Discussiones Mathematicae
Graph Theory 32 (2012) 449–459
doi:10.7151/dmgt.1609

FRACTIONAL DISTANCE DOMINATION IN GRAPHS

S. Arumugam[1,2], Varughese Mathew[3] and K. Karuppasamy[1]

[1]*National Centre for Advanced Research in Discrete Mathematics (n-CARDMATH)*
Kalasalingam University, Anand Nagar, Krishnankoil-626 126, India
[2]*School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science*
The University of Newcastle, NSW 2308, Australia
[3]*Department of Mathematics, Mar Thoma College, Tiruvalla-689 103, India*

e-mail: s.arumugam.klu@gmail.com
{k_karuppasamy,varughese_m1}@yahoo.co.in

Abstract

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph and let k be a positive integer with $k \leq rad(G)$. A subset $D \subseteq V$ is called a distance k-dominating set of G if for every $v \in V - D$, there exists a vertex $u \in D$ such that $d(u, v) \leq k$. In this paper we study the fractional version of distance k-domination and related parameters.

Keywords: domination, distance k-domination, distance k-dominating function, k-packing, fractional distance k-domination .

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C69, 05C72.

1. Introduction

By a graph $G = (V, E)$ we mean a finite, undirected and connected graph with neither loops nor multiple edges. The order and size of G are denoted by n and m respectively. For basic terminology in graphs we refer to Chartrand and Lesniak [3]. For basic terminology in domination related concepts we refer to Haynes *et al.* [9].

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. A subset D of V is called a *dominating set* of G if every vertex in $V - D$ is adjacent to at least one vertex in D. A dominating set D is called a *minimal dominating set* if no proper subset of D is a dominating set of G. The minimum (maximum) cardinality of a minimal dominating set of G is called the *domination number* (*upper domination number*) of G and is denoted by $\gamma(G)$ ($\Gamma(G)$). Let A and B be two subsets of V. We say that B *dominates* A if

every vertex in $A - B$ is adjacent to at least one vertex in B. If B dominates A, then we write $B \to A$. Meir and Moon [12] introduced the concept of a k-packing and distance k-domination in a graph as a natural generalisation of the concept of domination. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph and $v \in V$. For any positive integer k, let $N_k(v) = \{u \in V : d(u, v) \leq k\}$ and $N_k[v] = N_k(v) \cup \{v\}$. A set $S \subseteq V$ is a *distance k-dominating set* of G if $N_k[v] \cap S \neq \emptyset$ for every vertex $v \in V - S$. The minimum (maximum) cardinality among all minimal distance k-dominating sets of G is called the *distance k-domination number* (*upper distance k-domination number*) of G and is denoted by $\gamma_k(G)$ ($\Gamma_k(G)$). A set $S \subseteq V$ is said to be an *efficient distance k-dominating set* of G if $|N_k[v] \cap S| = 1$ for all $v \in V - S$. Clearly, $\gamma(G) = \gamma_1(G)$. A distance k-dominating set of cardinality $\gamma_k(G)$ ($\Gamma_k(G)$) is called a γ_k (Γ_k)-set. Hereafter, we shall use the term k-domination for distance k-domination.

Note that, $\gamma_k(G) = \gamma(G^k)$, where G^k is the kth power of G, which is obtained from G by joining all pairs of distinct vertices u, v with $d(u, v) \leq k$. A subset $S \subseteq V(G)$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is said to be a *k-packing* ([12]) of G, if $d(u, v) > k$ for all pairs of distinct vertices u and v in S. The *k-packing number* $\rho_k(G)$ is defined to be the maximum cardinality of a k-packing set in G. The *corona* of a graph G, denoted by $G \circ K_1$, is the graph formed from a copy of G by attaching to each vertex v a new vertex v' and an edge $\{v, v'\}$. The *Cartesian product* of graphs G and H, denoted by $G \Box H$, is the graph with vertex set $V(G) \times V(H)$ and two vertices (u_1, v_1) and (u_2, v_2) are adjacent in $G \Box H$ if and only if either $u_1 = u_2$ and $v_1 v_2 \in E(H)$ or $v_1 = v_2$ and $u_1 u_2 \in E(G)$. For a survey of results on distance domination we refer to Chapter 12 of Haynes *et al.* [10].

Hedetniemi *et al.* [11] introduced the concept of fractional domination in graphs. Grinstead and Slater [6] and Domke *et al.* [5] have presented several results on fractional domination and related parameters in graphs. Arumugam *et al.* [1] have investigated the fractional version of global domination in graphs.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. Let $g : V \to \mathbb{R}$ be any function. For any subset S of V, let $g(S) = \sum_{v \in S} g(v)$. The *weight* of g is defined by $|g| = g(V) = \sum_{v \in V} g(v)$. For a subset S of V, the function $\chi_S : V \to \{0, 1\}$ defined by

$$\chi_S(v) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v \in S, \\ 0 & \text{if } v \notin S, \end{cases}$$

is called the *characteristic function* of S.

A function $g : V \to [0, 1]$ is called a *dominating function* (DF) of the graph $G = (V, E)$ if $g(N[v]) = \sum_{u \in N[v]} g(u) \geq 1$ for all $v \in V$. For functions f, g from $V \to [0, 1]$ we write $f \leq g$ if $f(v) \leq g(v)$ for all $v \in V$. Further, we write $f < g$ if $f \leq g$ and $f(v) < g(v)$ for some $v \in V$. A DF g of G is *minimal* (MDF) if f is not a DF for all functions $f : V \to [0, 1]$ with $f < g$.

The *fractional domination number* $\gamma_f(G)$ and the *upper fractional domination number* $\Gamma_f(G)$ are defined as follows:

$$\gamma_f(G) = \min\{|g| : g \text{ is a minimal dominating function of } G\},$$
$$\Gamma_f(G) = \max\{|g| : g \text{ is a minimal dominating function of } G\}.$$

For a dominating function f of G, the *boundary set* $\mathcal{B}_f$ and the *positive set* $\mathcal{P}_f$ are defined by $\mathcal{B}_f = \{u \in V(G) : f(N[u]) = 1\}$ and $\mathcal{P}_f = \{u \in V(G) : f(u) > 0\}$. A function $g : V \to [0, 1]$ is called a *packing function* (PF) of the graph $G = (V, E)$ if $g(N[v]) = \sum_{u \in N[v]} g(u) \leq 1$ for all $v \in V$. The *lower fractional packing number* $p_f(G)$ and the *fractional packing number* $P_f(G)$ are defined as follows:

$$p_f(G) = \min\{|g| : g \text{ is a maximal packing function of } G\},$$
$$P_f(G) = \max\{|g| : g \text{ is a maximal packing function of } G\}.$$

It was observed in Chapter 3 of [10] that for every graph G, $1 \leq \gamma_f(G) = P_f(G) \leq \gamma(G) \leq \Gamma(G) \leq \Gamma_f(G)$. We need the following theorems:

Theorem 1.1 [5]**.** *For a graph G, $p_f(G) \leq \rho_2(G) \leq P_f(G)$.*

Theorem 1.2 [2]**.** *A DF f of G is an MDF if and only if $\mathcal{B}_f \to \mathcal{P}_f$.*

Theorem 1.3 [2]**.** *If f and g are MDFs of G and $0 < \lambda < 1$ then $h_\lambda = \lambda f + (1 - \lambda)g$ is an MDF of G if and only if $\mathcal{B}_f \cap \mathcal{B}_g \to \mathcal{P}_f \cup \mathcal{P}_g$.*

Theorem 1.4 [5]**.** *If G is an r-regular graph of order n, then $\gamma_f(G) = \frac{n}{r+1}$.*

Theorem 1.5 [4]**.** *Let G be a block graph. Then for any integer $k \geq 1$, we have $\rho_{2k}(G) = \gamma_k(G)$.*

For other families of graphs satisfying $\rho_2(G) = \gamma(G)$, we refer to Rubalcaba *et al.* [13].

Definition 1.6 [15]**.** A *linear Benzenoid chain* $B(h)$ of length h is the graph obtained from $P_2 \square P_{h+1}$ by subdividing exactly once each edge of the two copies of P_{h+1}. Hence $B(h)$ is a subgraph of $P_2 \square P_{2h+1}$. The graph $B(4)$ is given in Figure 1.



Figure 1. $B(4)$.

Theorem 1.7 [15]**.** *For the linear benzenoid chain $B(h)$, we have*

$$\gamma_k(B(h)) = \begin{cases} \lceil \frac{h+1}{k} \rceil & \text{if } k \neq 2, \\ \lceil \frac{h+2}{k} \rceil & \text{if } k = 2. \end{cases}$$

We refer to Scheinerman and Ullman [14] for fractionalization techniques of various graph parameters. Hattingh *et al.* [8] introduced the distance k-dominating function and proved that the problem of computing the upper distance fractional domination number is NP-complete. In this paper we present further results on fractional distance k-domination.

2. Distance k-dominating Function

Hattingh *et al.* [8] introduced the following concept of fractional distance k-domination.

Definition 2.1. A function $g : V \to [0,1]$ is called a *distance k-dominating function* or simply a *k-dominating function* (kDF) of a graph $G = (V, E)$, if for every $v \in V$, $g(N_k[v]) = \sum_{u \in N_k[v]} g(u) \geq 1$. A k-dominating function (kDF) g of a graph G is called a *minimal k-dominating function* ($MkDF$) if f is not a k-dominating function of G for all functions $f : V \to [0,1]$ with $f < g$. The *fractional k-domination number* $\gamma_{kf}(G)$ and the *upper fractional k-domination number* $\Gamma_{kf}(G)$ are defined as follows:

$$\gamma_{kf}(G) = \min\{|g| : g \text{ is an } MkDF \text{ of } G\},$$
$$\Gamma_{kf}(G) = \max\{|g| : g \text{ is an } MkDF \text{ of } G\}.$$

We observe that if $k \geq rad(G)$, then $\Delta(G^k) = n - 1$ and $\gamma_{kf}(G) = 1$. Hence throughout this paper, we assume that $k < rad(G)$.

Lemma 2.2 [8]**.** *Let f be a k-dominating function of a graph $G = (V, E)$. Then f is minimal k-dominating if and only if whenever $f(v) > 0$ there exists some $u \in N_k[v]$ such that $f(N_k[u]) = 1$.*

Remark 2.3. The characteristic function of a γ_k-set and that of a Γ_k-set of a graph G are $MkDF$s of G. Hence it follows that $1 \leq \gamma_{kf}(G) \leq \gamma_k(G) \leq \Gamma_k(G) \leq \Gamma_{kf}(G)$.

Definition 2.4. A function $g : V \to [0,1]$ is called a *distance k-packing function* or simply a *k-packing function* of a graph $G = (V, E)$, if for every $v \in V$, $g(N_k[v]) \leq 1$. A k-packing function g of a graph G is *maximal* if f is not a k-packing function of G for all functions $f : V \to [0,1]$ with $f > g$. The *fractional k-packing number* $p_{kf}(G)$ and the *upper fractional k-packing number* $P_{kf}(G)$ are defined as follows:

$$p_{kf}(G) = \min\{|g| : g \text{ is a maximal k-packing function of } G\},$$
$$P_{kf}(G) = \max\{|g| : g \text{ is a maximal k-packing function of } G\}.$$

Observation 2.5. The fractional k-domination number $\gamma_{kf}(G)$ is the optimal solution of the following linear programming problem (LPP).

Minimize $z = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(v_i)$, subject to

$$\sum_{u \in N_k[v]} f(u) \geq 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq f(v) \leq 1 \text{ for all } v \in V.$$

The dual of the above LPP is

Maximize $z = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(v_i)$, subject to

$$\sum_{u \in N_k[v]} f(u) \leq 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq f(v) \leq 1 \text{ for all } v \in V.$$

The optimal solution of the dual LPP is the upper fractional k-packing number $P_{kf}(G)$. It follows from the strong duality theorem that $P_{kf}(G) = \gamma_{kf}(G)$. Hence if there exists a minimal k-dominating function g and a maximal k-packing function h with $|g| = |h|$, then $P_{kf}(G) = |h| = |g| = \gamma_{kf}(G)$.

Lemma 2.6. *For any graph G of order n we have $\gamma_{kf}(G) \leq \frac{n}{k+1}$ and the bound is sharp.*

Proof. Since $|N_k[u]| \geq k+1$ for all $u \in V$, it follows that the constant function f defined on V by $f(v) = \frac{1}{k+1}$ for all $v \in V$, is a k-dominating function with $|f| = \frac{n}{k+1}$. Hence $\gamma_{kf}(G) \leq \frac{n}{k+1}$. To prove the sharpness of this bound, consider the graph G consisting of a cycle of length $2k$ with a path of length k attached to each vertex of the cycle. Clearly $n = 2k(k+1)$. Further the set S of all pendant vertices of G forms an efficient k-dominating set of G and hence $\sum_{u \in N_k[v]} f(u) = 1$ for all $v \in V$ where f is the characteristic function of S. Hence $\gamma_k(G) = \gamma_{kf}(G) = 2k = \frac{n}{k+1}$. ■

Observation 2.7. We observe that $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_f(G^k)$. Hence the following is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.2.

Let G be a graph and let $A, B \subseteq V$. We say that A, *k-dominates* B if $N_k[v] \cap A \neq \emptyset$ for all $v \in B$ and we write $A \to_k B$. Now for any kDF f of G let $\mathcal{P}_f = \{u \in V(G) : f(u) > 0\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_f = \{u \in V(G) : f(N_k[u]) = 1\}$. Then f is an $MkDF$ of G if and only if $\mathcal{B}_f \to_k \mathcal{P}_f$.

Observation 2.8. If f and g are $kDFs$ of a graph $G = (V, E)$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$, then the convex combination of f and g defined by $h_\lambda(v) = \lambda f(v) + (1 - \lambda) g(v)$ for all $v \in V$ is a kDF of G. However, the convex combination of two $MkDFs$ of a graph G need not be minimal, as shown in the following example.

Consider the cycle $G = C_7 = (u_1 u_2 \ldots u_7 u_1)$ with $k = 2$. The function $f : V(G) \to [0, 1]$ defined by

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in \{u_1, u_5\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

is a minimal 2-dominating function of G with $\mathcal{P}_f = \{u_1, u_5\}$, $\mathcal{B}_f = \{u_1, u_2, u_4, u_5\}$. Also, the function $g : V(G) \to [0, 1]$ defined by

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in \{u_3, u_6\}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

is a minimal 2-dominating function of G with $\mathcal{P}_g = \{u_3, u_6\}$, $\mathcal{B}_g = \{u_2, u_3, u_6, u_7\}$. Let $h = \frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g$. Then $h(u_1) = h(u_3) = h(u_5) = h(u_6) = \frac{1}{2}$, $h(u_2) = h(u_4) = h(u_7) = 0$, $h(N_2[u_i]) = \frac{3}{2}$ for $i \neq 2$ and $h(N_2[u_2]) = 1$. Hence $\mathcal{P}_h = \{u_1, u_3, u_5, u_6\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_h = \{u_2\}$. Since $u_5, u_6 \notin N_2[u_2]$ we have $\mathcal{B}_h$ does not 2-dominate $\mathcal{P}_h$ and hence the kDF h is not minimal.

Observation 2.9. If f and g are $MkDFs$ of G and $0 < \lambda < 1$, then $h_\lambda = \lambda f + (1-\lambda)g$ is an $MkDF$ of G if and only if $\mathcal{B}_f \cap \mathcal{B}_g \to_k \mathcal{P}_f \cup \mathcal{P}_g$.

Observation 2.10. For the cycle C_n, the graph $G = C_n^k$ is $2k$-regular and hence it follows from Theorem 1.4 that $\gamma_{kf}(C_n) = \frac{n}{2k+1}$.

We now proceed to determine the fractional k-domination number of several families of graphs.

Proposition 2.11. *For the hypercube Q_n, $\gamma_{kf}(Q_n) = \frac{2^n}{\binom{n}{0}+\binom{n}{1}+\binom{n}{2}+\cdots+\binom{n}{k}}$.*

Proof. For any two vertices $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n)$ in Q_n, $d(x, y) \leq k$ if and only if x and y differ in at most k coordinates and hence Q_n^k is r-regular where $r = \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \cdots + \binom{n}{k}$. Hence by Theorem 1.4, we have $\gamma_{kf}(Q_n) = \frac{2^n}{r+1} = \frac{2^n}{\binom{n}{0}+\binom{n}{1}+\binom{n}{2}+\cdots+\binom{n}{k}}$. ■

Proposition 2.12. *For the graph $G = P_2 \square C_n$, we have*

$$\gamma_{kf}(G) = \begin{cases} \frac{8}{7} & \text{if } n = 4 \text{ and } k = 2, \\ \frac{n}{2k} & \text{if } n \geq 5. \end{cases}$$

Proof. If $n = 4$ and $k = 2$, then G^2 is a 6-regular graph and hence $\gamma_{2f}(G) = \frac{8}{7}$. If $n \geq 5$, G^k is a $(4k-1)$-regular graph and hence $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \frac{2n}{4k-1+1} = \frac{n}{2k}$. ■

Theorem 2.13. *Let $G = C_n \circ K_1$. Then $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \frac{n}{2k-1}$.*

Proof. Let $C_n = (v_1 v_2 \ldots v_n v_1)$. Let u_i be the pendant vertex adjacent to v_i. Clearly, $|N_k[u_i] \cap V(C_n)| = 2k-1$ and $N_k[u_i] \subset N_k[v_i]$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Hence the function $g : V(G) \to [0, 1]$ defined by

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x = u_i, \\ \frac{1}{2k-1} & \text{if } x = v_i \end{cases}$$

is a minimal k-dominating function of G with $|g| = \frac{n}{2k-1}$. Also we have $|N_k[v_i] \cap \{u_j : 1 \leq j \leq n\}| = 2k-1$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Hence the function $h : V(G) \to [0, 1]$ defined by

$$h(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2k-1} & \text{if } x = u_i, \\ 0 & \text{if } x = v_i \end{cases}$$

is a maximal k-packing function of G with $|h| = \frac{n}{2k-1}$. Hence by Observation 2.5, we have $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \frac{n}{2k-1}$. ■

Theorem 2.14. *For the grid $G = P_2 \Box P_n$, we have*

$$\gamma_{kf}(G) = \begin{cases} \frac{n(n+2k)}{2k(n+k)} & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{2k}, \\ \lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $P_2 = (u_0, u_1)$ and $P_n = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1})$, so that $V(G) = \{(u_i, v_j) : i = 0, 1,\ 0 \le j \le n-1\}$.

Case 1. $n \equiv 0 \pmod{2k}$. Let $n = 2kp$, $p > 1$. Define $f : V(G) \to [0, 1]$ by

$$f((u_i, v_j)) = \begin{cases} (\frac{1}{2p+1})(p - \lfloor \frac{j}{2k} \rfloor) & \text{if } j \equiv (k-1) \pmod{2k}, \\ (\frac{1}{2p+1})(\lfloor \frac{j}{2k} \rfloor + 1) & \text{if } j \equiv k \pmod{2k}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then f is a k-dominating function of G. Also, since $f((u_0, v_j)) = f((u_1, v_j))$ for all j, we have $|f| = 2(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f((u_0, v_j))) = \frac{2}{2p+1}[(p + (p-1) + \cdots + 3 + 2 + 1) + (1 + 2 + 3 + \cdots + p)] = \frac{2p(p+1)}{2p+1} = \frac{n(n+2k)}{2k(n+2)}$. Now consider the function $h : V(G) \to [0, 1]$ defined by

$$h((u_i, v_j)) = \begin{cases} (\frac{1}{2p+1})(p - \lfloor \frac{j}{2k} \rfloor) & \text{if } j \equiv 0 \pmod{2k}, \\ (\frac{1}{2p+1})(\lfloor \frac{j}{2k} \rfloor + 1) & \text{if } j \equiv (2k-1) \pmod{2k}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then h is a k-packing function of G with $|h| = \frac{2p(p+1)}{2p+1} = \frac{n(n+2k)}{2k(n+2k)}$. Hence $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \frac{n(n+2k)}{2k(n+k)}$.

Case 2. $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{2k}$. Let $n = 2kq + r$, $1 \le r \le 2k-1$. Let $S = S_1 \cup S_2$ and

$$S_1 = \begin{cases} \{(u_0, v_j) : j \equiv 0 \pmod{4k}\} & \text{if } 1 \le r \le k, \\ \{(u_0, v_j) : j \equiv (k-1) \pmod{4k}\} & \text{if } k+1 \le r \le 2k-1. \end{cases}$$

$$S_2 = \begin{cases} \{(u_1, v_j) : j \equiv 2k \pmod{4k}\} & \text{if } 1 \le r \le k, \\ \{(u_1, v_j) : j \equiv (3k-1) \pmod{4k}\} & \text{if } k+1 \le r \le 2k-1. \end{cases}$$

Let f be the characteristic function of S. Since $d(x, y) \ge 2k+1$ for all $x, y \in S$, it follows that $f(N_k[u]) = 1$ for all $u \in V(G)$. Thus f is both a minimal k-dominating function and a maximal k-packing function of G and hence $\gamma_{kf}(G) = |f| = |S| = \lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil$. ■

A special case of the above theorem gives the following result of Hare [7].

Corollary 2.15. *For the grid graph $G = P_2 \Box P_n$, we have*

$$\gamma_f(G) = \begin{cases} \frac{n(n+2)}{2(n+1)} & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

3. Graphs with $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G)$

In this section we obtain several families of graphs for which the fractional k-domination number and the k-domination number are equal.

Lemma 3.1. *If a graph G has an efficient k-dominating set, then $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G)$.*

Proof. Let D be an efficient k-dominating set of G. Then $|N_k[u] \cap D| = 1$ for all $u \in V(G)$. Hence the characteristic function of D is both a minimal k-dominating function and a maximal k-packing function of G and so $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G)$. ■

Lemma 3.2. *For any graph G, $\gamma_{kf}(G) = 1$ if and only if $\gamma_k(G) = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose $\gamma_k(G) = 1$. Since $\gamma_{kf}(G) \leq \gamma_k(G)$, it follows that $\gamma_{kf}(G) = 1$. Conversely, let $\gamma_{kf}(G) = 1$. Then $\gamma_f(G^k) = 1$ and hence $\gamma(G^k) = 1$. Since $\gamma(G^k) = \gamma_k(G)$ the result follows. ■

Lemma 3.3. *For any graph G, $p_{kf}(G) \leq \rho_{2k}(G) \leq P_{kf}(G)$.*

Proof. Let $u \in V(G)$. Since $N_k[u] = N_{G^k}[u]$, we have $p_{kf}(G) = p_f(G^k)$, $P_{kf}(G) = P_f(G^k)$ and $\rho_{2k}(G) = \rho_2(G^k)$.

Hence the result follows from Theorem 1.1. ■

Corollary 3.4. *For any graph G, $1 \leq p_{kf}(G) \leq \rho_{2k}(G) \leq P_{kf}(G) = \gamma_{kf}(G) \leq \gamma_k(G) \leq \Gamma_k(G) \leq \Gamma_{kf}(G)$.*

Corollary 3.5. *If G is any graph with $\rho_{2k}(G) = \gamma_k(G)$, then $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G)$.*

Corollary 3.6. *If G is a block graph, then $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G)$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 1.5 that $\rho_{2k}(G) = \gamma_k(G)$ and hence the result follows. ■

Corollary 3.7. *For any tree T, we have $\gamma_{kf}(T) = \gamma_k(T)$.*

Theorem 3.8. *For the graph $G = P_{k+1} \Box P_n$ where $n \equiv 1 \pmod{(k+1)}$, $k \geq 1$, we have $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G) = \lceil \frac{n}{k+1} \rceil$.*

Proof. Let $n = (k+1)q + 1$, $q \geq 1$. Clearly $|V(G)| = n(k+1) = (k+1)^2 q + (k+1)$. Let $P_{k+1} = (u_0, u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_k)$ and $P_n = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1})$ so that $V(G) = \{(u_i, v_j) : 0 \leq i \leq k,\ 0 \leq j \leq n-1\}$.

Now let $S_1 = \{(u_0, v_i) : i \equiv 0 \pmod{2(k+1)}\}$, $S_2 = \{(u_k, v_i) : i \equiv (k+1) \pmod{2(k+1)}\}$ and $S = S_1 \cup S_2$. Clearly, $d(x, y) = (2k+1)r$, $r \geq 1$, for all $x, y \in S$ and $|S| = \lceil \frac{n}{k+1} \rceil = q + 1$. Also, (u_0, v_0) and exactly one of

the vertices (u_0, v_{n-1}) or (u_k, v_{n-1}) are in S and each of these two vertices k-dominates $\frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{2}$ vertices of G. Also, if $u \in N_k[x] \cap N_k[y]$, where $x, y \in S$, then $d(u,x) \leq k$, $d(u,y) \leq k$ and so $d(x,y) \leq d(x,u) + d(u,y) \leq 2k$, which is a contradiction. Thus $N_k[x] \cap N_k[y] = \emptyset$ for all $x, y \in S$. Each of the remaining vertices of S k-dominates $(k+1)^2$ vertices of G. Further, $|V(G)| - (k+1)(k+2)$ is a multiple of $(k+1)^2$ and hence it follows that S is an efficient k-dominating set of G. Hence, by Lemma 3.1, we have $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G) = |S| = \lceil \frac{n}{k+1} \rceil$. ■

Theorem 3.9. *For the graph $G = P_3 \Box P_n$, we have $\gamma_{2f}(G) = \gamma_2(G) = \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$.*

Proof. If $n \equiv 1 \pmod 3$, then the result follows from Theorem 3.8. Suppose $n \equiv 0 \pmod 3$ or $2 \pmod 3$. Let $n = 3q$, $q \geq 1$ or $n = 3q+2$, $q \geq 0$. Let $P_3 = (u_0, u_1, u_2)$ and $P_n = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1})$ so that $V(G) = \{(u_i, v_j) : 0 \leq i \leq 2,\ 0 \leq j \leq n-1\}$. Now $D = \{(u_1, v_j) : j \equiv 1 \pmod 3\}$ is a γ_2-set of G with $|D| = \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$ and hence $\gamma_2(G) = \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$. Further $f = \chi_D$ is a 2-dominating function of G with $|f| = \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$. Also let $S_1 = \{(u_0, v_j) : j \equiv 0 \pmod 6\}$, $S_2 = \{(u_2, v_j) : j \equiv 3 \pmod 6\}$ and $S = S_1 \cup S_2$. Then $g = \chi_S$ is a 2-packing function of G with $|g| = \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$. Hence $\gamma_{2f}(G) = \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil$. ■

Observation 3.10. The graph $G = P_3 \Box P_5$ does not have an efficient 2-dominating set. In fact the set $S = \{(u_0, v_0), (u_2, v_3)\}$ efficiently 2-dominates 14 vertices of G and the vertex (u_0, v_4) is not 2-dominated by S. Further if S is any 2-dominating set of G with $|S| = \gamma_2(G) = 2$, then at least one vertex of G is 2-dominated by both vertices of S. This shows that the converse of Lemma 3.1 is not true.

Theorem 3.11. *For the linear benzenoid chain $G = B(h)$, we have*

$$\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G) = \begin{cases} \frac{h}{2} + 1 & \text{if } k = 2 \text{ and } h \equiv 0 \pmod 2, \\ \lceil \frac{h}{k} \rceil & \text{if } k \geq 3 \text{ and } h \equiv \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor \pmod k. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since $G = B(h)$ is a subgraph of $P_2 \Box P_{2h+1}$, we take $V(G) = \{(u_i, v_j) : i = 0, 1,\ 0 \leq j \leq 2h\}$, where $P_2 = (u_0, u_1)$ and $P_{2h+1} = (v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{2h})$. Clearly, $|V(G)| = 4h+2$. Any vertex $u \in V(G)$ k-dominates at most $4k$ vertices of G and hence $\gamma_k(G) \geq \lceil \frac{4h+2}{4k} \rceil$.

Case 1. $k = 2$ and $h \equiv 0 \pmod 2$. In this case we have $\gamma_2(G) \geq \lceil \frac{4h+2}{8} \rceil = \frac{h}{2} + 1$. Now let $S_1 = \{(u_0, v_j) : j \equiv 0 \pmod 8\}$, $S_2 = \{(u_1, v_j) : j \equiv 4 \pmod 8\}$ and $S = S_1 \cup S_2$. Clearly, for any $x, y \in S$, $d(x,y) \geq 5$ and hence $N_2[x] \cap N_2[y] = \emptyset$. Also $|S| = \lceil \frac{2h+1}{4} \rceil = \frac{h}{2} + 1$. Now (u_0, v_0) and exactly one of the vertices (u_0, v_{2h}) or (u_1, v_{2h}) is in S and each of these two vertices 2-dominates exactly 5 vertices of G. Each of the remaining vertices of S 2-dominates 8 vertices of G. Further $|V(G)| - 10 = 4h - 8 = 8(\frac{h}{2} - 1)$, which is a multiple of 8 and hence it follows that S is an efficient 2-dominating set of G. Hence $\gamma_{2f}(G) = \gamma_2(G) = |S| = \frac{h}{2} + 1$.

Case 2. $k \geq 3$ and $h \equiv \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor \pmod{k}$. Let $h = kq + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$, $q \geq 1$. In this case we have $\gamma_k(G) \geq \lceil \frac{4h+2}{4k} \rceil = \lceil \frac{h}{k} \rceil$. Now let $S_1 = \{(u_0, v_j) : j \equiv (k-1) \pmod{4k}\}$, $S_2 = \{(u_1, v_j) : j \equiv (3k-1) \pmod{4k}\}$ and $S = S_1 \cup S_2$. Clearly, $d(x, y) = (2k+1)r$, $r \geq 1$ for all $x, y \in S$, hence $N_k[x] \cap N_k[y] = \emptyset$. Also $|S| = \lceil \frac{2h-(k-1)}{2k} \rceil = \lceil \frac{h}{k} \rceil$.

Now, when k is odd, exactly one of the vertices (u_0, v_{2h}) or (u_1, v_{2h}) is in S and it k-dominates $2k+1$ vertices. When k is even, exactly one of the vertices (u_0, v_{2h-1}) or (u_1, v_{2h-1}) are in S and it k-dominates $2k+3$ vertices. The vertex (u_0, v_{k-1}) k-dominates $4k-1$ vertices. In both cases the number of vertices of G which are not k-dominated by these two vertices is a multiple of $4k$ and each of the remaining vertices of S k-dominates $4k$ vertices of G. Hence it follows that S is an efficient k-dominating set of G so that $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G) = |S| = \lceil \frac{h}{k} \rceil$. ■

Conclusion. In this paper we have determined the fractional k-domination number of several families of graphs. We have also obtained several families of graphs for which $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G)$. The study of the fractional version of distance k-irredundance and distance k-independence remains open. Slater has mentioned several efficiency parameters such as redundance and influence in Chapter 1 of [10]. One can investigate these parameters for fractional distance domination. The following are some interesting problems for further investigation.

1. Characterize the class of graphs G for which $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \frac{n}{k+1}$.
2. Characterize the class of graphs G with $\gamma_{kf}(G) = \gamma_k(G)$.
3. Determine $\gamma_{kf}(P_r \Box P_s)$ for $r, s \geq 4$.

Acknowledgement

We are thankful to the National Board for Higher Mathematics, Mumbai, for its support through the project 48/5/2008/R&D-II/561, awarded to the first author. The second author is thankful to the UGC, New Delhi for the award of FIP teacher fellowship during the XIth plan period. We are also thankful to the referees for their helpful suggestions.

References

[1] S. Arumugam, K. Karuppasamy and I. Sahul Hamid, *Fractional global domination in graphs*, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory **30** (2010) 33–44. doi:10.7151/dmgt.1474

[2] E.J. Cockayne, G. Fricke, S.T. Hedetniemi and C.M. Mynhardt, *Properties of minimal dominating functions of graphs*, Ars Combin. **41** (1995) 107–115.

[3] G. Chartrand and L. Lesniak, Graphs & Digraphs, Fourth Edition, Chapman & Hall/CRC (2005).

[4] G.S. Domke, S.T. Hedetniemi and R.C. Laskar, *Generalized packings and coverings of graphs*, Congr. Numer. **62** (1988) 259–270.

[5] G.S. Domke, S.T. Hedetniemi and R.C. Laskar, *Fractional packings, coverings, and irredundance in graphs*, Congr. Numer. **66** (1988) 227–238.

[6] D.L. Grinstead and P.J. Slater, *Fractional domination and fractional packings in graphs*, Congr. Numer. **71** (1990) 153–172.

[7] E.O. Hare, *k-weight domination and fractional domination of $P_m \times P_n$*, Congr. Numer. **78** (1990) 71–80.

[8] J.H. Hattingh, M.A. Henning and J.L. Walters, *On the computational complexity of upper distance fractional domination*, Australas. J. Combin. **7** (1993) 133–144.

[9] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi and P.J. Slater, Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs (Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998).

[10] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi and P.J. Slater, Domination in graphs: Advanced Topics (Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998).

[11] S.M. Hedetniemi, S.T. Hedetniemi and T.V. Wimer, Linear time resource allocation algorithms for trees, Technical report URI -014, Department of Mathematics, Clemson University (1987).

[12] A. Meir and J.W. Moon, *Relations between packing and covering numbers of a tree*, Pacific J. Math. **61** (1975) 225–233.

[13] R.R. Rubalcaba, A. Schneider and P.J. Slater, *A survey on graphs which have equal domination and closed neighborhood packing numbers*, AKCE J. Graphs. Combin. **3** (2006) 93–114.

[14] E.R. Scheinerman and D.H. Ullman, Fractional Graph Theory: A Rational Approach to the Theory of Graphs (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1997).

[15] D. Vukičević and A. Klobučar, *k-dominating sets on linear benzenoids and on the infinite hexagonal grid*, Croatica Chemica Acta **80** (2007) 187–191.

Received 22 December 2010
Revised 12 August 2011
Accepted 16 August 2011