

DECIDABILITY OF THE ISOMORPHISM PROBLEM BETWEEN MULTIDIMENSIONAL SUBSTITUTIVE SUBSHIFTS

CHRISTOPHER CABEZAS AND JULIEN LEROY

ABSTRACT. An important question in dynamical systems is the classification problem, i.e., the ability to distinguish between two isomorphic systems. In this work, we study the topological factors between a family of multidimensional substitutive subshifts generated by morphisms with uniform support. We prove that it is decidable to check whether two minimal aperiodic substitutive subshifts are isomorphic. The strategy followed in this work consists of giving a complete description of the factor maps between these subshifts. Then, we deduce some interesting consequences on coalescence, automorphism groups, and the number of aperiodic symbolic factors of substitutive subshifts. We also prove other combinatorial results on these substitutions, such as the decidability of defining a subshift, the computability of the recognizability radius, and the conjugacy between substitutions with different supports.

1. INTRODUCTION

Isomorphic systems are indistinguishable concerning their dynamical properties, making classification an important problem in dynamical systems. Nevertheless, finding an isomorphism (or conjugation) between two dynamical systems has proven to be highly challenging. We recall that an *isomorphism* between two symbolic systems (X, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) and (Y, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) is a continuous and bijective map $\phi : (X, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (Y, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ commuting with the action, i.e., for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\phi \circ S^{\mathbf{n}} = S^{\mathbf{n}} \circ \phi$. If the map ϕ is only surjective, it is called a *factor map*.

One classic approach to address the classification problem involves identifying *invariants*, which are properties shared by isomorphic systems and are easily determinable. However, in some cases, the existing invariants may not suffice for this purpose. Additionally, the topological factors of a topological dynamical system are rarely used explicitly to unravel the structure of a particular dynamical system. Nonetheless, they contain valuable information for certain aspects and can be employed for concrete computations or the study of specific structures, such as in spectral theory.

We are also concerned with the *decidability* of certain properties. A property is said to be decidable if there exists an algorithm that allows one to verify whether the property is satisfied or not. In this article, our focus lies on the decidability of the classification problem within the family of *multidimensional substitutive subshifts*.

One-dimensional substitutive subshifts have been extensively studied for several decades, ever since they were introduced by W.H. Gottschalk in [27]. They represent

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 37B10; Secondary 37A35, 37B51, 68R15.

Key words and phrases. Substitutive subshifts, automorphism groups, decidability, computability, conjugacies, factor maps, recognizability, følner sequences.

The authors acknowledge the financial support of ANR project IZES ANR-22-CE40-0011.

the simplest nontrivial zero-entropy symbolic systems and are generated in a highly deterministic manner. This simplicity has led to their presence in various fields of mathematics, computer science, and physics, such as combinatorics of words, number theory, dynamics of aperiodic tilings, quasi-crystals, and more (see, for example, [1, 2, 33, 34]). However, their deep understanding took several decades, with significant contributions made by A. Cobham [10] (who identified them as so-called *automatic sequences* from a computational perspective), M. Queffélec and others [14, 39, 37] (in terms of their spectral properties), B. Mossé [32] (focused on recognizability, which is a sort of invertibility of substitutions), F. Durand [18] (who classified their topological factor systems), and B. Host and F. Parreau among several others [12, 13, 15, 29, 31, 38] (classification of their automorphism groups). We refer to [37, 23] for extensive bibliographies on the (earlier developments of) the subject. Many of the aspects mentioned above remain largely unexplored in the context of multidimensional substitutive systems.

In the multidimensional setting, substitutive subshifts find their motivation in physical phenomena, particularly through the discovery of the aperiodic structure of quasi-crystals, modeled by the Penrose tiling [35]. In these models, symmetries play a fundamental role and are described using finite data. Numerous articles have been dedicated to the study of these tilings (see [3] for an extensive bibliography on aperiodic order). Substitutive systems have then emerged as valuable mathematical models within this research direction. Our focus in this article is on substitutions with uniform support, where the shape of any pattern defined by the substitution remains the same (see [8] for basic properties on this topic, where we follow the same notation). Within this class of substitutive subshifts, we prove that, assuming to have the same combinatorial structure, it is decidable whether a factor map exists between two aperiodic substitutive subshifts.

Theorem A. Let ζ_1, ζ_2 be two aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution with the same expansion matrix L . It is decidable to know whether there exists a factor map $\phi : (X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$.

The strategy followed in this article involves providing a complete description of the factor maps between substitutive subshifts. This approach draws inspiration from a series of works on automorphism groups of symbolic systems, which we proceed to describe. The study of factors and conjugacies between dynamical systems is a classical problem, primarily concerning their algebraic and dynamical properties in relation to the one of the system (X, T, \mathbb{Z}^d) . *Automorphisms*, which are self-conjugacies of a particular system, can be algebraically defined as elements of the centralizer of the action group $\langle T \rangle$, considered as a subgroup of all homeomorphisms $\text{Homeo}(X)$ from X to itself. Symbolic systems already exhibit significant rigidity properties regarding factor maps and automorphisms. For instance, the famous Curtis-Hedlund-Lyndon theorem [28] establishes that any factor map between subshifts is a sliding block code, implying that the automorphism group is countable and discrete. Initially studied for *subshifts of finite type* [28], these automorphism groups were shown to be infinitely generated and containing various groups, including all finite groups, the free group on two generators, the direct sum of a countable number of copies of \mathbb{Z} , and any countable collection of finite groups. The existence of a conjugacy between two subshifts of finite type is known to be equivalent to the notion of *Strong Shift Equivalence* for matrices over \mathbb{Z}^+ [42], which is not known to be decidable [30].

However, within the rich family of substitutive subshifts, factor maps exhibit strong rigidity properties, as proven by B. Host and F. Parreau in [29]. They provided a complete description of factor maps between subshifts arising from certain constant-length substitutions, proving that any measurable factor map induces a continuous one. As a consequence, the automorphism group is virtually generated by the shift action, meaning that there exists a finite set of automorphisms such that any automorphism can be expressed as the composition of an element from this finite set and a power of the shift. Moreover, any finite group can be realized as a quotient group $\text{Aut}(X, S, \mathbb{Z}) / \langle S \rangle$ for these subshifts, as proven by M. Lemańczyk and M. K. Mentzen in [31]. The proof by B. Host and F. Parreau is based on the following fact: there exists a bound (in this case, $r = 2$) such that any factor map between these substitutive subshifts is the composition of a sliding block code with a radius less than r and a power of the shift map. Using the self-induced properties of substitutive subshifts, V. Salo and I. Törmä provided in [38] a renormalization process for factor maps between two minimal substitutive subshifts of constant-length and for Pisot substitutions, extending the description obtained in [29] within a topological framework. More recently, F. Durand and J. Leroy [20] showed the decidability of the factorization problem between two minimal substitutive subshifts, extending the results of V. Salo and I. Törmä, giving a *computable* upper bound R such that every factor map between minimal substitutive subshifts is the composition of a power of the shift map with a factor map having a radius less than R . The decidability of the factorization problem in the constant-length case had previously been proved by I. Fagnot in [22] using the first-order logic framework of Presburger arithmetic, without assuming minimality. In [8], an analogous result to that of B. Host and F. Parreau for the multidimensional framework was established. In this article, we further extend the findings in [8] to the whole class of aperiodic minimal multidimensional constant-shape substitutive subshifts.

Theorem B. Let ζ_1, ζ_2 be two aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions with the same expansion matrix. Then, there exists a computable constant R such that every factor map between $(X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $(X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ is the composition of a shift map with a factor map of radius less than R .

The constant R of the previous theorem depends on the recognizability radius of the image substitution ζ_2 . In [8] it was already established that aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions are recognizable. In this article, we prove that this constant is computable.

Theorem C. Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution with expansion matrix L and support F . There is a computable upper bound for the recognizability radius of ζ . This bound can be expressed only by the cardinality of the alphabet $|\mathcal{A}|$, the expansion matrix L , the support F and the dimension d .

This result is an analogue of the one proved by F. Durand and J. Leroy in [19] for the one-dimensional case.

This article is organized as follows. The basic definitions and background are introduced in Section 2. Section 3 is devoted to the study of the supports of a constant-shape substitution. We prove the decidability of whether this sequence is Følner (Theorem 3.3), useful to define the substitutive subshift. Then, we use this proof to deduce that the language of a constant-shape substitution is computable (Lemma 3.4) and to get a bound on their complexity function (Lemma 3.5). In

Section 4 we deal with the conjugacy problem between two aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions with the same expansion matrix but different support. We prove that for any pair of different supports F_1, G_1 of an expansion matrix and any constant-shape substitution with support F_1 , there exists a constant-shape substitution with support G_1 such that the two substitutive subshifts are topologically conjugate (Theorem 4.1). This answers a question raised in [24], where a similar result was showed for the one-dimensional case. Section 5 is devoted to the computability of the recognizability radius of constant-shape substitutions. To do this, we study the computability of the repetitivity function for substitutive subshifts (Lemma 5.4). Finally, in Section 6 we characterize the factor maps between aperiodic primitive substitutive subshifts sharing the expansion matrix (Theorem 6.2). Then, we deduce the coalescence of substitutive subshifts (Proposition 6.4), meaning any endomorphism between the substitutive subshift and itself is invertible. We also prove that the automorphism group of substitutive subshifts is virtually generated by the shift action (Proposition 6.5). Additionally, we use Theorem 6.2 to conclude the decidability of the factorization problem between substitutive subshifts having the same expansion matrix (Theorem 6.6). Thanks to the coalescence of substitutive subshifts, we also deduce the decidability of the isomorphism problem (Corollary 6.7). We finish this section proving that substitutive subshifts have finitely many aperiodic symbolic factors, up to conjugacy (Lemma 6.10). Thanks to Theorem 6.2 we are able to provide a list containing these factors.

2. DEFINITIONS AND BASIC PROPERTIES

2.1. Basic definitions and notation.

2.1.1. *Notation.* Throughout this article, we will denote by $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_d)$ the elements of \mathbb{Z}^d and by $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ the elements of \mathbb{R}^d . If $F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ is a finite set, it will be denoted by $F \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, and we use the notation $\|F\| = \max_{\mathbf{n} \in F} \|\mathbf{n}\|$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the standard Euclidean norm of \mathbb{R}^d . If $L \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{R})$ is a matrix, we denote $\|L\| = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \|L(\mathbf{x})\|/\|\mathbf{x}\|$ as the *matrix norm* of L .

A sequence of finite sets $(F_n)_{n>0} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ is said to be a *Følner sequence*¹ if for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|F_n \Delta (\mathbf{n} + F_n)|}{|F_n|} = 0,$$

where $|X|$ stands for the cardinality of the set X . For any pair of subsets $E, F \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, we denote $F^{\circ E}$, as the set of all elements $\mathbf{f} \in F$ such that $\mathbf{f} + E \subseteq F$, i.e.,

$$F^{\circ E} = \{\mathbf{f} \in F : \mathbf{f} + E \subseteq F\}.$$

In the case E is a discrete ball centered at the origin, meaning $E = [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$ for some $r > 0$, we will denote $F^{\circ[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}$ simply by $F^{\circ r}$. Note that the Følner assumption implies that for any $E \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$(1) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|F_n^{\circ E} \Delta F_n|}{|F_n|} = 1.$$

¹In the literature, especially group theory, it is common to also ask that the union of the sequence of sets $(F_n)_{n>0}$ is equal to \mathbb{Z}^d for a sequence to be Følner, but we will not use it in this article.

2.2. Symbolic Dynamics. Let \mathcal{A} be a finite alphabet, and let $d \geq 1$ be an integer. We define a topology on $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ by endowing \mathcal{A} with the discrete topology and considering on $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ the product topology, generated by cylinders. Since \mathcal{A} is finite, $\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ is a metrizable compact space. The additive group \mathbb{Z}^d acts on this space by translations (or shifts), defined for every $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ by

$$S^{\mathbf{n}}(x)_{\mathbf{k}} = x_{\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{k}}, \quad x \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}, \quad \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

The \mathbb{Z}^d -action $(\mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ is called the *full-shift*.

Let $P \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a finite set. A *pattern* is an element $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}^P$. We say that P is the *support* of \mathbf{p} , denoted $P = \text{supp}(\mathbf{p})$. We say that a pattern \mathbf{p} *occurs in* $x \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ if there exists $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\mathbf{p} = x|_{\mathbf{n}+P}$ (identifying P with $\mathbf{n}+P$ by translation). In this case, we denote it $\mathbf{p} \sqsubseteq x$, and we call such \mathbf{n} an *occurrence in* x of \mathbf{p} .

A *subshift* (X, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) is given by a closed subset $X \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ that is invariant under the \mathbb{Z}^d -action. In this article, even if the alphabet changes, S will always denote the shift map, and we usually say that X itself is a subshift. A subshift can also be defined by its language. For $P \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define

$$\mathcal{L}_P(X) = \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{A}^P : \exists x \in X, \mathbf{p} \sqsubseteq x\}.$$

We define the *language* of a subshift X by

$$\mathcal{L}(X) = \bigcup_{P \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d} \mathcal{L}_P(X).$$

We say that the subshift (X, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) is *minimal* if it does not contain proper non-empty subshifts. The subshift is *aperiodic* if there are no nontrivial periods; that is, if $S^{\mathbf{p}}x = x$ for some $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $x \in X$, then $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$.

Let \mathcal{B} be a finite alphabet, and consider a subshift $Y \subseteq \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$. A map $\phi : (X, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (Y, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ is a *factor map* if it is continuous, surjective and commutes with the actions, i.e., $\phi \circ S^{\mathbf{n}} = S^{\mathbf{n}} \circ \phi$ for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. In this case, we say that (Y, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) is a *factor* of (X, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) . If ϕ is also injective, we say it is a *conjugacy* (or an *isomorphism*). When $\phi : (X, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (Y, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ is a factor map, there exists a finite subset $P \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ and a *P -block map* $\Phi : \mathcal{L}_P(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $x \in X$, $\phi(x)_{\mathbf{n}} = \Phi(x|_{\mathbf{n}+P})$. This is known as the Curtis-Hedlund-Lyndon theorem [28]. We call such P *the support* of Φ and *a support* of ϕ . Observe that if ϕ is induced by Φ , we can define another block map Φ' also inducing ϕ and whose support is a discrete ball of the form $[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$, for $r \in \mathbb{N}$. We define the *radius* of ϕ (and denote it $r(\phi)$) as the infimum of $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that ϕ is induced by a block map with support $[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$.

2.3. Multidimensional constant-shape substitutions. We recall some basic definitions and results about multidimensional substitutive subshifts of constant-shape that will be used throughout this article. We refer to [8] for basic properties on this topic, where we follow the same notation (see also [25] for spectral properties of these substitutive subshifts). Let $L \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{Z})$ be an expansion integer matrix, i.e., there exists $\lambda > 1$ such that for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we have that $\|L(\mathbf{x})\| > \lambda\|\mathbf{x}\|$. Let F be a fundamental domain of $L(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ in \mathbb{Z}^d , meaning a set of representative classes of $\mathbb{Z}^d/L(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ (with $\mathbf{0} \in F$), and let \mathcal{A} be a finite alphabet. A *multidimensional constant-shape substitution* is a map $\zeta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^F$. The set F is called the *support* of the substitution. The following shows an example of a constant-shape substitution:

Example 2.1 (Triangular Thue-Morse substitution). The *triangular Thue-Morse substitution* is defined with $L = 2 \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}$, $F = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1), (-1, -1)\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{a, b\}$ as

$$\sigma_{\Delta TM} : \begin{array}{c} a \\ a \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{cc} & b \\ a & b \\ & a \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} b \\ b \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{cc} & a \\ b & a \\ & b \end{array}.$$

In the literature, constant-shape substitutions with a positive diagonal expansion matrix $L = \text{diag}(l_i)_{i=1, \dots, d}$ and support equal to the standard d -dimensional parallelepiped $F_1 = \prod_{i=1}^d \llbracket 0, l_i - 1 \rrbracket$ are called *block substitutions*. These substitutions have a characteristic block structure defined by the shape of F_1 . Moreover, when $L = p \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ is equal to some positive multiple of the identity, and the support is equal to $F = \llbracket 0, p - 1 \rrbracket^2$, we use the term *square substitution* to describe such cases.

Given a substitution ζ , we let L_ζ denote its expansion matrix, and F_1^ζ its support. For any $n > 0$, we define the n -th iteration of the substitution $\zeta^n : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{F_n^\zeta}$ by induction: $\zeta^{n+1} = \zeta \circ \zeta^n$, where the supports of these substitutions satisfy the recurrence

$$(2) \quad F_{n+1}^\zeta = L_\zeta(F_n^\zeta) + F_1^\zeta, \quad \forall n \geq 1.$$

Observe that we trivially have $L_{\zeta^n} = L_\zeta^n$.

The *language* of a substitution is the set of all patterns that appear in $\zeta^n(a)$, for some $n > 0$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_\zeta = \{\mathbf{p} : \mathbf{p} \sqsubseteq \zeta^n(a), \text{ for some } n > 0, a \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

For such a language to define a subshift, we need the sequence $(F_n)_{n>0}$ to be Følner, as it is exactly that condition that ensure that the language contains patterns of support arbitrarily large. Hence we will always assume that the sequence of supports $(F_n)_{n>0}$ is Følner. We prove in the next section that the Følner property is decidable (see Theorem 3.3).

The following shows the first three iterations of the substitution given in Example 2.1.

Example 2.2 (Iterations of a constant-shape substitution). The first three iterations of the substitution $\sigma_{\Delta TM}$ illustrated in Example 2.1.

$$\begin{array}{c} a \\ b \\ a \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{ccc} & b & \\ a & a & b \\ & a & \end{array} \mapsto \begin{array}{ccccc} & & & a & \\ & & & b & a \\ & & & b & a \\ & & & a & b & a \\ & & & b & a & b & a \\ & & & a & b & b & a \\ & & & a & b & & \\ & & & a & & & \end{array}$$




FIGURE 1. An example of application of the first three iterations of the substitution illustrated in Example 2.1.

We define the subshift X_ζ associated with ζ as the set of all sequences $x \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ such that every pattern occurring in x is in \mathcal{L}_ζ . We call this subshift a *substitutive subshift*. We recall that in this case, the substitutive subshift is minimal if and only if the substitution is primitive.

A substitution ζ is called *primitive* if there exists a positive integer $n > 0$, such that, for every $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, b occurs in $\zeta^n(a)$. Each substitution $\zeta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{F_1^\zeta}$ can be naturally associated with an *incidence matrix* denoted as M_ζ . For any $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ as $(M_\zeta)_{a,b}$ is defined as $|\{\mathbf{f} \in F_1^\zeta : \zeta(a)_{\mathbf{f}} = b\}|$, i.e., it is equal to the number of occurrences of b in the pattern $\zeta(a)$. The substitution ζ is primitive if and only if its incidence matrix is primitive. A matrix is primitive when it has a power with strictly positive coefficients.

If ζ is a primitive constant-shape substitution, the existence of *periodic points* is well-known, i.e., there exists at least one point $x_0 \in X_\zeta$ such that $\zeta^p(x_0) = x_0$ for some $p > 0$. In the primitive case, the subshift is preserved by replacing the substitution by a power of it, meaning X_{ζ^n} is equal to X_ζ for any $n > 0$. Thus, we may assume that the substitution possesses at least one fixed point. As in the one-dimensional case, the supports do not need to cover all the space. Nevertheless, up to adding a finite set and taking its images under power of the expansion map L , they cover the space. This property is explained in the following proposition. It is similar to the notion of rest in numeration theory and will be technically useful.

Proposition 2.3. [8, Proposition 2.10] *Let $L \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{Z})$ be an expansion matrix, and F_1 be a fundamental domain of $L(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ in \mathbb{Z}^d (containing $\mathbf{0}$). Then, the set $K_{L, F_1} = \bigcup_{m>0} ((\text{id} - L^m)^{-1}(F_m) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d)$ is finite and satisfies*

$$\bigcup_{n \geq 0} L^n(K_{L, F_1}) + F_n = \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

using the notation $F_0^\zeta = \{\mathbf{0}\}$.

If ζ is a constant-shape substitution, we denote $K_\zeta = K_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta}$. The set K_ζ controls, in some way, the number of periodic points that a constant-shape substitution has. More specifically, it can be proved that a primitive constant-shape substitution has at most $|\mathcal{L}_{K_\zeta}(K_\zeta)|$ ζ -periodic points.

Remark 2.4. Observing that the sets $\bigcup_{m=1}^n ((\text{id} - L^m)^{-1}(F_m) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d)$, $n \geq 1$, are nested, Proposition 2.3 implies that K_{L, F_1} is equal to $\bigcup_{m=1}^j ((\text{id} - L^m)^{-1}(F_m) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d)$ for some $j > 0$. Therefore, whenever ζ is primitive, up to replacing ζ by a power of itself, we may assume that K_ζ is equal to $(\text{id} - L_\zeta)^{-1}(F_1^\zeta) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$.

For the triangular Thue-Morse substitution, the set $K_{\Delta TM}$ is equal to $\{(-1, 0), (0, 0), (0, -1), (1, 1)\}$.

The proof of Proposition 2.3 is inspired by the *Euclidean Division algorithm*, which was used to obtain finite sets satisfying particular properties as shown in the following result that we will use in the rest of this article.

Proposition 2.5. [8, Proposition 2.12] *Set $A \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ containing $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and let $F \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ containing a fundamental domain F_1 of an integer expansion matrix L . Then, there exists a (computable) finite subset $B \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ containing $\mathbf{0}$ and such that*

- (1) $A + F \subseteq B + A + F \subseteq L(B) + F_1$.
- (2) *More generally, for any $n \geq 0$*
 - $L^n(B + A + F) + F_n \subseteq L^{n+1}(B) + F_{n+1}$
 - $B + \sum_{i=0}^n L^i(A + F) \subseteq L^{n+1}(B) + F_{n+1}$.
- (3) *The sequence of sets $(L^n(B) + F_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is nested.*
- (4) $\|B\| \leq (\|L^{-1}(A + F)\| + \|L^{-1}(F_1)\|) / (1 - \|L^{-1}\|)$.

Proof. We define the sequence $(B_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of finite sets by $B_0 = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and, for every $n \geq 0$,

$$B_{n+1} = L^{-1}(B_n + A + F - F_1).$$

One easily checks by induction that $B_n \subseteq B_{n+1}$ for all n and a quick computation shows that

$$\|B_n\| \leq \frac{\|L^{-1}(A + F)\| + \|L^{-1}(F_1)\|}{1 - \|L^{-1}\|}.$$

As a consequence, the sequence $(B_n)_{n \geq 0}$ stabilizes and we set $B = B_N$ where N is such that $B_n = B_N$ for every $n \geq N$.

Let us now check that the set B satisfies all items. The set B contains $\mathbf{0}$ by construction, which directly implies that $A + F \subseteq B + A + F$. If $\mathbf{n} \in B + A + F$, then \mathbf{n} belongs to $B_n + A + F$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We can thus write $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{n}' + \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{f}$ as well as $\mathbf{n} = L(\mathbf{m}) + \mathbf{f}'$, for some $\mathbf{n}' \in B_n$, $\mathbf{a} \in A$, $\mathbf{f} \in F$ and $\mathbf{f}' \in F_1$. We deduce that $L(\mathbf{m}) \in B_n + A + F - F_1$, hence $\mathbf{m} \in B$. Item (2) follows by induction and implies Item (3), as $\mathbf{0} \in A \cap F$. \square

Remark 2.6. Note that if we change the pair (L, F_1) by (L^n, F_n) for any $n \geq 1$, then set B given by Proposition 2.5 is the same for fixed A and F . Using the notion of *digit tile* defined in Section 2.7 of [8], we note that $\|L^{-n}(F_n)\| \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \|T_{(L, F_1)}\|$. Hence, the sequence $(\|L^{-n}(F_n)\| / (1 - \|L^{-n}\|))_{n \geq 1}$ is uniformly bounded.

From now on, we denote C_{L,F_1} to the set given by Remark 2.6 using $A = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and $F = F_1 + F_1$. By [8, Remark 2.13 (2)], we have that for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $C_{L,F_1} + F_n + F_n \subseteq L^n(C_{L,F_1}) + F_n$.

Every element of \mathbb{Z}^d can be expressed in a unique way as $\mathbf{p} = L(\mathbf{j}) + \mathbf{f}$, with $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathbf{f} \in F$, so we can consider the substitution ζ as a map from X_ζ to itself given by

$$\zeta(x)_{L(\mathbf{j})+\mathbf{f}} = \zeta(x(\mathbf{j}))_{\mathbf{f}}.$$

This map is continuous. Moreover, when the substitution is aperiodic and primitive, Proposition 5.7 below ensures that this map is actually a homeomorphism. This property is satisfied, even in the case where the substitution is not *injective on letters*, i.e., when there exist distinct letters $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\zeta(a) = \zeta(b)$. This comes from the notion of *recognizability* of a substitution (see Section 5).

Definition 2.7. Let ζ be a substitution and $x \in X_\zeta$ be a fixed point. We say that ζ is *recognizable on x* if there exists some constant $R > 0$ such that for all $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$x|_{[B(L_\zeta(\mathbf{i}), R) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} = x|_{[B(\mathbf{j}, R) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} \implies (\exists \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d)((\mathbf{j} = L_\zeta(\mathbf{k})) \wedge (x_{\mathbf{i}} = x_{\mathbf{k}})).$$

The recognizability of a substitution ζ implies that for every $x \in X_\zeta$, there exist a unique $x' \in X_\zeta$ and a unique $\mathbf{j} \in F_1^\zeta$ such that $x = S^{\mathbf{j}}\zeta(x')$. This implies that the set $\zeta(X_\zeta)$ is a clopen subset of X_ζ , and $\{S^{\mathbf{j}}\zeta(X_\zeta) : \mathbf{j} \in F_1^\zeta\}$ forms a clopen partition of X_ζ (The proof is classical and similar to the one-dimensional case [37, Section 5.6]). Any power of a recognizable substitution is also recognizable, so these properties extend to ζ^n , for all $n > 0$. The recognizability property was first proved for any aperiodic primitive substitution by B. Mossé in the one-dimensional case [32], and in the multidimensional case by B. Solomyak [40] for aperiodic self-affine tilings with an \mathbb{R}^d -action. Later, in [8] it was established that the aperiodic symbolic factors of primitive substitutive subshifts also satisfy a recognizability property.

3. DECIDABILITY OF THE FÖLNER PROPERTY FOR FUNDAMENTAL DOMAINS OF AN EXPANSION MATRIX AND COMPUTABILITY OF THE LANGUAGE OF CONSTANT-SHAPE SUBSTITUTIONS

Let $L \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{Z})$ be an expansion matrix and $F_1 \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a fundamental domain of $L(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ in \mathbb{Z}^d containing $\mathbf{0}$. Define the sequence of fundamental domains of $L^n(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ as in (2):

$$F_{n+1} = L(F_n) + F_1, \forall n \geq 1.$$

Consider the set $K \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ given by Proposition 2.3 and the set $C_{L,F_1} \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ given by Proposition 2.5 with $A = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $F = F_1 + F_1$. We recall that, by Item (2), for any $n \geq 1$, $C_{L,F_1} + F_n + F_n \subseteq L^n(C_{L,F_1}) + F_n$. Assume, up to replacing L by an appropriate power of it, that $K = (\text{id} - L)^{-1}(F_1) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$. The following result shows a characterization, for the sequence of fundamental domains $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ to be Følner. We recall that a sequence $(A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of finite sets of \mathbb{Z}^d is said to be Følner if for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|A_n \Delta (\mathbf{n} + A_n)|}{|A_n|} = 0.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let $L \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{Z})$ be an expansion matrix, $F_1 \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ a fundamental domain of $L(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ in \mathbb{Z}^d containing $\mathbf{0}$ and $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of fundamental domains defined as (2). The sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Følner if and only if*

$$(3) \quad (\exists n \in \mathbb{N})(\exists \mathbf{f} \in F_n) \mathbf{f} + C_{L,F_1} + K \subseteq F_n.$$

Lemma 3.1 implies that we need to check for a computable set, such that some fundamental domain F_n contains a translation of this set.

Proof. One direction is direct. For the other direction, we recall that by Proposition 2.3 $\bigcup_{p \in \mathbb{N}} L^p(K) + F_p = \mathbb{Z}^d$ and the sequence of finite sets $(L^p(K) + F_p)_{p \in \mathbb{N}}$ is nested. To check that $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Følner, it is enough to prove that

$$(\forall p \in \mathbb{N}) \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{|F_n \Delta (F_n + C_{L, F_1} + L^p(K) + F_p)|}{|F_n|} = 0.$$

Claim 1.

$$(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})(\exists \mathbf{f} \in F_n) \mathbf{f} + C_{L, F_1} + K \subseteq F_n \implies (\forall p \in \mathbb{N})(\exists n(p) \in \mathbb{N})(\mathbf{f}_p \in F_{n(p)}) \\ \mathbf{f}_p + C_{L, F_1} + L^p(K) + F_p \subseteq F_{n(p)}.$$

Proof of Claim 1. Indeed, note that

$$\mathbf{f} + C_{L, F_1} + K \subseteq F_n \implies L(\mathbf{f}) + (L(C_{L, F_1}) + F_1) + L(K) \subseteq F_{n+1} \\ \implies (L(\mathbf{f}) + F_1) + C_{L, F_1} + (L(K) + F_1) \subseteq F_{n+1}.$$

Hence, any element $\mathbf{h} \in F_{n+1}$ that can be written as $L(\mathbf{f}) + \mathbf{g}$, for some $\mathbf{g} \in F_1$ satisfies the property for $p = 1$. We then conclude using induction on $p \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Now, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote $J_{n,p} = \{\mathbf{f} \in F_n : \mathbf{f} + C_{L, F_1} + L^p(K) + F_p \subseteq F_n\}$, $a_{n,p} = |J_{n,p}|$, $b_{n,p} = a_{n,p}/|F_n|$. By the proof of Claim 1, we note that for any $n, p \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_{n+1,p} \geq |\det(L)|a_{n,p}$. Therefore, for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequence $(b_{n,p})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is non-decreasing. To conclude that the sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Følner, we prove that for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} b_{n,p} = 1$. We define $m(p) = \inf\{n \mid a_{n,p} > 0\}$. By hypothesis and Claim 1 we note that $m(p) < \infty$. Recall that for any $k \geq 1$, any element in $F_{k \cdot m(p)}$ can be written as $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{f}_i)$, with $\mathbf{f}_i \in F_{m(p)}$.

Claim 2. If there exists $0 \leq i \leq k-1$ such that $\mathbf{f}_i \in J_{m(p),p}$, then $\left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{f}_i)\right) \in J_{k \cdot m(p),p}$.

Proof of Claim 2. First, we note that $m(p) \geq p$. For any $\mathbf{c} \in C_{L, F_1}$ and $\mathbf{n} \in L^p(K) + F_p$, we need to find $(\mathbf{g}_i)_{i=0}^{k-1} \subseteq F_{m(p)}$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{f}_i)\right) + \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{n} = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{g}_i)\right).$$

Let $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ be the minimal such that $\mathbf{f}_j \in J_{m(p),p}$. If $j = 0$, then the proof is direct, noting that $\mathbf{f}_0 + \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{n} \in F_{m(p)}$. If $j > 0$, there exists $\mathbf{k} \in K$ and $(\mathbf{h}_i)_{i=0}^{j-1} \subseteq F_{m(p)}$ such that

$$\mathbf{n} = L^{j \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{k}) + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{h}_i)\right).$$

Then, using Proposition 2.5, there exists $\mathbf{c}_1 \in C_{L, F_1}$ and $(\mathbf{g}_i)_{i=0}^{j-1} \subseteq F_{m(p)}$ such that

$$\mathbf{c} + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{f}_i)\right) + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{h}_i)\right) = L^{j \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{c}_1) + \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{g}_i)$$

Hence

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{f}_i) \right) + \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{n} = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{j-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{g}_i) \right) + \left(\sum_{i=j+1}^{k-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{f}_i) \right) + L^{j \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{f}_j + \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{k}).$$

We conclude noting that $\mathbf{f}_j + \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{k} \in F_{m(p)}$. \square

Now, Claim 2 implies that

$$|F_{k \cdot m(p)} \Delta(F_{k \cdot m(p)} + C + L^p(K) + F_p)| \subseteq \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} L^{i \cdot m(p)}(\mathbf{f}_i) \in F_{k \cdot m(p)} : (\forall i) \mathbf{f}_i \notin J_{m(p), p} \right\}.$$

Hence, for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} b_{k,p} &\geq \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} b_{km(p),p} \\ &\geq 1 - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left| \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} L^i(\mathbf{f}_i) \in F_{k \cdot m(p)} : (\forall 0 \leq i \leq k-1) \mathbf{f}_i \notin J_{m(p), p} \right\} \right|}{|F_{k \cdot m(p)}|} \\ &= 1 - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(|\det(L)|^{m(p)} - |J_{m(p), p}|)^k}{|\det(L)|^{k \cdot m(p)}} \\ &= 1 - \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{|J_{m(p), p}|}{|\det(L)|^{m(p)}} \right)^k \\ &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that the sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Følner. \square

Now, we proceed to prove the decidability of checking whether a sequence of fundamental domains $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined as (2) for an expansion matrix $L \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{Z})$ is Følner. To do this, we consider a labelled directed graph $\mathcal{G}(L, F_1)$, where the vertex set is $C_{L, F_1} + K$ and there is an edge from $\mathbf{a} \in C_{L, F_1} + K$ to $\mathbf{b} \in C_{L, F_1} + K$ labeled with $\mathbf{f} \in F_1$ if and only if there exists $\mathbf{g} \in F_1$ such that $\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{a} = L(\mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{g}$.

Note that $\mathbf{0} \in C_{L, F_1} + K$ has out-degree $|F_1| = |\det(L)|$ and any edge from $\mathbf{0}$ is a self-loop. Furthermore, if $\mathbf{a} \in C_{L, F_1} + K$ is an *in-neighbor* of $\mathbf{0}$ with an edge labeled by $\mathbf{f} \in F_1$, then $\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{a} \in F_1$. Let $P = \mathbf{a}_0 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_0} \mathbf{a}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_1} \mathbf{a}_2$ be a path in $\mathcal{G}(L, F_1)$. By definition, we have that $\mathbf{f}_0 + \mathbf{a}_0 = L(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{g}_0$ and $\mathbf{f}_1 + \mathbf{a}_1 = L(\mathbf{a}_2) + \mathbf{g}_1$, for some $\mathbf{g}_0, \mathbf{g}_1 \in F_1$. This implies that $L(\mathbf{f}_1) + \mathbf{f}_0 + \mathbf{a}_0 = L^2(\mathbf{a}_2) + L(\mathbf{g}_1) + \mathbf{g}_0$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $n \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{f} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} L^i(\mathbf{f}_i) \in F_n$, with $\mathbf{f}_i \in F_1$ for every i .*

We have that $\mathbf{f} + C_{L, F_1} + K \subseteq F_n$ if and only if $\mathbf{f}_0 \mathbf{f}_1 \cdots \mathbf{f}_{n-1}$ labels a path from every vertex in $\mathcal{G}(L, F_1)$ to $\mathbf{0}$.

Proof. Assume that $\mathbf{f} + C_{L, F_1} + K \subseteq F_n$. Set $\mathbf{a} \in C_{L, F_1} + K$. Then, there exists $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{a}) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} L^i(\mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{a})) \in F_n$ such that $\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{a})$. Note that, there exists $\mathbf{a}_1 \in C_{L, F_1} + K$ such that $\mathbf{f}_0 + \mathbf{a} = L(\mathbf{a}_1) + \mathbf{g}_0(\mathbf{a})$, and a straightforward induction shows that there exists a sequence $(\mathbf{a}_i)_{i=1}^{n-1}$ such that for any $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, $\mathbf{f}_i + \mathbf{a}_i = L(\mathbf{a}_{i+1}) + \mathbf{g}_i(\mathbf{a})$ and $\mathbf{f}_{n-1} + \mathbf{a}_{n-1} = \mathbf{g}_{n-1}(\mathbf{a})$. This implies that, there is a path $P_{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{a} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_0} \mathbf{a}_1 \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_1} \cdots \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_{n-2}} \mathbf{a}_{n-1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{f}_{n-1}} \mathbf{0}$. All of these paths have the same label. The other direction is direct. \square

To prove the decidability of checking whether the sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is Følner, we give the graph $\mathcal{G}(L, F_1)$ the structure of a DFA $\mathcal{G}(L, F_1) = (C_{L, F_1} + K, F_1, \delta)$, where $C_{L, F_1} + K$ is the set of states, F_1 is the input alphabet, and $\delta : (C_{L, F_1} + K) \times F_1 \rightarrow (C_{L, F_1} + K)$ is the transition function given by the labeled edges of $\mathcal{G}(L, F_1)$.

By Lemma 3.1, Proposition 3.2 and the fact that $\mathbf{0}$ has only self-loops, the Følner property of the sequence $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equivalent to find a synchronizing word on $\mathcal{G}(L, F_1)$. A word in the input alphabet of a DFA is synchronizing if it sends any state of the DFA to one and the same state. Fig. 2 represents the DFA for the triangular Thue-Morse.




FIGURE 2. The DFA $\mathcal{G}(L, F_1)$ for the triangular Thue-Morse. Some edges were simplified. A synchronizing word is $(0,1)(-1,-1)(1,0)(0,1)$, which implies that $(-2,5)$ in F_4 satisfies (3).

The problem of finding a synchronizing word is known to be decidable and an upper bound for the length of the shortest synchronizing word for a DFA with n states is equal to $(n^3 - n)/6$ [26, 36]. We have proved the following result.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $L \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{Z})$ be an expansion matrix and $F_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ be a fundamental domain of $L(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ in \mathbb{Z}^d containing $\mathbf{0}$. It is decidable to check whether the sequence of fundamental domains $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ defined as (2) is a Følner sequence.*

The proof of the decidability of the Følner property is also useful to show the computability of the language of a constant-shape substitution. Indeed, if $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and $\mathbf{n}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\mathbf{f}_1 \in F_1$ are such that $\mathbf{n} = L(\mathbf{n}_1) + \mathbf{f}_1$, then

$$\|\mathbf{n}_1\| \leq \|L^{-1}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{n}\| + \|L^{-1}(\mathbf{f}_1)\|.$$

In particular, we have that

$$(4) \quad (\forall r > 0) [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] \subseteq L([B(\mathbf{0}, \|L^{-1}\| \cdot r + \|L^{-1}(F_1)\|) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_1,$$

which implies that if $n(r) = \lceil \log(r - \|L^{-1}(F_1)\|) / \log(\|L^{-1}\|) \rceil$, then

$$(5) \quad [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] \subseteq L^{n(r)} \left(\left[B \left(\mathbf{0}, \frac{\|L^{-1}(F_1)\|}{1 - \|L^{-1}\|} \right) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \right] \right) + F_{n(r)}$$

If we replace K by the discrete ball $A_{L, F_1} = [B(\mathbf{0}, \|L^{-1}(F_1)\| / (1 - \|L^{-1}\|)) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$ on the definition of the directed graph $\mathcal{G}(L, F_1)$, then the length \bar{n}_{L, F_1} of the shortest synchronizing word for the DFA

$$\overline{\mathcal{G}(L, F_1)} = (C_{L, F_1} + A_{L, F_1}, F_1, \delta)$$

is the smallest integer n for which a fundamental domain F_n of the lattices $L^n(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ contains a translation of the set $C_{L, F_1} + A_{L, F_1}$. Hence, it is the first time a substitution with expansion matrix L and support F_1 , produces a pattern with support $[B(\mathbf{0}, \|L^{-1}(F_1)\| / (1 - \|L^{-1}\|)) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$. This implies that we can compute all the patterns with support $[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$ of a constant-shape substitution, for any $r > 0$. We then have the following result

Lemma 3.4. *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution with expansion matrix L_ζ and support F_1^ζ . Then, the language $\mathcal{L}(X_\zeta)$ is computable.*

Proof. Set $r > 0$. Using $A = [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$ and $F = F_1^\zeta$ in Proposition 2.5 we obtain a finite set $B_r \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that

$$(6) \quad (\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) L_\zeta^n(B_r + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_n^\zeta \subseteq L_\zeta^{n+1}(B_r) + F_{n+1}^\zeta.$$

Consider $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{L}_{[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}(X_\zeta)$. Let $m > 0$ be the minimal such that $\mathbf{w} \sqsubseteq \zeta^m(a)$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$. We prove that $m \leq \bar{n}_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + n(r) + |\mathcal{A}|^{|B_r|}$. Indeed, if \mathbf{w} occurs in $\zeta^m(a)$, but does not occur in $\zeta^{m-1}(a)$, we can consider $\mathbf{f}_m = L_\zeta(\mathbf{f}_{m-1}) + \mathbf{f}_1 \in F_m^\zeta$ such that $\zeta^m(a)_{\mathbf{f}_m + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} = \mathbf{w}$, and let $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_1 = \zeta^m(a)_{\mathbf{f}_m + B_r}$. By (6), there exists a pattern $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{B_r}(X_\zeta)$ occurring in $\zeta^{m-1}(a)$ and satisfies $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_1 \sqsubseteq \zeta(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_2)$. Since $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_1$ does not occur in $\zeta^{m-1}(a)$, we conclude that $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_1 \neq \bar{\mathbf{w}}_2$ and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_2$ does not occur in $\zeta^{m-2}(a)$. We can then, inductively, construct a sequence of distinct patterns $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_1, \bar{\mathbf{w}}_2, \dots$ in $\mathcal{L}_{B_r}(X_\zeta)$, such that for any $j \geq 1$, $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_j \sqsubseteq \zeta(\bar{\mathbf{w}}_{j+1})$, and $\bar{\mathbf{w}}_j$ occurs in $\zeta^{m-j+1}(a)$ but does not occur in $\zeta^{m-j}(a)$. Considering that there are at most $|\mathcal{A}|^{|B_r|}$ patterns in $\mathcal{L}_{B_r}(X_\zeta)$, we conclude that $m \leq \bar{n}_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + n(r) + |\mathcal{A}|^{|B_r|}$. \square

In the multidimensional setting, we define the *pattern complexity function* (or just the complexity function), denoted by $p_\zeta(r)$ as the number of patterns in $\mathcal{L}_{[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]}(X_\zeta)$. To simplify notation, for now on we denote $\mathfrak{C}(L, F_1)$ to the set $C_{L, F_1} + A_{L, F_1}$.

Using (5) we deduce the following.

Lemma 3.5. *Let ζ be an aperiodic and primitive constant-shape substitution with expansion matrix L_ζ and support F_1^ζ . Then, there exists a constant $c > 0$, such that*

$$p_\zeta(r) \leq c \cdot r^{-\log(|\det(L)|)/\log(\|L^{-1}\|)}$$

Proof. Set $A_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} = \left[B\left(\mathbf{0}, \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)\right) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \right]$. Then, by (5), for any $r > 0$, we get that

$$F_{n(r)}^\zeta + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] \subseteq L_\zeta^{n(r)}(\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)) + F_{n(r)}^\zeta.$$

Let $x \in X_\zeta$ be a fixed point of ζ . Since $x = \zeta(x)$, for every pattern $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{L}_{[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]}(X_\zeta)$, there exists a $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)}(X_\zeta)$ and $\mathbf{f} \in F_{n(r)}^\zeta$ such that $\mathbf{u} = \zeta^{n(r)}(\mathbf{v})_{\mathbf{f}+[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]}$. Indeed, if $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ is such that $\mathbf{u} = x_{\mathbf{n}+[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]}$, write $\mathbf{n} = L_\zeta^{n(r)}(\mathbf{n}_1) + \mathbf{f}$ for some $\mathbf{n}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathbf{f} \in F_{n(r)}^\zeta$. Consider $\mathbf{v} = x|_{\mathbf{n}_1 + \mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)}$. Since x is a fixed point of ζ , we have that $\zeta^{n(r)}(\mathbf{v}) = x|_{\mathbf{n} + L_\zeta^{n(r)}(\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)) + F_{n(r)}^\zeta}$. In particular, $\mathbf{u} = \zeta^{n(r)}(\mathbf{v})_{\mathbf{f}+[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]}$. Now, since $|\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)}(X_\zeta)|$ is at most $|\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} p_\zeta(r) &\leq |\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|} |\det(L_\zeta)|^{n(r)} \\ &\leq |\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|} \cdot r^{-\log(|\det(L_\zeta)|)/\log(\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)}. \end{aligned}$$

The result follows. \square

4. CONJUGACY BETWEEN CONSTANT-SHAPE SUBSTITUTIONS SHARING THE EXPANSION MATRIX

Constant-shape substitutions in dimension 1 were defined in [24] under the name of *pattern substitutions*. This notion slightly differs from the one-dimensional constant-shape substitutions by allowing the support associated with each letter to vary. The authors proved that every biinfinite sequence which is a fixed point of a pattern substitution is, in fact, substitutive. As a consequence, pattern substitutions do not generate new aperiodic sequences beyond those produced by regular substitutions. This raises the question of whether this fact holds in higher dimensions. In this section, we prove an analogue of this result (Theorem 4.1): For a fixed expansion matrix, the conjugacy class of a substitutive subshifts is invariant by changing the supports of the substitution.

Let us start with an example. The triangular Thue-Morse substitution has exactly 8 $\sigma_{\Delta TM}$ -periodic points of order 2 (or $\sigma_{\Delta TM}^2$ has exactly 8 fixed points), which are generated by the 8 patterns in $\mathcal{L}_{K_{\Delta TM}}(X_{\sigma_{\Delta TM}})$:

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
& & b & & a & & a & & b \\
b & a & & a & b & & b & b & & a & a & & b \\
& & a & & b & & a & & & & b & & \\
& & & a & & & b & & a & & & & b \\
b & a & & a & b & & a & a & & b & b & & \\
& & b & & a & & a & & & & b & &
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 3. The 8 patterns in $\mathcal{L}_{K_{\Delta TM}}(X_{\sigma_{\Delta TM}})$.

Now, consider the following square substitution σ_1 , with $L = 2 \cdot \text{id}_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ and $F_1 = \llbracket 0, 1 \rrbracket^2$, over the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{0, 1, \dots, 15\}$ defined as

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
\sigma_1 : & 0 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 2 & 3 \\ 0 & 1 \end{array} & 1 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 5 & 6 \\ 7 & 4 \end{array} & 2 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 6 & 4 \\ 7 & 5 \end{array} & 3 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 8 & 0 \\ 0 & 8 \end{array} \\
& 4 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 8 & 6 \\ 0 & 1 \end{array} & 5 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 10 & 11 \\ 12 & 9 \end{array} & 6 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 2 & 4 \\ 0 & 8 \end{array} & 7 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 5 & 0 \\ 7 & 5 \end{array} \\
& 8 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 14 & 11 \\ 8 & 13 \end{array} & 9 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 0 & 10 \\ 8 & 13 \end{array} & 10 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 14 & 9 \\ 8 & 0 \end{array} & 11 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 0 & 8 \\ 8 & 0 \end{array} \\
& 12 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 15 & 8 \\ 12 & 15 \end{array} & 13 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 15 & 10 \\ 12 & 9 \end{array} & 14 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 10 & 9 \\ 12 & 15 \end{array} & 15 & \mapsto & \begin{array}{cc} 6 & 3 \\ 7 & 4 \end{array}
\end{array}$$

FIGURE 4. A square substitution conjugate to the triangular Thue-Morse substitution.

This square substitution is conjugate to the triangular Thue-Morse substitution via the following coding:

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
\Phi : & 0 & \mapsto & a & 1 & \mapsto & b & 2 & \mapsto & b & 3 & \mapsto & a \\
& 4 & \mapsto & a & 5 & \mapsto & a & 6 & \mapsto & a & 7 & \mapsto & b \\
& 8 & \mapsto & b & 9 & \mapsto & b & 10 & \mapsto & b & 11 & \mapsto & b \\
& 12 & \mapsto & a & 13 & \mapsto & a & 14 & \mapsto & a & 15 & \mapsto & b.
\end{array}$$

To see this, we note that σ_1 also has exactly 8 σ_1 -periodic points of order 2 generated by the following patterns in $\mathcal{L}_{\llbracket 0, 1 \rrbracket^2}(X_\sigma)$:

9	0	4	8	13	0	1	8
0	10	8	6	3	14	11	2
13	12	1	7	9	12	4	7
4	10	9	6	6	14	10	2.

FIGURE 5. The patterns that generate the 8 fixed points of σ_1^2 .

A standard computation shows that, if we define $\phi : X_{\sigma_{\Delta TM}} \rightarrow \phi(X_{\sigma_1})$ by the coding $\phi(x)_n = \Phi(x_n)$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, then any fixed point of σ_1^2 is mapped, via ϕ , to a fixed point of $\sigma_{\Delta TM}^2$. The minimality of $(X_{\sigma_{\Delta TM}}, S, \mathbb{Z}^2)$ let us conclude that $\phi(X_{\sigma_{\Delta TM}}) = X_{\sigma_1}$. It can be shown that, the map $\psi : X_{\sigma_{\Delta TM}} \rightarrow X_{\sigma_1}$ induced by the following local map:

$$\begin{array}{cccc}
\Psi : & b & a & \\
& a & b & \mapsto 0 \\
& & & \\
& a & a & \mapsto 4 \\
& a & b & \mapsto 8 \\
& b & b & \mapsto 12 \\
& & & \\
& a & a & \mapsto 5 \\
& a & a & \mapsto 9 \\
& b & b & \mapsto 13 \\
& & & \\
& b & a & \mapsto 1 \\
& b & a & \mapsto 9 \\
& a & b & \mapsto 13 \\
& & & \\
& b & a & \mapsto 2 \\
& b & a & \mapsto 10 \\
& a & b & \mapsto 14 \\
& & & \\
& a & a & \mapsto 3 \\
& b & a & \mapsto 7 \\
& b & b & \mapsto 11 \\
& b & a & \mapsto 15,
\end{array}$$

satisfies $\psi \circ \phi = \text{id}_{X_{\sigma_1}}$, so $(X_{\sigma_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^2), (X_{\sigma_{\Delta TM}}, S, \mathbb{Z}^2)$ are topologically conjugate. The example above generalizes as follows.

Theorem 4.1. *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution with an expansion matrix L and support F_1 . Now, consider G_1 be another fundamental domain of $\mathbb{Z}^d/L(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ with $\mathbf{0} \in G_1$, and such that the associated sequence $(G_n)_{n>0}$ is Følner. There exists an aperiodic computable primitive constant-shape substitution $\tilde{\zeta}$ with support G_1 such that $(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $(X_{\tilde{\zeta}}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ are topologically conjugate.*

Proof. Using Remark 2.4, we may assume that ζ has a fixed point $\bar{x} \in X_\zeta$. Assume $K_1 = (\text{id} - L)^{-1}(F_1) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $K_2 = (\text{id} - L)^{-1}(G_1) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ are the ones given by Proposition 2.3 for F_1 and G_1 , respectively.

First, we adapt the proof of Proposition 2.5 to obtain a finite set $A \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that for any $n \geq 0, K_2 + A + G_n \subseteq L^n(K_2 + A) + F_n$. Consider the sequence $(A_n)_{n \geq 0}$ of finite sets in \mathbb{Z}^d as follows: set $A_0 = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and for $n \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{n+1} &= \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \exists \mathbf{f} \in F_1, \mathbf{g}_1, \mathbf{g}_2 \in G_1, \mathbf{q} \in A_n : L(\mathbf{p}) + \mathbf{f} = \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{g}_1 + \mathbf{g}_2\} \\
&= L^{-1}(A_n + G_1 + G_1 - F_1) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d.
\end{aligned}$$

Claim 3. For every $n \geq 0$ and every $k > 0$, we have the following inclusions: $A_n \subseteq A_{n+1}$ and $K_2 + A_n + G_k \subseteq L^k(K_2 + A_{n+k}) + F_k$.

Proof of Claim 3. We first prove that $A_n \subseteq A_{n+1}$ for every $n \geq 0$. Since $\mathbf{0} \in G_1 \cap F_1$, we trivially have that $A_0 \subseteq A_1$. It is then a direct consequence of the definition of the sets A_n , that if $A_n \subseteq A_{n+1}$, then $A_{n+1} \subseteq A_{n+2}$.

Now, let us prove the other sequence of inclusions. The inclusion $K_2 + A_n + G_1 \subseteq L(K_2 + A_{n+1}) + F_1$ is direct for any $n \geq 0$. Suppose that $K_2 + A_n + G_k \subseteq L^k(K_2 + A_{n+k}) + F_k$ for some $n \geq 0$ and some $k > 0$. Since $G_{k+1} = G_k + L^k(G_1)$, we get that

$$K_2 + A_n + G_{k+1} = K_2 + A_n + G_k + L^k(G_1) \subseteq L^k(K_2 + A_{n+k} + G_1) + F_k.$$

By the initial case, we have that $K_2 + A_{n+k} + G_1 \subseteq L(K_2 + A_{n+k+1}) + F_1$. Using the equality $F_{k+1} = F_k + L^k(F_1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} L^k(K_2 + A_{n+k} + G_1) + F_k &\subseteq L^{k+1}(K_2 + A_{n+k+1}) + L^k(F_1) + F_k \\ &= L^{k+1}(K_2 + A_{n+k+1}) + F_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the claim. \square

Now, we define the sequence $a_n = \|A_n\|$. This sequence satisfies

$$a_{n+1} \leq \|L^{-1}\|a_n + \|L^{-1}(G_1 + G_1 - F_1)\|,$$

which implies that

$$a_n \leq a_0 \cdot \|L^{-1}\|^n + \|L^{-1}(G_1 + G_1 - F_1)\| \frac{1 - \|L^{-1}\|^n}{1 - \|L^{-1}\|}.$$

Since $\|L^{-1}\| < 1$, the sequence $(a_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is bounded. Therefore, the nested sequence $(A_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is eventually constant. Let $n \geq 0$ such that $A_n = A_m$ for all $m \geq n$, and set $A = A_n$. By Claim 3, we have

$$(7) \quad \forall k > 0, K_2 + A + G_k \subseteq L^k(K_2 + A) + F_k.$$

To define the substitution $\tilde{\zeta}$, we consider the set $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{L}_{K_2+A}(X_\zeta)$ as a new alphabet, and we define the substitution $\tilde{\zeta}$ with support G_1 on the alphabet \mathcal{B} as follows:

$$\forall \mathbf{g} \in G_1, (\tilde{\zeta}(\mathbf{w}))_{\mathbf{g}} = \zeta(\mathbf{w})_{\mathbf{g}+K_2+A}.$$

Note that by (7), the substitution $\tilde{\zeta}$ is well-defined. Using Claim 3 and the primitivity of ζ , it is straightforward to check that $\tilde{\zeta}$ is primitive. Let us now prove that $(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $(X_{\tilde{\zeta}}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ are topologically conjugate. Indeed, consider the factor map $\phi : X_\zeta \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ induced by

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : \mathcal{L}_{K_2+A}(X_\zeta) &\rightarrow \mathcal{B} \\ \mathbf{w} &\mapsto \mathbf{w}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $x \in X_\zeta$ and $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have that $\phi(x)_{\mathbf{n}} = \Phi(x|_{\mathbf{n}+K_2+A})$. We prove that $\phi(\bar{x})$ is a fixed point of $\tilde{\zeta}$. Set $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. There exists a unique $\mathbf{n}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and

$\mathbf{g} \in G_1$ such that $\mathbf{n} = L(\mathbf{n}_1) + \mathbf{g}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\tilde{\zeta}(\phi(\bar{x})))_{\mathbf{n}} &= (\tilde{\zeta}(\phi(\bar{x})))_{L(\mathbf{n}_1)+\mathbf{g}} \\
&= (\tilde{\zeta}(\phi(\bar{x}))_{\mathbf{n}_1})_{\mathbf{g}} \\
&= (\tilde{\zeta}(\Phi(\bar{x}|_{\mathbf{n}_1+K_2+A})))_{\mathbf{g}} \\
&= (\zeta(\bar{x}|_{\mathbf{n}_1+K_2+A}))_{\mathbf{g}+K_2+A} \\
&= (\zeta(\bar{x}))_{L(\mathbf{n}_1)+\mathbf{g}+K_2+A} \\
&= (\zeta(\bar{x}))_{\mathbf{n}+K_2+A} \\
&= \bar{x}_{\mathbf{n}+K_2+A} \\
&= \Phi(\bar{x}|_{\mathbf{n}+K_2+A}) \\
&= (\phi(\bar{x}))_{\mathbf{n}},
\end{aligned}$$

so $\phi(\bar{x}) \in X_{\tilde{\zeta}}$ is a fixed point of $\tilde{\zeta}$. By the minimality of $\phi(X_{\zeta})$ and $X_{\tilde{\zeta}}$, we conclude that $\phi(X_{\zeta}) = X_{\tilde{\zeta}}$. Therefore, ϕ is a factor map from X_{ζ} to $X_{\tilde{\zeta}}$. To prove that it is a conjugacy, we check that the factor map $\psi : X_{\tilde{\zeta}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ induced by

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\Psi : \mathcal{L}_{K_2+A}(X_{\tilde{\zeta}}) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{A} \\
& \mathbf{w} & \mapsto \mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{0}}
\end{array}$$

is its inverse map. Indeed, for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we get that $\psi(\phi(\bar{x}))_{\mathbf{n}} = \Psi(\phi(\bar{x}))_{\mathbf{n}} = \Psi(\bar{x}_{\mathbf{n}+K_2+A}) = \bar{x}_{\mathbf{n}}$, i.e., $\psi(\phi(\bar{x})) = \bar{x}$. The minimality of $(X_{\zeta}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ implies that $\psi \circ \phi = \text{id}_{X_{\zeta}}$. Hence, ϕ, ψ are invertible and $\phi^{-1} = \psi$. We conclude that $(X_{\zeta}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $(X_{\tilde{\zeta}}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ are topologically conjugate. \square

5. COMPUTABILITY OF THE RECOGNIZABILITY RADIUS

The recognizability property of substitutions is a combinatorial property that offers a form of invertibility, allowing the unique decomposition of points within the substitutive subshift. This property was initially established for aperiodic primitive substitutions by B. Mossé in [32]. This proof implies the existence of a natural sequence of refining (Kakutani-Rokhlin) partitions which is a key tool when studying substitutive systems and more general \mathcal{S} -adic systems. Subsequently, in [5], it was extended to cover non-primitive substitutions. Later, F. Durand and J. Leroy proved the computability of the recognizability length for one-dimensional primitive substitutions [19], which was then generalized by M.-P. Beal, D. Perrin, and A. Restivo in [4] for the most general class of morphisms, including ones with erasable letters. In the multidimensional setting, B. Solomyak showed in [40] that aperiodic translationally finite self-affine tilings of \mathbb{R}^d satisfy a recognizability property, referred to as the *unique composition property*. Furthermore, in [8], it was demonstrated that aperiodic symbolic factors of constant-shape substitutive subshifts also exhibit a recognizability property. In this section, we provide a computable upper bound for the recognizability radius of aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions (Theorem 5.1). This upper bound can be expressed solely in terms of $|\mathcal{A}|, L_{\zeta}, \|F_1^{\zeta}\|$ and d . This result will be instrumental in the subsequent section, where we establish the decidability of the factorization problem between minimal substitutive subshifts. To achieve this, we will adapt some of the proofs presented in [8] in order to obtain computable bounds. We prove the following.

Theorem 5.1. *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution on an alphabet \mathcal{A} , with expansion matrix L_ζ and support F_1^ζ admitting a fixed point $x \in X_\zeta$. Define $t = -\log(\|L_\zeta\|)/\log(\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)$. Then ζ is recognizable on x and the constant of recognizability is at most*

$$2 \cdot 9^{t+1} \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|^t \|F_1^\zeta\| \cdot \|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|} 4^{d \cdot 3 \cdot 9^t \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|^t \|F_1^\zeta\| \cdot \|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|}} \left(12 \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1)\|\right)^{d/(1-\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)^d}.$$

In B. Mossé's original proof, a key argument for the proof of the recognizability property is the existence of an integer $p > 0$ with the following property: for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, if $\zeta^n(a) = \zeta^n(b)$ for some $n \geq 0$, then $\zeta^p(a) = \zeta^p(b)$. This result was proved in [21]. Notably, this property holds true for $p = 1$ when the substitution is injective on letters. The original proof concerns only one-dimensional morphisms. Nevertheless, it is possible to adapt the proof to the multidimensional context. The proof is left to the reader.

Theorem 5.2. [21, Theorem 3]. *Let ζ be a constant-shape substitution. Then for any patterns $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}^P$, for some $P \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have that*

$$\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|^{-1}}(\mathbf{u}) \neq \zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|^{-1}}(\mathbf{v}) \implies \forall n, \zeta^n(\mathbf{u}) \neq \zeta^n(\mathbf{v}).$$

We recall that ζ is primitive if and only if its *incidence matrix* M_ζ defined for all $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ as $(M_\zeta)_{a,b} = |\{\mathbf{f} \in F_1^\zeta : \zeta(a)_\mathbf{f} = b\}|$ is primitive, i.e., there exists $k > 0$ such that M_ζ^k only contains positive integer entries. The following is a well-known bound for this k .

Lemma 5.3. [41] *A non-negative $d \times d$ matrix M is primitive if, and only if, there is an integer $k \leq d^2 - 2d + 2$ such that M^k only contains positive entries.*

Following the proof of the recognizability property of multidimensional substitutive subshifts in [8], we first study the computability of the growth of the repetitivity function. We recall that the *repetitivity function* of a minimal subshift is the map $R_X : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined for $r > 0$ as the smallest radius such that every ball $B(\mathbf{n}, R_X(r))$ contains an occurrence of every pattern with a diameter $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\mathbf{p})) \leq r$. We recall that $\mathfrak{C}(L, F_1)$ denotes the set $C_{L, F_1} + A_{L, F_1}$, where A_{L, F_1} is the discrete ball $[B(\mathbf{0}, \|L^{-1}(F_1)\|/(1-\|L^{-1}\|)) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$ and C_{L, F_1} corresponds to the set defined by Proposition 2.5, such that $C_{L, F_1} + F_1 + F_1 \subseteq L_\zeta(C_{L, F_1}) + F_1$.

Lemma 5.4. *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution. Then,*

$$R_{X_\zeta}(r) \leq 3 \|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|} \left(12 \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|\right)^{d/(1-\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)^d} \|F_1^\zeta\| r^{-\frac{\log(\|L_\zeta\|)}{\log(\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)}}$$

Proof. Set $r > 0$. Following the proof of Lemma 3.5, we know that for every pattern $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{L}_{[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}(X_\zeta)$, there exists $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)}(X_\zeta)$ and $\mathbf{f} \in F_{n(r)}^\zeta$ such that $\mathbf{u} = \zeta^{n(r)}(\mathbf{v})_{\mathbf{f} + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}$.

Set $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)}(X_\zeta)$ and consider $n > 0$ as the minimal such that $\mathbf{v} \sqsubseteq \zeta^n(a)$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$. We recall that $\bar{n}_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta}$ is the smallest integer m for which a translation of the set $\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)$ is contained in a support of ζ^m . We prove that $n \leq \bar{n}_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + |\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|}$. Indeed, if \mathbf{v} occurs in $\zeta^n(a)$, but does not occur in $\zeta^{n-1}(a)$, we can consider $\mathbf{f}_n = L_\zeta(\mathbf{f}_{n-1}) + \mathbf{f}_1 \in F_n^\zeta$ such that $\zeta^n(a)_{\mathbf{f}_n + \mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)} = \mathbf{v}$. Hence, there exists a pattern $\mathbf{v}_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)}(X_\zeta)$ occurring in $\zeta^{n-1}(a)$ and satisfies

$v_1 := v \sqsubseteq \zeta(v_2)$. Since v_1 does not occur in $\zeta^{n-1}(a)$, we conclude that $v_1 \neq v_2$ and v_2 does not occur in $\zeta^{n-2}(a)$. We can then, inductively, construct a sequence of distinct patterns v_1, v_2, \dots in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)}(X_\zeta)$, such that for any $j \geq 1$, $v_j \sqsubseteq \zeta(v_{j+1})$, and v_j occurs in $\zeta^{n-j+1}(a)$ but does not occur in $\zeta^{n-j}(a)$. Considering that there are at most $|\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|}$ patterns in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)}(X_\zeta)$, we conclude that

$$n \leq \bar{n}_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + |\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|}.$$

Now, by Lemma 5.3, for any pair of letters $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, we have that $a \sqsubseteq \zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|^2}(b)$. Hence, for any letter $a \in \mathcal{A}$, any pattern $v \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)}(X_\zeta)$ occurs in $\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|^2 + \bar{n}_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + |\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|}}(a)$.

Since for any $n > 0$, $L_\zeta^n(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ is $\|L_\zeta\|^n$ -relatively dense, any ball of radius $\|L_\zeta\|^n + 2\|F_1^\zeta\| \cdot \|L_\zeta\|^n$ contains a set of the form $L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{m}) + F_n^\zeta$ for some $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, which implies that any pattern of the form $\zeta^n(a)$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$ occurs in any pattern in $\mathcal{L}_{3\|L_\zeta\|^n\|F_1^\zeta\|}(X_\zeta)$. In particular, for $n = 3|\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|}$, we conclude that any ball of radius $3\|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|}} \cdot \|F_1^\zeta\|$ contains an occurrence of any pattern $v \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)}(X_\zeta)$. Hence, by (5), any ball of radius $\|L_\zeta\|^{n(r)} \cdot 3\|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|^{|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|}} \cdot \|F_1^\zeta\| + 2\|L_\zeta\|^{n(r)} \cdot \|F_1^\zeta\|$ contains an occurrence of any pattern $u \in \mathcal{L}_{[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}(X_\zeta)$.

To finish the proof, we need to bound $|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)|$. By Proposition 2.5 we know that

$$\|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)\| \leq 4 \frac{\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|}{1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|},$$

and using classical upper bounds for the cardinality of the discrete balls $[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$, we have that $|\mathfrak{C}(L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta)| \leq \left(12\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|\right)^d / (1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)^d$. With this new bound, we get that for any $r > 0$,

$$R_{X_\zeta}(r) \leq 3\|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|^{(12\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|)^d / (1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)^d}} \|F_1^\zeta\| r^t.$$

□

As pointed out in [8], the growth of the repetitivity function has a direct consequence on the distance between two occurrences of a pattern in a point $x \in X_\zeta$, called *repulsion property*. This is an analogue to the *k-power-free* property of one-dimensional primitive substitutions. We add the proof for completeness.

Proposition 5.5 (Repulsion property). *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution, $x \in X_\zeta$ and set $t = -\log(\|L_\zeta\|) / \log(\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)$. Then, if a pattern $p \sqsubseteq x$ with $[B(\mathbf{s}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] \subseteq \text{supp}(p)$, for some $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $r > 0$, has two occurrences $\mathbf{j}_1, \mathbf{j}_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ in x such that $r \geq 3\|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|^{(12\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|)^d / (1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)^d}} \|F_1^\zeta\| \cdot \|\mathbf{j}_1 - \mathbf{j}_2\|^t$, then \mathbf{j}_1 is equal to \mathbf{j}_2 .*




FIGURE 6. Illustration of a forbidden situation given by the repulsion property (Proposition 5.5).

Proof. For any $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we consider the pattern $\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{k}} = x|_{\mathbf{k} \cup (\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{j}_2 - \mathbf{j}_1)}$. Note that $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{k}})) = \|\mathbf{j}_2 - \mathbf{j}_1\|$. We are going to prove that the statement is true for $N > 0$ such that $M_{X_\zeta}(\|\mathbf{j}_2 - \mathbf{j}_1\|) \leq N\|\mathbf{j}_2 - \mathbf{j}_1\|^t \leq r$. By Lemma 5.4 such $N > 0$ exists. Indeed, since $r \geq M_{X_\zeta}(\|\mathbf{j}_2 - \mathbf{j}_1\|)$, then the support of the pattern \mathbf{p} contains an occurrence in x of any pattern $\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{k}}$. Since \mathbf{j}_1 is an occurrence of \mathbf{p} in x , we get that for any $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, there exists $\mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $x_{\mathbf{j}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{k}} = x_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $x_{\mathbf{j}_1 + \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{k}} + (\mathbf{j}_2 - \mathbf{j}_1 + \mathbf{k})} = x_{\mathbf{j}_2 - \mathbf{j}_1 + \mathbf{k}}$, which implies that $x_{\mathbf{j}_2 + \mathbf{n}_{\mathbf{k}} + \mathbf{k}} = x_{\mathbf{j}_2 - \mathbf{j}_1 + \mathbf{k}}$. The fact that \mathbf{j}_2 is an occurrence of \mathbf{p} in x let us conclude that for any $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $x_{\mathbf{j}_2 - \mathbf{j}_1 + \mathbf{k}}$ is equal to $x_{\mathbf{k}}$, i.e., $\mathbf{j}_2 - \mathbf{j}_1$ is a period of x . Since ζ is aperiodic, we conclude that $\mathbf{j}_1 = \mathbf{j}_2$. \square

Now, we proceed to give a computable upper bound for the recognizability radius of constant-shape substitutions. As mentioned in [19], the proof of the recognizability property has two steps. Here, we adapt the proofs in [8].

Proposition 5.6 (First step of the recognizability property of substitutive subshifts). *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution from an alphabet \mathcal{A} with expansion matrix L_ζ and support F_1^ζ . Let $x \in X_\zeta$ be a fixed point of ζ . Consider the constants*

- $t = -\log(\|L_\zeta\|) / \log(\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)$.
- $\bar{r} = \left[3 \cdot 9^t \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|^t \|F_1^\zeta\| \cdot \|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|} \left(12 \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\| \right)^{d/(1-\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)^d} \right]$.
- $\bar{n} = |\mathcal{A}|^{4^d \cdot \bar{r}^d}$.

Then, $R = \|L_\zeta\|^{\bar{n} + |\mathcal{A}|} (\bar{r} + ((2\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|) / (1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)) + 2\|L_\zeta\|^{\bar{n} + |\mathcal{A}|} \cdot \|F_1^\zeta\|)$ is such that for all $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,

$$x|_{L_\zeta(\mathbf{i}) + [B(\mathbf{0}, R) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} = x|_{\mathbf{j} + [B(\mathbf{0}, R) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} \implies \mathbf{j} \in L_\zeta(\mathbb{Z}^d).$$

Proof. Using Proposition 2.5 with $A = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $F = F_1 - F_1$, there exists a finite set $D \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that for every $n > 0$, $F_n^\zeta - F_n^\zeta \subseteq L_\zeta^n(D) + F_n^\zeta$. Set

$$r = \frac{3 \|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|} \left(12 \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\| \right)^{d/(1-\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)^d} \|F_1^\zeta\| \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|^{|\mathcal{A}|-1} \|L_\zeta\|^{t(|\mathcal{A}|-1)} 9^t \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|^t}{(1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)^t}.$$

Note that $r \leq \bar{r}$. We prove the statement by contradiction. Assume the contrary, then for every $|\mathcal{A}| \leq n \leq \bar{n} + |\mathcal{A}|$ there exist $\mathbf{i}_n \in L_\zeta(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, $\mathbf{j}_n \notin L_\zeta(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ such that

$$x|_{\mathbf{i}_n + L_\zeta^n(D + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_n^\zeta} = x|_{\mathbf{j}_n + L_\zeta^n(D + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_n^\zeta}.$$

For any $|\mathcal{A}| \leq n \leq |\mathcal{A}| + \bar{n}$, we consider $\mathbf{a}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathbf{f}_n \in F_n^\zeta$ such that $L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{a}_n) + \mathbf{f}_n = \mathbf{i}_n$. Note that $L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{a}_n) + L_\zeta^n([B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_n^\zeta \subseteq \mathbf{i}_n + L_\zeta^n(D + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_n^\zeta$. Let $\mathbf{u}_n \in \mathcal{L}_{[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}(X_\zeta)$ be such that

$$x|_{\mathbf{i}_n + L_\zeta^n([B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_n^\zeta} = \zeta^n(\mathbf{u}_n) = x|_{\mathbf{j}_n + L_\zeta^n([B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_n^\zeta}.$$




FIGURE 7. Illustration of the pattern $\zeta^n(\mathbf{u}_n)$ around the coordinates \mathbf{i}_n (black) and \mathbf{j}_n (blue).

Note that $\mathbf{j}_n - \mathbf{f}_n$ is not necessarily in $L_\zeta^n(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, so we set $\mathbf{b}_n \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathbf{g}_n \in F_n^\zeta$ such that $L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_n) + \mathbf{g}_n = \mathbf{j}_n - \mathbf{f}_n$. Now, for any $n > 0$ and $E \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ we define the following sets

$$G_{n,E} = \{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : (L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{n}) + F_n^\zeta) \cap (\mathbf{j}_n - \mathbf{f}_n) + L_\zeta^n(E) + F_n^\zeta \neq \emptyset\}$$

$$H_{n,E} = \{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : (L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{n}) + F_n^\zeta) \subseteq (\mathbf{j}_n - \mathbf{f}_n) + L_\zeta^n(E) + F_n^\zeta\}.$$

Since $x = \zeta(x)$, there exist a pattern $\mathbf{v}_n \in \mathcal{L}_{G_{n,[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{b}_n}(X_\zeta)$, with $L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_n)$ being an occurrence of $\zeta^n(\mathbf{v}_n)$ in x , such that $\mathbf{j}_n + L_\zeta^n([B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) \subseteq L_\zeta^n(G_{n,[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} + F_n^\zeta)$. In particular, $\zeta^n(\mathbf{u}_n)$ occurs in $\zeta^n(\mathbf{v}_n)$ as illustrated in Fig. 8:




FIGURE 8. Illustration of the patterns $\zeta^n(\mathbf{v}_n)$ and $\zeta^n(\mathbf{u}_n)$ around \mathbf{j}_n .

Claim 4. For any $n > 0$, $\mathbf{b}_n \in H_{n,[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}$ and $(G_{n,[B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{b}_n)$ is a bounded set.

Proof of Claim 4. Note that $\mathbf{b}_n \in H_{n,[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]}$ if and only if there $F_n^\zeta - \mathbf{g}_n \subseteq L_\zeta^n([B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_n^\zeta$, which is true since $r \geq \|D\|$. Now, set $\mathbf{m} \in (G_{n,[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{b}_n)$, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{h}_n \in F_n^\zeta$, $\mathbf{r}_n \in [B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]$ and $\mathbf{l}_n \in F_n^\zeta$ such that $L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{m}) + \mathbf{h}_n = L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_n) + \mathbf{g}_n + L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{r}_n) + \mathbf{l}_n$, i.e., $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{b}_n = \mathbf{r}_n + L_\zeta^{-n}(\mathbf{g}_n + \mathbf{l}_n - \mathbf{h}_n)$, which implies that $\|\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{b}_n\| \leq r + \|L_\zeta^{-n}(\mathbf{g}_n + \mathbf{l}_n - \mathbf{h}_n)\|$. Note that $\|L_\zeta^{-n}(\mathbf{g}_n + \mathbf{l}_n - \mathbf{h}_n)\| \leq 3\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)$, which let us conclude that $\|\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{b}_n\| \leq r + 3\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)$. \square

Since $\|G_{n,[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{b}_n\| \leq r + 3\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)$, then $|G_{n,[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{b}_n| \leq 3^d(r + 3\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|))^d$, which implies that $\mathcal{L}_{G_{n,[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{b}_n}(X_\zeta) \leq |\mathcal{A}|^{(3r+9\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|))^d}$. Since $\bar{n} \geq |\mathcal{A}|^{(3r+9\|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|))^d}$, there are two indices $0 < n < m \leq \bar{n}$, some finite sets $G, H \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $G = (G_{n,[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{b}_n) = (G_{m,[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{b}_m)$ and $H = (H_{n,[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{b}_n) = (H_{m,[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{b}_m)$ and some patterns $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{L}_{[B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d]}(X_\zeta)$, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{L}_G(X_\zeta)$ such that $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_n = \mathbf{u}_m$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}_n = \mathbf{v}_m$. Consider $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{L}_H(X_\zeta)$ such that $x|_{L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_n) + L_\zeta^n(H) + F_n^\zeta} = \zeta^n(\mathbf{w})$. Note that $L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_n)$ is an occurrence of $\zeta^n(\mathbf{w})$ in x and set $\mathbf{a}_n = x|_{(j_n - \mathbf{f}_n + (L_\zeta^n(F_n^\zeta + [B(\mathbf{0},r)\cap\mathbb{Z}^d])) \setminus (L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_n) + L_\zeta^n(H) + F_n^\zeta))}$ as illustrated in Fig. 9:




FIGURE 9. Illustration of the patterns $\zeta^n(\mathbf{w})$ and \mathbf{a}_n in \mathbf{j}_n .

Applying ζ^{m-n} to $\zeta^n(\mathbf{u})$, we obtain the patterns $\zeta^m(\mathbf{a}_n)$ and $\zeta^{m-n}(\zeta^n(\mathbf{w})) = \zeta^m(\mathbf{w})$.

Claim 5. For any $n > 0$ and any $E \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, the set $G_{n,E}$ is included in $H_{n,E} + C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + C_{L_\zeta + F_1^\zeta} + D$.

Proof of Claim 5. First, we prove that for any $n > 0$ and $E \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have that $G_{n,E} \subseteq H_{n,E} + C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + C_{L_\zeta + F_1^\zeta} + D$. Set $\mathbf{m} \in G_{n,E}$. Then, there exists $\mathbf{h}_n \in F_n^\zeta$, $\mathbf{e}_n \in E$, $\mathbf{l}_n \in F_n^\zeta$ such that $L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{m}) + \mathbf{h}_n = L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_n) + \mathbf{g}_n + L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{e}_n) + \mathbf{l}_n$. Set $\mathbf{d}_n \in D$ such that $\mathbf{l}_n - \mathbf{h}_n + \mathbf{g}_n = L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{d}_n)$. Hence $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{b}_n + \mathbf{e}_n + \mathbf{d}_n$. We prove that $\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{d}_n \in H_{n,E} + C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + C_{L_\zeta + F_1^\zeta}$.

Set $\mathbf{o}_n \in F_n^\zeta$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{d}_n) + \mathbf{o}_n &= L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{m}) + \mathbf{h}_n - L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{d}_n) - \mathbf{h}_n + \mathbf{o}_n \\ &= L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_n) + \mathbf{g}_n + L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{e}_n) + \mathbf{l}_n - L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{d}_n) - \mathbf{h}_n + \mathbf{o}_n \\ &= L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_n) + L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{e}_n) + \mathbf{o}_n \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{q}_n \in F_n^\zeta$ and $\mathbf{c}_n \in C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta}$ be such that $\mathbf{g}_n + \mathbf{q}_n = L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{c}_n)$. We get that $L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{m} - \mathbf{d}_n) + \mathbf{o}_n = L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_n) + \mathbf{g}_n + L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{e}_n + \mathbf{c}_n) + (\mathbf{o}_n + \mathbf{q}_n)$. Since $F_n^\zeta + \mathbf{q}_n \subseteq L_\zeta^n(C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta}) + F_n^\zeta$, we conclude that $\mathbf{m} \in H_{n, E+C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta}+C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta}} + D$.

To finish the proof, we note that a straightforward computation shows that for any $n > 0$ and $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have that $H_{n, A+B} \subseteq H_{n, A} + B$. We then, conclude that $G_{n, E} \subseteq H_{n, E} + C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + D$. \square

If $\zeta^{m-n}(\mathbf{a}_n)$ and \mathbf{a}_m are different, then the pattern $\zeta^m(\mathbf{v})$ contains two occurrences of $\zeta^m(\mathbf{w})$. By Theorem 5.2, these patterns come from two patterns $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \in \mathcal{L}_H(X_\zeta)$ such that $\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|-1}(\mathbf{w}_1) = \zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|-1}(\mathbf{w}_2) = \zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|-1}(\mathbf{w})$, occurring in $\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|-1}(\mathbf{v})$. The distance between these two occurrences is smaller than $\max_{\mathbf{t} \in C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + D} \|L_\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|-1}(\mathbf{t})\| \leq \|L_\zeta\|^{|\mathcal{A}|-1} \|C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + C_{L_\zeta, F_1^\zeta} + D\|$.

Claim 6. For any $r > 0$, we have that $L_\zeta^n(B(\mathbf{0}, r)) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \subseteq L_\zeta^n([B(\mathbf{0}, r + \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_n^\zeta$.

Proof of Claim 6. Set $\mathbf{n} \in L_\zeta^n(B(\mathbf{0}, r)) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$. Then, there exists $\mathbf{m}_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathbf{f} \in F_n^\zeta$ such that $\mathbf{m} = L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{m}_1) + \mathbf{f}$, which implies that $\|\mathbf{m}_1 + L_\zeta^{-n}(\mathbf{f})\| \leq r$. We then get that

$$\|\mathbf{m}_1\| \leq r + \|L_\zeta^{-n}(\mathbf{f})\| \leq r + \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L_\zeta^{-1}\|).$$

\square

By Claim 6 we have that $L_\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|-1}([B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) \subseteq \text{supp}(\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|-1}(\mathbf{w}))$, so $\text{supp}(\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|-1}(\mathbf{w}))$ contains a discrete ball of radius $1/\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|^{|\mathcal{A}|-1} \cdot r$. By the repulsion property (Proposition 5.5), this is a contradiction, so $\zeta^{m-n}(\mathbf{a}_n) = \mathbf{a}_m$ as illustrated in Fig. 10:




FIGURE 10. Illustration of the patterns $\zeta^{m-n}(\mathbf{a}_n)$ in $L_\zeta^{m-n}(\mathbf{j}_n)$.

To finish the proof, we note that since $\zeta^n(\mathbf{u}) \sqsubseteq \zeta^n(\mathbf{v})$, there exists $\mathbf{p}_m \in L_\zeta^n(\mathbf{b}_m) + L_\zeta^n(G) + F_n^\zeta$ such that $x|_{\mathbf{p}_m + L_\zeta^n([B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_n^\zeta} = \zeta^n(\mathbf{u})$, which implies that $x|_{L_\zeta^{m-n}(\mathbf{p}_m) + L_\zeta^m([B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_m^\zeta} = \zeta^m(\mathbf{u})$. Using the fact that $\zeta^{m-n}(\mathbf{a}_m) = \mathbf{a}_m$, we get that $L_\zeta^{m-n}(\mathbf{p}_m) + L_\zeta^m([B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_m^\zeta = \mathbf{j}_m - \mathbf{f}_m + L_\zeta^m([B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) + F_m^\zeta$, i.e., $\mathbf{j}_m - \mathbf{f}_m = L_\zeta^{m-n}(\mathbf{p}_m) \in L_\zeta^m(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. Since $\mathbf{i}_m, \mathbf{f}_m \in L_\zeta(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ we conclude that $\mathbf{j}_m \in L_\zeta(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. \square

In Proposition 5.6 we compute a constant such that we can recognize patterns of the form $\zeta(a)$ for $a \in \mathcal{A}$. But it does not give information on the letter such that the pattern $\zeta(a)$ comes from. To finish the proof of Theorem 5.1, we prove the second step of the recognizability property. We recall that if the substitution is injective on letters, the second step is a direct consequence of the first one.

Proposition 5.7. *[Recognizability property of constant-shape substitutive subshifts]* Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive substitution from the alphabet \mathcal{A} and $x \in X_\zeta$ be a fixed point of ζ . Consider $R_{|\mathcal{A}|} > 0$ as a recognizability radius from Proposition 5.6 for $\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|}$ and define $\bar{R} = R_{|\mathcal{A}|} + 2\|F_1^\zeta\| \cdot \|L_\zeta\|^{|\mathcal{A}|}$. Then, for any $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$

$$x|_{[B(L_\zeta(\mathbf{i}), \bar{R}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} = x|_{[B(L_\zeta(\mathbf{j}), \bar{R}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} \implies x_{\mathbf{i}} = x_{\mathbf{j}}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathbf{f} = \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} L_\zeta^i(\mathbf{f}_i) \in F_{|\mathcal{A}|}^\zeta$ be such that $L_\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|}(\mathbf{k}) + \mathbf{f} = L_\zeta(\mathbf{i})$.

Hence, we have that $L_\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|-1}(\mathbf{k}) + \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} L_\zeta^{i-1}(\mathbf{f}_i) = \mathbf{i}$. By the definition of $R_{|\mathcal{A}|} > 0$, we

have the existence of $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $L_\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|}(\mathbf{m}) + \mathbf{f} = L_\zeta(\mathbf{j})$, which implies that

$\mathbf{j} = L_\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|-1}(\mathbf{m}) + \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{A}|} L_\zeta^{i-1}(\mathbf{f}_i)$. Note that, by the definition of $\bar{R} > 0$, we get that

$x|_{L_\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|}(\mathbf{k}) + F_{|\mathcal{A}|}^\zeta} = x|_{L_\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|}(\mathbf{m}) + F_{|\mathcal{A}|}^\zeta}$. Hence $\zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|}(x_{\mathbf{k}}) = \zeta^{|\mathcal{A}|}(x_{\mathbf{m}})$, which then implies that $x_{\mathbf{i}} = x_{\mathbf{j}}$. \square

Remark 5.8. We recall that if R_ζ is a recognizability radius for ζ . Then $\|L_\eta\|R_\zeta$ is a recognizability radius for ζ^2 . Indeed, note that if $B_{R_\zeta} = [B(\mathbf{0}, R_\zeta) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$, then

$$x|_{L_\zeta(L_\zeta(\mathbf{i}) + B_{R_\zeta}) + B_{R_\zeta}} = x|_{L_\zeta(L_\zeta(\mathbf{j}) + B_{R_\zeta}) + B_{R_\zeta}} \implies x_{\mathbf{i}} = x_{\mathbf{j}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Finally to get an upper bound we just need to make the computation. By Remark 5.8, we have that if R_ζ is given by Proposition 5.6 for ζ , then

$$2 \cdot R_\zeta \|L_\zeta\|^{|\mathcal{A}|} + 2\|F_1^\zeta\| \|L_\zeta\|^{|\mathcal{A}|},$$

is a recognizability radius for ζ . By Proposition 5.6 we then get that the recognizability radius for ζ is at most

$$2 \cdot 9^{t+1} \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|^t \|F_1^\zeta\| \cdot \|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|} 4^{d \cdot 3 \cdot 9^t \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|^t \|F_1^\zeta\| \|L_\zeta\|^{3|\mathcal{A}|} \left(12 \|L_\zeta^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|\right)^{d/(1-\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|)^d}.$$

\square

6. RIGIDITY PROPERTIES OF TOPOLOGICAL FACTORS BETWEEN APERIODIC MINIMAL SUBSTITUTIVE SUBSHIFTS

In this section, we study factor maps between multidimensional substitutive subshifts. The main theorem (Theorem 6.2) shows that if ζ_1, ζ_2 are two aperiodic substitutions with the same expansion map L and there exists a factor map $\pi : (X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ between two substitutive subshifts, then, there exists another factor map $\phi : (X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ given by a local map of a computable bounded radius that only depends on the support and the constant of recognizability. We recall that, by Theorem 4.1, if two substitutions are defined with the same expansion matrix, we can assume, up to conjugacy, that they also share the same support. We then deduce the following consequences: every aperiodic minimal substitutive subshift is coalescent (Proposition 6.4) and the quotient group $\text{Aut}(X_{\zeta}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) / \langle S \rangle$ is finite, extending the results in [8] for the whole class of aperiodic minimal substitutive subshifts, given by constant-shape substitutions. Next, we prove the decidability of the factorization and the isomorphism problem between aperiodic minimal substitutive subshifts (Theorem 6.6 and Corollary 6.7). We finish this section proving that aperiodic minimal substitutive subshifts have finitely many aperiodic symbolic factors, up to conjugacy (Lemma 6.10) and providing an algorithm to obtain a list of the possible injective substitutions factors of an aperiodic substitutive subshift.

6.1. Factor maps between substitutive subshifts. We prove a multidimensional analogue of [20, Theorem 8.1]: There exists a computable upper bound R such that any factor map between two aperiodic minimal substitutive subshifts is equal to a shift map compose with a sliding block code of radius less than R . This was first done in the measurable setting under some extra combinatorial assumptions for the substitutions (in particular for bijective substitutions) in the one-dimensional case in [29] and in the multidimensional case in [8]. A similar result was also proved for factor maps between two minimal substitutive subshifts of constant-length and Pisot substitutions in [38]. This last result was extended in [20] for the whole class of aperiodic minimal substitutive subshifts. They also gave a computable bound for the radius of a factor map between two minimal substitutive subshifts. We prove a similar result of [20] for the multidimensional constant-shape case, where the expansion matrices of the constant-shape substitutions are the same. We start with the following property about factor maps between substitutive subshifts.

Proposition 6.1. *Let ζ_1, ζ_2 be two aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions with the same expansion matrix L and the same support F_1 , and $\phi : (X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ be a factor map. Then, for any $n > 0$ there exists a unique $\mathbf{f} \in F_n$ such that if $x \in \zeta_1^n(X_{\zeta_1})$, then $\phi(x) \in S^{\mathbf{f}n} \zeta_2^n(X_{\zeta_2})$.*

Proof. Set $x \in \zeta_1^n(X_{\zeta_1})$. Then, there exists $\mathbf{f}_n(x)$ such that $\phi(x) \in S^{\mathbf{f}_n(x)n} \zeta_2^n(X_{\zeta_2})$. We prove that $\mathbf{f}_n(x)$ is constant on $\zeta_1^n(X_{\zeta_1})$. Note that $S^{\mathbf{n}}x \in \zeta_1^n(X_{\zeta_1})$ if and only if $\mathbf{n} = L_{\zeta}^n(\mathbf{m})$, for some $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Hence, $\phi(S^{L_{\zeta}^n(\mathbf{m})}(x)) = S^{L_{\zeta}^n(\mathbf{m})} \phi(x) \in S^{\mathbf{f}_n} \zeta_2^n(X_{\zeta_2})$. Now, if $y \in \zeta_1^n(X_{\zeta_1})$, we use the minimality of $(X_{\zeta}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ to obtain a sequence $(S^{L_{\zeta}^n(\mathbf{m}_p)}(x))_{p>0}$ converging to y . By continuity of ϕ , we conclude that $\phi(y) \in S^{\mathbf{f}_n(x)n} \phi(x)$. \square

The following theorem states the rigidity properties that factor maps between substitutive subshifts with the same expansion map satisfy.

Theorem 6.2. *Let ζ_1, ζ_2 be two aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions with the same expansion matrix L and support F_1 . Suppose there exists a factor map $\phi : (X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ with radius r . Then, there exists $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and a factor map $\psi : (X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ such that $S^{\mathbf{j}}\phi = \psi$, satisfying the following two properties:*

- (1) *The factor map ψ is a sliding block code of radius $2\|L^{-1}(F_1)\|/(1-\|L^{-1}\|)+R_{\zeta_2}+1$, where R_{ζ_2} is a recognizability radius for ζ_2 .*
- (2) *There exists an integer $n > 0$ and $\mathbf{f} \in F_n$ such that $S^{\mathbf{f}}\psi\zeta_1^n = \zeta_2^n\psi$.*

Our proof follows a similar strategy than in [20]. We then use Theorem 6.2 to deduce some topological and combinatorial properties of aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions.

Proof. For any $n > 0$, we denote $\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)$ to the constant given by Proposition 6.1. We recall that the recognizability property implies that the substitution maps ζ_1^n, ζ_2^n are homeomorphisms from X_{ζ_1} to $\zeta_1^n(X_{\zeta_1})$ and from X_{ζ_2} to $\zeta_2^n(X_{\zeta_2})$, respectively. Hence, for any $x \in X_{\zeta_1}$, there exists a unique point $\phi_n(x) \in X_{\zeta_2}$ such that

$$S^{\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)}\phi\zeta_1^n(x) = \zeta_2^n(\phi_n(x)).$$

Note that ϕ_n is a continuous map. Take $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. We note that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_2^n(\phi_n(S^{\mathbf{m}}x)) &= S^{\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)}\phi\zeta_1^n(S^{\mathbf{m}}x) \\ &= S^{\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)}\phi S^{L^n(\mathbf{m})}\zeta_1^n(x) \\ &= S^{L^n(\mathbf{m})+\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)}\phi\zeta_1^n(x) \\ &= S^{L^n(\mathbf{m})}\zeta_2^n(\phi_n(x)) \\ &= \zeta_2^n(S^{\mathbf{m}}\phi_n(x)), \end{aligned}$$

so ϕ_n is a factor map between $(X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $(X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$. Now, we compute the radius r of ϕ_n . Let $P_n \Subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be such that if $x, y \in X_{\zeta_1}$, then $x|_{P_n} = y|_{P_n} \implies \phi_n(x)\mathbf{0} = \phi_n(y)\mathbf{0}$. By definition, we have that $\zeta_1^n(x)|_{L^n(P_n)+F_n}$ is equal to $\zeta_1^n(y)|_{L^n(P_n)+F_n}$. We then obtain that

$$(8) \quad (S^{\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)}\phi\zeta_1^n(x))|_{(L^n(P_n)+F_n)^{\circ r}-\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)} = (S^{\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)}\phi\zeta_1^n(y))|_{(L^n(P_n)+F_n)^{\circ r}-\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)},$$

which implies that $\zeta_2^n(\phi_n(x))|_{(L^n(P_n)+F_n)^{\circ r}-\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)} = \zeta_2^n(\phi_n(y))|_{(L^n(P_n)+F_n)^{\circ r}-\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)}$. Let R_{ζ_2} be the recognizability radius of ζ_2 . By Proposition 5.7 and Remark 5.8 we get that

$$(9) \quad \phi_n(x)|_{L^{-n}(((L^n(P_n)+F_n)^{\circ r}-\mathbf{f}_n(\phi))^{\circ R_n})} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d = \phi_n(y)|_{L^{-n}(((L^n(P_n)+F_n)^{\circ r}-\mathbf{f}_n(\phi))^{\circ R_n})} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d,$$

where $\mathcal{R}_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} L^i([B(\mathbf{0}, R_{\zeta_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d])$. Now, note that for ϕ_n to be a sliding block code induced by a P_n -block map, we need that

$$\mathbf{0} \in [L^{-n}(((L^n(P_n)+F_n)^{\circ r}-\mathbf{f}_n(\phi))^{\circ \mathcal{R}_n})] \cap \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{0} \in [L^{-n}(((L^n(P_n) + F_n)^{\circ r} - \mathbf{f}_n(\phi))^{\circ \mathcal{R}_n})] \cap \mathbb{Z}^d &\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{0} \in ((L^n(P_n) + F_n)^{\circ r} - \mathbf{f}_n(\phi))^{\circ \mathcal{R}_n} \\
&\Leftrightarrow R_n \subseteq (L^n(P_n) + F_n)^{\circ r} - \mathbf{f}_n(\phi) \\
(10) \quad &\Leftrightarrow \mathbf{f}_n(\phi) + R_n \subseteq (L^n(P_n) + F_n)^{\circ r}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $F_n + R_n + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] \subseteq L^n(P_n) + F_n$, we get (10). To obtain a finite set $P_n \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ satisfying (10) we use Proposition 2.5. We explain the procedure in the following:

- For $n = 1$, we consider $P_1 \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ as the set of $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that for some $\mathbf{f} \in F_1$, $\mathbf{r}_1 \in [B(\mathbf{0}, R_{\zeta_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$ and $\mathbf{r}_2 \in [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$, there exists $\mathbf{g} \in F_1$ such that

$$\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2 = L(\mathbf{a}) + \mathbf{g}.$$

With this, we have that ϕ_1 is a sliding block code induced by a P_1 -local map. We note that $\|P_1\| \leq 2\|L^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\| + \|L^{-1}\|(R_{\zeta_2} + r)$.

- Suppose now that for some $n > 1$, the factor map ϕ_n is induced by a P_n -local map such that $\|P_n\| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \|L^{-1}\|^i (2\|L^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\| + \|L^{-1}\|R_{\zeta_2}) + \|L^{-1}\|^n r$.

To get a bound for the radius for the map ϕ_{n+1} we need a set P_{n+1} such that

$$F_{n+1} + \sum_{i=0}^n L^i([B(\mathbf{0}, R_{\zeta_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) \subseteq L^{n+1}(P_{n+1}) + F_{n+1} \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(F_n + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} L^i([B(\mathbf{0}, R_{\zeta_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) \right) + L^n(F_1) + L^n([B(\mathbf{0}, R_{\zeta_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) \\
(11) \quad &\subseteq L^{n+1}(P_{n+1}) + F_{n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By hypothesis, we know that

$$\left(F_n + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} L^i([B(\mathbf{0}, R_{\zeta_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) \right) \subseteq L^n(P_n) + F_n,$$

so to obtain (11) it is suffice to have that $L^n(P_n) + F_n + L^n(F_1) + L^n([B(\mathbf{0}, R_{\zeta_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]) \subseteq L^{n+1}(P_{n+1}) + F_{n+1}$. If $P_n + F_1 + [B(\mathbf{0}, R_{\zeta_2}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] \subseteq L(P_{n+1}) + F_1$ we obtain (11). We note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|P_{n+1}\| &\leq \|L^{-1}(P_n)\| + 2\|L^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\| + \|L^{-1}\|R_{\zeta_2} \\
&\leq \|L^{-1}\| \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \|L^{-1}\|^i (2\|L^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\| + \|L^{-1}\|R_{\zeta_2}) + \|L^{-1}\|^n r \right) \\
&\quad + 2\|L^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\| + \|L^{-1}\|R_{\zeta_2} \\
&\leq \left(\sum_{i=0}^n \|L^{-1}\|^i (2\|L^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\| + \|L^{-1}\|R_{\zeta_2}) \right) + \|L^{-1}\|^{n+1} r.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, since

$$\sum_{i=0}^n \|L^{-1}\|^i \leq 1/(1 - \|L^{-1}\|)$$

$$\|L^{-1}\|/(1 - \|L^{-1}\|) \leq 1,$$

and the fact that for n large enough, $\|L^{-1}\|^{n+1}r \leq 1$, we conclude that for any n large enough, $\|P_n\| \leq 2\|L^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L^{-1}\|) + R_{\zeta_2} + 1$.

As in [8, 29] we note that for any $n \geq 1$, $\mathbf{f}_{n+1}(\phi) = \mathbf{f}_n(\phi) \pmod{L^n(\mathbb{Z}^d)}$. Hence, there exists $\mathbf{g} \in F_1$ such that $\mathbf{f}_{n+1}(\phi) = \mathbf{f}_n(\phi) + L^n(\mathbf{g}) \pmod{L^{n+1}(\mathbb{Z}^d)}$. We note that $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{f}_1(\phi_n)$. Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} S\mathbf{f}_{n+1}(\phi)\phi\zeta_1^{n+1} &= \zeta_2^{n+1}(\phi_{n+1}) \\ S\mathbf{f}_{n+1}(\phi) - \mathbf{f}_n S\mathbf{f}_n(\phi)\phi\zeta_1^n \zeta &= \zeta_2^{n+1}(\phi_{n+1}) \\ S^{L^n(\mathbf{g})}\zeta_2^n \phi_n \zeta_1 &= \zeta_2^{n+1}(\phi_{n+1}) \\ S^{\mathbf{g}}\phi_n \zeta_1 &= \zeta_2(\phi_{n+1}). \end{aligned}$$

By definition of \mathbf{g} , $\mathbf{f}_1(\phi_n)$, ϕ_{n+1} and $(\phi_n)_1$, we conclude that $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{f}_1(\phi_n)$ and $(\phi_n)_1 = \phi_{n+1}$. By recurrence, we conclude that for any $n, k \geq 0$, $(\phi_n)_k = \phi_{n+k}$.

To finish the proof, observe that for fixed alphabets \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , there exist a finite number of sliding block codes of radius $2\|L^{-1}(F_1)\|/(1 - \|L^{-1}\|) + R_{\zeta_2} + 1$. Thus, there exist two different integers $m, k \geq 0$ such that $\phi_m = \phi_{m+k}$.

Let $n \geq m$ be a multiple of k . Note that $(\phi_n)_k = \phi_{n+k} = (\phi_{m+k})_{n-m} = (\phi_m)_{n-m} = \phi_n$. This implies that for all $r \in \mathbb{N}$, ϕ_n is equal to $(\phi_n)_{rk}$. Since ϕ_n is equal to ϕ_{2n} we denote $\psi = \phi_n$ and $\mathbf{f} = \mathbf{f}_n(\psi)$. By definition of \mathbf{f} , we have that $S^{\mathbf{f}}\psi\zeta_1^n = \zeta_2^n\psi$.

Set $\mathbf{j} = \mathbf{f}_n(\phi) - \mathbf{f}$, then

$$S^{\mathbf{j}}\phi\zeta_1^n = S^{\mathbf{f}_n(\phi) - \mathbf{f}}\phi\zeta_1^n = S^{-\mathbf{f}}\zeta_2^n\psi = \psi\zeta_1^n,$$

this implies that $S^{\mathbf{j}}\phi$ and ψ coincides on $\zeta_1^n(X_{\zeta_1})$, hence on the whole set X_{ζ_1} by minimality. \square

6.2. Consequences of Theorem 6.2. As a consequence of Theorem 6.2, we extend the results on the coalescence and the automorphism group of substitutive subshifts proved in [8]. Specifically, we get rid of the reducibility condition for constant-shape substitutions. We recall that a system is *coalescent* if any factor map between X and itself is invertible. This was first proved in [16] for one-dimensional linearly recurrent subshifts (in particular aperiodic primitive substitutive subshifts). Multidimensional linearly recurrent substitutive subshifts (such as the self-similar ones) are also coalescent as a consequence of a result in [11]. For an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution, we denote R_ζ to be a recognizability radius for ζ .

Since the set of sliding block codes $2\|L^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L^{-1}\|) + R_\zeta + 1$ is finite, we will assume here (up to considering a power of ζ) that if a factor map $\psi \in \text{End}(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ satisfies Property 2 in Theorem 6.2, then it does so for $n = 1$, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{p} \in F_1^\zeta$ such that $S^{\mathbf{p}}\psi\zeta = \zeta\psi$.

6.2.1. *Coalescence of substitutive subshifts.* The coalescence of aperiodic substitutive subshifts was proved in [8] for reduced aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions. Here, we proved it for the whole class of aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions. As in [8], we use the notion of ζ -invariant orbits. An orbit $\mathcal{O}(x, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ is called ζ -invariant if there exists $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\zeta(x) = S^{\mathbf{j}}x$, i.e., the orbit is invariant under the action of ζ in X_ζ . Since for every $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ we have that $\zeta \circ S^{\mathbf{n}} = S^{L_\zeta \mathbf{n}} \circ \zeta$, the definition is independent of the choice of the point in the \mathbb{Z}^d -orbit of x . As an example, the orbit of a fixed point of the substitution map is an example of an invariant orbit. We recall that in [8] it was proved that there exists finitely many invariant orbits.

Proposition 6.3. [8, Proposition 3.9] *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution. Then, there exist finitely many ζ -invariant orbits in the substitutive subshift X_ζ . The bound is explicit and depends only on d , $|\mathcal{A}|$, $\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|$, $\|F_1^\zeta\|$ and $\det(L_\zeta - \text{id})$.*

We now prove that substitutive subshifts are coalescent.

Proposition 6.4. *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution. Then, the substitutive subshift $(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ is coalescent.*

Proof. Set $\phi \in \text{End}(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$. Theorem 6.2 ensures that there exists $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $S^{\mathbf{j}}\phi$ is equal to a sliding block code ψ of a fixed radius satisfying $S^{\mathbf{p}}\psi\zeta = \zeta\psi$, for some $\mathbf{p} \in F_1^\zeta$. Let $\bar{x} \in X_\zeta$ be in a ζ -invariant orbit, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{j} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\zeta(\bar{x}) = S^{\mathbf{j}}\bar{x}$. Note that

$$\zeta\psi(\bar{x}) = S^{\mathbf{p}}\psi\zeta(\bar{x}) = S^{\mathbf{p}+\mathbf{j}}\psi(\bar{x}),$$

so, if the orbit of x is in a ζ -invariant orbit, then $\psi(x)$ is also in a ζ -invariant orbit. By Proposition 6.3, there exist finitely many ζ -invariant orbits, hence for n large enough, we can find $x \in X_\zeta$ with x and $\psi^n(x)$ being in the same orbit, i.e., there exists $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $S^{\mathbf{m}}\psi^n(x) = x$. The minimality of $(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ allows us to conclude that $\psi^n = S^{-\mathbf{m}}$. Hence ψ is invertible, which implies that ϕ is invertible. \square

6.2.2. *The automorphism group of substitutive subshifts.* The rigidity properties of the topological factors between substitutive subshifts also allow us to conclude that the group $\text{Aut}(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)/\langle S \rangle$ is finite, since any element in $\text{Aut}(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ can be represented as an automorphism with radius $2\|L^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L^{-1}\|) + R_\zeta + 1$.

Proposition 6.5. *Let $(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ be a substitutive subshift from an aperiodic primitive reduced constant-shape substitution ζ . Then, the quotient group $\text{Aut}(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)/\langle S \rangle$ is finite. A bound for $|\text{Aut}(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)/\langle S \rangle|$ is given by an explicit formula depending only on d , $|\mathcal{A}|$, $\|L_\zeta^{-1}\|$, $\|F_1^\zeta\|$.*

We recall that this was proved in the one-dimensional case as a consequence of the works [12, 13, 15], where they proved that the automorphism group of a minimal subshift with non-superlinear complexity is virtually generated by the shift action.

6.2.3. *Decidability of the factorization problem between aperiodic substitutive subshifts.* In this section, we prove that the factorization problem is decidable for aperiodic substitutive subshifts, given by substitutions sharing the same expansion matrix (Theorem 6.6). This extends the one proved by I. Fagnot [22] and

F. Durand, J. Leroy [20] in the one-dimensional constant-length case. First, we note that, by Theorem 4.1, we may assume that the substitutions share the same support. Let ζ_1, ζ_2 be two aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions with the same expansion matrix L and support F_1 . We describe the algorithm testing whether there exists a factor map $\phi: (X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$.

To find a factor map $\phi: (X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d) \rightarrow (X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$, we need to test all sliding block codes of radius $\bar{r} = 2\|L^{-1}(F_1^\zeta)\|/(1 - \|L^{-1}\|) + R_{\zeta_2} + 1$, where R_{ζ_2} is a recognizability radius of ζ_2 . First, we note that if there exists one satisfying the properties of Theorem 6.2, we may assume Item 2 is true for $n = 1$, replacing ζ for an appropriate power. Indeed, by the proof of Theorem 6.2 we know that if ϕ is induced by a sliding block codes of radius \bar{r} , then for $n \geq \lfloor \log(\bar{r})/\log(2) \rfloor$ the map ϕ_n also has radius \bar{r} , so there exists two indices $m, n \in \lfloor \lfloor \log(\bar{r})/\log(2) \rfloor, \lfloor \log(\bar{r})/\log(2) \rfloor + |\mathcal{B}|^{\lfloor A \rfloor} \rfloor$ such that $\phi_n = \phi_m$. Now, note that, if Φ is the block map with radius \bar{r} associated with ϕ ,

$$\begin{aligned} S^{\mathbf{f}}\phi\zeta_1(x) = \zeta_2(\phi(x)) &\Leftrightarrow (\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d)(\forall \mathbf{g} \in F_1), \phi\zeta_1(x)_{L(\mathbf{n})+\mathbf{g}+\mathbf{f}} = \zeta_2(\phi(x))_{L(\mathbf{n})+\mathbf{g}} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d)(\forall \mathbf{g} \in F_1), \phi\zeta_1(x)_{L(\mathbf{n})+\mathbf{g}+\mathbf{f}} = \zeta_2(\phi(x)_{\mathbf{n}})_{\mathbf{g}} \\ (12) \quad &\Leftrightarrow (\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d)(\forall \mathbf{g} \in F_1), \phi\zeta_1(x)_{L(\mathbf{n})+\mathbf{g}+\mathbf{f}} = \zeta_2(\Phi(x|_{\mathbf{n}+[B(\mathbf{0}, \bar{r}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}))_{\mathbf{g}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{g}} \in C$ and $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{g}} \in F_1$ be such that $\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{f} = L(\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{g}}) + \mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{g}}$, then (12) is equivalent to

$$(13) \quad (\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d)(\forall \mathbf{g} \in F_1), \Phi(\zeta_1(x)|_{L(\mathbf{n})+L(\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{g}})+\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{g}}+[B(\mathbf{0}, \bar{r}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}) = \zeta_2(\Phi(x|_{\mathbf{n}+[B(\mathbf{0}, \bar{r}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}))_{\mathbf{g}}$$

Using Proposition 2.5 with $A = B(\mathbf{0}, \bar{r}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $F = F_1$, we find a set $E \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that

$$F_1 + [B(\mathbf{0}, \bar{r}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] \subseteq L(E) + F_1,$$

so we can rewrite (13) as

$$\begin{aligned} &(\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d)(\forall \mathbf{g} \in F_1), \Phi(\zeta_1(x)|_{L(\mathbf{n})+L(\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{g}})+L(E)+F_1}) = \zeta_2(\Phi(x|_{\mathbf{n}+[B(\mathbf{0}, \bar{r}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}))_{\mathbf{g}} \\ (14) \quad &(\forall \mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d)(\forall \mathbf{g} \in F_1), \Phi(\zeta_1(x|_{\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{g}}+E})) = \zeta_2(\Phi(x|_{\mathbf{n}+[B(\mathbf{0}, \bar{r}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}))_{\mathbf{g}} \end{aligned}$$

We note that $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(x|_{\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{g}}+E})) \leq 2\|E\| \leq 4\|L^{-1}(F_1)\| + 2\|L^{-1}\|\bar{r}$ and $\text{diam}(\text{supp}(x|_{\mathbf{n}+[B(\mathbf{0}, \bar{r}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]})) \leq 2\bar{r}$, so to test if a sliding block code satisfy (14), we consider any pattern $\mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{L}(X_{\zeta_1})$ with support $[B(\mathbf{0}, 3\|L\|^{3|A|} \binom{12\|L^{-1}(F_1)\|}{(1-\|L^{-1}\|)^d} \|F_1\| 2^t \bar{r}^t) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]$ that, by Lemma 5.4, contains an occurrence of any pattern of the form $x|_{\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{c}_{\mathbf{g}}+E}$ and $x|_{\mathbf{n}+[B(\mathbf{0}, \bar{r}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]}$ for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathbf{g} \in F_1$. Thus we proved the following theorem

Theorem 6.6. *Let ζ_1, ζ_2 be two aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution with the same expansion matrix L . It is decidable to know whether there exists a factor map between $(X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $(X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$.*

Using the fact that minimal substitutive subshifts from aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions are coalescent (Proposition 6.4), we can decide if two aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions with the same expansion matrix are conjugate.

Corollary 6.7. *Let ζ_1, ζ_2 be two aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution with the same expansion matrix L . It is decidable to know whether $(X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $(X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ are topologically conjugate.*

6.2.4. *Aperiodic symbolic factors of substitutive subshifts.* The radius of the sliding block codes given by Theorem 6.2 can be improved when the substitutions involved are injective on letters. Indeed, under the assumption of injectivity, we can deduce from (8) that $\phi_n(x)$ and $\phi_n(y)$ coincide on the set $\{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d : L^n(\mathbf{m}) + F_n \subseteq (L^n(P_n) + F_n)^{\circ[B(\mathbf{0},r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d]} - \mathbf{f}_n(\phi)\}$. Moreover, if ϕ_n is given by an P_n -local map we need that

$$F_n \subseteq (L^n(P_n) + F_n)^{\circ r} - \mathbf{f}_n(\phi),$$

which is true if $F_n + F_n + [B(\mathbf{0}, r) \cap \mathbb{Z}^d] \subseteq L^n(P_n) + F_n$. Proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 6.2 we get that ϕ_n has radius at most $3(\|L^{-1}(F_1)\|)/(1 - \|L^{-1}\|) + 1$. As mentioned in Remark 2.6, this bound is independent of the choices of the powers ζ_1 and ζ_2 . We thus have the following result.

Corollary 6.8. *Let ζ_1, ζ_2 be two aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution with the same expansion matrix L and support F_1 , such that ζ_2 is injective. If $\phi : X_{\zeta_1} \rightarrow X_{\zeta_2}$ is a factor map, then there is a factor map $\psi : X_{\zeta_1} \rightarrow X_{\zeta_2}$ with radius at most $3(\|L^{-1}(F_1)\|)/(1 - \|L^{-1}\|) + 1$ such that $\phi = S^j \psi$ for some $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.*

Now, as in [20], we prove that we can always assume that the aperiodic substitutions are injective on letters. Indeed, let $\zeta : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^F$ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution and consider $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ such that for any $a \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a unique $b \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfying $\zeta(a) = \zeta(b)$. Now, we define the map $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ such that $\Phi(a) = b$ if and only if $\zeta(a) = \zeta(b)$. Then, there exists a unique constant-shape substitution $\tilde{\zeta} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^F$ defined by $\tilde{\zeta} \circ \phi = \phi \circ \zeta$. It is clear that $\tilde{\zeta}$ is primitive and Φ induces a topological factor from $(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ to $(X_{\tilde{\zeta}}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ denoted by ϕ . The substitution $\tilde{\zeta}$ defined this way is called the *injectivization* of ζ .

Proposition 6.9. [6] *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution and $\tilde{\zeta}$ be its injectivization. Then $(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $(X_{\tilde{\zeta}}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ are topologically conjugate.*

Proof. Since ϕ is a factor map, we prove that it is one-to-one. Let $x, y \in X_\zeta$ be such that $\phi(x) = \phi(y)$. Note that $\zeta(x) = \zeta(\phi(x)) = \zeta(\phi(y)) = \zeta(y)$. The fact that $\zeta : X_\zeta \rightarrow \zeta(X_\zeta)$ is a homeomorphism let us conclude that $x = y$. \square

By construction, $\tilde{\zeta}$ may not be injective on letters, so we proceed in the same way to obtain an injectivization of $\tilde{\zeta}$ (and of ζ). Since in each step the cardinality of the alphabet is decreasing, we will obtain, in finite steps, an injective substitution $\bar{\zeta}$ such that $(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ and $(X_{\bar{\zeta}}, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ are topologically conjugate.

Now, let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution. From [8, Theorem 3.26], we know that any aperiodic symbolic factor of $(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ is conjugate to an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution with the same expansion matrix and support. Then, thanks to Theorem 6.2, we only need to test finitely many sliding block codes. In particular, we prove the following result, extending what is known [18] for linearly recurrent shifts (in particular, aperiodic primitive substitutions):

Lemma 6.10. *Let ζ be an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution. The substitutive subshift $(X_\zeta, S, \mathbb{Z}^d)$ has finitely many aperiodic symbolic factors, up to conjugacy.*

7. FUTURE WORKS AND DISCUSSIONS

7.1. Listing the factors and decidability of the aperiodicity of multidimensional substitutive subshifts. Since substitutions are defined by finite objects, it is natural to ask about the decidability of some properties about them. Lemma 6.10 states that any aperiodic substitutive subshift X_ζ has finitely many aperiodic symbolic factors. Furthermore, from [8, Theorem 3.26] and Proposition 6.9, any such factor is conjugate to a substitutive subshift defined by an injective constant-shape substitution with the same support as ζ . Thus we would like to give a list ζ_1, \dots, ζ_k of injective constant-shape substitutions that define all aperiodic symbolic factors of X_ζ .

Corollary 6.8 allows to give a bound on the size of the alphabet of any injective constant-shape substitution that would define an aperiodic symbolic factor of X_ζ . Hence, we can produce a finite list of candidates. Furthermore, if we know that two substitutions from that list are aperiodic, then Theorem 6.2 allows us to decide whether they are conjugate. Therefore, positively answering to the following question would allow us to list all possible aperiodic symbolic factors of X_ζ .

Question 7.1. *Is it decidable whether a primitive constant-shape substitution is aperiodic?*

7.2. To a Cobham's theorem for constant-shape substitutions. In [22] it was proved that if ζ_1, ζ_2 are two aperiodic primitive constant-length substitutions, and $(X_{\zeta_2}, S, \mathbb{Z})$ is a symbolic factor of $(X_{\zeta_1}, S, \mathbb{Z})$, then their lengths have a common power (greater than 1), generalizing a well-known result proved by A. Cobham [9]. In the multidimensional framework, Theorem 4.1 and [17] imply that this still remains true when the expansion matrix is equal to a multiple of the identity, but there is no generalized version for all constant-shape substitutions, which raises the following question.

Question 7.2. *Is there a version of Cobham's theorem for constant-shape substitutions?*

7.3. Connections with first-order logic theory. In the one-dimensional case, the decidability of the factorization problem between two constant-length substitutions was proved in [20] using automata theory and its connexion with first order logic. We describe the proof in the following. Let $k \geq 2$. An infinite sequence is called *k-automatic* if there is a finite state automaton with output (we refer to [2] for definitions) that, reading the base- k representation of a natural number n , outputs the letter $x(n)$.

Now, consider the first-order logical structure $\langle \mathbb{N}, +, V_k, = \rangle$, where V_k corresponds to *k-valuation function* $V_k : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ by $V_k(0) = 1$ and

$$V_k(n) = \max\{p: q^r \text{ divides } n\}.$$

A subset $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is called *k-definable* if there exists a first-order formula ϕ in $\langle \mathbb{N}, +, V_k, = \rangle$ such that $E = \{n \in \mathbb{N}: \phi(n)\}$. An infinite sequence $x \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is called *k-definable* if for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ the set $\{n: x_n = a\}$ is *k-definable*.

Theorem 7.3. [7, 10] *Let \mathcal{A} be a finite alphabet and $k \geq 2$. An infinite sequence $x \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is *k-automatic* if and only if it is *k-definable* and if and only if it is the image under a letter-to-letter substitution of a fixed point of a substitution of constant length k .*

Theorem 7.4. *The theory $\langle \mathbb{N}, +, V_k, = \rangle$ is decidable, i.e., for each closed formula expressed in this first order logical structure, there is an algorithm deciding whether it is true or not.*

Theorem 7.3 extends to multidimensionnal constant-shape substitutions for which the expansion matrix is proportional to the identity. Hence, in that case, the decidability of the factorization problem can be deduced by the Büchi-Bruyère theorem. In the general case, it is not clear that these tools can be applied. For an integer expansion matrix $L \in \mathcal{M}(d, \mathbb{Z})$, we don't have the analogous notions of L -automaticity and of L -definability. This raises the following questions:

- Question 7.5.** (1) *Can we extend the notion of k -automaticity to the general case of integer expansion matrices? More precisely, can we define L -automatic sequences so that these sequences are exactly the image under a letter-to-letter substitution of a constant-shape substitution with expansion matrix L ?*
- (2) *Can we define a logical structure depending on L and a notion of L -definability to obtain an analogue of the Büchi-Bruyère theorem for constant-shape substitutions?*
- (3) *Assuming that the logical structure exists, is this theory decidable?*

7.4. Topological Cantor factors of substitutive subshifts. In the one-dimensional case, the topological Cantor factors of aperiodic primitive substitutions are either expansive or equicontinuous [18]. This classification result is no longer true in the multidimensional framework ([8, Example 4.3] is an example of an aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitution with a Cantor factor which is neither expansive neither equicontinuous). Moreover, we only study the aperiodic topological factors of substitutive subshifts, leaving open the study of the topological factors with non-trivial periods. The following are open questions:

- Question 7.6.** (1) *Are the expansive factors of aperiodic substitutive subshifts also substitutive?*
- (2) *Is there a classification theorem for topological Cantor factors of constant-shape substitutions?*
- (3) *Do aperiodic primitive constant-shape substitutions have a finite number of aperiodic topological Cantor factors, up to conjugacy?*

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Adamczewski and Y. Bugeaud. On the complexity of algebraic numbers. I. Expansions in integer bases. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 165(2):547–565, 2007.
- [2] J.-P. Allouche and J. Shallit. *Automatic sequences*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003. Theory, applications, generalizations.
- [3] M. Baake and U. Grimm. *Aperiodic order. Vol. 1*, volume 149 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013. A mathematical invitation, With a foreword by Roger Penrose.
- [4] M.-P. Béal, D. Perrin, and A. Restivo. Recognizability of morphisms. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 43(11):3578–3602, 2023.
- [5] S. Bezuglyi, J. Kwiatkowski, and K. Medynets. Aperiodic substitution systems and their Bratteli diagrams. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 29(1):37–72, 2009.
- [6] F. Blanchard, F. Durand, and A. Maass. Constant-length substitutions and countable scrambled sets. *Nonlinearity*, 17(3):817–833, 2004.
- [7] J. R. Büchi. Weak second-order arithmetic and finite automata. *Z. Math. Logik Grundlagen Math.*, 6:66–92, 1960.

- [8] C. Cabezas. Homomorphisms between multidimensional constant-shape substitutions. *Groups Geom. Dyn.*, 17(4):1259–1323, 2023.
- [9] A. Cobham. On the base-dependence of sets of numbers recognizable by finite automata. *Math. Systems Theory*, 3:186–192, 1969.
- [10] A. Cobham. Uniform tag sequences. *Math. Systems Theory*, 6:164–192, 1972.
- [11] M. I. Cortez, F. Durand, and S. Petite. Linearly repetitive Delone systems have a finite number of nonperiodic Delone system factors. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 138(3):1033–1046, 2010.
- [12] E. M. Coven, A. Quas, and R. Yassawi. Computing automorphism groups of shifts using atypical equivalence classes. *Discrete Anal.*, pages Paper No. 3, 28, 2016.
- [13] V. Cyr and B. Kra. The automorphism group of a shift of linear growth: beyond transitivity. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 3:Paper No. e5, 27, 2015.
- [14] F. M. Dekking. The spectrum of dynamical systems arising from substitutions of constant length. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*, 41(3):221–239, 1977/78.
- [15] S. Donoso, F. Durand, A. Maass, and S. Petite. On automorphism groups of low complexity subshifts. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 36(1):64–95, 2016.
- [16] F. Durand. Linearly recurrent subshifts have a finite number of non-periodic subshift factors. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 20(4):1061–1078, 2000.
- [17] F. Durand. Cobham-Semenov theorem and \mathbb{N}^d -subshifts. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 391(1-2):20–38, 2008.
- [18] F. Durand, B. Host, and C. Skau. Substitutional dynamical systems, Bratteli diagrams and dimension groups. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 19(4):953–993, 1999.
- [19] F. Durand and J. Leroy. The constant of recognizability is computable for primitive morphisms. *J. Integer Seq.*, 20(4):Art. 17.4.5, 15, 2017.
- [20] F. Durand and J. Leroy. Decidability of isomorphism and factorization between minimal substitution subshifts. *Discrete Anal.*, pages Paper No. 7, 65, 2022.
- [21] A. Ehrenfeucht and G. Rozenberg. Simplifications of homomorphisms. *Inform. and Control*, 38(3):298–309, 1978.
- [22] I. Fagnot. Sur les facteurs des mots automatiques. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 172(1-2):67–89, 1997.
- [23] N. P. Fogg. *Substitutions in dynamics, arithmetics and combinatorics*, volume 1794 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002. Edited by V. Berthé, S. Ferenczi, C. Mauduit and A. Siegel.
- [24] N. Pytheas Fogg. Substitutions par des motifs en dimension 1. *Theor. Inform. Appl.*, 41(3):267–284, 2007.
- [25] N. P. Frank and N. Mañibo. Spectral theory of spin substitutions. *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, 42(11):5399–5435, 2022.
- [26] P. Frankl. An extremal problem for two families of sets. *European J. Combin.*, 3(2):125–127, 1982.
- [27] W. H. Gottschalk. Substitution minimal sets. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 109:467–491, 1963.
- [28] G. A. Hedlund. Endomorphisms and automorphisms of the shift dynamical system. *Math. Systems Theory*, 3:320–375, 1969.
- [29] B. Host and F. Parreau. Homomorphismes entre systèmes dynamiques définis par substitutions. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 9(3):469–477, 1989.
- [30] K. H. Kim and F. W. Roush. The Williams conjecture is false for irreducible subshifts. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 149(2):545–558, 1999.
- [31] M. Lemańczyk and M. K. Mentzen. On metric properties of substitutions. *Compositio Math.*, 65(3):241–263, 1988.
- [32] B. Mossé. Puissances de mots et reconnaissabilité des points fixes d’une substitution. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 99(2):327–334, 1992.
- [33] S. Mozes. Tilings, substitution systems and dynamical systems generated by them. *J. Analyse Math.*, 53:139–186, 1989.
- [34] V. Nekrashevych. Palindromic subshifts and simple periodic groups of intermediate growth. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 187(3):667–719, 2018.
- [35] R. Penrose. The role of aesthetics in pure and applied mathematical research. *Bull. Inst. Math. Appl.*, 10:266–271, 1974.

- [36] J.-E. Pin. On two combinatorial problems arising from automata theory. In *Combinatorial mathematics (Marseille-Luminy, 1981)*, volume 75 of *North-Holland Math. Stud.*, pages 535–548. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1983.
- [37] M. Queffélec. *Substitution dynamical systems—spectral analysis*, volume 1294 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2010.
- [38] V. Salo and I. Törmä. Block maps between primitive uniform and Pisot substitutions. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems*, 35(7):2292–2310, 2015.
- [39] A. Siegel. Spectral theory for dynamical systems arising from substitutions. In *European women in mathematics—Marseille 2003*, volume 135 of *CWI Tract*, pages 11–26. Centrum Wisk. Inform., Amsterdam, 2005.
- [40] B. Solomyak. Nonperiodicity implies unique composition for self-similar translationally finite tilings. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 20(2):265–279, 1998.
- [41] H. Wielandt. Unzerlegbare, nicht negative Matrizen. *Math. Z.*, 52:642–648, 1950.
- [42] R. F. Williams. Classification of subshifts of finite type. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 98:120–153; errata, *ibid.* (2) 99 (1974), 380–381, 1973.

UNIVERSITY OF LIÈGE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ALLÉE DE LA DÉCOUVERTE 12 (B37),
B-4000 LIÈGE, BELGIUM.

Email address: `ccabezas@uliege.be`

UNIVERSITY OF LIÈGE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ALLÉE DE LA DÉCOUVERTE 12 (B37),
B-4000 LIÈGE, BELGIUM.

Email address: `ccabezas@uliege.be`

This figure "thirditeration.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2403.11357v1>