 5 and Lemma 2 both morphisms ψ and φ map \mathbf{u} to lower Sturmian sequences with the same parameters. That is, $\varphi(\mathbf{u}) = \psi(\mathbf{u})$. By the same argument, $\varphi(\mathbf{u}) = \psi(\mathbf{u})$ for each upper Sturmian sequence \mathbf{u} , too. In other words, the images by the morphisms ψ and φ coincide for each element of their domain. We conclude that $\varphi = \psi$. Hence, \mathcal{R} is injective. \square

We continue by listing several straightforward properties of the representation \mathcal{R} of the special Sturmian monoid. Let us remind that a *convex cone* C in \mathbb{R}^n is a non-empty subset of \mathbb{R}^n such that $C \cap (-C) = \{0\}$ and $\mu x + \nu y \in C$ for each $x, y \in C$ and $\mu, \nu \geq 0$. For example, the set

$$\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \text{all components of } x \text{ are non-negative}\}$$

is a convex cone.

Lemma 7. Let $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$.

1. The convex cone $C_1 := \{(x, y, z)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq x, 0 \leq y, 0 \leq z \leq x + y\}$ is invariant under multiplication by $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$, i.e., $\mathcal{R}(\psi)(C_1) \subset C_1$.
2. The convex cone $C_2 := \{(x, y, z)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq x, 0 \geq y, y \leq z \leq x\}$ is invariant under multiplication by the inverse matrix of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$, i.e., $(\mathcal{R}(\psi))^{-1}(C_2) \subset C_2$.

3. The number 1 is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ and $(0, 0, 1)^\top$ is its corresponding eigenvector. In particular, the convex cone $C_3 := \{(0, 0, z)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq z\}$ is invariant under multiplication by $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$.

Proof. The validity of all items for the matrices $R_G, R_{\bar{G}}, R_D, R_{\bar{D}}$ can be verified directly. Since $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ belongs to the monoid generated by these four matrices, $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ satisfies these properties as well. \square

In order to provide some applications of the representation \mathcal{R} , we recall three properties of a linear mapping preserving a closed convex cone. The first item mentioned in the following proposition is a consequence of the Brouwer's theorem, see for instance [5]; the second and the third item are a consequence of the Perron-Frobenius theory, see for instance [6]. Let us note that the assumption $A(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ in second item below is equivalent to the property that all entries of A are non-negative.

Proposition 8. *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and C be a closed convex cone in \mathbb{R}^n .*

- (1) *If $AC \subset C$, then at least one eigenvector of A belongs to the convex cone C .*
- (2) *If $A(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n) \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$, then the spectral radius of A is an eigenvalue corresponding to an eigenvector from $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$.*
- (3) *If all entries of the matrix A^k are positive for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then the spectral radius r_A of A is a dominant simple eigenvalue of A , i.e. all other eigenvalues are of modulus strictly smaller than r_A . The corresponding eigenvector to r_A has all entries positive and an eigenvector corresponding to any other eigenvalue cannot have all entries non-negative.*

Corollary 9. *Let $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$ be a primitive morphism. The matrix $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ has eigenvalues Λ , 1 and $\frac{1}{\Lambda}$, where $\Lambda > 1$ is a quadratic unit. An eigenvector corresponding to Λ can be found in the form $(x, y, z)^\top \in (\mathbb{Q}(\Lambda))^3$ with $x > 0$, $y > 0$ and $z \geq 0$. No other eigenvalue has an eigenvector with the first two components positive.*

Proof. The matrix $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ has the form described in (6). The vector $(0, 0, 1)^\top$ is its eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue 1. Other eigenvalues of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ are eigenvalues of the matrix M_ψ as well. Since all entries of M_ψ are non-negative integers and $\det M_\psi = 1$, the two eigenvalues λ_1 and λ_2 of M_ψ are roots of the polynomial $X^2 - pX + 1$ with $p = \text{Tr}(M_\psi) > 0$. Thus λ_1 , and λ_2 are algebraic integers and $\lambda_1\lambda_2 = 1$. Primitivity of ψ implies that for some integer $k \geq 1$ all entries of M_ψ^k are positive. By Item (3) of Proposition 8, the spectral radius of M_ψ is a simple eigenvalue. It follows, without loss of generality, $\Lambda := \lambda_1 > 1 > \lambda_2 > 0$ and Λ is the dominant eigenvalue of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$. Since λ_2 is an algebraic integer lying in the interval $(0, 1)$, λ_2 cannot be rational. Consequently, λ_2 and λ_1 are quadratic irrational numbers. By Item (2) of Proposition 8, $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ has a non-negative eigenvector, say $(x, y, z)^\top$, corresponding to Λ . Since $(\mathcal{R}(\psi) - \Lambda I)(x, y, z)^\top = (0, 0, 0)^\top$, the entries x, y, z can be chosen to belong into $\mathbb{Q}(\Lambda)$. The vector $(x, y)^\top$ is an eigenvector of M_ψ corresponding to Λ and by Item (3) of Proposition 8, $x > 0, y > 0$.

If (x', y', z') is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ corresponding to λ_2 , then (x', y') is an eigenvector of M_ψ to the same eigenvalue. It follows from Item (3) of Proposition 8 that x' and y' are numbers with opposite signs. □

Remark 10. *The Sturmian morphism E exchanging the letters $0 \leftrightarrow 1$ can be associated with a matrix $R_E \in \mathbb{Z}^{3 \times 3}$ such that $R_E \vec{\mathbf{u}}$ is a vector of parameters of the Sturmian sequence $E(\mathbf{u})$. Using (2), we see that*

$$R_E = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, it is possible to extend the representation \mathcal{R} of the special Sturmian monoid \mathcal{M} into a representation of the Sturmian monoid St . Since we focus on the question when a Sturmian sequence is invariant under a primitive morphism, we can restrict ourselves to \mathcal{M} only: indeed, if \mathbf{u} is fixed by a primitive morphism $\psi \in St$, then \mathbf{u} is fixed by the morphism $\psi^2 \in \mathcal{M}$. Using this restriction, we avoid having negative entries in the matrices representing the morphisms and we can exploit the Perron-Frobenius theorem.

6. A submonoid of $Sl(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$ defined by three convex cones

Let us recall the notation $Sl(\mathbb{N}, 3) = \{R \in \mathbb{N}^{3 \times 3} : \det R = 1\}$ and $Sl(\mathbb{Z}, 3) = \{R \in \mathbb{Z}^{3 \times 3} : \det R = 1\}$. It is well known that the group $Sl(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$ is finitely generated. Rivat in [7] showed that the monoid $Sl(\mathbb{N}, 3)$ is not finitely generated. Clearly, our representation \mathcal{R} maps the special Sturmian monoid \mathcal{M} into $Sl(\mathbb{N}, 3)$. In particular, $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M})$ is a submonoid of $Sl(\mathbb{N}, 3)$ that is finitely generated by the four matrices $R_G, R_{\tilde{G}}, R_D, R_{\tilde{D}}$. Lemma 7 suggests to study a new submonoid of $Sl(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$. We set

$$\mathcal{E} = \{R \in Sl(\mathbb{Z}, 3) : RC_1 \subset C_1, R^{-1}C_2 \subset C_2, RC_3 \subset C_3\}, \quad (7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &:= \{(x, y, z)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq x, 0 \leq y, 0 \leq z \leq x + y\}, \\ C_2 &:= \{(x, y, z)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq x, 0 \geq y, y \leq z \leq x\}, \text{ and} \\ C_3 &:= \{(0, 0, z)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq z\} \end{aligned}$$

(in accordance with the notation in Lemma 7).

In this section we show that the representation \mathcal{R} is in fact an isomorphism between \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{E} . By Lemma 7, $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathcal{E}$. In the remaining part of the section we prove $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{E}$. To achieve this goal, we characterize the elements of \mathcal{E} by inequalities. We first give a technical lemma that shall be used to reduce the number of inequalities.

Lemma 11. *If $A, B, C, D, E, F \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy $E < A + C$, $F < B + D$ and $AD - BC = 1$, then*

$$-A < AF - BE \leq B \iff -C \leq CF - DE < D.$$

Proof. (\implies) If $C = 0$, then $AD - BC = 1$ implies $A = D = 1$ and $E < A + C$ gives $E < 1$, i.e. $E = 0$. The desired inequality $-C \leq CF - DE < D$ has now the form $0 \leq 0 < 1$ and it is obviously satisfied.

If $C > 0$, then the restated assumption $-A + 1 \leq AF - BE \leq B$ implies

$$-AC + C \leq AFC - BEC \leq BC.$$

We continue by substituting $BC = AD - 1$

$$-AC + C \leq AFC - E(AD - 1) \leq AD - 1 \implies -AC + C - E \leq A(CF - ED) \leq AD - 1 - E.$$

As $0 \leq E \leq A + C - 1$, we obtain

$$-AC - A + 1 \leq A(CF - ED) < AD \implies -C - \frac{A-1}{A} \leq CF - ED < D,$$

where we used $A > 0$ which is a simple consequence of $AD - BC = 1$. As $A, C, D, E, F \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\frac{A-1}{A} \in [0, 1)$, the last inequality gives the desired $-C \leq CF - DE < D$.

(\impliedby) Let us note that the relations $E < A + C$, $F < B + D$ and $AD - BC = 1$ in the assumption of the lemma are invariant under exchange of the parameters $A \leftrightarrow D$, $C \leftrightarrow B$ and $E \leftrightarrow F$. Applying the exchange to the implication $-A < AF - BE \leq B \implies -C \leq CF - DE < D$ which is already proven, we obtain the converse. \square

Lemma 12. *If $R \in Sl(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$, then $R \in \mathcal{E}$ if and only if there exist $A, B, C, D, E, F \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 \\ C & D & 0 \\ E & F & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where } AD - BC = 1 \quad \text{and}$$

$$E < A + C, \quad F < B + D, \tag{8}$$

$$-C \leq CF - DE < D. \tag{9}$$

Proof. (\implies) Let $R = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & G \\ C & D & H \\ E & F & J \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{E}$, where $A, B, \dots, H, J \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $RC_3 \subset C_3$,

we have $R \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} G \\ H \\ J \end{pmatrix} \in C_3$. Therefore, $G = H = 0$ and $J \geq 0$. The determinant

of R is 1 and can be now computed as $\det R = (AD - BC)J = 1$. Since A, B, C, D, J are integers and $J \geq 0$, we have $AD - BC = 1 = J$.

By the assumption $RC_1 \subset C_1$ we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 \\ C & D & 0 \\ E & F & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Ax + By \\ Cx + Dy \\ Ex + Fy + z \end{pmatrix} \in C_1 \quad \text{for each} \quad \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix} \in C_1.$$

The inequalities $Ax + By \geq 0$, $Cx + Dy \geq 0$ and $Ex + Fy + z \geq 0$ for all choices $x, y \geq 0$ and $z = 0$ imply $A, B, C, D, E, F \geq 0$, i.e., $R \in Sl(\mathbb{N}, 3)$. Moreover, $Ex + Fy + z \leq Ax + By + Cx + Dy$ holds for any z satisfying $0 \leq z \leq x + y$. In particular, if $z = x + y$, then

$$Ex + Fy + x + y \leq Ax + By + Cx + Dy \text{ gives } 0 \leq (A + C - E - 1)x + (B + D - F - 1)y.$$

Therefore, $A + C - E - 1 \geq 0$ and $B + D - F - 1 \geq 0$.

Since $R^{-1}C_2 \subset C_2$ and $R^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} D & -B & 0 \\ -C & A & 0 \\ FC - ED & BE - FA & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, we have

$$R^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Dx - By \\ -Cx + Ay \\ (FC - ED)x + (BE - FA)y + z \end{pmatrix} \in C_2$$

for any choice $y \leq 0 \leq x$ and $y \leq z \leq x$. In particular, the third coordinate satisfies two inequalities:

- i) $-Cx + Ay \leq (FC - ED)x + (BE - FA)y + z$, and
- ii) $(FC - ED)x + (BE - FA)y + z \leq Dx - By$.

Setting $y = z = 0$ and $x \geq 0$, inequality **i**) implies $FC - ED + C \geq 0$. Similarly, putting $0 \leq z = x$ and $y = 0$ we obtain $FC - ED - D + 1 \leq 0$ from **ii**).

(\Leftarrow): We have to verify 3 conditions in the definition of \mathcal{E} in (7). Let us start with checking $R^{-1}C_2 \subset C_2$. We consider $(x, y, z)^\top \in C_2$, i.e., $x \geq 0$, $y \leq 0$, $y \leq z \leq x$. Then

$$R^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Dx - By \\ -Cx + Ay \\ (FC - ED)x + (BE - FA)y + z \end{pmatrix} =: \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{x} \\ \tilde{y} \\ \tilde{z} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Obviously, the first component $\tilde{x} = Dx - By \geq 0$, as $x \geq 0 \geq y$ and $B, D \geq 0$. By the same reason, the second component $\tilde{y} = -Cx + Ay \leq 0$. To deduce inequalities required for the third component \tilde{z} we use (9) and by Lemma 11 also the inequality $-A < AF - BE \leq B$. Hence

$$0 \geq \underbrace{(FC - ED - D + 1)}_{\leq 0} x - \underbrace{(-B - BE + FA)}_{\leq 0} y = \tilde{z} - \tilde{x} + \underbrace{x - z}_{\geq 0} \geq \tilde{z} - \tilde{x}.$$

Analogously,

$$0 \leq \underbrace{(FC - ED + C)}_{\geq 0} x + \underbrace{(-A + 1 + BE - FA)}_{\leq 0} y = \tilde{z} - \tilde{y} + \underbrace{y - z}_{\leq 0} \leq \tilde{z} - \tilde{y}.$$

We can conclude that $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z})^\top \in C_2$.

To verify that $RC_1 \subset C_1$ and $RC_3 \subset C_3$ is straightforward and we omit it. \square

Before we show that \mathcal{E} equals the image of the special Sturmian monoid \mathcal{M} under our representation \mathcal{R} , we recall a property of $Sl(\mathbb{N}, 2) = \{M \in \mathbb{N}^{2 \times 2} : \det M = 1\}$.

Claim 13. *If $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in Sl(\mathbb{N}, 2)$ and $M \neq I$, then either $(A \geq C$ and $B \geq D)$ or $(A \leq C$ and $B \leq D)$.*

Proof. Let us note that $A > 0$ and $D > 0$. Indeed, if $AD = 0$, then $1 = \det M = AD - CB \leq 0$ — a contradiction.

Assume that the claim does not hold true, i.e., $(A < C$ or $B < D)$ and $(A > C$ or $B > D)$.

First discuss the case $A < C$. Necessarily, $B > D$. Since $1 = \det M = AD - BC \leq (C - 1)D - (D + 1)C = -D - C \leq 0$ — a contradiction.

Now let us discuss the case $B < D$. Hence $A > C$. It follows that $1 = \det M = AD - BC \geq (C + 1)D - (D - 1)C = D + C \geq 1$. Therefore, we can replace inequalities by equalities. As $D > 0$ and $C \geq 0$, the last inequality gives $C = 0$ and $D = 1$. Consequently, $A = C + 1 = 1$ and $B = D - 1 = 0$. In other words $M = I$ — a contradiction. \square

Theorem 14. *The monoid \mathcal{E} defined by (7) coincides with $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}) = \langle R_G, R_{\tilde{G}}, R_D, R_{\tilde{D}} \rangle$.*

Proof. The inclusion $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}) \subset \mathcal{E}$ follows from Lemma 7.

Let us show $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M})$. Let $R = (R_{ij}) \in \mathcal{E}$ have the form given by Lemma 12, i.e.,

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 \\ C & D & 0 \\ E & F & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and all entries of R are non-negative.

First assume that $C = 0$. As $1 = \det R = AD - BC$, we have $A = D = 1$. Inequalities (8) say $E = 0$ and $0 \leq F \leq B$. Therefore, R has the form

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & B & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & F & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{R_G}^{B-F} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{R_{\tilde{G}}}^F \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}).$$

Now assume that $B = 0$. Analogously to the previous case, $\det R = 1$ implies $A = D = 1$. Inequalities (8) give $0 \leq E \leq C$, $F = 0$ and

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ C & 1 & 0 \\ E & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{R_{\tilde{D}}}^{C-E} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{R_D}^E \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}).$$

We proceed by induction on $R_{11} + R_{21} = A + C$. Note that $\det R = 1$ forces $A, D > 0$. Hence the case $A + C = 1$ implies $A = 1, C = 0$ and it is treated above. Further, in the induction step, it suffices to discuss only the situation $A, B, C, D \geq 1$. Using Claim 13, we split our discussion into the following two cases:

(I) $A \geq C \geq 1$ and $B \geq D \geq 1$,

(II) $1 \leq A \leq C$ and $1 \leq B \leq D$.

Case (I) $A \geq C \geq 1$ and $B \geq D \geq 1$:

First we show by contradiction that entries of R satisfy

$$(C \leq E \text{ and } D \leq F) \quad \text{or} \quad (E < A \text{ and } F < B). \quad (10)$$

Assuming that (10) does not hold and using inequalities of Case (I) we obtain

$$(C > E \text{ and } F \geq B \geq D \geq 1) \quad \text{or} \quad (B \geq D > F \text{ and } E \geq A \geq C \geq 1).$$

In the first case, we have $C \geq E + 1$ and $D \leq F$. Combining these inequalities with inequality (9) of Lemma 12 we obtain

$$D \stackrel{(9)}{>} CF - DE \geq (E + 1)F - FE = F \geq D,$$

which is a contradiction.

In the second case, we have $F \leq B - 1$ and $E \geq A$. By Lemma 12, the assumptions of Lemma 11 are satisfied, and inequality (9) can be restated as $-A < AF - BE \leq B$, hence

$$-A < AF - BE.$$

Together with $F \leq B - 1$ and $E \geq A$ we conclude

$$-A < AF - BE \leq A(B - 1) - BA = -A,$$

which is a contradiction.

Subcase (I.a) $C \leq E$ and $D \leq F$:

We observe that the matrix R' defined via

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 \\ C & D & 0 \\ E & F & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{R_{\tilde{G}}} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} A - C & B - D & 0 \\ C & D & 0 \\ E - C & F - D & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{=:R'}$$

is in $Sl(\mathbb{N}, 3)$, as all entries of R' are non-negative integers and $\det R' = 1$.

We continue by proving $R' \in \mathcal{E}$ using Lemma 12 for R' . Inequalities (8) for the matrix R' read $E - C < A - C + C$ and $F - D < B - D + D$. These are equivalent to $E < A + C$ and $F < B + D$, which are satisfied due to $R \in \mathcal{E}$ and Lemma 12. Inequalities (9) for R' say $-C \leq C(F - D) - (E - C)D < D$. They are equivalent to $-C \leq CF - ED < D$, again satisfied by $R \in \mathcal{E}$ and Lemma 12. Therefore $R' \in \mathcal{E}$.

Let us recall that we proceed by induction on $R_{11} + R_{21}$. Since $R'_{11} + R'_{21} = A < A + C = R_{11} + R_{21}$, we know by the induction hypothesis that $R' \in \langle R_G, R_{\tilde{G}}, R_D, R_{\tilde{D}} \rangle$. The relation $R = R_{\tilde{G}}R'$ implies $R \in \langle R_G, R_{\tilde{G}}, R_D, R_{\tilde{D}} \rangle$ as well.

Subcase (I.b) $E < A$ and $F < B$:

We define the matrix R' by

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 \\ C & D & 0 \\ E & F & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{R_G} \underbrace{\begin{pmatrix} A-C & B-D & 0 \\ C & D & 0 \\ E & F & 1 \end{pmatrix}}_{=:R'}.$$

Obviously, $R' \in Sl(\mathbb{N}, 3)$. We use again Lemma 12 to show that $R' \in \mathcal{E}$. Inequality (8) for R' states $E < A - C + C$ and $F < B - D + D$. These are satisfied by the specification Subcase I.b. Inequalities (9) for R' and R coincide and they follow from $R \in \mathcal{E}$ and Lemma 12. As $R'_{11} + R'_{21} < R_{11} + R_{21}$ and $R = R_G R'$, we conclude that $R \in \langle R_G, R_{\tilde{G}}, R_D, R_{\tilde{D}} \rangle$.

Case (II) $1 \leq A \leq C$ and $1 \leq B \leq D$:

We transform this case to the Case (I). We use the permutation matrix $P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

and the following 3 facts:

- $P \langle R_G, R_{\tilde{G}}, R_D, R_{\tilde{D}} \rangle P = \langle R_G, R_{\tilde{G}}, R_D, R_{\tilde{D}} \rangle$.
Proof: The equality follows from the equalities $PR_{\tilde{G}}P = R_D$, $PR_GP = R_{\tilde{D}}$ and $P^2 = I_3$.
- $P\mathcal{E}P = \mathcal{E}$.
Proof: The cones C_1, C_2 and C_3 satisfy $PC_1 = C_1$, $PC_2 = -C_2$ and $PC_3 = C_3$. Let $R \in \mathcal{E}$. We have $PRP \in Sl(\mathbb{Z}, 3)$ and $(PRP)^{-1}C_2 = PR^{-1}PC_2 = -PR^{-1}C_2 \subset -PC_2 = C_2$. Analogously, $PRPC_i \subset C_i$ for i being 1 or 3. It means that $PRP \in \mathcal{E}$, or equivalently $\mathcal{E} \supset P\mathcal{E}P$. Multiplying the last inclusion by P from the right and left, we obtain $P\mathcal{E}P \supset P^2\mathcal{E}P^2 = \mathcal{E}$.
- If $R \in \mathcal{E}$ belongs to Case (II), then PRP belongs to Case (I).

Proof of the theorem is now complete. □

7. The representation \mathcal{R} and fixed points of Sturmian morphisms

In this section we apply the faithful representation \mathcal{R} to study the parameters of fixed points of primitive morphisms.

7.1. Parameters of a fixed point of Sturmian morphisms

In article [15] Peng and Tan solve the question to determine the parameters of a fixed point \mathbf{u} of a given primitive Sturmian morphism ψ . To find the slope of \mathbf{u} , i.e. the frequency of the letter 1 in \mathbf{u} , one can use the incidence matrix of M_ψ . For a primitive morphism, it is well-known that the positive components of the eigenvector corresponding to the dominant eigenvalue are proportional to the frequencies of letters. Hence, the only

non-trivial question is to determine the intercept of \mathbf{u} . Theorems 2.3 and 3.2 of [15] answer this question using the structure of the words $\psi(01)$ and $\psi(10)$. The faithful representation $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ provides a simple algebraic method to determine the parameters of \mathbf{u} .

Proposition 15. *Let $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$ be a primitive morphism and \mathbf{u} be a Sturmian sequence with the vector of parameters $\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$. The sequence \mathbf{u} is fixed by ψ if and only if $\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$ is an eigenvector to the dominant eigenvalue of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$.*

Proof. Let the sequence \mathbf{u} with parameters $\vec{v}(\mathbf{u}) = (\ell_0, \ell_1, \rho)^\top$ be fixed by ψ . Since the Sturmian sequences \mathbf{u} and $\psi(\mathbf{u})$ coincide, the vectors of their parameters are collinear, i.e. there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that $\vec{v}(\psi(\mathbf{u})) = \Lambda\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$. By Claim 5,

$$\Lambda\vec{v}(\mathbf{u}) = \vec{v}(\psi(\mathbf{u})) = \mathcal{R}(\psi)\vec{v}(\mathbf{u}).$$

By Corollary 9, an eigenvector $(\ell_0, \ell_1, \rho)^\top$ with positive components ℓ_0 and ℓ_1 corresponds to the dominant eigenvalue of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$.

To prove the converse, assume that $\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$ is an eigenvector corresponding to the dominant eigenvalue Λ of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$. By Claim 5, the sequence $\psi(\mathbf{u})$ has the vector of parameters $\vec{v}(\psi(\mathbf{u})) = \mathcal{R}(\psi)\vec{v}(\mathbf{u}) = \Lambda\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$, i.e., the vectors of parameters of \mathbf{u} and $\psi(\mathbf{u})$ are the same up to a scalar factor. Recall that any morphism of \mathcal{M} maps a lower (resp. upper) mechanical sequence to a lower (resp. upper) mechanical sequence. Two lower (resp. upper) mechanical sequences with the same vector of parameters up to a scalar factor coincide. Consequently, $\psi(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$. \square

7.2. Pairs $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}$ and $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}$ fixed by (possibly distinct) morphisms

Dekking [4] studies for which values of the slope and the intercept are both sequences $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}$ and $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}$ fixed by primitive morphisms. His result can be also proven by applying the representation \mathcal{R} . Recall that the definition of $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}$ and $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}$ immediately implies that $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}$ and $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}$ are either identical or they differ at most on two neighbouring positions.

First we state several simple claims on invariant subspaces of matrices from $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M})$. A subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is an *invariant subspace* of a matrix R if $RV \subset V$. By inspecting the behaviour of the matrices assigned to the generators of \mathcal{M} we obtain the following properties.

Lemma 16. *Let $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$.*

1. *If $\psi \in \langle G, D \rangle$, then $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ has an invariant subspace $\{(x, y, z)^\top : y = z\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.*
2. *If $\psi \in \langle \tilde{G}, \tilde{D} \rangle$, then $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ has an invariant subspace $\{(x, y, z)^\top : x = z\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.*
3. *If $\psi \in \langle \tilde{G}, D \rangle$, then $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ has an invariant subspace $\{(x, y, z)^\top : z = x + y\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.*
4. *If $\psi \in \langle G, \tilde{D} \rangle$, then $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ has an invariant subspace $\{(x, y, z)^\top : z = 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$.*

The last lemma is transformed directly into the next statement in terms of parameters of a Sturmian sequence.

Lemma 17. *Let a Sturmian sequence \mathbf{u} with parameters ℓ_0, ℓ_1, ρ be fixed by a primitive morphism $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$.*

1. *If $\psi \in \langle \tilde{G}, D \rangle$, then $\rho = \ell_0 + \ell_1$.*
2. *If $\psi \in \langle G, D \rangle$, then $\rho = \ell_1$.*
3. *If $\psi \in \langle \tilde{G}, \tilde{D} \rangle$, then $\rho = \ell_0$.*
4. *If $\psi \in \langle G, \tilde{D} \rangle$, then $\rho = 0$.*

Proof. Item (1): Assume $\psi \in \langle \tilde{G}, D \rangle$. By Proposition 15, the vector $(\ell_0, \ell_1, \rho)^\top$ is the eigenvector of $\mathcal{R}(\psi) \in \langle R_{\tilde{D}}, R_G \rangle$ corresponding to the dominant eigenvalue. By Lemma 16, the plane $P = \{(x, y, z)^\top : z = x + y\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is invariant under multiplication by R_G and by $R_{\tilde{D}}$, therefore $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ has two eigenvectors in the plane. As the eigenvector $(0, 0, 1)^\top$ of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ corresponding to 1 does not belong to P , the eigenvector corresponding to the dominant eigenvalue $(\ell_0, \ell_1, \rho)^\top$ must be in P . It implies $\rho = \ell_0 + \ell_1$, and hence the Sturmian sequence \mathbf{u} is an upper Sturmian sequence coding the two interval exchange transformation with the domain $(0, \ell_0 + \ell_1]$.

Proofs of the other Items are analogous. □

Now we state Dekking's (see [4, Theorems 2 and 3]) result and provide its alternative proof.

Proposition 18. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, α irrational, and $\delta \in [0, 1)$. Assume that both sequences $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}$ and $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha, \delta}$ are fixed by primitive morphisms and $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta} \neq \mathbf{s}'_{\alpha, \delta}$. Then either*

1. *$\delta = 1 - \alpha$, in which case $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}$ and $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha, \delta}$ are distinct fixed points of the same primitive morphism $\psi \in \langle \tilde{G}, \tilde{D} \rangle$; or*
2. *$\delta = 0$, in which case $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}$ is fixed by a morphism $\psi \in \langle G, \tilde{D} \rangle$ and $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha, \delta}$ is fixed by a morphism $\eta \in \langle \tilde{G}, D \rangle$. Moreover, if $\psi = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2 \circ \dots \circ \varphi_n$ with $\varphi_i \in \{G, \tilde{D}\}$, then*

$$\eta = \xi_1 \circ \xi_2 \circ \dots \circ \xi_n, \quad \text{where } \xi_i = \begin{cases} \tilde{G} & \text{if } \varphi_i = G, \\ D & \text{if } \varphi_i = \tilde{D}, \end{cases} \quad \text{for every } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}$ is fixed by a primitive morphism, there exists a primitive morphism $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$ which fixes $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}$ (see Remark 10).

Firstly, we assume that $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Due to Lemma 1, $\vec{v}(\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}) = \vec{v}(\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha, \delta}) = (1 - \alpha, \alpha, \delta)^\top$. By Proposition 15, $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha, \delta}$ is fixed by ψ as well. As $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta} \neq \mathbf{s}'_{\alpha, \delta}$, the primitive morphism ψ has two fixed points. In particular, $\psi(0)$ has a prefix 0 and $\psi(1)$ has a prefix 1.

The form of morphisms $G, D, \tilde{G}, \tilde{D}$ implies that the starting letters of $\psi(0)$ and $\psi(1)$ coincide whenever the morphism G or D occurs in the composition of ψ . Therefore, $\psi \in \langle \tilde{G}, \tilde{D} \rangle$. By Lemma 17, $\delta = 1 - \alpha$.

Secondly, we assume that $\delta = 0$. Due to Lemma 1, $\vec{v}(\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}) = (1 - \alpha, \alpha, 0)^\top$ and $\vec{v}(\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}) = (1 - \alpha, \alpha, 1)^\top$.

Let us recall that M_ψ is the product of incidence matrices of the elementary morphisms $M_D = M_{\tilde{D}}$ and $M_G = M_{\tilde{G}}$. Let us write $M_\psi = M_{\varphi_1} M_{\varphi_2} \cdots M_{\varphi_n}$, where $\varphi_i \in \{G, \tilde{D}\}$, and define $\varphi = \varphi_1 \circ \varphi_2 \circ \cdots \circ \varphi_n$. Obviously, $M_\psi = M_\varphi$ and $\mathcal{R}(\varphi) = R_{\varphi_1} R_{\varphi_2} \cdots R_{\varphi_n}$. Since the third row of both the matrices R_G and $R_{\tilde{D}}$ equals $(0, 0, 1)$, the third row of the matrix $\mathcal{R}(\varphi)$ is $(0, 0, 1)$ as well. Hence $\mathcal{R}(\psi) = \mathcal{R}(\varphi)$, c.f. (6). As the representation is faithful, $\psi = \varphi \in \langle G, \tilde{D} \rangle$.

Let η be the morphism created in Item (2). The incidence matrices M_η and M_ψ coincide, since $M_G = M_{\tilde{G}}$ and $M_D = M_{\tilde{D}}$. Obviously, $(1 - \alpha, \alpha)^\top$ is the positive eigenvector of M_η as well. By Lemma 16, the positive eigenvector of $\mathcal{R}(\eta)$ belongs to the plane formed by the vectors $(x, y, z)^\top$ for which $z = x + y$. Therefore, the positive eigenvector of $\mathcal{R}(\eta)$ equals $(1 - \alpha, \alpha, 1)^\top$. By Proposition 15, $\mathbf{s}'_{\alpha,\delta}$ is fixed by η . \square

7.3. Sturmian sequences fixed by a morphism

Yasutomi in [17] gave a necessary and sufficient condition under which a Sturmian sequence is invariant under a primitive morphism. The same result is proved in [2] and [3].

Using the faithful representation \mathcal{R} of the Sturmian monoid we provide here a simple proof that the condition is necessary. Due to the relation $E(\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}) = \mathbf{s}'_{1-\alpha,1-\delta}$ mentioned in (2), it is enough to characterize lower Sturmian sequences fixed by a primitive morphism.

Proposition 19. *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ be irrational and $\delta \in [0, 1)$. If $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}$ is fixed by a primitive morphism, then*

1. α and δ belong to the same quadratic field, say $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{m})$;
2. $\bar{\alpha} \notin (0, 1)$ and $\min\{\bar{\alpha}, 1 - \bar{\alpha}\} \leq \bar{\delta} \leq \max\{\bar{\alpha}, 1 - \bar{\alpha}\}$, where the mapping $x \mapsto \bar{x}$ is the non-trivial field automorphism on $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{m})$ induced by $\sqrt{m} \mapsto -\sqrt{m}$.

Proof. Let ψ be a primitive morphism fixing $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}$. The vector $\vec{v} = (1 - \alpha, \alpha, \delta)^\top$ is a vector of parameters of the Sturmian sequence $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha,\delta}$. By Proposition 15, \vec{v} is an eigenvector to the dominant eigenvalue Λ of the matrix $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$. Due to Corollary 9:

- Λ is a quadratic number, i.e. $\mathbb{Q}(\Lambda) = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{m})$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$.
- $c\vec{v} = c(1 - \alpha, \alpha, \delta)^\top \in (\mathbb{Q}(\Lambda))^3$ for some positive c . Consequently, $c = c(1 - \alpha) + c\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(\Lambda)$. It implies $(1 - \alpha, \alpha, \delta)^\top \in (\mathbb{Q}(\Lambda))^3$ and thus δ and α are in the same quadratic field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{m})$.

Let us apply the field automorphism to $\mathcal{R}(\psi)(1 - \alpha, \alpha, \delta)^\top = \Lambda(1 - \alpha, \alpha, \delta)^\top$. Since the entries of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ are rational, $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ is invariant under the automorphism and thus we get that $(1 - \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta})^\top$ is an eigenvector to the eigenvalue $\bar{\Lambda}$. The third eigenvector of $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ is $(0, 0, 1)^\top$.

By Item 2) of Lemma 7 and Item 1) of Proposition 8, one eigenvector of $(\mathcal{R}(\psi))^{-1}$ belongs to the cone $C_2 := \{(x, y, z)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq x, 0 \geq y, y \leq z \leq x\}$. Now we use the fact that if a non-singular matrix has an eigenvector \vec{d} to λ , then \vec{d} is an eigenvector of its inverse matrix to the eigenvalue $\frac{1}{\lambda}$. Hence the eigenvector $(1 - \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta})$ or $-(1 - \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta})$ belongs to C_2 .

If $(1 - \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}, \bar{\delta})^\top \in C_2$, then $\bar{\alpha} \leq \bar{\delta} \leq 1 - \bar{\alpha}$.

If $(-1 + \bar{\alpha}, -\bar{\alpha}, -\bar{\delta})^\top \in C_2$, then $-\bar{\alpha} \leq -\bar{\delta} \leq -1 + \bar{\alpha}$, or equivalently, $1 - \bar{\alpha} \leq \bar{\delta} \leq \bar{\alpha}$.

Both cases confirm Item (2) of the proposition. \square

Let us stress that Yasutomi also proved that Items (1) and (2) of the previous proposition are also sufficient for $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}$ to be fixed by a primitive morphism.

Remark 20. *Yasutomi's characterization implies that if $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta_1}$ and $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta_2}$ are fixed by primitive morphisms, then $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}$ is fixed by a primitive morphism for every $\delta = c\delta_1 + (1 - c)\delta_2$, where $c \in (0, 1) \cap \mathbb{Q}$. Indeed, $\bar{\delta} = c\bar{\delta}_1 + (1 - c)\bar{\delta}_2$ belongs to the interval $[\min\{\bar{\alpha}, 1 - \bar{\alpha}\}, \max\{\bar{\alpha}, 1 - \bar{\alpha}\}]$ since $\bar{\delta}$ is a convex combination of two numbers from this interval.*

7.4. Conjugacy of Sturmian morphisms

In this subsection we use the faithful representation of the special Sturmian monoid to deduce a known result on the number of morphisms which are conjugates of a given Sturmian morphism. First we recall some notions.

We say that a morphism φ is a *right conjugate* of a morphism ψ , or that ψ is a *left conjugate* of φ , noted $\psi \triangleright \varphi$, if there exists $w \in \mathcal{A}^*$ such that

$$w\psi(a) = \varphi(a)w, \quad \text{for every letter } a \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (11)$$

If (11) is satisfied for $\psi = \varphi$ with a non-empty w , then the morphism ψ is called *cyclic*. A fixed point of a cyclic morphism is periodic, hence Sturmian morphisms are acyclic. To any acyclic morphism one may assign a morphism φ_R , called the *rightmost conjugate* of φ , such that the following two conditions hold:

- (i) φ_R is a right conjugate of φ ;
- (ii) if ξ is a right conjugate of φ_R , then $\xi = \varphi_R$.

Remark 21. *Let us list some simple properties of the relation \triangleright .*

1. *If $\psi \triangleright \varphi$, then $|\varphi(a)|_b = |\psi(a)|_b$ for every $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence the incidence matrices of φ and ψ coincide, i.e., $M_\varphi = M_\psi$. In particular, ψ is primitive if and only if φ is primitive.*
2. *Let $\psi : \mathcal{A}^* \mapsto \mathcal{A}^*$ be a morphism and \mathbf{u} be an infinite sequence over \mathcal{A} such that every letter of \mathcal{A} occurs in \mathbf{u} . If $\psi \triangleright \varphi$ and $\mathbf{u} = \varphi(\mathbf{u}) = \psi(\mathbf{u})$, then $\varphi = \psi$.*
3. *If an acyclic morphism φ acts on binary alphabet $\{0, 1\}$, the last letters of $\varphi_R(0)$ and of $\varphi_R(1)$ are distinct. Consequently, if $0u$ and $1u$ occur in a fixed point of φ_R , then $0\varphi_R(u)$ and $1\varphi_R(u)$ occur in the fixed point as well.*

The following result can be found in [9, Proposition 2.3.21].

Theorem 22. *If $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in Sl(\mathbb{N}, 2)$, then M is the incidence matrix of $A + B + C + D - 1$ mutually conjugate Sturmian morphisms.*

Proof. Fix $S \in \{0, 1, \dots, A + B + C + D - 2\}$. First we show that there exists a unique

pair $(E, F) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that $E + F = S$ and $R = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 \\ C & D & 0 \\ E & F & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{E}$. By Lemmas 11 and 12

we look for $E \in \mathbb{N}$ and $F = S - E$ satisfying $-A < A(S - E) - BE \leq B$. Or equivalently, $\frac{AS-B}{A+B} \leq E < \frac{AS+A}{A+B}$. Since the distance between the lower and the upper bounds on E equals 1, exactly one integer E , namely $E = \lceil \frac{AS-B}{A+B} \rceil$, satisfies $-A < A(S - E) - BE \leq B$. Let us check that such E and $F := S - E$ satisfy (8). Using the definition of E and $A \geq 1$ we obtain

$$-1 < \frac{-B}{A+B} \leq \frac{AS-B}{A+B} \leq E < \frac{AS-B}{A+B} + 1 \leq \frac{A(A+B+C+D-2)-B}{A+B} + 1 = A + C - \frac{A-1}{A+B} \leq A + C.$$

As E is an integer, the previous inequalities confirm that $0 \leq E < A + C$. To check (8) for F , we use $F := S - E$ and write

$$\begin{aligned} -1 &\leq \frac{-A}{A+B} \leq \frac{SB-A}{A+B} = S - \frac{AS-B}{A+B} - 1 < F \leq S - \frac{AS-B}{A+B} = \\ &= \frac{(S+1)B}{A+B} \leq \frac{B(A+B+C+D-1)}{A+B} = B + D - \frac{1+B}{A+B}. \end{aligned}$$

It confirms that $0 \leq F < B + D$. By Lemma 11, the E and F satisfy (9) as well.

Observe that if $S \notin \{0, 1, \dots, A + B + C + D - 2\}$, then no values $E, F \in \mathbb{N}, S = E + F$, satisfy inequalities $E < A + C$ and $F < B + D$ required by Lemma 12. We have proved that any $M \in Sl(\mathbb{N}, 2)$ occurs in the left upper corner of a matrix from \mathcal{E} exactly $A + B + C + D - 1$ times. By Theorem 14 and the fact that the representation \mathcal{R} of the monoid \mathcal{M} is faithful, there exist in \mathcal{M} exactly $A + B + C + D - 1$ Sturmian morphisms having the incidence matrix M . Let us denote these morphisms by $\varphi^{(i)}$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, A + B + C + D - 2$. We need to show that these morphisms are mutually conjugate, or equivalently, to show that the rightmost conjugate $\varphi_R^{(i)}$ does not depend on the index i .

If the matrix M is primitive, then the frequencies of letters in a fixed point of $\varphi^{(i)}$ form an eigenvector to the dominant eigenvalue of M . Therefore, all fixed points of the $A + B + C + D - 1$ morphisms have the same frequencies of letters, i.e., they have the same slope, say α . By Item (3) of Remark 21, any prefix of the fixed point of $\varphi^{(i)}$ is a left special factor of the fixed point. In other words, the fixed point of $\varphi_R^{(i)}$ is the characteristic sequence \mathbf{c}_α for every index i . By Item (2) of the same remark, $\varphi_R^{(i)} = \varphi_R^{(0)}$ for every i .

If the matrix M is not primitive, then either $B = 0$ or $C = 0$. Assume that $C = 0$. It follows that the morphism $\varphi^{(i)}$ is of the form $0 \mapsto 0, 1 \mapsto 0^i 10^{C-i}$, for $i = 0, 1, \dots, C$. It is obvious that they are mutually conjugate. The case $B = 0$ is analogous. \square

8. The square root of fixed point of characteristic Sturmian morphisms

Saari [16] showed that for every Sturmian sequence \mathbf{u} there exist 6 its factors w_1, \dots, w_6 such that

$$\mathbf{u} = w_{i_1}^2 w_{i_2}^2 w_{i_3}^2 \dots, \quad \text{where } i_k \in \{1, \dots, 6\} \text{ for each } k \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (12)$$

and moreover, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the shortest square prefix of the sequence $w_{i_k}^2 w_{i_{k+1}}^2 w_{i_{k+2}}^2 \dots$ is $w_{i_k}^2$. This result served as inspiration for J. Peltomäki and M. Whiteland to introduce the square root $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$ of the Sturmian sequence \mathbf{u} written in the form (12) as

$$\sqrt{\mathbf{u}} = w_{i_1} w_{i_2} w_{i_3} \dots$$

In [13], they also proved the following theorem.

Theorem 23. *If \mathbf{u} is a Sturmian sequence with the slope α and the intercept δ , then the sequence $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$ is a Sturmian sequence with the same slope α and the intercept $\frac{1-\alpha+\delta}{2}$.*

Example 24. *Let $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}$ such that $\varphi = DG^2 : 0 \mapsto 10, 1 \mapsto 10101$. The fixed point of φ can be written as concatenation of the squares of these 6 factors: 10, 1, 0110101, 101, 01, 01101. The beginning of this decomposition is as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u} &= 1010110101011010101101011010101101010110101011010101101010110101010110101010101010101\dots \\ &= \underbrace{10}_{w_1} \underbrace{10}_{w_1} \underbrace{1}_{w_2} \underbrace{1}_{w_2} \underbrace{01}_{w_3} \underbrace{01}_{w_3} \underbrace{0110101}_{w_4} \underbrace{0110101}_{w_4} \underbrace{10}_{w_1} \underbrace{10}_{w_1} \underbrace{101}_{w_5} \underbrace{101}_{w_5} \underbrace{01}_{w_3} \underbrace{01}_{w_3} \underbrace{10}_{w_1} \underbrace{10}_{w_1} \dots \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the square root begins with

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\mathbf{u}} &= 101010110101101010110101011010101101010110101011010101\dots \\ &= \underbrace{10}_{w_1} \underbrace{1}_{w_2} \underbrace{01}_{w_3} \underbrace{0110101}_{w_4} \underbrace{10}_{w_1} \underbrace{101}_{w_5} \underbrace{01}_{w_3} \underbrace{10}_{w_1} \underbrace{101}_{w_5} \underbrace{0110101}_{w_4} \underbrace{0110101}_{w_4} \underbrace{10}_{w_1} \underbrace{101}_{w_5} \underbrace{01}_{w_3} \dots \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 25. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a Sturmian sequence fixed by a primitive morphism $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}$. The square root $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$ is fixed by a morphism $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$ which is a conjugate of one of the morphisms $\varphi, \varphi^2, \varphi^3$ or φ^4 .*

Proof. Let $\vec{v}(\mathbf{u}) = (1 - \alpha, \alpha, \delta)^\top$ be the vector of parameters of \mathbf{u} . According to Proposition 15, the vector $\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$ is an eigenvector of $\mathcal{R}(\varphi)$ corresponding to the dominant eigenvalue.

Set $P := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$. Then by Theorem 23 we have $\vec{v}(\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}) = (1 - \alpha, \alpha, \frac{1-\alpha+\delta}{2})^\top = P\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$.

Clearly $P\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$ is the eigenvector of the matrix $P\mathcal{R}(\varphi^k)P^{-1}$ for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and by Corollary 9 the eigenvector corresponds to the dominant eigenvalue.

For the moment, assume

$$P\mathcal{R}(\varphi^k)P^{-1} \in \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{M}) \quad \text{for some } k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}. \quad (13)$$

It means that $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$ is fixed by a morphism $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$, for which $\mathcal{R}(\psi) = P\mathcal{R}(\varphi^k)P^{-1}$. Because of the form of the matrix P , the left upper (2×2) -submatrices of the matrices $\mathcal{R}(\psi)$ and

$\mathcal{R}(\varphi^k)$ coincide and they are equal to the incidence matrices of the morphisms ψ and φ^k . By Theorem 22, the morphism ψ is conjugate to the morphism φ^k as stated.

Therefore, to complete the proof we have to verify (13). Let $Q \in \mathbb{N}^{3 \times 3}$ denote $Q = \mathcal{R}(\varphi) = \begin{pmatrix} M & \vec{0} \\ e_1^\top & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ where $M = M_\varphi$ is the incidence matrix of the morphism φ and $e_1^\top = (E, F)$. Then $\mathcal{R}(\varphi^k) = \mathcal{R}(\varphi)^k = Q^k$. We prove (13) in 4 steps.

i): It holds that $Q^k = \begin{pmatrix} M^k & \vec{0} \\ e_k^\top & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ where $e_k^\top = e_1^\top \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} M^i$. Indeed, from the relation $Q^{k+1} = Q^k Q$ we get the recurrence relation $e_{k+1}^\top = e_k^\top M + e_1^\top$. The term $e_k^\top = e_1^\top \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} M^i$ fulfils the recurrent relation.

ii): For every matrix $M \in Sl(\mathbb{N}, 2)$ there exists $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ such that $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} M^i$ has all elements even, i.e., $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} M^i \bmod 2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Indeed, every matrix $M \in Sl(\mathbb{N}, 2)$ is equal mod 2 to one of the following 6 matrices

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & M_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & M_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ M_4 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & M_5 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & M_6 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

By inspection of these matrices we get that $k = 2$ if $M = M_1 \bmod 2$, $k = 4$ if $M = M_i \bmod 2$ for $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ and $k = 3$ if $M = M_i \bmod 2$ for $i \in \{5, 6\}$. E.g.

$$M_6^0 + M_6^1 + M_6^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \bmod 2.$$

iii): For $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ associated to the matrix $M = M_\varphi$ by *ii)* it holds that

$$PQ^k P^{-1} \in Sl(\mathbb{Z}, 3).$$

Indeed,

$$PQ^k P^{-1} = P \begin{pmatrix} M^k & \vec{0} \\ e_k^\top & 1 \end{pmatrix} P^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} M^k & \vec{0} \\ f_k^\top & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_k^\top &= \left(\frac{1}{2}, 0\right)M^k + \frac{1}{2}(e_k^\top - (1, 0)) = \frac{1}{2} \left((1, 0)(M^k - I) + e_1^\top \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} M^i \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left((1, 0)(M - I) + e_1^\top \right) \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} M^i. \end{aligned}$$

As by *ii)* the matrix $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} M^i$ has all elements even, $f_k^\top \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and thus $PQ^k P^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}^{3 \times 3}$. Moreover, $\det PQ^k P^{-1} = \det M^k = 1$.

iv): We prove that $PQ^k P^{-1} \in \mathcal{E}$. We denote $Q^k = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} & 0 \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} & 0 \\ \tilde{E} & \tilde{F} & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. As $Q^k = \mathcal{R}(\varphi^k) \in \mathcal{E}$, by Lemma 12 we have that $\tilde{A}, \tilde{B}, \tilde{C}, \tilde{D}, \tilde{E}, \tilde{F} \in \mathbb{N}$ and the inequalities

$$\tilde{A}\tilde{D} - \tilde{B}\tilde{C} = 1, \quad \tilde{E} < \tilde{A} + \tilde{C}, \quad \tilde{F} < \tilde{B} + \tilde{D}, \quad -\tilde{C} \leq \tilde{C}\tilde{F} - \tilde{D}\tilde{E} < \tilde{D}. \quad (15)$$

Analogous inequalities for

$$PQ^kP^{-1} = P \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} & 0 \\ \tilde{C} & \tilde{D} & 0 \\ \tilde{E} & \tilde{F} & 1 \end{pmatrix} P^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{B} & 0 \\ \frac{\tilde{C}}{2} & \frac{\tilde{D}}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{\tilde{E}+\tilde{A}-1}{2} & \frac{\tilde{B}+\tilde{F}}{2} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

namely $\frac{\tilde{E}+\tilde{A}-1}{2} < \tilde{A}+\tilde{C}$, $\frac{\tilde{B}+\tilde{F}}{2} < \tilde{B}+\tilde{D}$ and $-\tilde{C} \leq \tilde{C}\frac{\tilde{B}+\tilde{F}}{2} - \tilde{D}\frac{\tilde{E}+\tilde{A}-1}{2} < \tilde{D}$, are a consequence of (15). Moreover, $\frac{\tilde{E}+\tilde{A}-1}{2} \in \mathbb{N}$ as $\tilde{A}, \tilde{E} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\frac{\tilde{E}+\tilde{A}-1}{2} \in \mathbb{Z}$ by *iii*). The result follows by Lemma 12. \square

If \mathbf{u} is a characteristic Sturmian sequence, we provide an algorithm finding the morphism fixing $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$. To state our result we need to recall that a word $w = w_0w_1 \dots w_{n-1}$ is a *palindrome* if it reads the same from the left as from the right, i.e., $w_k = w_{n-1-k}$ for each $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$.

Corollary 26. *Let $\mathbf{u} \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a characteristic Sturmian sequence fixed by a primitive morphism $\varphi \in \mathcal{M}$ having the incidence matrix $M = M_\varphi$. Let k be the smallest positive integer such that $(1, 1)M^k = (1, 1) \pmod{2}$. Then $k \leq 3$ and the square root $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$ is fixed by a morphism $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$ which is a conjugate of φ^k . Moreover, $\psi(0)$ and $\psi(1)$ are palindromes of odd length.*

Proof. We start by showing that in this case it suffices to consider $k \leq 3$ in the proof of Theorem 25. The characteristic sequence has a vector of parameters $\vec{v}(\mathbf{u}) = (1 - \alpha, \alpha, \alpha)^\top$,

which is an eigenvector of the matrix $\mathcal{R}(\varphi) = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & 0 \\ C & D & 0 \\ E & F & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. From the relation $\mathcal{R}(\varphi)\vec{v}(\mathbf{u}) =$

$\Lambda\vec{v}(\mathbf{u})$ we obtain the equality

$$C(1 - \alpha) + D\alpha = \Lambda\alpha = E(1 - \alpha) + F\alpha + \alpha.$$

As the values α and $1 - \alpha$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} , we conclude that $E = C$ and $F = D - 1$. Hence in the proof of the previous theorem $e_1^\top = (E, F) = (C, D - 1) = (0, 1)(M - I)$ and consequently, $f_k^\top = \frac{1}{2}(1, 1)(M^k - I)$. The assumption $(1, 1)M^k = (1, 1) \pmod{2}$ is equivalent to the claim that f_k^\top has integer coordinates. One can easily check by inspection of 6 matrices listed in (14) that the vector f_k^\top has integer coefficients for some $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. In details,

1. If $M = M_i \pmod{2}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then $(1, 1)(M_i - I) \pmod{2} = (0, 0)$ and we take $k = 1$.
2. If $M = M_i \pmod{2}$ for $i \in \{3, 4\}$, then $(1, 1)(M_i^2 - I) \pmod{2} = (0, 0)$, but $(1, 1)(M_i - I) \pmod{2} \neq (0, 0)$. We take $k = 2$.
3. If $M = M_i \pmod{2}$ for $i \in \{5, 6\}$, then $k = 3$ is the smallest positive $k \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $(1, 1)(M_i^k - I) = (0, 0) \pmod{2}$.

Finally let us show that $\psi(0)$ and $\psi(1)$ are palindromes. Let us recall that $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}} = \mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \frac{1}{2}}$. Consider the biinfinite sequence $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \frac{1}{2}} = \dots \nu_{-3} \nu_{-2} \nu_{-1} \nu_0 \nu_1 \nu_2 \dots$. Let us deduce that its left part $\dots \nu_{-3} \nu_{-2} \nu_{-1}$ is the mirror image of the right part $\nu_0 \nu_1 \nu_2 \dots$.

As $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \frac{1}{2}}(n) = \lfloor \alpha(n+1) + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha n + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \frac{1}{2}}(-n-1) = \lfloor \alpha(-n) + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor - \lfloor \alpha(-n-1) + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor$. Using the relations $\lfloor -x \rfloor = -\lfloor x \rfloor - 1$ and $\lfloor x+1 \rfloor = \lfloor x \rfloor + 1$ for $x \notin \mathbb{Z}$ we get that $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \frac{1}{2}}(-n-1) = \mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \frac{1}{2}}(n)$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. It confirms the mirror symmetry. In particular we have that $\nu_{-1} = \nu_0$ and hence $\psi(\nu_0) = \psi(\nu_{-1})$. Now we use the result of [2], where the authors proved that a biinfinite Sturmian sequence $\mathbf{s}_{\alpha, \delta}$ is fixed by a primitive morphism $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$ if and only if its right part is fixed by ψ .

The symmetry of

$$\begin{aligned} \dots \nu_{-3} \nu_{-2} \nu_{-1} &= \dots \psi(\nu_{-3}) \psi(\nu_{-2}) \psi(\nu_{-1}) & \text{and} \\ \nu_0 \nu_1 \nu_2 \dots &= \psi(\nu_0) \psi(\nu_1) \psi(\nu_2) \dots \end{aligned}$$

gives that the mirror image of $\psi(\nu_{-1})$ is equal to $\psi(\nu_0)$. In other words $\psi(\nu_0)$ is a palindrome. The mirror symmetry also gives that the image under ψ of the letter other than ν_0 is a palindrome as well.

The morphism ψ has the incidence matrix M^k . The lengths of images of the letters 0 and 1 by ψ fulfil $(|\psi(0)|, |\psi(1)|) = (1, 1)M^k$. From the assumption $(1, 1)M^k = (1, 1) \pmod{2}$ we have that the palindromes $\psi(0)$ and $\psi(1)$ have odd length. \square

Example 27. (continuation of Example 24) We observe that $\varphi = DG^2$ which fixes a characteristic Sturmian sequence has the incidence matrix $M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$ and $(1, 1)(M^2 - I) = (0, 0) \pmod{2}$. The morphism φ^2 has a conjugate

$$\psi : 0 \mapsto 1010101, 1 \mapsto 1010101101011010101,$$

such that both $\psi(0)$ and $\psi(1)$ are palindromes of odd length. This corresponds with Corollary 26. The prefix of $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$ displayed in Example 24 illustrates that $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$ is fixed by ψ .

To illustrate Corollary 26 more thoroughly, we show other examples where a conjugate of φ , φ^2 or φ^3 is used to fix the square root $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$.

φ	k	conjugate of φ^k
D^2G^2	1	$0 \mapsto 101, 1 \mapsto 1011101$
GDG	1	$0 \mapsto 010, 1 \mapsto 01010$
D^2G	2	$0 \mapsto 10111011101, 1 \mapsto 101110111011101$
DG	3	$0 \mapsto 1010110110101, 1 \mapsto 101011011010110110101$
GD	3	$0 \mapsto 010100100101001001010, 1 \mapsto 0101001001010$

We show an example of a morphism φ for which only a conjugate of φ^4 fixes $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$. Of course, the fixed point \mathbf{u} of φ is not characteristic.

Example 28. The morphism $\varphi = DG\tilde{G}$ has the representation $\mathcal{R}(\varphi) = R_D R_G R_{\tilde{G}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 & 0 \\ 1 & 3 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, the incidence matrix $M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$ and $e_1^\top = (1, 3)$. In the proof of Theorem 25

$f_k^\top = \frac{1}{2} \left((1, 0)(M - I) + e_1^\top \right) \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} M^i \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ if either $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} M^i$ has all elements even or $\left((1, 0)(M - I) + e_1^\top \right) = (1, 5)$, the smallest possible $k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ such that a conjugate of φ^k fixes $\sqrt{\mathbf{u}}$ is $k = 4$.

9. Comments

Let us formulate two questions on Sturmian morphisms we were not able to answer.

- Conjugate Sturmian morphisms can be ordered with respect to the relation \triangleright from the leftmost conjugate morphism to the rightmost conjugate. All the morphisms have the same incidence matrix and thus the matrices of their faithful representation differ only in the last row. It will be interesting to describe the relationship between the last rows of two subsequent elements in this chain. Let us demonstrate the question on an example.

By Theorem 22, $M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 5 \end{pmatrix}$ is the incidence matrix for 9 mutually conjugate Sturmian morphisms. Let us list them from the leftmost conjugate to the rightmost conjugate morphism:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_0 &= \tilde{D}^2 \tilde{G}^2, & \psi_1 &= \tilde{D} D \tilde{G}^2, & \psi_2 &= D^2 G \tilde{G}^2, & \psi_3 &= \tilde{D}^2 G \tilde{G}, & \psi_4 &= D \tilde{D} G \tilde{G} \\ \psi_5 &= D^2 G \tilde{G}, & \psi_6 &= \tilde{D}^2 G^2, & \psi_7 &= \tilde{D} D G^2, & \text{and } \psi_8 &= D^2 G^2. \end{aligned}$$

If we compute the faithful representation of the morphism ψ_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 8$, we obtain $\mathcal{R}(\psi_i) = \begin{pmatrix} M & 0 \\ e_i & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ with $e_0 = (0, 2)$, $e_1 = (1, 4)$, $e_2 = (2, 6)$, $e_3 = (0, 1)$, $e_4 = (1, 3)$, $e_5 = (2, 5)$, $e_6 = (0, 0)$, $e_7 = (1, 2)$, $e_8 = (2, 4)$.

The question is how to generate the sequence e_i using the form of the matrix M , and, consequently, the sequence ρ_i , where ρ_i is the intercept of the fixed point of ψ_i .

- Proposition 19 is only the necessary condition of Yasutomi's theorem. The sufficient condition of the theorem can be formulated in our formalism as follows:

Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{m})$, where $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\sqrt{m} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and $\frac{x}{y} \notin \mathbb{Q}$. If $(x, y, z)^\top \in C_1$ and the Galois conjugate $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})^\top \in C_2$, then $(x, y, z)^\top$ is an eigenvector of a matrix $R \in \mathcal{E}$, $R \neq I_3$.

We were not able to prove this statement directly and obtain a proof that would differ substantially from Yasutomi's proof.

The exhibited faithful representation relies on the geometric representation of Sturmian sequences. A natural question is finding a faithful representation of some other monoids of morphisms that fix some other families of infinite sequences, e.g., Arnoux–Rauzy sequences and sequences coding symmetric k -interval exchange transformations. Let us point out that a geometrical representation of ternary Arnoux–Rauzy sequences can be found already in the article [1]. Recently, a representation of Arnoux–Rauzy sequences

using a generalized Ostrowski numeration system is introduced in [14]. The sequences coding 3-interval exchanges can be viewed as sequences obtained by cut-and-project sets, see [10].

Acknowledgements

Jana Lepšová acknowledges financial support by The French Institute in Prague and the Czech Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports through the Barrande fellowship programme and Agence Nationale de la Recherche through the project Codys (ANR-18-CE40-0007), and the support by Grant Agency of Czech technical university in Prague, through the project SGS20/183/OHK4/3T/14. Edita Pelantová acknowledges financial support by The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic, project no. CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000778. Štěpán Starosta acknowledges the support of the OP VVV MEYS funded project CZ.02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16_019/0000765.

References

- [1] P. ARNOUX AND G. RAUZY, *Représentation géométrique de suites de complexité $2n + 1$* , Bull. Soc. Math. France, 119 (1991), pp. 199–215.
- [2] P. BALÁŽI, Z. MASÁKOVÁ, AND E. PELANTOVÁ, *Complete characterization of substitution invariant Sturmian sequences*, Integers, 5 (2005), pp. A14, 23.
- [3] V. BERTHÉ, H. EI, S. ITO, AND H. RAO, *On substitution invariant Sturmian words: an application of Rauzy fractals*, Theor. Inform. Appl., 41 (2007), pp. 329–349.
- [4] M. DEKKING, *Substitution invariant Sturmian words and binary trees*, Integers, 18A (2018), p. #A17.
- [5] N. DUNFORD AND J. T. SCHWARTZ, *Linear operators. Part I*, Wiley Classics Library, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1988. General theory, With the assistance of William G. Bade and Robert G. Bartle, Reprint of the 1958 original, A Wiley-Interscience Publication.
- [6] M. FIEDLER, *Special matrices and their applications in numerical mathematics*, Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, second ed., 2008. Translated from the Czech by Petr Přikryl and Karel Segeth.
- [7] N. P. FOGG, *Substitutions in Arithmetics, Dynamics and Combinatorics*, vol. 1794 of Lecture notes in mathematics, Springer, 1st ed., 2002.
- [8] H. GEORGI, *Lie Algebras In Particle Physics: from Isospin To Unified Theories*, CRC Press, 2018.
- [9] M. LOTHAIRE, *Algebraic Combinatorics on Words*, no. 90 in Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Cambridge University Press, 2002.

- [10] Z. MASÁKOVÁ, E. PELANTOVÁ, AND Š. STAROSTA, *Exchange of three intervals: substitutions and palindromicity*, Eur. J. Combin., 62 (2017), pp. 217–231.
- [11] F. MIGNOSI AND P. SÉÉBOLD, *Morphismes sturmiens et règles de Rauzy*, J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux, 5 (1993), pp. 221–233.
- [12] M. MORSE AND G. A. HEDLUND, *Symbolic dynamics II. Sturmian trajectories*, Amer. J. Math., 62 (1940), pp. 1–42.
- [13] J. PELTOMÄKI AND M. A. WHITELAND, *A square root map on Sturmian words*, Electron. J. Combin., 24 (2017), pp. Paper No. 1.54, 50.
- [14] J. PELTOMÄKI, *Initial nonrepetitive complexity of regular episturmian words and their Diophantine exponents*. preprint available at <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2103.08351>, 2021.
- [15] L. PENG AND B. TAN, *Sturmian sequences and invertible substitutions*, Discr. Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci., 13 (2011), pp. 63–68.
- [16] K. SAARI, *Everywhere α -repetitive sequences and Sturmian words*, European J. Combin., 31 (2010), pp. 177–192.
- [17] S.-I. YASUTOMI, *On Sturmian sequences which are invariant under some substitutions.*, in Number theory and its applications. Proceedings of the conference held at the RIMS, Kyoto, Japan, November 10–14, 1997, vol. 2 of Dev. Math., Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999, pp. 347–373.