

A bound for the shortest reset words for semisimple synchronizing automata via the packing number

Emanuele Rodaro
 Dipartimento di Matematica
 Politecnico di Milano
 Piazza Leonardo da Vinci, 32
 20133 Milano, Italy

We show that if a semisimple synchronizing automaton with n states has a minimal reachable non-unary subset of cardinality $r \geq 2$, then there is a reset word of length at most $(n - 1)D(2, r, n)$, where $D(2, r, n)$ is the 2-packing number for families of r -subsets of $[1, n]$.

Keywords: Synchronizing automaton, Cerny's conjecture, packing number, simple automaton, semisimple automaton, Wedderburn-Artin Theorem

1 Introduction

An automaton is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = \langle Q, \Sigma, \delta \rangle$, where Q is the set of states, Σ is the finite alphabet acting on Q , and the function $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q$ describes the action of Σ on the set Q . More compactly we put $q \cdot a = \delta(q, a)$. This action naturally extends to Σ^* and to the subsets of Q in the obvious way. Automata are mostly used in theoretical computer science as languages recognizers, see for instance [15, 18]. However, the interested of such objects from their dynamical point of view is mostly motivated by the longstanding Cerny's conjecture regarding the class of synchronizing automata. If the automaton \mathcal{A} has a word $u \in \Sigma^*$ sending all the states to a unique one, i.e., $q \cdot u = p \cdot u$ for all $q, p \in Q$, then \mathcal{A} is called *synchronizing* (or reset) and the word u is called reset (or synchronizing). Cerny's conjecture states that a synchronizing automaton with n states has always a reset word of length at most $(n - 1)^2$, see [12]. In [12] it is also shown that this bound is tight by exhibiting an infinite series of synchronizing automata \mathcal{C}_n having a shortest synchronizing word of length $(n - 1)^2$. For more information on synchronizing automata we refer the reader to Volkov's survey [26]. The literature around Cerny's conjecture and

synchronizing automata is vast and span from the algorithmic point of view to the proof of Cerny's conjecture or the existence of quadratic bounds on the smallest reset word for several classes of automata, see for instance [2, 4, 9, 8, 13, 14, 16, 22, 25, 27]. The best upper bound for the shortest reset word is cubic $(n^3 - n)/6$ obtained by Pin-Frankl [19] and recently asymptotically improved to roughly $O(114n^3/685)$ by Szykula [23]. In this paper we follow a representation theoretic approach to synchronizing automata initially pursued in [1, 3, 6, 13, 22], but from a more ring theoretic point of view as followed in [2]. We provide a new upper bound on the shortest reset word for the quite broad class of semisimple synchronizing automata. This class contains the natural class of simple synchronizing automata, i.e., automata without non-trivial congruences. This bound depends on the notion of former-rank of the automaton \mathcal{A} which is the smallest reachable subset H of Q with $|H| > 1$. The tool used is the Wedderburn-Artin theorem together with the notion of the t -packing number $D(t, r, n)$, i.e., the maximum size of a collection of r -subsets of $[1, n]$ such that no t -subset is covered more than once. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1. *If an automaton \mathcal{A} with n states is semisimple with former-rank $r \geq 2$, then there is a reset word of length at most $(n - 1)D(2, r, n)$. In particular, we have that there is a reset word of length at most*

$$\frac{n(n - 1)^2}{r(r - 1)}$$

2 The Wedderburn-Artin point of view

In this section we fix the notation and we recall some basic facts that will be used throughout all the paper. The notation introduced and the considered approach strictly follow the one introduced in [2]. Henceforth, we consider a synchronizing automaton $\mathcal{A} = \langle Q, \Sigma, \delta \rangle$ with set of n states $Q = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$, and by \mathcal{S} (sometimes also $\text{Syn}(\mathcal{A})$) we denote the set of the synchronizing (or reset) words of \mathcal{A} . It is a well known fact that this set is a two-sided ideal of Σ^* , i.e., $\Sigma^* \mathcal{S} \Sigma^* \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. By $M(\mathcal{A})$ we denote the transition monoid of \mathcal{A} and by $\pi : \Sigma^* \rightarrow M(\mathcal{A})$ we denote the associated natural epimorphism. Put $\mathcal{A}^* = M(\mathcal{A})/\pi(\mathcal{S})$. There is a natural and well known action of $M(\mathcal{A})$ on the set Q given by $q \cdot \pi(u) = \delta(q, u)$; we often omit the map π and we use the simpler notation $q \cdot u$. This action extends to the subsets of Q in the obvious way. By this action, $M(\mathcal{A})$ embeds into the ring $\mathbb{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{C} and with a slight abuse of notation we still denote by $\pi : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ the representation induced by this embedding. This representation determines an action of Σ^* on the vector space $\mathbb{C}Q$ defined by $v \cdot u = v\pi(u)$. Consider the vector $w = q_1 + \dots + q_n$ formed by summing all the elements of the canonical basis. It is a well known fact in the literature, that Σ^* acts on the orthogonal space $w^\perp = \{u \in \mathbb{C}Q : \langle u | w \rangle = 0\}$, and $u \in \mathcal{S}$ if and only if for every $v \in w^\perp$ we get $v \cdot u = 0$ (see for instance [6]). This induces a representation $\varphi : \Sigma^*/\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \text{End}(w^\perp) \simeq \mathbb{M}_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$ with $\varphi(\Sigma^*/\mathcal{S}) \simeq \mathcal{A}^*$. Thus, \mathcal{A}^* may be seen as a finite multiplicative submonoid of $\mathbb{M}_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$. We now consider the \mathbb{C} -subalgebra \mathcal{R}

of $\mathbb{M}_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$ generated by \mathcal{A}^* . Clearly \mathcal{R} is a finitely generated \mathbb{C} -algebra. Since \mathcal{A}^* embeds into \mathcal{R} , with a slight abuse of notation we identify \mathcal{A}^* with the image of this embedding $\mathcal{A}^* \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}$. Therefore, the *radical* $\text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}^*)$ of \mathcal{A}^* is defined by

$$\text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}^*) = \text{Rad}(\mathcal{R}) \cap \mathcal{A}^*$$

where $\text{Rad}(\mathcal{R})$ is the radical (see [17]) of the \mathbb{C} -subalgebra \mathcal{R} . Throughout the paper we consider the morphism

$$\rho : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^*$$

that is the composition of the Rees morphism $\Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*/\mathcal{S}$ with the representation map φ . Using this map we may define the set of the radical words of the automaton \mathcal{A} as the following ideal of Σ^* :

$$\text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}) = \rho^{-1}(\text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}^*))$$

This is an ideal containing \mathcal{S} , moreover $\text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})/\mathcal{S}$ is the largest nilpotent left (right) ideal of Σ^*/\mathcal{S} , see [2]. The importance of radical words stem from the fact that if one is able to find a radical word u , then a synchronizing word may be obtained by considering a suitable power of u . Indeed, for any $u \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})$ it is easy to check that u^{n-1} is reset. Actually, if one is able to find short reset words, then it is also possible to find a reset word of quadratic bound.

Proposition 1. [2] *If it is true that for any strongly connected synchronizing automaton with n states there is a radical word of length at most $(n-1)^2$, then for any strongly connected synchronizing automata with n states there is a synchronizing word u with $|u| \leq 2(n-1)^2$.*

Finding “short” radical words might be an easier task than finding short reset words, thus this problem may be an intermediate step to tackle Cerny’s conjecture. This statement is justified by the nice representation of the ring $\overline{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{R}/\text{Rad}(\mathcal{R})$ due to the Wedderburn-Artin Theorem. Since $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ is semisimple, $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ may be factorized into k simple components:

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}} \simeq \mathbb{M}_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}_1) \times \dots \times \mathbb{M}_{n_k}(\mathbb{C}_k) \tag{1}$$

for some (uniquely determined) positive integers n_1, \dots, n_k . Let $\varphi_i : \overline{\mathcal{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$, for $i \in [1, k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$, be the projection map onto the i -th simple component, and let $\psi : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{R}}$ be the canonical epimorphism. For each $i \in [1, k]$ we defined the following frequently used morphism

$$\theta_i = \varphi_i \circ \psi \circ \rho : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$$

Note that a radical word $u \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})$ may be characterized by the property $\theta_i(u) = 0_i$ for each $i \in [1, k]$, where 0_i is the zero of $\mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$. We now recall a notion that plays an important role in this paper. Let $\mathcal{M}_i = \theta_i(\Sigma^*)$ be the subsemigroup of $\mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$ generated by Σ^* , $i \in [1, k]$. We call \mathcal{M}_i the i -th factor monoid. The following lemma holds.

Lemma 1. [2] *The i -th factor monoid \mathcal{M}_i has a unique 0-minimal ideal \mathcal{I}_i which is a 0-simple semigroup. Furthermore, \mathcal{M}_i acts faithfully on both left and right of \mathcal{I}_i .*

For a word $u \in \Sigma^*$, the *rank* of u is $\text{rk}(u) = |Q \cdot u|$. We recall that for any $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ $\text{rk}(uv) \leq \min\{\text{rk}(u), \text{rk}(v)\}$ holds. The notion of rank may be extended to elements in $\mathcal{I}_i \setminus \{0\}$ by defining for any $g \in \mathcal{I}_i \setminus \{0\}$ the i -th rank of g as the following integer

$$\text{Rk}_i(g) = \min\{\text{rk}(u) : \theta_i(u) = g\}$$

and by extension we put

$$\text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i) = \min\{\text{Rk}_i(g) : g \in \mathcal{I}_i \setminus \{0\}\}$$

The i -th rank is the same for all the non-zero elements in the unique 0-minimal ideal \mathcal{I}_i .

Lemma 2. [2] *For any $g \in \mathcal{I}_i \setminus \{0\}$ we have $\text{Rk}_i(g) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$.*

2.1 Simple and semisimple synchronizing automata

An automaton-congruence (or simply a congruence) is an equivalence relation σ on the set of states Q such that $q\sigma p$ implies that $(q \cdot u)\sigma(p \cdot u)$ for all $u \in \Sigma^*$. The set of congruences forms a lattice with maximum the universal relation, and minimum the identity relation. In case this lattice is formed by just these two congruences the automaton is called *simple*, see for instance [2, 7, 21, 24]. For example, automata having some letters acting like a primitive group, the Cerny's automata \mathcal{C}_n , or some of the "slowly synchronized" automata $\mathcal{W}_n, \mathcal{D}'_n$ considered in [5], are all simple [2]. Moreover, in a possible proof of Cerny's conjecture by induction on the number of states, simple synchronizing automata would constitute the base case. Simple synchronizing automata are framed nicely in the approach we are considering. We say that a synchronizing automaton \mathcal{A} is *semisimple* whenever $\text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}^*) = \{0\}$ [2]. Equivalently, \mathcal{A} is semisimple if and only if $\text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{S}$. The following result nicely frames the simple class in the class of semisimple.

Theorem 2. [2] *A synchronizing simple automaton is also semisimple.*

Therefore, it seems that there is a connection between semisimplicity and the difficulty of synchronizing an automaton with a short (below the quadratic bound) reset word. On the other hand, finding reset words in the semisimple case, looks easier because of the nice structure (1) and the fact that finding radical words is the same as finding reset words. Moreover, in case the automaton is not semisimple, there is a natural congruence that allows the construction of reset words in an "inductive way". The key lemma is the following.

Lemma 3. [2] *Let $\mathcal{A} = \langle Q, \Sigma, \delta \rangle$ be a synchronizing automaton which is not semisimple. Let $w \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \mathcal{S}$ and let $\text{Ker}(w)$ be the kernel of the transformation induced by the word w . Then there is a non-trivial congruence σ with $\sigma \subseteq \text{Ker}(w)$.*

Indeed, if \mathcal{A} is not semisimple and $w \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})$ is a radical word, then by the above lemma we may consider the quotient automaton $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}/\sigma$. Consider any reset word $u \in \text{Syn}(\mathcal{B})$, then since $\sigma \subseteq \text{Ker}(w)$ we deduce that $uw \in \text{Syn}(\mathcal{A})$.

2.2 Former-rank and semisimple automata

The *former-rank* of $\mathcal{A} = \langle Q, \Sigma, \delta \rangle$ is the smallest reachable subset H of Q with $|H| > 1$. In formulae:

$$\text{Fr}(\mathcal{A}) = \min\{|Q \cdot u| : u \in \Sigma^* \setminus \text{Syn}(\mathcal{A})\}$$

The set of *former-synchronizing words* is $\text{FSyn}(\mathcal{A}) = \{u \in \Sigma^* : |Q \cdot u| = \text{Fr}(\mathcal{A})\}$. The following proposition relates the notion of former-rank with the i -th rank.

Proposition 2. *With the above notation,*

$$\text{Fr}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \min\{\text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i) : i \in [1, k]\}.$$

Moreover, if $\text{FSyn}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$ then

$$\min\{\text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i) : i \in [1, k]\} = \text{Fr}(\mathcal{A})$$

Proof. By the definition of former-rank we clearly have:

$$\text{Fr}(\mathcal{A}) \leq \min\{\text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i) : i \in [1, k]\}.$$

Let $u \in \text{FSyn}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})$. Then, there is an index $i \in [1, k]$ such that $\theta_i(u) \neq 0_i$. Moreover, by Lemma 1 the unit 1_i of the i -th factor monoid $\mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$ is a linear combination $\sum_j \lambda_j r_j = 1_i$ of elements $r_j \in \mathcal{I}_i$ for some $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{C}$. Hence,

$$\sum_j \lambda_j r_j \theta_i(u) = \theta_i(u) \neq 0$$

from which we deduce that $r_j \theta_i(u) \neq 0_i$ for some index j in the summation. Hence, since $r_j, r_j \theta_i(u) \in \mathcal{I}_i$ by Lemma 2 we have the other side of the inequality

$$\min\{\text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i) : i \in [1, k]\} \leq \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i) = \text{Rk}(r_j \theta_i(u)) \leq \text{Rk}(\theta_i(u)) \leq \text{Fr}(\mathcal{A})$$

□

Note that in case the automaton is semisimple, condition $\text{FSyn}(\mathcal{A}) \setminus \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}) \neq \emptyset$ is always satisfied.

3 Support and minimal sections

Following [2], for a word $v \in \Sigma^*$ the *support* $\text{Supp}(v)$ is the following subset of $[1, k]$:

$$\text{Supp}(v) = \{i \in [1, k] : \theta_i(v) \neq 0_i\}$$

Note that $\text{Supp}(v) = \emptyset$ if and only if $v \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})$. We consider the following poset

$$\mathcal{S}(v) = \{\text{Supp}(z) : z \in \Sigma^* v \Sigma^*\}$$

ordered by inclusion. A non-empty minimal element $\text{Supp}(u)$ in $\mathcal{S}(v)$ is called a *v-minimal section* (or just a minimal section when v is clear from the context), and the element u realizing such set is called *v-minimal*. Clearly, if $\text{Supp}(u)$ is a v -minimal section and $\text{Supp}(z) \subsetneq \text{Supp}(u)$, for some $z \in \Sigma^* v \Sigma^*$, then $z \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})$. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *Let u be a v -minimal word. Then, for any $a, b \in \Sigma^*$, the word aub either belongs to $\text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})$, or aub is v -minimal.*

Proof. It follows from the fact that if $\theta_j(u) = 0_j$, then $\theta_j(aub) = 0_j$ as well. Hence, $\text{Supp}(aub) \subseteq \text{Supp}(u)$, and so since u is v -minimal we get that either $aub \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})$ or $\text{Supp}(aub) = \text{Supp}(u)$. \square

Definition 1. *Let u be a v -minimal word. Let $i \in \text{Supp}(u)$ and $g \in \mathcal{I}_i$. We say that a word w u -represents g if $w \in \Sigma^*u\Sigma^*$, $\theta_i(w) = g$ and either $g = 0_i$, or the rank $\text{rk}(w)$ is minimum among all the words with the above properties.*

We will see that the last condition is equivalent to request that $\text{rk}(w) = \text{Rk}(w)$. We have the following observation.

Lemma 5. *If w u -represents $g \in \mathcal{I}_i$, then either $g = \theta_i(w) = 0_i$, or $\text{Supp}(w) = \text{Supp}(u)$.*

Proof. Since u is a v -minimal word, and w contains u as a factor then by Lemma 4 either $w \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})$ (corresponding to the case $g = \theta_i(w) = 0_i$), or $\text{Supp}(w) = \text{Supp}(u)$. \square

Lemma 6. *With the above notation, the following facts hold:*

- *Every element $g \in \mathcal{I}_i$ is u -representable;*
- *If w is a word that u -represents $g \in \mathcal{I}_i \setminus \{0_i\}$, then $\text{rk}(w) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$;*
- *If x is a word such that $\theta_i(x) = 0_i$ for some $i \in \text{Supp}(u)$, then $\theta_j(x) = 0_j$ for all $j \in \text{Supp}(u)$.*

Proof. Let u be a v -minimal word. Since $R = \mathbb{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is simple, then $R\theta_i(u)R = R$. In particular we have

$$\sum_j \lambda_j \theta_i(a_j u b_j) = 1_i$$

for some suitable words a_j, b_j . Let z be a word such that $\theta_i(z) \in \mathcal{I}_i \setminus \{0_i\}$ and with $\text{rk}(z) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$. Thus, we have:

$$\sum_j \lambda_j \theta_i(a_j u b_j z) = \theta_i(z) \neq 0_i$$

from which we deduce that there is some element $\theta_i(a_s u b_s z) \in \mathcal{I}_i \setminus \{0_i\}$. We clearly have

$$\text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i) \leq \text{rk}(a_s u b_s z) \leq \text{rk}(z) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$$

i.e., $\text{rk}(a_s u b_s z) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$. If $g = 0_i$, then g is u -representable. Otherwise, consider a generic $g \in \mathcal{I}_i \setminus \{0_i\}$. Since $\mathcal{I}_i \setminus \{0_i\}$ is a \mathcal{J} -class, we have that there are suitable words x, y such that $g = \theta_i(x a_s u b_s z y)$. Hence, also in this case we get

$$\text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i) \leq \text{rk}(x a_s u b_s z y) \leq \text{rk}(z) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$$

and so g is u -representable. Moreover, we have $\text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i) \leq \text{rk}(w) \leq \text{rk}(xa_s ub_s zy) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$, i.e., $\text{rk}(w) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$. Let us prove the last property. Take any $g \in \mathcal{I}_j$, for some $j \in \text{Supp}(u)$. Since g is u -represented $g = \theta_j(aub)$, for some $a, b \in \Sigma^*$. Consider the word $aubx$, we clearly have $\theta_i(aubx) = 0_i$, whence $\text{Supp}(aubx) \subsetneq \text{Supp}(aub) = \text{Supp}(u)$. Hence, since $\text{Supp}(u)$ is a minimal section we get $\text{Supp}(aubx) = \emptyset$, i.e., $g\theta_j(x) = \theta_j(aubx) = 0_j$. Whence, $\theta_j(x) = 0_j$ since g is an arbitrary element in \mathcal{I}_j . \square

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let w be a word that u -represents $g \in \mathcal{I}_i$, then for any $a, b \in \Sigma^*$ we have that the word aub u -represents $\theta_i(a)g\theta_i(b)$.*

Proof. The following facts hold: $\theta_i(a)g\theta_i(b) \in \mathcal{I}_i$, $aub \in \Sigma^*u\Sigma^*$, and $\theta_i(aub) = \theta_i(a)g\theta_i(b)$. If $\theta_i(aub) = 0_i$, then clearly aub u -represents $\theta_i(a)g\theta_i(b)$. Otherwise, if $\theta_i(aub) \neq 0_i$, then $\theta_i(w) \neq 0_i$ and by Lemma 6 we have:

$$\text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i) \leq \text{rk}(aub) \leq \text{rk}(w) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i).$$

Hence, $\text{rk}(aub) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$ and if we would have a word z containing u as a factor such that $\theta_i(a)g\theta_i(b) = \theta_i(z)$ with $\text{rk}(z) < \text{rk}(aub) = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$, then by Lemma 6 we would have $\theta_i(z) = 0_i$, a contradiction. \square

The following proposition shows that minimal sections are disjoint.

Proposition 3. *Let $\text{Supp}(u_1), \text{Supp}(u_2)$ be two minimal sections in $\mathcal{S}(v_1), \mathcal{S}(v_2)$, respectively (v_1, v_2 non-necessarily distinct). Then, $\text{Supp}(u_1) \cap \text{Supp}(u_2) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose contrary to our claim that $\text{Supp}(u_1) \cap \text{Supp}(u_2) \neq \emptyset$. Let $i \in \text{Supp}(u_1) \cap \text{Supp}(u_2)$. By the same argument of Lemma 6 since

$$\sum_j \lambda_j \theta_i(a_i u_1 b_j) = 1_i$$

we have have:

$$\sum_j \lambda_j \theta_i(a_i u_1 b_j u_2) = \theta_i(u_2) \neq 0_i$$

Thus, we deduce that $\theta_i(a_j u_1 b_j u_2) \neq 0_i$ for some j . Since $a_j u_1 b_j u_2 \in \Sigma^* u_1 \Sigma^* \cap \Sigma^* u_2 \Sigma^*$, we get:

$$\emptyset \neq \{s : \theta_s(a_j u_1 b_j u_2) \neq 0_s\} \subseteq \text{Supp}(u_1) \cap \text{Supp}(u_2)$$

that contradicts the minimality of both $\text{Supp}(u_1)$ and $\text{Supp}(u_2)$. \square

We say that a subset $T \subseteq [1, k]$ is a *core* whenever the condition $\theta_i(u) = 0_i$ for all $i \in T$ implies $\theta_i(u) = 0_i$ for all $i \in [1, k]$. Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [1, k]$ be a minimal core with respect to the inclusion. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 8. *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [1, k]$ be a minimal core. Then, there is a family*

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\text{Supp}(u_1), \dots, \text{Supp}(u_m)\}$$

of minimal sections covering \mathcal{C} .

Proof. Let v_1 be a word such that $\theta_i(v_1) \neq 0_i$ for some $i \in \mathcal{C}$ and consider a v_1 -minimal word u_1 such that $\text{Supp}(u_1)$ is a minimal section. By Lemma 6 and the definition of core we deduce $\text{Supp}(u_1) \cap \mathcal{C} \neq \emptyset$ for if we would have $u_1 \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\text{Supp}(u_1) = \emptyset$, a contradiction. If $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{Supp}(u_1)$, then we are done. Otherwise, by the minimality of \mathcal{C} we may find a word v_2 with $\theta_i(v_2) = 0_i$ for all $i \in \text{Supp}(u_1) \cap \mathcal{C}$ such that $\theta_j(v_2) \neq 0_j$ for some $j \in \mathcal{C} \setminus \text{Supp}(u_1)$. Let u_2 be a v_2 -minimal word such that $\text{Supp}(u_2)$ is a minimal section. By Proposition 3 we have $\text{Supp}(u_2) \cap \text{Supp}(u_1) = \emptyset$ and by the same reason of u_1 we have that $\text{Supp}(u_2) \cap \mathcal{C} \neq \emptyset$. If $\mathcal{C} \subseteq (\text{Supp}(u_1) \cup \text{Supp}(u_2))$, then we are done. Otherwise, we may repeat (at most $|\mathcal{C}|$ -times) the previous argument until we find m words u_1, \dots, u_m such that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq (\text{Supp}(u_1) \cup \text{Supp}(u_2) \cup \dots \cup \text{Supp}(u_m))$ for some minimal sections $\text{Supp}(u_i)$, $i \in [1, m]$. \square

4 Main result

In this section we prove the main result of the paper, but first we introduce an equivalence relation that is a key ingredient to prove this result. Let u be a v -minimal word. Fix an index $i \in \text{Supp}(u)$. By Lemma 6 all the elements from \mathcal{I}_i are u -representable. We define a binary relation σ_i on \mathcal{I}_i in the following way. We say that $g\sigma_i f$ if one of the following conditions is satisfied:

- $g = f$;
- there exists $w_1, w_2 \in \Sigma^*$ that u -represent g and f , respectively with:

$$|Q \cdot w_1 \cap Q \cdot w_2| > 1$$

We have the following proposition.

Proposition 4. *The relation σ_i is right-compatible with respect to the product: if $g\sigma_i f$, then for any $a \in \Sigma^*$ we have $g\theta_i(a)\sigma_i f\theta_i(a)$.*

Proof. Clearly if $f = g$ then $g\theta_i(a)\sigma_i f\theta_i(a)$. Otherwise, let $w_1, w_2 \in \Sigma^*$ be two words that u -represent f and g , respectively, and satisfying the inequality $|Q \cdot w_1 \cap Q \cdot w_2| > 1$. Note that the set $H = Q \cdot w_1 \cap Q \cdot w_2$ has at least two elements, and $H \cdot b \subseteq Q \cdot (aw_1b) \cap Q \cdot (aw_2b)$. We consider the following two cases.

- If $|H \cdot b| > 1$ then $|Q \cdot (w_1a) \cap Q \cdot (w_2a)| > 1$, and by Lemma 7 we have that w_1a and w_2a u -represent $g\theta_i(a)$ and $f\theta_i(a)$, respectively. Hence, $g\theta_i(a)\sigma_i f\theta_i(a)$ holds.

- Otherwise from $|H \cdot b| = 1$ we deduce

$$|Q \cdot w_1 a| < |Q \cdot w_1|, |Q \cdot w_2 a| < |Q \cdot w_2|$$

If $f, g \neq 0_i$, then by Lemma 6 we necessarily have $|Q \cdot w_1| = |Q \cdot w_2| = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$, from which we deduce $g\theta_i(a) = f\theta_i(a) = 0_i$, i.e., $g\theta_i(a) \sigma_i f\theta_i(a)$. If $f = g = 0_i$, or just one among f, g , say f , is not equal to 0_i , then by the same argument we deduce $g\theta_i(a) = f\theta_i(a) = 0_i$, and so also in this case we get $g\theta_i(a) \sigma_i f\theta_i(a)$.

□

Since σ_i is reflexive, symmetric and right-compatible with respect to the product, we may consider the transitive closure \sim_i of σ_i that is clearly a right-congruence on \mathcal{I}_i . To state the next result we need to recall some basic fact on the packing problem [11]. Let $X = [1, n]$ be a finite set of n elements, and let t, r be two integers in $[1, n]$. The t -packing problem is the problem of determining the maximum size $D(t, r, n)$ of a collection of r -subsets of X such that no t -subset is covered more than once. With a double counting argument one can easily show that the following upper bound holds:

$$D(t, r, n) \leq \frac{\binom{n}{t}}{\binom{r}{t}} \quad (2)$$

with equality if and only if a Steiner system $S(t, r, n)$ exists. Note that if $r_1 \leq r_2$, then $D(t, r_1, n) \geq D(t, r_2, n)$.

Henceforth we put $r_i = \text{Rk}(\mathcal{I}_i)$, $i \in [1, k]$, and $n = |Q|$. We have the following proposition.

Proposition 5. *With the above notation we have that $|\mathcal{I}_i / \sim_i| \leq D(2, r_i, n) + 1$. In particular, for any $g \in \mathcal{I}_i$ there is a word z with $|z| \leq D(2, r_i, n)$ such that*

$$g\theta_i(z) \sim_i 0_i$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{I}_i / \sim_i = \{[0_i]_{\sim_i}, [g_1]_{\sim_i}, \dots, [g_\ell]_{\sim_i}\}$. Let z_1, \dots, z_ℓ be words that u -represent g_j for $j \in [1, \ell]$. Put $F_j = Q \cdot z_j$ for $j \in [1, \ell]$. Then, by Lemma 6 $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, \dots, F_\ell\}$ is a family of r_i -sets satisfying the property that

$$|F_i \cap F_j| \leq 1$$

for all $i, j \in [1, \ell]$ with $i \neq j$. Therefore, each pair is covered at most once, and so $\ell \leq D(2, r_i, n)$. Since \sim_i is a right-congruence, \mathcal{M}_i acts on the right of \mathcal{I}_i / \sim_i . Thus, for any $g \in \mathcal{I}_i$ there is a word z such that $[g]_{\sim_i} \theta_i(z) = [0_i]_{\sim_i}$, and so since $\ell \leq D(2, r_i, n)$ we may find such z with $|z| \leq \ell$. □

We have the following proposition.

Proposition 6. *For any v -minimal word u and $i \in \text{Supp}(u)$, there is a word $w_i \in \Sigma^*$ with $|w_i| \leq n_i D(2, r_i, n)$ such that*

$$\theta_i(w_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m h_j t_j$$

for some elements $h_j \in \mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$ and $t_j \in \mathcal{I}_i$ with $t_j \sim_i 0_i$ for all $j \in [1, m]$.

Proof. Let $R = \mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$. Since R is simple there are elements $g_1, \dots, g_m \in \mathcal{I}_i$ such that

$$Rg_1 + \dots + Rg_m = R$$

Moreover, since R is the direct sum of n_i left ideals, by the Jordan-Hölder Theorem we may assume $m \leq n_i$. In particular we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^m h_j g_j = 1_i$$

for some suitable elements $h_j \in R$. Consider $g_1 \in \mathcal{I}_i$, by Proposition 5 there is a word z_1 such that $|z_1| \leq D(2, r_i, n)$ and $g_1 \theta_i(z_1) \sim_i 0_i$. Consider $g_2 \theta_i(z_1) \in \mathcal{I}_i$ and apply again Proposition 5 to find a word z_2 such that $|z_2| \leq D(2, r_i, n)$ and $g_2 \theta_i(z_1 z_2) \sim_i 0_i$. Since \sim_i is a right-congruence, $g_1 \theta_i(z_1 z_2) \sim_i 0_i$ holds as well. Continuing in this way we may find a sequence z_1, \dots, z_s of words such that each $|z_j| \leq D(2, r_i, n)$ and

$$g_j \theta_i(z_1 z_2 \dots z_s) \sim_i 0_i$$

holds for any $s \leq m$. In particular taking $w_i = z_1 \dots z_m$ we have that $|w_i| \leq mD(2, r_i, n) \leq n_i D(2, r_i, n)$ and $g_j \theta_i(z_1 z_2 \dots z_m) \sim_i 0_i$ for all $j \in [1, m]$. Therefore, by putting $t_j = g_j \theta_i(w_i)$, $j \in [1, m]$, we deduce that

$$\theta_i(w_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m h_j t_j$$

for some suitable $t_j \in \mathcal{I}_i$ with $t_j \sim_i 0_i$. □

In case the automaton is semisimple we obtain the following result.

Theorem 3. *If the automaton \mathcal{A} is semisimple, then for any v -minimal word u and $i \in \text{Supp}(u)$, there is a word w with*

$$|w| \leq \min_{i \in \text{Supp}(u)} \{n_i D(2, r_i, n)\}$$

such that $\theta_i(w) = 0_i$ for all $i \in \text{Supp}(u)$.

Proof. By Proposition 6 there is a word w_i with $|w_i| \leq n_i D(2, r_i, n)$ such that $\theta_i(w_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m h_j t_j$ for some elements $h_j \in \mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$ and $t_j \in \mathcal{I}_i$ with $t_j \sim_i 0_i$ for all $j \in [1, m]$. Thus, it is enough to prove that $t_j = 0_i$ for each $j \in [1, m]$. Consider a generic t_j for some $j \in [1, m]$. We may assume $t_j \neq 0_i$. Since \sim_i is the transitive closure of σ_i we have that there are $\ell > 1$ elements $f_1, \dots, f_\ell \in \mathcal{I}_i$ with $f_1 = t_j$, $f_\ell = 0_i$ such that $f_s \sigma_i f_{s+1}$ for all $s \in [1, \ell - 1]$. Choosing the minimal ℓ we may assume that f_1, \dots, f_ℓ are distinct. By definition of σ_i we have words z_1, \dots, z_ℓ that u -represent f_1, \dots, f_ℓ , respectively, and such that

$$|Q \cdot z_s \cap Q \cdot z_{s+1}| > 1 \quad (3)$$

for all $s \in [1, \ell - 1]$.

We claim that z_ℓ is reset. Indeed, since z_ℓ u -represents 0_i we have that u is a factor of z_ℓ that is also a v -minimal word. Hence, $\text{Supp}(z_\ell) \subseteq \text{Supp}(u)$ and since $\theta_i(z_\ell) = 0_i$ we have $\text{Supp}(z_\ell) \subsetneq \text{Supp}(u)$ which by the minimality condition on u implies $z_m \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{Syn}(\mathcal{A})$ since \mathcal{A} is semisimple. Suppose $\ell > 1$. Therefore, by (3) and the fact that $z_m \in \text{Syn}(\mathcal{A})$ we get:

$$1 = |Q \cdot z_{m-1} \cap Q \cdot z_m| > 1$$

a contradiction. Thus, $\ell = 1$ and $t_j = f_1 = 0_i$. Hence, we get that $\theta_i(w_i) = 0_i$. The statement now follows by taking the index $i \in \text{Supp}(u)$ such that $n_i D(2, r_i, n)$ is minimum and by the last property of Lemma 6 \square

The following lemma is similar to [2, Lemma 16] and we state here with proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 9. *Consider an ideal I of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ of the form*

$$I = \mathbb{M}_{n_{i_1}}(\mathbb{C}) \times \dots \times \mathbb{M}_{n_{i_m}}(\mathbb{C})$$

for some subset $T = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ of $[1, k]$. Let $J = \psi^{-1}(I)$. There is a sequence $i_j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ of integers for $j \in [1, \ell]$ such that for any words z_j , $j \in [1, \ell]$ with $\theta_{i_j}(z_j) = 0_{i_j}$, the word

$$u = \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} z_j$$

such that $\rho(u)J = 0$. Moreover, $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} n_{i_j} \leq n - 1$.

Proof. Renumbering the indexes in the decomposition of the ideal, we may suppose without loss of generality that $I = \mathbb{M}_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \dots \times \mathbb{M}_{n_m}(\mathbb{C})$ for some $m \leq k$, and so we may consider $T = [1, m]$. Since \mathcal{R} is a subalgebra of $\mathbb{M}_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})$, the vector space $V = \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ is a J -module. By Proposition 4.8 of [17] J and $J/\text{Rad}(J)$ have the same simple left modules. By Exercise 4.7 of [17] we have $\text{Rad}(J) = J \cap \text{Rad}(\mathcal{R})$, hence $J/\text{Rad}(J) = I$. Let

$$V = V_0 \supset V_1 \supset \dots \supset V_j \supset \dots \supset V_\ell = 0$$

be a Jordan-Hölder series. Each module V_{j-1}/V_j for $j \in [1, \ell]$ is a simple J -module and so, by the above argument, also an I -module. In particular, we have $uv = \psi(u)v$ for all

$u \in J$, $v \in V_{j-1}/V_j$. We claim that either $mv = 0$ for all $m \in J$, $v \in V_{j-1}/V_j$ or there is a $v \in V_{j-1}/V_j$ such that $V_{j-1}/V_j = \mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})v$, for some $i \in T$ and $n_i = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V_{j-1}/V_j)$, where $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V_{j-1}/V_j)$ is the dimension of the \mathbb{C} -vector space V_{j-1}/V_j . Indeed, the first condition occurs only if for every $v \in V_{j-1}/V_j$, $mv = 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$ and for all $i \in T$. Otherwise, we may assume that $mv \neq 0$, for some $v \in V_{j-1}/V_j$ and $m \in \mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$ for some $i \in T$. Thus, $\mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})v$ is a left I -submodule of V_{j-1}/V_j which is non-trivial, thus $V_{j-1}/V_j = \mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})v$. Therefore, V_{j-1}/V_j is a simple $\mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})$ -module and by Theorem 3.3 of [17] $n_i = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V_{j-1}/V_j)$. Hence, putting $i_j = i$, if z_j is any word such that $\theta_i(z_j) = 0_i$ we deduce

$$\rho(z_j)V_{j-1}/V_j = \psi(\rho(z_j))\mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})v = \theta_i(z_j)\mathbb{M}_{n_i}(\mathbb{C})v = 0$$

In case $mv = 0$ for all $m \in J$, $v \in V_{j-1}/V_j$ we clearly have that also $\rho(z_j)V_{j-1}/V_j = 0$ holds. Therefore, the following word

$$u = z_\ell \dots z_1 = \prod_{j=\ell}^1 z_j$$

satisfies $\rho(u)JV = 0$ since $\rho(z_j)V_{j-1}/V_j = 0$ for all $j \in [1, \ell]$. Thus, $\rho(u)J = 0$. Moreover, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} n_{i_j} = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V_{j-1}/V_j) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(V) = n - 1$$

□

Theorem 4. *With the above notation. If the automaton \mathcal{A} is semisimple, and \mathcal{C} is a minimal core of \mathcal{A} , then there is a reset word w with*

$$|w| \leq (n - 1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \{D(2, r_i, n)\}$$

Proof. By a suitable permutation we may assume $\mathcal{C} = [1, m]$ for some $m \leq k$. By Lemma 8 there is a family

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\text{Supp}(u_1), \dots, \text{Supp}(u_t)\}$$

of minimal sections covering \mathcal{C} . Consider the ideal pinpointed by \mathcal{C}

$$I = \mathbb{M}_{n_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \dots \times \mathbb{M}_{n_m}(\mathbb{C})$$

By Theorem 3 for each $j \in [1, t]$ there is a word w_j with

$$|w_j| \leq \min_{i \in \text{Supp}(u_j)} \{n_i D(2, r_i, n)\}$$

such that $\theta_i(w_j) = 0_i$ for all $i \in \text{Supp}(u_j)$. Thus, by Lemma 9 we may find a sequence of integers $i_j \in [1, t]$, $j \in [1, \ell]$ such that the following word

$$u = \prod_{j=\ell}^1 w_{i_j}$$

satisfies the property $\rho(u)J = 0$ for $J = \psi^{-1}(I)$. Hence, $\theta_i(u) = 0_i$ for all $i \in [1, m]$, and since \mathcal{C} is a core and \mathcal{A} is semisimple we conclude that $u \in \text{Rad}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{Syn}(\mathcal{A})$. Moreover, we get

$$|u| \leq \max_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \{D(2, r_i, n)\} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} n_{i_j} \leq (n-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \{D(2, r_i, n)\}$$

□

From the previous theorem we immediately obtain our main result.

Theorem 5. *If an automaton \mathcal{A} with n states is semisimple with former-rank $r = \text{Fr}(\mathcal{A})$, then there is a reset word of length at most $(n-1)D(2, r, n)$. In particular, we have that there is a reset word of length at most*

$$\frac{n(n-1)^2}{r(r-1)}$$

Proof. From Theorem 4 we deduce that there is a reset word of length at most

$$(n-1) \max_{i \in \mathcal{C}} \{D(2, r_i, n)\}$$

Let $r = \min\{r_i, i \in [1, k]\}$. By Proposition 2 we have $r = \text{Fr}(\mathcal{A})$. Moreover, since $D(2, r_i, n) \leq D(2, r, n)$ for all $i \in [1, k]$ we may conclude that there is a reset word of length at most $(n-1)D(2, r, n)$. By the upper bound (2) we immediately get the bound in the statement. □

5 Conclusion and open problems

The bound $n(n-1)^2/r(r-1)$ of Theorem 5 is already better than the Pin-Frankl's bound for $r \geq 3$, but not asymptotically better than Szykula's $O(114n^3/685)$. However, it starts to be better already for $r \geq 4$. Moreover, $n(n-1)^2/r(r-1)$ is a straightforward upper bound for $D(2, r, n)$ although they are asymptotic [11]. There is a slightly more precise bound for $D(2, r, n)$ and many others for specific choices of the parameters, we remind the reader to [11, Section 14] for further details. For instance, for "small" n

$$D(2, r, n) \leq \frac{(r-1)n}{r^2 - n}$$

holds provided that the denominator is positive. Thus, if $r^2 - n \geq 0$ we may conclude that there is a reset word of length $(n-1)n(r-1)/(r^2 - n)$.

Semisimplicity is just used in Theorem 3. Hopefully, using similar techniques, it may be possible to extend the main result to a general synchronizing automaton:

Open Problem 1. *For a general synchronizing automaton \mathcal{A} with former-rank r , prove that there is a radical word of length at most $(n-1)D(2, r, n)$.*

Even though the previous open problem would be solved, the crucial case remains that of former-rank two. Indeed, in this case $D(2, 2, n) = n(n - 1)/2$ and this gives rise to a non interesting upper bound for the shortest reset word. However, this case suggests that the automata that are more difficult to synchronize, are the ones having former-rank two. Therefore, the following direction of research seems important in understanding how to crack Cerny’s conjecture.

Open Problem 2. *What is the structure of i -th factors \mathcal{M}_i and their unique 0-minimal ideals \mathcal{I}_i in case of the former-rank two?*

In Proposition 5 it is used the fact that each pair is covered at most once by the family $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, \dots, F_\ell\}$ of r -sets, from which we deduced $\ell \leq D(2, r, n)$. However, there is an action of Σ^* on the family \mathcal{F} therefore we may state the following “dynamical packing problem” in the hope to have a better upper bound.

Open Problem 3. *Find the maximum size $Dd(t, r, n, k)$ of a collection $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, \dots, F_m\}$ of r -subsets of $[1, n]$ such that no t -subset is covered more than once and with the property that the alphabet $[1, k]$ acts partially on \mathcal{F} , and this action is transitive.*

For instance using the Cerny’s series \mathcal{C}_n , it is not difficult to check that in case $k = r = t = 2$ we have $Dd(2, 2, n, 2) = D(2, 2, n) = \binom{n}{2} / \binom{2}{2}$.

References

- [1] Almeida, J., Margolis, S., Steinberg, B., Volkov, M.V.: *Representation theory of finite semigroups, semigroup radicals and formal language theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 361(3), (2009), pp. 1429–1461.
- [2] Almeida, J., Rodaro, E. “*Semisimple synchronizing automata and the Wedderburn-Artin theory*” Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci., 27(2), (2016), pp. 127–145.
- [3] Almeida, J., Steinberg, B. *Matrix Mortality and the Černý-Pin Conjecture*, In: DLT 2009, Vol 5583 of Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, (2009), pp. 67–80.
- [4] Ananichev, D. S., Volkov, M. V.: Synchronizing generalized monotonic automata. Theoret. Comput. Sci., 330(1), (2005), pp. 3–13.
- [5] Ananichev, D. S., Volkov, M. V., Gusev, V.V.: *Primitive digraphs with large exponents and slowly synchronizing automata*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) 402, no. Kombinatorika i Teoriya Grafov. IV, (2012), pp. 9–39.
- [6] Arnold, F., Steinberg, B.: *Synchronizing groups and automata*. Theor. Comput. Sci., 359(1-3), (2006), pp. 101–110.
- [7] I. Babcsányi, *Automata with Finite Congruence Lattices*, Acta Cybernet., Vol. 18(1), (2007), pp. 155–165.

- [8] Béal, M.-P., Berlinkov, M. V., Perrin D.: *A quadratic upper bound on the size of a synchronizing word in one-cluster automata*. Int. J. Found. Comput. S., 22(2), (2011), pp. 277–288.
- [9] Berlinkov, M., Szykula, M.: *Algebraic synchronization criterion and computing reset words*. Inform. Sciences, 369, (2016), pp. 718–730.
- [10] Berstel, J., Perrin, D., Reutenauer, C.: *Codes and automata*, Encyclopedia of mathematics and its applications 129. Cambridge University Press, (2010).
- [11] Brouwer, A. E.: *Block Designs*, Chapter 14 in: Handbook of Combinatorics, R. Graham, M. Grötschel and L. Lovász Eds., Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995.
- [12] J. Černý, *Poznámka k homogénnym experimentom s konečnými automatami [in Slovak]*, Mat.-Fyz. Čas. Slovensk. Akad. Vied., 14 (1964), pp. 208–216.
- [13] Dubuc, L.: *Sur les automates circulaires et la conjecture de Cerny*. Informatique théorique et applications, 32, (1998), pp. 21–34, [in French]
- [14] Grech, M., Kisielewicz, A.: *The Cerny conjecture for automata respecting intervals of a directed graph*. Discret. Math. Theor. C., 15(3), (2013), pp. 61–72.
- [15] Hopcroft, J.E., Ullman, J.D.: *Introduction to automata theory, languages, and computation*. Addison Wesley, (1979).
- [16] Kari, J.: *Synchronizing finite automata on Eulerian digraphs*. Theor. Comput. Sci, 295(1-3), (2003,) pp.223–232.
- [17] Lam, T.Y.: *A first course in noncommutative rings*, Springer.
- [18] Perrin, D.: *Finite automata*. Handbook of theoretical computer science, J. van Leewen (eds.), Elsevier, B., (1990), pp. 1–57.
- [19] Pin, J.-E.: *On two combinatorial problems arising from automata theory*. Ann. Discrete Math, 17, (1983), pp. 535–548.
- [20] Rystsov, I.K.: *Reset words for commutative and solvable automata*, Theor. Comp. Sci., 172(1-2), (1997), pp. 273–279.
- [21] Rystsov, I.K.: *Primitive and Irreducible Automata*, Cybern. Syst. Anal., 51(4) (2015), pp. 506–513.
- [22] Steinberg, B.: *The Černý conjecture for one-cluster automata with prime length cycle*, Theor. Comp. Sci., 412(39), (2011), pp. 5487–5491.
- [23] Szykula, M.: *Improving the upper bound on the length of the shortest reset words*, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1702.05455.pdf> (2017)
- [24] Thierrin, G.: *Simple automata*, Kybernetika, 6(5), (1970), pp. 343–350.

- [25] Trahtman, A. N.: *The Cerny conjecture for aperiodic automata*. Discrete Math. Theor. C., 9(2), (2007), pp. 3–10.
- [26] Volkov, M.V.: *Synchronizing automata and the Černý conjecture*, In: LATA 2008, Vol 5196 of Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, (2008), pp. 11–27.
- [27] Volkov, M.V.: *Synchronizing automata preserving a chain of partial orders*, Theor. Comp. Sci. 410, (2009), pp. 3513–3519.