

Twin-roots of words and their properties [★]

Lila Kari ^a, Kalpana Mahalingam ^a, and Shinnosuke Seki ^{a,*}

^a*Department of Computer Science, University of Western Ontario,
London, Ontario, Canada, N6A 5B7*

Tel: 1-519-661-2111

Fax: 1-519-661-3515

Abstract

In this paper we generalize the notion of an ι -symmetric word, from an antimorphic involution, to an arbitrary involution ι as follows: a nonempty word w is said to be ι -symmetric if $w = \alpha\beta = \iota(\beta\alpha)$ for some words α, β . We propose the notion of ι -twin-roots (x, y) of an ι -symmetric word w . We prove the existence and uniqueness of the ι -twin-roots of an ι -symmetric word, and show that the left factor α and right factor β of any factorization of w as $w = \alpha\beta = \iota(\beta\alpha)$, can be expressed in terms of the ι -twin-roots of w . In addition, we show that for any involution ι , the catenation of the ι -twin roots of w equals the primitive root of w . We also provide several characterizations of the ι -twin-roots of a word, for ι being a morphic or antimorphic involution.

Key words: f -symmetric words, twin-roots, morphic and antimorphic involutions, primitive roots

1 Introduction

Periodicity, primitivity, overlaps, and repetitions of factors play an important role in combinatorics of words, and have been the subject of extensive studies, [9] and [13]. Recently, a new interpretation of these notions has emerged, motivated by information encoding in DNA computing.

[★] This research was supported by The Natural Sciences and Engineering Council of Canada Discovery Grant and Canada Research Chair Award to L.K.

* Corresponding author.

Email addresses: lila@csd.uwo.ca (Lila Kari), kalpana@csd.uwo.ca (Kalpana Mahalingam), sseki@csd.uwo.ca (Shinnosuke Seki).

DNA computing is based on the idea that data can be encoded as biomolecules, [1], e.g., DNA strands, and molecular biology tools can be used to transform this data to perform, e.g., arithmetic and logic operations. DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) is a linear chain made up of four different types of nucleotides, each consisting of a base (Adenine, Cytosine, Guanine, or Thymine) and a sugar-phosphate unit. The sugar-phosphate units are linked together by covalent bonds to form the backbone of the DNA single strand. Since nucleotides may differ only by their bases, a DNA strand can be viewed as simply a word over the four-letter alphabet $\{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T}\}$. A DNA single strand has an orientation, with one end known as the 5' end, and the other as the 3' end, based on their chemical properties. By convention, a word over the DNA alphabet represents the corresponding DNA single strand in the 5' to 3' orientation, i.e., the word \mathbf{GGTTTT} stands for the DNA single strand 5'- \mathbf{GGTTTT} -3'. A crucial feature of DNA single strands is their Watson-Crick complementarity: \mathbf{A} is complementary to \mathbf{T} , \mathbf{G} is complementary to \mathbf{C} , and two complementary DNA single strands with opposite orientation will bind to each other by hydrogen bonds between their individual bases to form a stable DNA double strand with the backbones at the outside and the bound pairs of bases lying at the inside.

Thus, in the context of DNA computing, a word u encodes the same information as its complement $\theta(u)$, where θ denotes the Watson-Crick complementarity function, or its mathematical formalization as an arbitrary antimorphic involution. This special feature of DNA-encoded information led to new interpretations of the concepts of repetitions and periodicity in words, wherein u and $\theta(u)$ were considered to encode the same information. For example, [2] proposed the notion of θ -primitive words for an antimorphic involution θ : a nonempty word w is θ -primitive iff it cannot be written in the form $w = u_1 u_2 \dots u_n$ where $u_i \in \{u, \theta(u)\}$, $n \geq 2$. Initial results concerning this special class of primitive words are promising and include, e.g., an extension, [2], of the Fine-and-Wilf's theorem [6].

To return to our motivation, the proof of the extended Fine-and-Wilf's theorem [2], as well as that of an extension of the Lyndon-Schützenberger, [12] equation $u^i = v^j w^k$ in [3], to cases involving both words and their Watson-Crick complements, pointed out the importance of investigating overlaps between the square u^2 of a word u , and its complement $\theta(u)$, i.e., overlaps of the form $u^2 = v\theta(u)w$ for some words v, w . This is an analogue of the classical situation wherein u^2 overlaps with u , i.e., $u^2 = vuw$, which happens iff $v = p^i$ and $w = p^j$ for some $i, j \geq 1$, where p is the primitive root of u .

A natural question is thus whether there is any kind of 'root' which characterizes overlaps between u^2 and $\theta(u)$ in the same way in which the primitive root characterizes the overlaps between u^2 and u . For an arbitrary involution ι , this paper proposes as a candidate the notion of ι -*twin-roots* of a word. Unlike the primitive root, the ι -twin-roots are defined only for ι -*symmetric* words.

A word u is ι -symmetric if $u = \alpha\beta = \iota(\beta\alpha)$ for some words α, β and the connection with the overlap problem is the following: If ι is an involution and u is an ι -symmetric word, then u^2 overlaps with $\iota(u)$, i.e., $u^2 = \alpha\iota(u)\beta$. The implication becomes equivalence if ι is a morphic or antimorphic involution. In this paper, we prove that an ι -symmetric word u has unique ι -twin-roots (x, y) such that xy is the primitive root of u (i.e., $u = (xy)^n$ for some $n \geq 1$). In addition, if $u = \alpha\beta = \iota(\beta\alpha)$, then $\alpha = (xy)^i x$, $\beta = y(xy)^{n-i-1}$ for some $i \geq 1$ (Proposition 4). Moreover, we provide several characterizations of ι -twin-roots for the case when ι is morphic or antimorphic.

The paper is organized as follows. After basic notations, definitions and examples in Section 2, in Section 3 we investigate relationships between the primitive root and twin-roots of a word. We namely show that for an involution ι , the primitive root of an ι -symmetric word equals the catenation of its ι -twin-roots. Furthermore, for a morphic or antimorphic involution δ , we provide several characteristics of δ -twin-roots of words. In Section 4, we place the set of δ -symmetric words in the Chomsky hierarchy of languages. As an application of these results, in Section 5 we investigate the μ -commutativity between languages, $XY = \mu(Y)X$, for a morphic involution μ .

2 Preliminaries

Let Σ be a finite alphabet. A word over Σ is a finite sequence of symbols in Σ . The empty word is denoted by λ . By Σ^* , we denote the set of all words over Σ , and $\Sigma^+ = \Sigma^* \setminus \{\lambda\}$. For a word $w \in \Sigma^*$, the set of its prefixes, infixes, and suffixes are defined as follows: $\text{Pref}(w) = \{u \in \Sigma^+ \mid \exists v \in \Sigma^*, uv = w\}$, $\text{Inf}(w) = \{u \in \Sigma^+ \mid \exists v, v' \in \Sigma^*, vuv' = w\}$, and $\text{Suff}(w) = \{u \in \Sigma^+ \mid \exists v \in \Sigma^*, vu = w\}$. For other notions in the formal language theory, we refer the reader to [11] and [13].

A word $u \in \Sigma^+$ is said to be *primitive* if $u = v^i$ implies $i = 1$. By Q we denote the set of all primitive words. For any nonempty word $u \in \Sigma^+$, there is a unique primitive word $p \in Q$, which is called the *primitive root* of u , such that $u = p^n$ for some $n \geq 1$. The primitive root of u is denoted by \sqrt{u} .

An *involution* is a mapping f such that f^2 is the identity. A *morphism* (resp. *antimorphism*) f over an alphabet Σ is a mapping such that $f(uv) = f(u)f(v)$ ($f(uv) = f(v)f(u)$) for all words $u, v \in \Sigma^*$. We denote by f , ι , μ , θ , and δ , an arbitrary mapping, an involution, a morphic involution, an antimorphic involution and a d-morphic involution (an involution that is either morphic or antimorphic), respectively. Note that an involution is not always length-preserving but a d-morphic involution is.

A palindrome is a word which is equal to its mirror image. The concept of palindromes was generalized to θ -palindromes, [8], [10], where θ is an arbitrary antimorphic involution: a word w is called a θ -palindrome if $w = \theta(w)$.

This definition can be generalized as follows: For an arbitrary mapping f on Σ^* , a word $w \in \Sigma^*$ is called a f -palindrome if $w = f(w)$. We denote by P_f the set of all f -palindromes over Σ^* . The name f -palindrome serves as a reminder of the fact that, in the particular case when f is the mirror image function, i.e., the identity function on Σ extended to an antimorphism of Σ^* , an f -palindrome is an ordinary palindrome. An additional reason for this choice of term was the fact that, in biology, the term “palindrome” is routinely used to describe DNA strings u with the property that $\theta(u) = u$, where θ is the Watson-Crick complementarity function. In the case when f is an arbitrary function on Σ^* , what we here call an f -palindrome is simply a fixed point for the function f .

Lemma 1 *Let $u \in \Sigma^+$ and δ be a d -morphic involution. Then $u \in P_\delta$ if and only if $\sqrt{u} \in P_\delta$.*

PROOF. Note that $\delta(\sqrt{u}^n) = \delta(\sqrt{u})^n$ for a d -morphic involution δ . If $u \in P_\theta$, then we have $\sqrt{u}^n = \delta(\sqrt{u}^n)$. This means that $\sqrt{u}^n = \delta(\sqrt{u})^n$. Since δ is length-preserving, $\sqrt{u} = \delta(\sqrt{u})$. The opposite direction can be proved in a similar way. \square

The θ -symmetric property of a word was introduced in [10] for antimorphic involutions θ . In [10], a word is said to be θ -symmetric if it can be written as a product of two θ -palindromes. We extend this notion to the f -symmetric property, where f is an arbitrary mapping. For a mapping f , a nonempty word $w \in \Sigma^+$ is f -symmetric if $w = \alpha\beta = f(\beta\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in \Sigma^+$ and $\beta \in \Sigma^*$. Our definition is a generalization of the definition in [10]. Indeed, when f is an antimorphic involution, $w = \alpha\beta = f(\beta\alpha) = f(\alpha)f(\beta)$ implies $\alpha, \beta \in P_f$. For an f -symmetric word w , we call a pair (α, β) such that $w = \alpha\beta = f(\beta\alpha)$ an f -symmetric factorization of w . Given an f -symmetric factorization (α, β) of a word, α is called its left factor and β is called its right factor. We denote by S_f the set of all f -symmetric words over Σ^* . We have the following observation on the inclusion relation between P_f and S_f .

Proposition 2 *For a mapping f on Σ^* , $P_f \subseteq S_f$.*

3 Twin-roots and primitive roots

Given an involution ι , in this section we define the notion of ι -twin-roots of an ι -symmetric word u with respect to ι . We prove that any ι -symmetric word u has unique ι -twin roots. We show that the right and left factors of any ι -symmetric factorization of u as $u = \alpha\beta = \iota(\beta\alpha)$ can all be expressed in terms of the twin roots of u with respect to ι . Moreover, we show that the catenation of the twin roots of an ι -symmetric word u with respect to ι equals the primitive root of u . We also provide several other properties of twin roots, for the particular case of d-morphic involutions.

We begin by recalling a theorem from [7] on language equation of the type $Xu = vX$, whose corollary will be used for finding the “twin-roots” of an ι -symmetric word.

Corollary 3 ([7]) *Let $u, v, w \in \Sigma^+$. If $uw = vw$, then there uniquely exist two words $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ with $xy \in Q$ such that $u = (xy)^i$, $v = (yx)^i$, and $w = (xy)^jx$ for some $i \geq 1$ and $j \geq 0$.*

Proposition 4 *Let ι be an involution on Σ^* and u be an ι -symmetric word. Then there uniquely exist two words $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ such that $u = (xy)^i$ for some $i \geq 1$ with $xy \in Q$. In addition, if $u = \alpha\beta = \iota(\beta\alpha)$, then there exists $k \geq 0$ such that $\alpha = (xy)^{i-k-1}x$ and $\beta = y(xy)^k$.*

PROOF. Given that u is ι -symmetric and (α, β) is an ι -symmetric factorization of u . It is easy to see that $\beta u = \iota(u)\beta$ holds. Then from Corollary 3, there exist two words $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ such that $xy \in Q$, $u = (xy)^i$, $\iota(u) = (yx)^i$, and $\beta = y(xy)^k$ for some $k \geq 0$. Since $u = \alpha\beta = (xy)^i$, we have $\alpha = (xy)^{i-k-1}x$. Now we have to prove that such (x, y) does not depend on the choice of (α, β) . Suppose there were an ι -symmetric factorization (α', β') of u for which $x'y' \in Q$, $u = (x'y')^i$, $\theta(u) = (y'x')^i$, $\alpha' = (x'y')^{i-j-1}x'$, and $\beta' = y'(x'y')^j$ for some $0 \leq j < i$ and $x', y' \in \Sigma^*$ such that $(x, y) \neq (x', y')$. Then we have $xy = x'y'$ and $yx = y'x'$, which contradicts the primitivity of xy . \square

The preceding result shows that, if u is ι -symmetric, then its left factor and right factor can be written in terms of a unique pair (x, y) . We call (x, y) the *twin-roots of u with respect to ι* , or shortly *ι -twin-roots of u* . We denote the ι -twin-roots of u by $\sqrt[\iota]{u}$. Note that $x \neq y$ and we can assume that x cannot be empty whereas y can. Proposition 4 has the following two consequences.

Corollary 5 *Let ι be an involution on Σ^* and u be an ι -symmetric word. Then the number of ι -symmetric factorizations of u is n for some $n \geq 1$ if and only if $u = (\sqrt{u})^n$.*

Corollary 6 *Let ι be an involution on Σ^* and u be an ι -symmetric word such that $\sqrt[\iota]{u} = (x, y)$. Then the primitive root of u is xy .*

Corollary 6 is the first result that relates the notion of the primitive root of an ι -symmetric word to ι -twin-roots. For the particular case of a d -morphic involution δ , the primitive root and the δ -twin-roots are related more strongly. Firstly, we make a connection between the two elements of δ -twin-roots.

Lemma 7 *Let δ be a d -morphic involution on Σ^* , and u be a δ -symmetric word with δ -twin-roots (x, y) . Then $xy = \delta(yx)$.*

PROOF. Let $u = (xy)^i = \alpha\beta = \delta(\beta\alpha)$ for some $i \geq 1$ and $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma^*$. Due to Proposition 4, $\alpha = (xy)^k x$ and $\beta = y(xy)^{i-k-1}$ for some $0 \leq k < i$. Substituting these into $(xy)^i = \delta(\beta\alpha)$ results in $(xy)^i = \delta((yx)^i)$. Since δ is either morphic or antimorphic, we have $xy = \delta(yx)$. \square

Proposition 8 *Let δ be a d -morphic involution on Σ^* , and u, v be δ -symmetric words. Then $\sqrt{u} = \sqrt{v}$ if and only if $\sqrt[\delta]{u} = \sqrt[\delta]{v}$.*

PROOF. (If) For $\sqrt[\delta]{u} = \sqrt[\delta]{v} = (x, y)$, Corollary 6 implies $\sqrt{u} = \sqrt{v} = xy$. (Only if) Let $\sqrt[\delta]{u} = (x, y)$ and $\sqrt[\delta]{v} = (x', y')$. Corollary 6 implies $\sqrt{u} = xy$ and $\sqrt{v} = x'y'$. Let $p = \sqrt{u} = \sqrt{v}$ and we have $p = xy = x'y'$. From Lemma 7, both (x, y) and (x', y') are δ -symmetric factorizations of p . If $(x, y) \neq (x', y')$, due to Corollary 5, $p = (\sqrt{p})^n$ for some $n \geq 2$, a contradiction. \square

Proposition 9 *Let δ be a d -morphic involution on Σ^* , and u be a δ -symmetric word such that $\sqrt[\delta]{u} = (x, y)$.*

- (1) *If δ is antimorphic, then both x and y are δ -palindromes,*
- (2) *If δ is morphic, then either (i) x is a δ -palindrome and $y = \lambda$, or (ii) x is not a δ -palindrome and $y = \delta(x)$.*

PROOF. Due to Lemma 7, we have $xy = \delta(yx)$. If δ is antimorphic, then this means that $xy = \delta(x)\delta(y)$, and hence $x = \delta(x)$ and $y = \delta(y)$. If δ is morphic, then $xy = \delta(y)\delta(x)$. If $y = \lambda$, then we have $x = \delta(x)$. Otherwise, we have three cases depending on the lengths of x and y . If they have the same length, then $y = \delta(x)$. The primitivity of xy forces x not to be a δ -palindrome. If $|x| < |y|$, then $y = y_1 y_2$ for some $y_1, y_2 \in \Sigma^+$ such that $\delta(y) = xy_1$ and $y_2 = \delta(x)$. Then $xy = x\delta(x)\delta(y_1) = \delta(y_1)x\delta(x)$, which is a contradiction with $xy \in Q$. The case when $|y| < |x|$ can be proved by symmetry. \square

Next we consider the δ -twin-roots of a δ -palindrome; indeed δ -palindromes are δ -symmetric (Proposition 2), and hence have δ -twin-roots. The δ -twin-roots of δ -palindromes have the following property.

Lemma 10 *Let δ be a d -morphic involution and u be a δ -symmetric word such that $\sqrt[\delta]{u} = (x, y)$ for some $x \in \Sigma^+$ and $y \in \Sigma^*$. Then u is a δ -palindrome if and only if x is a δ -palindrome and $y = \lambda$.*

PROOF. **(If)** Since $y = \lambda$, $u = x^i$ for some $i \geq 1$. Then $\delta(u) = \delta(x^i) = \delta(x)^i = x^i$, and hence $u \in P_\delta$. **(Only if)** First we consider the case when δ is antimorphic. From Proposition 9, $x, y \in P_\delta$. Suppose $y \neq \lambda$. Since $u \in P_\delta$, Lemma 1 implies $\sqrt{u} \in P_\delta$, and hence $xy = \delta(xy) = \delta(y)\delta(x) = yx$. This means that nonempty words x and y commute, a contradiction with $xy \in Q$. Next we consider the case of δ being morphic. Since u is a δ -palindrome, any letter a from u has the palindrome property, i.e., $\delta(a) = a$. Then all prefixes of u satisfy the palindrome property so that $x = \delta(x)$. Proposition 9 implies either $y = \lambda$ or $y = \delta(x)$, but the latter, with $\sqrt{u} = xy$, leads to $\sqrt{u} = x^2$, a contradiction. \square

Note that the notion of ι -symmetry and ι -twin-roots of a word are dependent on the involution ι under consideration. Thus, for example, a word u may be ι_1 -symmetric and not ι_2 -symmetric, and its twin-roots might be different depending on the involution considered. The following two examples show that there exist words u and morphic involutions μ_1 and μ_2 such that the μ_1 -twin-roots of u are different from μ_2 -twin-roots of u , and the same situation can be found for the antimorphic case.

Example 11 *Let $u = \text{ATTAATTA}$, μ_1 be the identity on Σ extended to a morphism, and μ_2 be the morphic involution such that $\mu_2(\text{A}) = \text{T}$ and $\mu_2(\text{T}) = \text{A}$. Then u is both μ_1 -symmetric and μ_2 -symmetric. Indeed, $u = \text{ATTA} \cdot \text{ATTA} = \mu_1(\text{ATTA})\mu_1(\text{ATTA})$, and $u = \text{AT} \cdot \text{TAATTA} = \mu_2(\text{TAATTA})\mu_2(\text{AT})$. The μ_1 -symmetric property of u implies that ${}^{\mu_1}\sqrt{u} = (\text{ATTA}, \lambda)$, and the μ_2 -symmetric property of u implies ${}^{\mu_2}\sqrt{u} = (\text{AT}, \text{TA})$. We can easily check that $\sqrt{u} = \text{ATTA} \cdot \lambda = \text{AT} \cdot \text{TA}$.*

Example 12 *Let $u = \text{TAAATTTAAATT}$, mi be the identity on Σ extended to an antimorphism, namely the well-known mirror-image mapping, and θ be the antimorphic involution such that $\theta(\text{A}) = \text{T}$ and $\theta(\text{T}) = \text{A}$. We can split u into two palindromes TAAAT and TTAAATT so that u is mi -symmetric. By the same token, u is a product of two θ -palindromes TAAATTTA and AATT , and hence θ -symmetric. We have that ${}^{mi}\sqrt{u} = (\text{TAAAT}, \text{T})$ and ${}^\theta\sqrt{u} = (\text{TA}, \text{AATT})$. Note that $\sqrt{u} = \text{TAAAT} \cdot \text{T} = \text{TA} \cdot \text{AATT}$ holds.*

The last example shows that it is possible to find a word u , and morphic and antimorphic involutions μ and θ , such that the μ -twin-roots of u and the

θ -twin-roots of u are distinct.

Example 13 Let $u = \text{AACGTTGC}$. μ and θ be morphic and antimorphic involutions, respectively, which map **A** to **T**, **C** to **G**, and vice versa. Then $u = \mu(\text{TTGC})\mu(\text{AACG}) = \theta(\text{AACGTT})\theta(\text{GC})$ so that u is both μ -symmetric and θ -symmetric. We have that $\sqrt[\mu]{u} = (\text{AACG}, \text{TTGC})$ and $\sqrt[\theta]{u} = (\text{AACGTT}, \text{GC})$. Moreover $\sqrt{u} = \text{AACG} \cdot \text{TTGC} = \text{AACGTT} \cdot \text{GC}$.

4 The set of symmetric words in the Chomsky hierarchy

In this section we consider the classification of the language S_μ of the μ -symmetric words with respect to a morphic involution μ , and S_θ of the θ -symmetric words with respect to an antimorphic involution θ , in the Chomsky hierarchy, [4,11]. For a morphic involution μ , we show that P_μ , the set of all μ -palindromes, is regular (Proposition 14). Unless empty, the set $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ of all μ -symmetric but non μ -palindromic words, is not context-free (Proposition 16) but is context-sensitive (Proposition 19). As a corollary of these results we show that, unless empty, the set S_μ of all μ -symmetric words is context-sensitive (Corollary 20), but not context-free (Corollary 17). In contrast, for an antimorphic involution θ , the set of all θ -symmetric words turns out to be context-free (Proposition 21).

Proposition 14 Let μ be a morphic involution on Σ^* . Then P_μ is regular.

PROOF. For $\Sigma_p = \{a \in \Sigma \mid a = \mu(a)\}$, $P_\mu = \Sigma_p^*$, which is regular. \square

Next we consider $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$. If $c = \mu(c)$ holds for all letters $c \in \Sigma$, then $\Sigma^* = P_\mu$, that is, $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ is empty. Therefore, we assume the existence of a character $c \in \Sigma$ satisfying $c \neq \mu(c)$. Under this assumption, we show that $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ is not context-free but context-sensitive.

Lemma 15 Let μ be a morphic involution on Σ^* . If there is $c \in \Sigma$ such that $c \neq \mu(c)$, then $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ is infinite.

PROOF. This is clear from the fact that $(c\mu(c))^k \in S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ for all $k \geq 1$. \square

Proposition 16 Let μ be a morphic involution on Σ^* . If Σ contains a character $c \in \Sigma$ satisfying $c \neq \mu(c)$, then $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ is not context-free.

PROOF. Lemma 15 implies that $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ is not finite. Suppose $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ were context-free. Then there is an integer n given to us by the pumping lemma. Let us choose $z = a^n \mu(a)^n a^n \mu(a)^n$ for some $a \in \Sigma$ satisfying $a \neq \mu(a)$. We may write $z = uvwxy$ subject to the usual constraints (1) $|vwx| \leq n$, (2) $vx \neq \lambda$, and (3) for all $i \geq 0$, $z_i = uv^i wx^i y \in S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$.

Note that for any $w \in S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ and any $a \in \Sigma$ satisfying $a \neq \mu(a)$, the number of occurrences of a in w should be equal to that of $\mu(a)$ in w . Therefore, if vx contained different numbers of a 's and $\mu(a)$'s, $z_0 = uwy$ would not be a member of $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$. Suppose vwx straddles the first block of a 's and the first block of $\mu(a)$'s of z , and vx consists of k a 's and k $\mu(a)$'s for some $k > 0$. Note that $2k < n$ because $|vx| \leq |vwx| \leq n$. Then $z_0 = a^{n-k} \mu(a)^{n-k} a^n \mu(a)^n$, and $z_0 \in S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ means that there exist $\gamma \notin P_\mu$ and an integer $m \geq 1$ such that $z_0 = (\gamma \mu(\gamma))^m$. Thus, $\mu(\gamma) \in \Sigma^* \mu(a)$, i.e., $\gamma \in \Sigma^* a$. This implies that the last block of $\mu(a)$ of z_0 is a suffix of the last $\mu(\gamma)$ of z_0 , and hence $|\gamma| = |\mu(\gamma)| \geq n$. As a result, $a^{n-k} \mu(a)^k \in \text{Pref}(\gamma)$, i.e., $\mu(a)^{n-k} a^k \in \text{Pref}(\mu(\gamma))$. Since $a \neq \mu(a)$, we have $\mu(\gamma) = \mu(a)^{n-k} a^k \beta \mu(a)^n$ for some $\beta \in \Sigma^*$. This implies $|\mu(\gamma)| \geq 2n$. On the other hand, $|z_0| = 4n - 2k$, and hence $|\mu(\gamma)| \leq 2n - k$. Now we reached the contradiction. Even if we suppose that vwx straddles the second block of a 's and the second block of $\mu(a)$'s of z , we would reach the same contradiction. Finally, suppose that vwx were a substring of the first block of $\mu(a)$'s and the second block of a 's of z . Then $z_0 = a^n \mu(a)^{n-k} a^{n-k} \mu(a)^n = (\gamma \mu(\gamma))^m$ for some $m \geq 1$. As proved above, $\mu(a)^n \in \text{Suff}(\mu(\gamma))$, and this is equivalent to $a^n \in \text{Suff}(\gamma)$. Since z_0 contains the n consecutive a 's only as the prefix a^n , we have $\gamma = a^n$, i.e., $\mu(\gamma) = \mu(a)^n$. However, the prefix a^n is followed by at most $n - k$ occurrences of $\mu(a)$ and $k \geq 1$. This is a contradiction. Consequently, $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ is not context-free. \square

The proof of Proposition 16 suggests that for an alphabet Σ containing a character c satisfying $c \neq \mu(c)$, S_μ is not context-free either.

Corollary 17 *Let μ be a morphic involution on Σ^* . If Σ contains a character $c \in \Sigma$ satisfying $c \neq \mu(c)$, then S_μ is not context-free.*

Next we prove that $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ is context-sensitive. We will construct a type-0 grammar and prove that the grammar is indeed a context-sensitive grammar. For this purpose, the workspace theorem is employed, which requires a few terminologies: Let $G = (N, T, S, P)$ be a grammar and consider a derivation D according to G like $D : S = w_0 \Rightarrow w_1 \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow w_n = w$. The workspace of w by D is defined as $WS_G(w, D) = \max\{|w_i| \mid 0 \leq i \leq n\}$. The workspace of w is defined as $WS_G(w) = \min\{WS_G(w, D) \mid D \text{ is a derivation of } w\}$.

Theorem 18 (Workspace theorem [11]) *Let G be a type-0 grammar. If there is a nonnegative integer k such that $WS_G(w) \leq k|w|$ for all nonempty*

words $w \in L(G)$, then $L(G)$ is context-sensitive.

Proposition 19 *Let μ be a morphic involution on Σ^* . If Σ contains a character $c \in \Sigma$ satisfying $c \neq \mu(c)$, then $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ is context-sensitive.*

PROOF. We provide a type-0 grammar which generates a language equivalent to $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$. Let $G = (N, \Sigma, P, S)$, where $N = \{S, \hat{Z}, \overleftarrow{Z}, \hat{X}_i, \hat{X}_m, Y, \overleftarrow{L}, \#\} \cup \bigcup_{a \in \Sigma} \{\overrightarrow{X}_a, \overrightarrow{C}_a\}$, the set of non-terminal symbols, and P is the set of production rules given below. First off, this grammar creates $\alpha\mu(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$ that contains a character $c \in \Sigma$ satisfying $c \neq \mu(c)$. The 1-7th rules of the following list of P achieve this task. Secondly, 5th and 10-18th rules copy $\alpha\mu(\alpha)$ at arbitrary times so that the resulting word is $(\alpha\mu(\alpha))^i$ for some $i \geq 0$.

1. $S \rightarrow \#\hat{Z}a\hat{X}_i\overrightarrow{X}_aY\# \quad \forall a \in \Sigma,$
2. $S \rightarrow \#\hat{Z}b\hat{X}_m\overrightarrow{X}_bY\# \quad \forall b \in \Sigma \text{ such that } b \neq \mu(b),$
3. $\overrightarrow{X}_ac \rightarrow c\overrightarrow{X}_a \quad \forall a, c \in \Sigma,$
4. $\overrightarrow{X}_aY \rightarrow \overleftarrow{L}\mu(a)Y \quad \forall a \in \Sigma,$
5. $c\overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{L}c \quad \forall c \in \Sigma,$
6. $\hat{X}_i\overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow a\hat{X}_i\overrightarrow{X}_a \quad \forall a \in \Sigma,$
7. $\hat{X}_i\overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow b\hat{X}_m\overrightarrow{X}_b \quad \forall b \in \Sigma \text{ such that } b \neq \mu(b),$
8. $\hat{X}_m\overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow a\hat{X}_m\overrightarrow{X}_a \quad \forall a \in \Sigma,$
9. $\hat{X}_m\overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{L}$
10. $\hat{Z}a\overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow a\hat{Z}\overrightarrow{C}_a \quad \forall a \in \Sigma,$
11. $\overrightarrow{C}_ac \rightarrow c\overrightarrow{C}_a \quad \forall a, c \in \Sigma,$
12. $\overrightarrow{C}_aY \rightarrow Y\overrightarrow{C}_a \quad \forall a \in \Sigma,$
13. $\overrightarrow{C}_a\# \rightarrow \overleftarrow{L}a\# \quad \forall a \in \Sigma,$
14. $Y\overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{L}Y,$
15. $\hat{Z}Y\overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{Z}\overleftarrow{L}Y$
16. $\hat{Z}Y\overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow \lambda$
17. $c\overleftarrow{Z} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{Z}c \quad \forall c \in \Sigma,$
18. $\#\overleftarrow{Z} \rightarrow \#\hat{Z},$
19. $\# \rightarrow \lambda.$

This grammar works in the following manner. After the 1st or 6th rule generates a terminal symbol $a \in \Sigma$, the 3rd and 4th rules deliver information of the symbol to Y and generate $\mu(a)$ just before Y , and by the 5th rule, the header \overleftarrow{L} go back to \hat{X}_i . This process is repeated until a character $b \in \Sigma$ satisfying $b \neq \mu(b)$ is generated, which is followed by changing \hat{X}_i to \hat{X}_m and generating $\mu(b)$ just before Y . Now the grammar may continue the a - $\theta(a)$ generating process or shift to a copy phase (9th rule $\hat{X}_m \overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{L}$). From now on, whenever the a - $\mu(a)$ process ends, the grammar can do this choice. Just after using the 9th rule $\hat{X}_m \overleftarrow{L} \rightarrow \overleftarrow{L}$, the sentential form of this derivation is $\hat{Z}\alpha\overleftarrow{L}\mu(\alpha)Y$ for some $\alpha \in \Sigma^+$ which contains at least one character $b \in \Sigma$ satisfying $b \neq \mu(b)$. The 5th and 10-18th rules copy $\alpha\mu(\alpha)$ at the end of sentential form. Just after coping $\alpha\mu(\alpha)$, the sentential form $\alpha\mu(\alpha)\hat{Z}Y\overleftarrow{L}(\alpha\mu(\alpha))^m$ appears so that if the 15th rule is applied, then another $\alpha\mu(\alpha)$ is copied; otherwise the derivation terminates. Therefore, a word w derived by this grammar G can be represented as $(\alpha\mu(\alpha))^n$ for some $n \geq 1$, and hence $w \in S_\mu$. In addition, G generates only non- θ -palindromic word so that $w \in S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$. Thus, $L(G) \subseteq S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$. Conversely, if $w \in S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$, then it has the μ -twin-roots $\sqrt[n]{w} = (x, y)$ and $w = (xy)^n$ for some $n \geq 1$. Since $y = \mu(x)$, w can be generated by G . Therefore, $S_\mu \setminus P_\mu \subseteq L(G)$. Consequently, $L(G) = S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$. Furthermore, this grammar satisfies the workspace theorem (Theorem 18). Any sentential form to derive a word cannot be longer than $|w| + c$ for some constant $c \geq 0$. Therefore, $L(G)$ is context-sensitive. \square

Corollary 20 *Let μ be a morphic involution on Σ^* . If Σ contains a character $c \in \Sigma$ satisfying $c \neq \mu(c)$, then S_μ is context-sensitive.*

Finally we show that the set of all θ -symmetric words for an antimorphic involution θ is context-free.

Proposition 21 *For an antimorphic involution θ , S_θ is context-free.*

PROOF. It is known that P_θ is context-free and the family of context-free languages is closed under catenation. Since $S_\theta = P_\theta \cdot P_\theta$, S_θ is context-free. \square

5 On the pseudo-commutativity of languages

We conclude this paper with an application of the results obtained in Section 3 to the μ -commutativity of languages for a morphic involution μ . For two languages $X, Y \subseteq \Sigma^*$, X is said to μ -commute with Y if $XY = \mu(Y)X$ holds.

Example 22 *Let $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$ and μ be a morphic involution such that $\mu(a) = b$ and $\mu(b) = a$. For $X = \{ab(baab)^i \mid i \geq 0\}$ and $Y = \{(baab)^j \mid j \geq 1\}$,*

$XY = \mu(Y)X$ holds.

In this section we investigate languages X which μ -commute with a set Y of μ -symmetric words. When analyzing such pseudo-commutativity equations, the first step is to investigate equations wherein the set of the shortest words in X μ -commutes with the set of the shortest words of Y . (In [5], the author used this strategy to find a solution to the classical commutativity of formal power series, result known as Cohn's theorem.) For $n \geq 0$, by X_n we denote the set of all words in X of length n , i.e., $X_n = \{w \in X \mid |w| = n\}$. Let m and n be the lengths of the shortest words in X and Y , respectively. Then $XY = \mu(Y)X$ implies $X_m Y_n = \mu(Y_n)X_m$. The main contribution of this section is to use results from Section 3 to prove that X cannot contain any word shorter than the shortest left factor of all μ -twin-roots of words in Y_n (Proposition 28). Its proof requires several results, e.g., Lemmata 25, 26, and 27.

Lemma 23 ([13]) *Let $u, v \in \Sigma^+$ and $X \subseteq \Sigma^*$. If X is not empty and $Xu = vX$ holds, then $|X_n| \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.*

Lemma 24 *Let $u, v \in \Sigma^+$ and $X \subseteq \Sigma^*$. If X is not empty and $uX = \mu(X)v$ holds, then $|X_n| \leq 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$.*

Let $X \subseteq \Sigma^*$, $Y \subseteq S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ such that $XY = \mu(Y)X$, and n be the length of the shortest words in Y . For $n \geq 1$, let $Y_{n,\ell} = \{y \in Y_n \mid \surd y = (x, \mu(x)), |x| = \ell\}$. Informally speaking, $Y_{n,\ell}$ is a set of words in Y of length n having the μ -twin-roots whose left factor is of length ℓ .

Lemma 25 *Let $Y \subseteq S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$, $y_1, y_2 \in Y_{n,\ell}$ for some $n, \ell \geq 1$, and $u, w \in \Sigma^*$. If $uy_1 = \mu(y_2)w$ and $|u|, |w| \leq \ell$, then $u = w$.*

PROOF. Since $|y_1| = |y_2| = n$, we have $|u| = |w|$. Let $y_1 = (x_1 \mu(x_1))^{n/2\ell}$ and $y_2 = (x_2 \mu(x_2))^{n/2\ell}$, where $\surd y_1 = (x_1, \mu(x_1))$ and $\surd y_2 = (x_2, \mu(x_2))$ for some $x_1, x_2 \in \Sigma^+$. Now we have $u(x_1 \mu(x_1))^{n/2\ell} = \mu(x_2 \mu(x_2))^{n/2\ell} w$. This equation, with $|u| \leq \ell$, implies that $ux_1 \mu(x_1) = \mu(x_2 \mu(x_2))w$. Then we have $\mu(x_2) = u\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$, and $ux_1 \mu(x_1) = u\alpha \mu(u) \mu(\alpha)w$. This means $x_1 = \alpha \mu(u)$ and $\mu(x_1) = \mu(\alpha)w$, which conclude $u = w$. \square

Lemma 26 *Let $X \subseteq \Sigma^*$, and $Y \subseteq S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ such that $XY = \mu(Y)X$. For integers $m, n \geq 1$ such that $X_m Y_n = \mu(Y_n)X_m$ and $m \leq \min\{\ell \mid Y_{n,\ell} \neq \emptyset\}$, we have $X_m Y_{n,\ell} = \mu(Y_{n,\ell})X_m$ for all $\ell \geq 1$.*

PROOF. Let $y_1 \in Y_n$ such that $y_1 = (x_1 \mu(x_1))^i$ for some $i \geq 1$, where $\surd y_1 = (x_1, \mu(x_1))$. Since $X_m Y_n = \mu(Y_n)X_m$ holds, there exist $u, v \in X_m$ and $y_2 \in Y_n$ satisfying $uy_1 = \mu(y_2)v$. When $y_2 = (x_2 \mu(x_2))^j$ for some $j \geq 1$, where $\surd y_2 = (x_2, \mu(x_2))$, we will show that $i = j$.

$\mu(x_2\mu(x_2))^k$ implies that for all k , $\alpha \in \text{Suff}(\alpha_k)$. Recall that for all k , $\alpha_k \in \text{Pref}(x_1\mu(x_1))$. Then, with the 1-to-1 correspondence, we can say that α appears on $x_1\mu(x_1)$ at even intervals. Let $x_1\mu(x_1) = \alpha\beta_1\alpha\beta_2\cdots\alpha\beta_j$ (see Figure 1), where $|\beta_1| = \cdots = |\beta_j| = |\beta|$. By substituting $\mu(x_2\mu(x_2))^k = u(x_1\mu(x_1))^{i_k}\alpha_k$ into $\mu(x_2\mu(x_2))^{k+1} = u(x_1\mu(x_1))^{i_{k+1}}\alpha_{k+1}$, we have $(x_1\mu(x_1))^{i_{k+1}-i_k}\alpha_{k+1} = \alpha_k\mu(x_2\mu(x_2)) = \alpha_k\beta w\alpha$ for any $1 \leq k \leq j-1$. Note that $i_{k+1} \geq i_k$; otherwise, we would have $(x_1\mu(x_1))^{i_k-i_{k+1}}\alpha_k\mu(x_2\mu(x_2)) = \alpha_{k+1}$, which is a contradiction with the fact that $|x_1\mu(x_1)| \geq |\alpha_{k+1}|$. Since $|\alpha_k\beta| \leq |x_1\mu(x_1)|$, $\alpha_k\beta \in \text{Pref}(x_1\mu(x_1))$. Even if $i_{k+1} - i_k = 0$, $\alpha_k\beta \in \text{Pref}(\alpha_{k+1}) \subseteq \text{Pref}(x_1\mu(x_1))$. Thus, there exists an integer $1 \leq j' \leq j$ such that $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_{j'-1} = \beta_{j'+1} = \cdots = \beta_j = \beta$, that is, $x_1\mu(x_1) = (\alpha\beta)^{j'-1}\alpha\beta_{j'}(\alpha\beta)^{j-j'}$. If $j' < j$, then there exist k_1, k_2 such that $\alpha_{k_1} = (\alpha\beta)^{j'-1}\alpha\beta_{j'}\alpha$ and $\alpha_{k_2} = \alpha(\beta\alpha)^k$ for some $k \geq 1$. Clearly, $|\alpha_{k_1}|, |\alpha_{k_2}| \geq \ell$. By the original definitions of α_{k_1} and α_{k_2} , they must share the suffix of length ℓ . Hence, $\beta_{j'} = \beta$. If $j' = j$, then we claim that for all $1 \leq k < j$ and some $w \in \Sigma^{\leq 2\ell}$, $\alpha_k w \in \text{Pref}(x_1\mu(x_1))$ implies $w \in \text{Pref}(\mu(x_2\mu(x_2)))$. Indeed, as above we have $(x_1\mu(x_1))^{i_{k+1}-i_k}\alpha_{k+1} = \alpha_k\mu(x_2\mu(x_2))$. If $i_{k+1} - i_k \geq 1$, then this means that $\alpha_k w \in \text{Pref}(\alpha_k\mu(x_2\mu(x_2)))$, and hence $w \in \text{Pref}(\mu(x_2\mu(x_2)))$; otherwise, $\alpha_{k+1} = \alpha_k\mu(x_2\mu(x_2))$. Since $\alpha_{k+1} \in \text{Pref}(x_1\mu(x_1))$ and $x_2\mu(x_2) \geq 2\ell$, $\alpha_k w \in \text{Pref}(\alpha_{k+1})$, and hence $w \in \text{Pref}(\mu(x_2\mu(x_2)))$. Let $\alpha_{k_1} = (\alpha\beta)^{j-3}\alpha$ and $\alpha_{k_2} = (\alpha\beta)^{j-2}\alpha$. Then $\alpha_{k_1}\beta\alpha\beta\alpha \in \text{Pref}(x_1\mu(x_1))$ implies $\beta\alpha\beta\alpha \in \text{Pref}(\mu(x_2\mu(x_2)))$. By the same token, $\alpha_{k_2}\beta\alpha\beta_j = x_1\mu(x_1)$ implies $\beta\alpha\beta_j \in \text{Pref}(\mu(x_2\mu(x_2)))$. Thus, $\beta_j = \beta$. Consequently, $x_1\mu(x_1) = (\alpha\beta)^j$. Since $j \geq 3$, this contradicts the primitivity of $x_1\mu(x_1)$. \square

Lemma 27 *Let $X \subseteq \Sigma^*$, and $Y \subseteq S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ such that $XY = \mu(Y)X$. If there exist $m, n \geq 1$ such that $X_m Y_n = \mu(Y_n)X_m$, and $m \leq \min\{\ell \mid Y_{n,\ell} \neq \emptyset\}$, then $|Y_{n,\ell}| \leq 1$ holds for all $\ell \geq 1$.*

PROOF. Lemma 26 implies that $X_m Y_{n,\ell} = \mu(Y_{n,\ell})X_m$ for all $\ell \geq 1$. Let us consider this equation for some ℓ such that $Y_{n,\ell} \neq \emptyset$. Then for $y_1 \in Y_{n,\ell}$, there must exist $u, w \in X_m$ and $y_2 \in Y_{n,\ell}$ satisfying $uy_1 = \mu(y_2)w$. Lemma 25 enables us to say $u = w$ because $m \leq \ell$. Thus, $X_m Y_{n,\ell} = \mu(Y_{n,\ell})X_m$ is equivalent to $\forall u \in X_m, uY_{n,\ell} = \mu(Y_{n,\ell})u$. For the latter equation, Lemma 24 and the assumption $|Y_{n,\ell}| \geq 1$ make it possible to conclude $|Y_{n,\ell}| = 1$. \square

Having proved the required lemmata, now we will prove the main results.

Proposition 28 *Let $X \subseteq \Sigma^*$, and $Y \subseteq S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ such that $XY = \mu(Y)X$. Let n be the length of the shortest words in Y . Then X does not contain any nonempty word which is strictly shorter than the shortest left factor of μ -twin-roots of an element of Y_n .*

PROOF. If there were such an element of X , the shortest words of X are shorter than any left factor of μ -twin-roots of words in Y . Let u be one of the shortest nonempty words in X , and let $|u| = m$ for some $m \geq 1$. Then $XY = \mu(Y)X$ implies $X_m Y_n = \mu(Y_n)X_m$. Moreover, Lemma 26 implies that $X_m Y_n = \mu(Y_n)X_m$ if and only if $X_m Y_{n,\ell} = \mu(Y_{n,\ell})X_m$ for all $\ell \geq 1$. Then, Lemma 27 implies $|Y_{n,\ell}| \leq 1$ for all $\ell \geq 1$. Let us consider the minimum ℓ satisfying $|Y_{n,\ell}| = 1$. Such an ℓ certainly exists because $Y_n \neq \emptyset$. Let $Y_{n,\ell} = \{y\}$, where $y = (x\mu(x))^i$ for some $i \geq 1$ and $\sqrt[i]{y} = (x, \mu(x))$. Then, $uy = \mu(y)u$ means $u(x\mu(x))^i = \mu((x\mu(x))^i)u$. Moreover, the condition $|u| < |x|$ results in $ux\mu(x) = \mu(x)xu$. Letting $\mu(x) = u\alpha$ for some $\alpha \in \Sigma^+$, we have $ux\mu(x) = u\alpha\mu(u)\mu(\alpha)u$, which means $x\mu(x) = \alpha \cdot \mu(u)\mu(\alpha)u = \mu(u)\mu(\alpha)u \cdot \alpha$. Since $\alpha, u \in \Sigma^+$, this is a contradiction with the primitivity of $x\mu(x)$. \square

Corollary 29 *Let $X \subseteq \Sigma^*$, and $Y \in S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ such that $XY = \mu(Y)X$, and m, n be the lengths of the shortest words in X and in Y , respectively. If $m = \min\{\ell \mid Y_{n,\ell} \neq \emptyset\}$, then both X_m and Y_n are singletons.*

PROOF. It is obvious that $X_m Y_n = \mu(Y_n)X_m$ holds. Lemma 26 implies that $X_m Y_{n,\ell} = \mu(Y_{n,\ell})X_m$ for all $\ell \geq 1$. Moreover Lemma 27 implies that for all ℓ , $|Y_{n,\ell}| \leq 1$. If there exists $\ell' > m$ such that $|Y_{n,\ell'}| = 1$, then $X_m Y_{n,\ell'} = \mu(Y_{n,\ell'})X_m$ must hold. This contradicts Proposition 28, where X_m and $Y_{n,\ell'}$ correspond to X and Y in the proposition, respectively. Now we know that Y_n is singleton. Then Lemma 23 means that X_m is singleton. \square

Proposition 30 *Let $X \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and $Y \subseteq S_\mu \setminus P_\mu$ such that $XY = \mu(Y)X$. Let m and n be the lengths of the shortest words in X and Y , respectively. If $m = \min\{\ell \mid Y_{n,\ell} \neq \emptyset\}$, then a language which commutes with Y cannot contain any nonempty word which is strictly shorter than any primitive root of a word in Y_n .*

PROOF. Corollary 29 implies that Y_n is a singleton. Let $Y_n = \{w\}$, and let $w = (x\mu(x))^i$ for some $i \geq 1$, where $\sqrt[i]{w} = (x, \mu(x))$. Then from Corollary 6, we have $\sqrt{w} = x\mu(x)$. Let Z be a language which commutes with Y . Suppose the shortest word in Z , say v , is strictly shorter than \sqrt{w} . Let $|v| = \ell'$. Then $Z_{\ell'} Y_n = Y_n Z_{\ell'}$, i.e., $Z_{\ell'} w = w Z_{\ell'}$. Lemma 23 results in $|Z_{\ell'}| = 1$. Let $Z_{\ell'} = \{v\}$. Now we have $vw = wv$. This implies that $\sqrt{v} = \sqrt{w}$, which contradicts the fact that $|v| < |\sqrt{w}|$ and $v \neq \lambda$. \square

6 Conclusion

This paper generalizes the notion of f -symmetric words to an arbitrary mapping f . For an involution ι , we propose the notion of the ι -twin-roots of an ι -symmetric word, show their uniqueness, and the fact that the catenation of the ι -twin-roots of a word equals its primitive root. Moreover, for a morphic or antimorphic involution δ , we prove several additional properties of twin-roots. We use these results to make steps towards solving pseudo-commutativity equations on languages.

References

- [1] L. Adleman, *Molecular computation of solutions to combinatorial problems*, Science, **266**, pp.1021-24, 1994.
- [2] E. Czeizler, L. Kari, and S. Seki, *On a special class of primitive words*, To appear in Proceedings of *MFCS 2008*.
- [3] E. Czeizler, E. Czeizler, L. Kari, and S. Seki, *A generalization of the Lyndon Schützenberger result*, Preprint.
- [4] N. Chomsky and M. P. Schützenberger, *The Algebraic Theory of Context Free Languages, Computer Programming and Formal Languages*, North Holland, Amsterdam, pp.118-161, 1963.
- [5] P. M. Cohn, *Factorization in noncommuting power series rings*, Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 58, pp.452-464, 1962.
- [6] N. J. Fine and H. S. Wilf, *Uniqueness theorem for periodic functions*, Proceedings of American Mathematical Society 16, pp.109-114, 1965.
- [7] C. C. Huang and S. S. Yu, *Solutions to the language equation $LB = AL$* , Soochow Journal of Mathematics 29(2), pp.201-213, 2003.
- [8] L. Kari and K. Mahalingam, *Watson-Crick conjugate and commutative words*, in: M. Garzon and H. Yan (Eds.), *DNA 13, LNCS*, 4848, pp.273-283, 2008.
- [9] M. Lothaire, *Combinatorics on words*, Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- [10] A. D. Luca and A. D. Luca, *Pseudopalindrome closure operators in free monoids*, Theoretical Computer Science 362, pp.282-300, 2006.
- [11] G. Rozenberg and A. Salomaa (Eds.), *Handbook of Formal Languages*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1997.
- [12] R. Lyndon and M. Schützenberger, *The equation $a^M = b^N c^P$ in a free group*, Michigan Math.J., 9, pp.289-298, 1962.
- [13] S. S. Yu, *Languages and codes*, Lecture Notes, Department of Computer Science, National Chung-Hsing University, Taichung, Taiwan, 402, 2005