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#### Abstract

If the length of a word $w$ in a free semigroup $F(X)$ satisfies $l(w) \geq p n^{k}$, then for every partition of $F(X)$ into $k$ classes, $w$ has $n$ consecutive factors of length $\geq p$ in the same class. As a consequence, the diagonal Ramsey numbers $R(p n+1, p+1, k)$ have $1+p n^{k}$ as lower bound.


1. The free semigroup $F(X)$ on the alphabet $X$ is the set of all non-empty words in the letters of $X$ with the usual concatenation operation. The length of a word $w \in F(X)$, denoted by $l(w)$, is the total number of occurrences of letters of $X$ in $w$. A factor (resp. left, right factor) of a word $w$ is a word $w^{\prime}$ such that $w=u w^{\prime} v$ (resp. $w=w^{\prime} v, w=u w^{\prime}$ ) for some $u, v \in F(X)$. Congruences on $F(X)$ of finite index are of interest in language theory, especially in the study of recognizable subsets of $F(X)$ (also called regular events, see e.g. [5] Theorem 2.1.5). Herein, we are concerned with partitions of $F(X)$ into a finite number of classes and we prove the following results.

Theorem. Let $A_{1}, A_{2}, \ldots, A_{k}$ be a partition of the free semigroup $F(X)$ into $k$ classes.
(a) For every integer $n$, there exists a smallest integer $r_{k}(n, p)$ such that every word $w \in F(X)$ of length $l(w) \geq r_{k}(n, p)$ has $n$ consecutive factors of length $\geq p$ in a single class $A_{i}$ of the partition.
(b) $r_{k}(n, p)=p n^{k}$.

For $p=1$, this theorem is established in [11], and in sections 2 and 3 we present an adaptation of the proof in [11] to the case of an arbitrary $p$. The connection with a theorem of Van der Waerden are explained in [9].
Part (a) of the Theorem is a direct consequence of a theorem of Ramsey: Given a set $E$ and a partition $\theta$ of the set $P_{r}(E)$ of all $r$-subsets of $E$ into $k$ classes, then for every integer $q$ there is a smallest integer $R(q, r, k)$ such that card $E \geq$ $R(q, r, k)$ implies that there is a $q$-subset $F$ of $E$ such that $P_{r}(F)$ is contained in a single class $\bmod \theta$. In the notation of [10], p. 39, we have

$$
R(q, r, k)=N\left(q_{1}, q_{2}, \ldots, q_{k}, r\right) \text { with } q_{1}=q_{2}=\cdots=q_{k}=q
$$

and the numbers $R(q, r, k)$ appear as the "diagonal" Ramsey numbers. The theorem above has the following

Corollary. $1+p n^{k} \leq R(p n+1, p+1, k)$.

Remarks. For the case $p=1$, the inequality $1+n^{k} \leq R(n+1,2, k)$ appears in [4] (Proposition 3.5.3 and Remarque 4.2a) as a consequence of a Ramsey type theorem on partitions of $P_{2}(E)$ respecting a linear ordering of $E$. It has been improved to

$$
\frac{(2 n-1)^{k}+3}{2} \leq R(n+1,2, k)
$$

(see [6], [8]). For $R(n+1,2,2)$ the lower bound $1+n^{2}$ is better than $(\sqrt{ } 2)^{n+1},[3]$, up to $n=15$, while other methods (see e.g. [1], [7]) produce better lower bounds in particular cases. For example

$$
R(p n+1, p+1, k) \geq((p n+1)!)^{\frac{1}{p n+1}} \frac{\left.\begin{array}{c}
p n+1 \\
p+1
\end{array}\right)-1}{k^{p n+1}}
$$

proved in [1] (Corollary 2B), gives a better lower bound only in case $k$ is small with respect to $n$ and $p$.
2. Proof of part (a) and the Corollary. Let $w=x_{1} x_{2} \ldots x_{t} \in F(X)$. To any sequence of $p+1$ integers $i_{0}, i_{1}, \ldots, i_{p}$ such that $0 \leq i_{0}<i_{1}<\cdots i_{p} \leq t$ we associate the word

$$
b\left(i_{0}, i_{1}, \ldots, i_{p}\right)=\left|x_{i_{0}+1} \cdots x_{i_{1}}\right| x_{i_{1}+1} \cdots x_{i_{2}}|\cdots| x_{i_{p-1}+1}, \ldots, x_{i_{p}} \mid
$$

in $F(X \cup\{\mid\})$ and we call $b\left(i_{0}, i_{1}, \ldots, i_{p}\right)$ a $p$-block of $w$. Letting $E=\{0,1,2, \ldots$, $l(w)\}$, there is a $1-1$ correspondence between the set of all $(p+1)$-subsets of $E$ and the set of all $p$-blocks of $w$. The partition $\theta=\left\{A_{1}, A_{2}, \ldots, A_{k}\right\}$ of $F(X)$ induces a partition $\pi$ of the set of all $p$-blocks of $w$ defined as follows

$$
b\left(i_{0}, i_{1}, \ldots, i_{p}\right) \pi b\left(j_{0}, j_{1}, \ldots, j_{p}\right) \Leftrightarrow\left(x_{i_{0}+1} \cdots x_{i_{p}}\right) \theta\left(x_{j_{0}+1} \cdots x_{i_{p}}\right)
$$

In turn, $\pi$ defines a partition (also denoted $\pi$ ) of the set of all $(p+1)$-subsets of $E$ which has at most $k$ classes. By Ramsey's theorem if card $E=1+l(w) \geq$ $R(p n+1, p+1, k)$ there is a (pn+1)-subset $F$ of $E$ having all its $(p+1)$-subsets in a single class of $\pi$. Let $F=\left\{l_{0}, l_{1}, \ldots, l_{p n}\right\}$ with $l_{1}<l_{i+1}$. The $p$-blocks of $w$

$$
b\left(l_{k p}, l_{k p+1}, \ldots, l_{\left.(k+1)_{p}\right)} \quad 0 \leq k \leq(n-1)\right.
$$

are all in the same class of $\pi$. It follows that the $n$ consecutive factors of $w$ of the type

$$
x_{l_{k p}} \cdots x_{l_{k p+1}} \cdots x_{l_{(k+1) p}} \quad 0 \leq k \leq(n-1)
$$

are all of length $\geq p$ and contained in the same class of $\theta$. This proves part (a) of the theorem and also $r_{k}(n, p) \leq R(p n+1, p+1, k)-1$.
3. Proof of part (b). To every word $w \in F(X)$ we associate a $k$-tuple of integers $\left(a_{i}(w)\right), i=1,2, \ldots, k$ where $a_{i}(w)$ is the largest integer $m$ such that a right factor of $w$ consists of $m$ consecutive factors of length $\geq p$ in $A_{i}$. Let $\mu: F(X) \rightarrow N^{k}$ be the mapping $\mu(w)=\left(a_{i}(w)\right)$.

Suppose that $w=u v$ with $l(v) \geq p$ and that $\mu(w)=\mu(u)$. Then for every $i=$ $1,2, \ldots, k$ we have $w=u_{i}^{\prime} u_{i}^{\prime \prime} v$ where $u^{\prime \prime}$ is a product of $a(u)=a(w)$ words of length $\geq p$ all contained in $A_{i}$. In particular if $v \in A_{i_{0}}$, then $w=u_{i_{0}}^{\prime} u_{i_{0}}^{\prime \prime} v$ and $w$ has a right factor $u_{i_{0}}^{\prime \prime} v$ having $a_{i_{0}}(w)+1$ consecutive factors of length $\geq p$ all contained in $A_{i_{0}}$. This contradicts the definition of $a_{i_{0}}(w)$. Therefore $\mu(w) \neq \mu(u)$. Considering two factorizations of $w$, say $w=u_{1} v_{1}, w=u_{2} v_{2}$ with $l\left(u_{i}\right)=k_{i} p, l\left(v_{i}\right) \geq p$ for $i=1,2$ and $k_{1}>k_{2}$ we have, by Theorem 9.6 [2], $u_{1}=u_{2} v$ with $l(v) \geq p$. The same argument as above shows that $\mu\left(u_{1}\right) \neq \mu\left(u_{2}\right)$.Thus all the factorizations $w=u v$ with $l(u)=k p$ ( $k \geq 1$ ) and $l(v) \geq p$ give rise to words $u$ that are mapped onto distinct points of $N^{k}$ by $\mu$. If $l(w) \geq p n^{k}, \mu(w)$ and the $\mu(u)$ 's from the various factorizations of $w$ constitute a set of $n^{k}$ distinct points in $N^{k}$. Since there are only $n^{k}$ points in $N^{k}$ having all their coordinates $<n$ and since $\mu(w)$ or $\mu(u) \neq(0,0, \ldots, 0)$ for any left factor $u$ of $w$, it follows that $w$ has $n$ consecutive factors of length $\geq p$ contained in an $A_{i}$ for some $i=1,2, \ldots, k$. Therefore $r_{k}(n, p) \leq p n^{k}$.
To show that $r_{k}(n, p) \nless p n^{k}$ we construct counterexamples by induction on $k$. Define in $F\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{p}\right)$

$$
w_{1}(n, p)=\left(x_{1} x_{2} \cdots x_{p}\right)^{n-1} x_{1} x_{2} \cdots x_{p-1} .
$$

For $k>1$ define $w_{k}(n, p)$ in $F\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{p+k-1}\right)$ by

$$
w_{k}(n, p)=\left[w_{k-1}(n, p) x_{p+k-1}\right]^{n-1} w_{k-1}(n, p)
$$

By induction on $k$ one checks that $l\left(w_{k}(n, p)\right)=p n^{k}-1$. On $F\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{p+k-1}\right)$ we define the following partition into $k$ classes

$$
\begin{gathered}
A_{1}=F\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{p}\right) \\
A_{i}=F\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{p+i-1}\right)-F\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{p+i-2}\right) \text { for } 1<i \leq k
\end{gathered}
$$

Then, by induction on $k$, one shows easily that $w_{k}(n, p)$ has at most $n-1$ consecutive factors of length $\geq p$ in a single $A_{i}$. This completes the proof of $r_{k}(n, p)=$ $p n^{k}$.
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