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#### Abstract

For a graph $G=(V, E)$, a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a total dominating set if it is dominating and both $\langle S\rangle$ has no isolated vertices. The cardinality of a minimum total dominating set in $G$ is the total domination number. A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a total restrained dominating set if it is total dominating and $\langle V(G)-S\rangle$ has no isolated vertices. The cardinality of a minimum total restrained dominating set in $G$ is the total restrained domination number. We characterize all trees for which total domination and total restrained domination numbers are the same. Keywords: total domination number, total restrained domination number, tree.
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## 1. Introduction

By a graph we mean a finite, undirected graph without loops or multiple edges. Terms not defined here are used in the sense of Arumugam [1].

Let $G=(V, E)$ be a simple graph of order $n$. The degree, neighborhood and closed neighborhood of a vertex $v$ in the graph $G$ are denoted by $d_{G}(v)$, $N_{G}(v)$ and $N_{G}[v]=N_{G}(v) \cup\{v\}$, respectively. For a subset $S$ of $V, N_{G}(S)=$ $\bigcup_{v \in S} N_{G}(v)$ and $N_{G}[S]=N_{G}(S) \cup S$. The graph induced by $S \subseteq V$ is denoted by $\langle S\rangle$. The minimum degree and maximum degree of the graph $G$ are denoted by $\delta(G)$ and $\Delta(G)$, respectively. The $\operatorname{diameter} \operatorname{diam}(G)$ of a connected graph $G$ is the maximum distance between two vertices of $G$, that is $\operatorname{diam}(G)=\max _{u, v \in V(G)} d_{G}(u, v)$. Let $P_{n}$ denote a path with $n$ vertices. Let $K_{1, r}$ denote the star with $r+1$ vertices. Define $K_{1, r, 4}$ as follows: for each edge of $K_{1, r}$, we subdivide by two vertices. The vertex of degree $r$ is called the central vertex of $K_{1, r, 4}$. Let $\eta$ be a family of graphs and $\eta=\left\{K_{1, r, 4} \mid r \geq 1\right.$ and $r$ is an integer $\}$.

A subset $S$ of $V$ is called a dominating set if every vertex in $V-S$ is adjacent to some vertex in $S$. The domination number $\gamma(G)$ of $G$ is the minimum cardinality taken over all dominating sets of $G$. A set $S \subseteq$ $V(G)$ is a total dominating set if it is dominating and $\langle S\rangle$ has no isolated vertices. The cardinality of a minimum total dominating set in $G$ is the total domination number and is denoted by $\gamma_{t}(G)$. Cockayne et al. [6] studied total dominating functions in trees: minimality and convexity.

The total restrained domination number of a graph was defined by D. Ma et al. in [4]. A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a total restrained dominating set if it is total dominating and $\langle V(G)-S\rangle$ has no isolated vertices. The cardinality of a minimum total restrained dominating set in $G$ is the total restrained domination number and is denoted by $\gamma_{r}^{t}(G)$.

A total dominating set $S$ with cardinality $\gamma_{t}(G)$ is called a $\gamma_{t}$-set. A total restrained dominating set $S$ with cardinality $\gamma_{r}^{t}$ is called a $\gamma_{r}^{t}$-set. Let $S \subset V(G)$ and $x \in S$, we say that $x$ has a private neighbour (with respect to $S$ ) if there is a vertex in $V(G)-S$ whose only neighbour in $S$ is $x$. Let $P N(x, S)$ denote the private neighbours set of $x$ with respect to $S$.

A vertex of degree one is called a leaf. A vertex $v$ of $G$ is called a support if it is adjacent to a leaf. If $T$ is a tree, $L(T)$ and $S(T)$ denote the set of leaves and supports, respectively. Any vertex of degree greater than one is called an internal vertex.

For any graph theoretical parameters $\lambda$ and $\mu$, we define $G$ to be $(\lambda, \mu)$-graph if $\lambda(G)=\mu(G)$. In this paper we provide a constructive characterization of $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-trees.

## 2. A Characterization of $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-trees

As a consequence of the definition of total restrained domination number, we have the following observations.

Observation 1. Let $G$ be a graph without isolated vertices. Then
(i) every leaf belongs to every $\gamma_{r}^{t}$-set;
(ii) every support belongs to every $\gamma_{r}^{t}$-set;
(iii) $\gamma_{t}(G) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}(G)$.

Observation 2. Let $T$ be $a\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree. Then each $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)$-set is a $\gamma_{t}(T)$-set.
Let $\tau_{1}$ and $\tau_{2}$ be the following two operations defined on a tree $T$.

- Operation $\tau_{1}$. Assume $x \in V(T)$ is a leaf or support. Then add one or more trees of $\eta$ and the edges between $x$ and each central vertex.
- Operation $\tau_{2}$. Assume $x \in N(S(T))-L(T)$. Then add one or more paths $P_{3}$ and the edges between $x$ and one leaf of each $P_{3}$.

Let $\tau$ be the family of trees such that $\tau=\left\{T: T\right.$ is obtained from $P_{6}$ by a finite sequence of operations $\tau_{1}$ or $\left.\tau_{2}\right\} \cup\left\{P_{2}, P_{6}\right\}$. We show first that each tree in the family $\tau$ has equal total domination number and total restrained domination number.

Lemma 1. If $T$ belongs to the family $\tau$, then $T$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree.
Proof. We proceed by induction on the number of operations $s(T)$ required to construct the tree $T$. If $s(T)=0$, then $T \in\left\{P_{2}, P_{6}\right\}$ and clearly $T$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree. Assume now that $T$ is a tree with $s(T)=k$ for some positive integer $k$ and each tree $T^{\prime} \in \tau$ with $s\left(T^{\prime}\right)<k$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree. Then $T$ can be obtained from a tree $T^{\prime}$ belonging to $\tau$ by operation $\tau_{1}$ or $\tau_{2}$. We now consider two possibilities depending on whether $T$ is obtained from $T^{\prime}$ by operation $\tau_{1}$ or $\tau_{2}$.

Case 1. $T$ is obtained from $T^{\prime}$ by operation $\tau_{1}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $T$ is obtained from $T^{\prime}$ by adding $k$ trees $K_{1, r_{1}, 4}, K_{1, r_{2}, 4}, \ldots, K_{1, r_{k}, 4}$ of $\eta$ and the edges between $x$ and each central vertex, where $r_{1} \leq r_{2} \leq \cdots \leq r_{k}$. It is obvious that $\gamma_{t}(T) \leq \gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+$ $2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} r_{i}$. Let $D$ be a $\gamma_{t}$-set of $T$ such that $D \cap L(T)=\emptyset$. Then


Case 1.1. $x$ is a support of $T^{\prime}$. Then $x \in D^{\prime}$. If $N_{T^{\prime}}(x) \cap D^{\prime} \neq \emptyset$, then $D^{\prime}$ is a total dominating set of $T^{\prime}$. So $\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \leq\left|D^{\prime}\right| \leq \gamma_{t}(T)-2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} r_{i}$. If $N_{T^{\prime}}(x) \cap D^{\prime}=\emptyset$, then there exists a tree $K_{1, r_{i}, 4}$ such that $\left.\mid D \cap K_{1, r_{i}, 4}\right\rceil \geq 2 r_{i}+1$ and its central vertex belongs to $D$. Let $y \in N_{T^{\prime}}(x)$ and $D^{\prime \prime}=D^{\prime} \cup\{y\}$. Then $D^{\prime \prime}$ is a total dominating set of $T^{\prime}$. So $\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \leq\left|D^{\prime \prime}\right|=\left|D^{\prime}\right|+1 \leq$ $\gamma_{t}(T)-2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} r_{i}$.

Case 1.2. $x$ is a leaf of $T^{\prime}$. Let $y \in N_{T^{\prime}}(x)$. If $y \in D$, then $D^{\prime}$ is a total dominating set of $T^{\prime}$. Suppose $y \notin D$. Then there exists a tree $K_{1, r_{i}, 4}$ such that $\left|D \cap K_{1, r_{i}, 4}\right| \geq 2 r_{i}+1$ and its central vertex belongs to $D$. Let $D^{\prime \prime}=D^{\prime} \cup\{y\}$. Then $D^{\prime \prime}$ is a total dominating set of $T^{\prime}$. So $\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \leq\left|D^{\prime \prime}\right|=\left|D^{\prime}\right|+1 \leq \gamma_{t}(T)-2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} r_{i}$.

By Case 1.1 and 1.2, $\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \leq \gamma_{t}(\bar{T})-2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} r_{i}$. Hence, $\gamma_{t}(T)=$ $\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} r_{i}$. It is obvious that $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} r_{i}$. Since $\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} r_{i}=\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} r_{i}=\gamma_{t}(T) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}(T)$. Hence $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)=$ $\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k}^{-i \leq k} r_{i}$. So $\gamma_{t}(T)=\gamma_{r}^{t}(\bar{T})$.

Case 2. $T$ is obtained from $T^{\prime}$ by operation $\tau_{2}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $T$ is obtained from $T^{\prime}$ by adding paths $v_{1 j}, v_{2 j}, v_{3 j}$ and the edges between $x$ and $v_{1 j}$ for $j=1,2, \cdots, k$. It is obvious that $\gamma_{t}(T) \leq \gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 k$. Let $D$ be a $\gamma_{t}$-set of $T$ such that $D \cap L(T)=\emptyset$. Then $v_{1 j}, v_{2 j} \in D$. Let $D^{\prime}=D \cap V\left(T^{\prime}\right)$. Then $D^{\prime}$ is a total dominating set of $T^{\prime}$. So $\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \leq \gamma_{t}(T)-2 k$. Hence $\gamma_{t}(T)=\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 k$. Let $D^{\prime \prime}$ be a $\gamma_{r}^{t}$-set of $T^{\prime}$. Since $T^{\prime}$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree, it follows that $x \notin$ $D^{\prime \prime}$. Otherwise, assume $N_{T^{\prime}}(x) \cap S\left(T^{\prime}\right)=\{y\}$ and $N_{T^{\prime}}(y) \cap L\left(T^{\prime}\right)=$ $\{z\}$. Then $D^{\prime \prime}-\{z\}$ is a total dominating set of $T^{\prime}$ with cardinality less than $\left|D^{\prime \prime}\right|$, which is a contradiction. So, $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 k$. Since $\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 k=\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 k=\gamma_{t}(T) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}(T)$. Hence $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)=\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 k$. So $\gamma_{t}(T)=\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)$.

We show next that every $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree belongs to the family $\tau$.

Lemma 2. Let $T$ be $a\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree. Then
(i) for each support $v \in S(T),|N(v) \cap L(T)|=1$;
(ii) for any two supports $u, v \in S(T), d(u, v) \geq 3$.

Proof. (i) Suppose that there exists a support $v$ such that $|N(v) \cap L(T)|$ $\geq 2$. Let $N(v) \cap L(T)=\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{k}\right\}$ where $k \geq 2$. Let $D$ be a $\gamma_{r}^{t}$-set of $T$. Then, by Observation 1 , it follows that $D-\left\{v_{2}, \ldots, v_{k}\right\}$ is a total dominating set of $T$ with cardinality less than $\gamma_{t}(T)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $|N(v) \cap L(T)|=1$ for each support $v \in S(T)$.
(ii) Suppose that there exist two supports $u$ and $v$ such that $d(u, v) \leq 2$. Let $u_{1} \in N(u) \cap L(T)$ and $v_{1} \in N(v) \cap L(T)$. Let $D$ be a $\gamma_{r}^{t}$-set of $T$. If $u$ is adjacent to $v$, then, by Observation 1, it follows that $D-\left\{u_{1}\right\}$ is a total dominating set of $T$ with cardinality less than $\gamma_{t}(T)$, which is a contradiction. Suppose $d(u, v)=2$. Assume $w \in N(u) \cap N(v)$. Then by Observation 1, it follows that $\left(D-\left\{u_{1}, v_{1}\right\}\right) \cup\{w\}$ is a total dominating set of $T$ with cardinality less than $\gamma_{t}(T)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $d(u, v) \geq 3$ for any two supports $u, v \in S(T)$.

Lemma 3. If $T$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree, then $T$ belongs to the family $\tau$.
$\boldsymbol{P r o o f}$. Let $T$ be a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree. If $\operatorname{diam}(T) \leq 5$, then $T$ is $P_{2}$ or $P_{6}$. It is clear that the statement is true. For this reason, we only consider only trees $T$ with $\operatorname{diam}(T) \geq 6$.

Let $T$ be a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree and assume that the result holds for all trees on $n(T)-1$ and fewer vertices. We proceed by induction on the number of vertices of a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree. Let $P=\left(v_{0}, v_{1}, \ldots, v_{l}\right), l \geq 6$, be a longest path in $T$ and let $D$ be a $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)$-set. Then $v_{0}, v_{1} \in D$. By Lemma 2, it follows that $d\left(v_{1}\right)=d\left(v_{2}\right)=2$. It is obvious that $v_{2}, v_{3} \notin D$. Otherwise $D-\left\{v_{0}\right\}$ is a total dominating set with cardinality less than $|D|$, which is a contradiction.

Now we have the following claim.
Claim 1. $\left|N_{T}\left(v_{3}\right) \cap D\right|=1$.
Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume $\left|N_{T}\left(v_{3}\right) \cap D\right|=t$ and $t>1$. Then $N_{T}\left(v_{3}\right) \cap D \subseteq S(T) \cup\left\{v_{4}\right\}$. By Lemma $2,\left|N_{T}\left(v_{3}\right) \cap D \cap S(T)\right|=1$. So, $t=2$. We can assume $N_{T}\left(v_{3}\right) \cap D=\left\{v_{31}, v_{4}\right\}$, where $v_{31} \in S(T)$. By Lemma 2, it is easy to prove that $v_{5} \in D$. Let $A_{1}=N_{T}\left(v_{5}\right)-\left\{v_{4}\right\}$.

Then for any $v \in A_{1}, v \notin D$. Otherwise, let $T_{1}$ denote the component of $T-\left\{v_{5}\right\}$ containing $v_{4}$. Then $\left(D-\left(L\left(T_{1}\right) \cup\left\{v_{4}\right\}\right)\right) \cup\left(N_{T_{1}}\left[S\left(T_{1}\right)\right]-L\left(T_{1}\right)\right)$ is a total dominating set of $T$ with cardinality less than $|D|$, which is a contradiction. Let $B_{1}=N_{T}\left(A_{1}\right) \cap(V(T)-D), A_{2}=N_{T}\left(B_{1}\right) \cap D$ and $B_{2}=N_{T}\left(A_{2}\right) \cap D$. For $i \geq 1$, let $A_{2 i+1}=N_{T}\left(B_{2 i}\right) \cap(V(T)-D), B_{2 i+1}=$ $N_{T}\left(A_{2 i+1}\right) \cap(V(T)-D), A_{2 i+2}=N_{T}\left(B_{2 i+1}\right) \cap D$ and $B_{2 i+2}=N_{T}\left(A_{2 i+2}\right) \cap D$. It is obvious that $\left|B_{2 i+1}\right| \leq\left|A_{2 i+2}\right| \leq\left|B_{2 i+2}\right|$ for $i \geq 0$.

Now we prove that if $N_{T}\left(B_{2 i+2}\right) \cap D-A_{2 i+2} \neq \emptyset$, then $\left|N_{T}(v) \cap D\right| \geq 2$ for any $v \in N_{T}\left(B_{2 i+2}\right) \cap D-A_{2 i+2}$. Otherwise, we can assume $t$ is the maximum $i$ satisfying $N_{T}\left(B_{2 i+2}\right) \cap D-A_{2 i+2} \neq \emptyset$ and there exists a vertex $v \in N_{T}\left(B_{2 i+2}\right) \cap D-A_{2 i+2}$ such that $\left|N_{T}(v) \cap D\right|=1$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $u \in B_{2 t+2}$ and $u v \in E(T)$.

Define $C_{1}=N_{T}(v) \backslash\{u\}$. Then for any $w \in C_{1}, w \notin D$. Let $D_{1}=$ $N_{T}\left(C_{1}\right) \cap(V(T)-D)$. Let $C_{2}=N_{T}\left(D_{1}\right) \cap D$ and $D_{2}=N_{T}\left(C_{2}\right) \cap D$. For $i \geq 1$, let $C_{2 i+1}=N_{T}\left(D_{2 i}\right) \cap(V(T)-D), D_{2 i+1}=N_{T}\left(C_{2 i+1}\right) \cap(V(T)-D)$, $C_{2 i+2}=N_{T}\left(D_{2 i+1}\right) \cap D$ and $D_{2 i+2}=N_{T}\left(C_{2 i+2}\right) \cap D$. It is obvious that $\left|D_{2 i+1}\right| \leq\left|C_{2 i+2}\right| \leq\left|D_{2 i+2}\right|$ for $i \geq 0$. Let $D^{\prime}=\left(D-\{v\}-\bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq t} D_{2 i+2}\right) \cup$ $\bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq t} D_{2 i+1}$. It is obvious that $D^{\prime}$ is a total dominating set of $T$ with cardinality less than $|D|$, which is a contradiction.

Let $w \in A_{1}$. Let $\bar{D}=\left(D-\left(L\left(T_{1}\right) \cup\left\{v_{4}, v_{5}\right\}\right)-\bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq t} B_{2 i+2}\right) \cup$ $\left.\bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq t} B_{2 i+1} \cup\{w\} \cup\left(N_{T_{1}}\left[S\left(T_{1}\right)\right)\right]-L\left(T_{1}\right)\right)$. It is obvious that $\bar{D}$ is a total dominating set of $T$ with cardinality less than $|D|$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $\left|N_{T}\left(v_{3}\right) \cap D\right|=1$.

By the above claim, we consider the following three cases. Assume $d_{T}\left(v_{4}\right)=j$.

Case 1. $v_{4} \in D$ and $v_{4} \in S(T)$. Let $T_{1}$ denote the component of $T-\left\{v_{4}\right\}$ containing $v_{5}$. Let $N_{T}\left(v_{4}\right) \cap L(T)=\{l\}$ and $N_{T}\left(v_{4}\right)-\left\{v_{5}, l\right\}=$ $\left\{v_{41}, \cdots, v_{4(j-2)}\right\}$. Denote $T^{\prime}=\left\langle V\left(T_{1}\right) \cup\left\{v_{4}, l\right\}\right\rangle$. Then it is easy to prove that $\gamma_{t}(T)=\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq(j-2)}\left(d_{T}\left(v_{4 i}\right)-1\right)$. It is obvious that $\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}(T)-2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq(j-2)}\left(d_{T}\left(v_{4 i}\right)-1\right)$. Since $T$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree, it follows that $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)=\gamma_{t}(T)=\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq(j-2)}\left(d_{T}\left(v_{4 i}\right)-1\right) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+$ $2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq(j-2)}\left(d_{T}\left(v_{4 i}\right)-1\right)$. Hence $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)=\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq(j-2)}\left(d_{T}\left(v_{4 i}\right)-1\right)$. So $\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)=\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)$. Consequently, $T^{\prime}$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree and by induction hypothesis, $T^{\prime} \in \tau$. As $v_{4}$ is a support in $T^{\prime}$, we deduce that $T$ may be obtained from $T^{\prime}$ by operation $\tau_{1}$.

Case 2. $v_{4} \in D$ and $v_{4} \notin S(T)$. Let $T_{1}$ denote the component of $T-\left\{v_{4}\right\}$ containing $v_{5}$. Then $v_{5} \in D$. Let $N_{T}\left(v_{4}\right)-\left\{v_{5}\right\}=\left\{v_{41}, \cdots, v_{4(j-1))}\right\}$. Denote $T^{\prime}=\left\langle V\left(T_{1}\right) \cup\left\{v_{4}\right\}\right\rangle$. Then it is obvious that $\gamma_{t}(T)=\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+$ $2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq(j-1)}\left(d\left(v_{4 i}\right)-1\right)$. It is obvious that $\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}(T)-2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq(j-1)}$ $\left(d\left(v_{4 i}\right)-1\right)$. Since $T$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree, it follows that $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)=\gamma_{t}(T)=$ $\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq(j-1)}\left(d\left(v_{4 i}\right)-1\right) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq(j-1)}\left(d\left(v_{4 i}\right)-1\right)$. Hence $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)=\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2 \sum_{1 \leq i \leq(j-1)}\left(d\left(v_{4 i}\right)-1\right)$. So $\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)=\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)$. Consequently, $T^{\prime}$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree and by induction hypothesis, $T^{\prime} \in \tau$. As $v_{4}$ is a leaf in $T^{\prime}$, we deduce that $T$ may be obtained from $T^{\prime}$ by operation $\tau_{1}$.

Case 3. $v_{4} \notin D$. Then there exists exactly one vertex $x \in N_{T}\left(v_{3}\right) \cap D$ and $x$ is a support. Assume $N_{T}(x) \cap L(T)=\{l\}$. Let $T_{1}$ denote the component of $T-\left\{v_{3}\right\}$ containing $v_{4}$. Denote $T^{\prime}=\left\langle V\left(T_{1}\right) \cup\left\{v_{3}, x, l\right\}\right\rangle$. It is obvious that $\gamma_{t}(T)=\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2\left(d_{T}\left(v_{3}\right)-2\right)$. It is obvious that $x, l \in D$. Hence $\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}(T)-2\left(d_{T}\left(v_{3}\right)-2\right)$. Since $T$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree, it follows that $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)=\gamma_{t}(T)=\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2\left(d_{T}\left(v_{3}\right)-2\right) \leq \gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2\left(d_{T}\left(v_{3}\right)-2\right)$. Hence $\gamma_{r}^{t}(T)=\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)+2\left(d_{T}\left(v_{3}\right)-2\right)$. So $\gamma_{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)=\gamma_{r}^{t}\left(T^{\prime}\right)$. Consequently, $T^{\prime}$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree and by induction hypothesis, $T^{\prime} \in \tau$. As $v_{3}$ is a vertex adjacent to a support in $T^{\prime}$, we deduce that $T$ may be obtained from $T^{\prime}$ by operation $\tau_{2}$.
As an immediate consequence of Lemmas 2 and 3 we have the following characterization of $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-trees.

Theorem 3. $A$ tree $T$ is a $\left(\gamma_{t}, \gamma_{r}^{t}\right)$-tree if and only if $T$ belongs to the family $\tau$.
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