Discussiones Mathematicae
Graph Theory 25 (2005) 79–84

NOTE ON THE SPLIT DOMINATION NUMBER OF THE CARTESIAN PRODUCT OF PATHS

Maciej Zwierzchowski

Institute of Mathematics
Technical University of Szczecin
Al. Piastów 48/49, 70–310 Szczecin, Poland

e-mail: mzwierz@ps.pl

Abstract

In this note the split domination number of the Cartesian product of two paths is considered. Our results are related to [2] where the domination number of $P_m \Box P_n$ was studied. The split domination number of $P_2 \Box P_n$ is calculated, and we give good estimates for the split domination number of $P_m \Box P_n$ expressed in terms of its domination number.

Keywords: domination number, split domination number, Cartesian product of graphs.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C69.

1. Introduction

In this paper we consider finite undirected simple graphs. For any graph G we denote $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, the vertex set of G and the edge set of G, respectively. If n is the cardinality of $V(G)$, then we say that G is of *order n*. By $\langle X \rangle_G$ we mean a subgraph of a graph G induced by a subset $X \subseteq V(G)$. A subset $D \subseteq V(G)$ is a *dominating set* of G, if for every $x \in V(G) - D$, there is a vertex $y \in D$ such that $xy \in E(G)$. We also say that x is dominated by D in G or by y in G. A dominating set D of G is a *split dominating set* of G, if the induced subgraph $\langle V(G) - D \rangle_G$ of G is disconnected. The domination number, [the split domination number] of a graph G, denoted $\gamma(G)$, [$\gamma_s(G)$] is the cardinality of the smallest dominating [the smallest split dominating] set of G. A dominating set D is called a $\gamma(G)$-set if D realizes the domination number. Similarly we define a $\gamma_s(G)$-set. From the definition of a split dominating set it follows immediately that $\gamma(G) \leq \gamma_s(G)$. Additionally note that for a connected graph G a $\gamma_s(G)$-set exists if and only if G is different from a complete graph. More information about a split dominating set and the split domination number can be found in [3]. The Cartesian product of two graphs G and H, is a graph $G\Box H$ with $V(G\Box H) = V(G) \times V(H)$ and $(g_1, h_1)(g_2, h_2) \in E(G\Box H)$ if and only if ($g_1 = g_2$ and $h_1h_2 \in E(H)$) or ($g_1g_2 \in E(G)$ and $h_1 = h_2$).

Any other terms not defined in this paper can be found in [1].

2. Main Results

Theorem 1. *For any* $n, m \geq 2$

$$\gamma(P_m\Box P_n) \leq \gamma_s(P_m\Box P_n) \leq \gamma(P_m\Box P_n) + 1.$$

Proof. Let $m, n \geq 2$ and let D be the minimum dominating set of $P_m\Box P_n$. According to the definition of a split dominating set we have $\gamma(P_m\Box P_n) \leq \gamma_s(P_m\Box P_n)$. Thus to prove this theorem we will show that $\gamma_s(P_m\Box P_n) \leq \gamma(P_m\Box P_n) + 1$. Consider the graph $P_m\Box P_n$, as m canonical copies of P_n with vertices labelled $x_{i,j}$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, and with edges $x_{i,j}x_{i+1,j}$ and $x_{i,j}x_{i,j+1}$.

If $x_{1,1} \in D$, then the subset $D' = D - \{x_{1,1}\} \cup \{x_{1,2}, x_{2,1}\}$ is also a dominating set of $P_m\Box P_n$. Moreover, since $N_{P_m\Box P_n}(x_{1,1}) = \{x_{1,2}, x_{2,1}\} \subset D'$, then $x_{1,1}$ is an isolated vertex of the induced subgraph $\langle V(P_m\Box P_n) - D'\rangle_{P_m\Box P_n}$ of a graph $P_m\Box P_n$. It means that D' is a split dominating set of $P_m\Box P_n$, with $|D'| \leq \gamma(P_m\Box P_n) + 1$.

If $x_{1,1} \notin D$, then it must be that $x_{1,2} \in D$ or $x_{2,1} \in D$ (otherwise $x_{1,1}$ would not be dominated by D in $P_m\Box P_n$). Assume that $x_{1,2} \in D$, then $D' = D \cup \{x_{1,2}\}$ is a split dominating set of $P_m\Box P_n$ and $|D'| \leq |D| + 1 = \gamma(P_m\Box P_n) + 1$, as desired.

Thus $\gamma_s(P_m\Box P_n) \leq \gamma(P_m\Box P_n) + 1$, for any $m, n \geq 2$ and the proof is complete. ■

In [2] it was obtained that $\lim_{n,m\to\infty} \frac{\gamma(P_m\Box P_n)}{mn} = \frac{1}{5}$. As a consequence from the above fact and from Theorem 1 we obtain the following

Corollary 2.

$$\lim_{n,m\to\infty} \frac{\gamma_s(P_m \Box P_n)}{mn} = \frac{1}{5}.$$

■

The following result was proved in [2].

Theorem 3 [2]**.** *For* $n \geq 2$,

$$\gamma(P_2 \Box P_n) = \left\lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \right\rceil.$$

■

Inspired by this result we shall calculate the split domination number of $P_2 \Box P_n$, for $n \geq 2$. Before proceeding we give a few necessary results.

Let $V(P_2) = \{v_1, v_2\}$ and $V(P_n) = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n\}$. For convenience, in the rest of the paper we will write x_i instead of $(v_1, u_i) \in V(P_2 \Box P_n)$ and y_i instead of $(v_2, u_i) \in V(P_2 \Box P_n)$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Hence $V(P_2 \Box P_n) = \{x_i, y_i : i = 1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ and $E(P_2 \Box P_n) = \{x_i x_{i+1},\ y_i y_{i+1},\ x_i y_i,\ x_n y_n : i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$.

Lemma 4. *If* $n \equiv 2 (\operatorname{mod} 4)$, $n \geq 2$, *then*

$$D = \{x_i : i \equiv 1 (\operatorname{mod} 4)\} \cup \{y_j : j \equiv 3 (\operatorname{mod} 4)\} \cup \{y_n\}$$

is the $\gamma_s(P_2 \Box P_n)$*-set with* $|D| = \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil$.

Proof. Let $D = \{x_i : i \equiv 1 (\operatorname{mod} 4)\} \cup \{y_j : j \equiv 3 (\operatorname{mod} 4)\} \cup \{y_n\}$ be a subset of $V(P_2 \Box P_n)$.

We show that any vertex of $P_2 \Box P_n$ is either in D or it is adjacent to some vertex from D. Let r be an integer not greater than n.

If $r = 4q$, $q \geq 1$, then the vertex x_r is adjacent to $x_{r+1} = x_{4q+1} \in D$ and y_r is adjacent to $y_{r-1} = y_{4q-1} \in D$.

If $r = 4q + 1$, $q \geq 0$, then $x_r \in D$ and y_r is adjacent to x_r.

If $r = 4q + 2$, $q \geq 0$, then x_r is adjacent to $x_{r-1} \in D$. If $r = n$, then $y_r = y_n \in D$ and if $r < n$, then y_r is adjacent to $y_{r+1} \in D$.

Finally, if $r = 4q + 3$, $q \geq 0$, then $y_r \in D$ and x_r is adjacent to y_r.
All this together gives that D is a dominating set of $P_2 \Box P_n$.

Let $n = 4s + 2$, $s \geq 0$. We state that $|D| = \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil$. Indeed, partition $V(P_2 \Box P_n)$ into subsets $B_i = \{x_{4i-3}, y_{4i-3}, \ldots, x_{4i}, y_{4i}\}$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$

and $B_{s+1} = \{x_{n-1}, y_{n-1}, x_n, y_n\}$. Note that $|D \cap B_i| = 2$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s + 1$. Thus $|D| = 2s + 2 = \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil = \gamma(P_2 \Box P_n)$, by Theorem 3. Since $N_{P_2 \Box P_n}(x_n) = \{x_{n-1}, y_n\} \subset D$, hence x_n is an isolated vertex of $\langle V(P_2 \Box P_n) - D \rangle_{P_2 \Box P_n}$. Thus this induced subgraph is disconnected. All this together gives that D is a $\gamma_s(P_2 \Box P_n)$-set, since D is a split dominating set of $P_2 \Box P_n$ with the minimum cardinality. Hence the result is true. ∎

Lemma 5. *If $n \equiv 0 (\mathrm{mod}\, 4)$, $n \geq 2$, then*

$$D = \{x_i : i \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\, 4)\} \cup \{y_j : j \equiv 3 (\mathrm{mod}\, 4)\} \cup \{x_n\}$$

is the $\gamma_s(P_2 \Box P_n)$-set with $|D| = \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil$.

Proof. Let D be as in the statement of the theorem. Arguing similarly as in the proof of above lemma, it follows that D is a dominating set of $P_2 \Box P_n$. Now, we show that $|D| = \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil$. Put $n = 4s$ and partition $V(P_2 \Box P_n)$ into the subsets $B_i = \{x_{4i-3}, y_{4i-3}, \ldots, x_{4i}, y_{4i}\}$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s$. It is easy to observe that $|D \cap B_i| = 2$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, s - 1$ and $|D \cap B_s| = 3$. Hence $|D| = 2(s-1)+3 = 2s+1 = \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil = \gamma(P_2 \Box P_n)$, as desired. Finally, observe that y_n is an isolated vertex of $\langle V(P_2 \Box P_n) - D \rangle_{P_2 \Box P_n}$. This means that the last subgraph is disconnected and as a consequence D is a split dominating set of $P_2 \Box P_n$. Since D is also a $\gamma(P_2 \Box P_n)$-set, it is a $\gamma_s(P_2 \Box P_n)$-set, as required. ∎

Lemma 6. *Let $n \geq 5$ be odd and let D be a $\gamma(P_2 \Box P_n)$-set. Then exactly one of x_1 and y_1 belong to D.*

Proof. Let $n = 2k + 1$ with $k \geq 2$ and let D be a $\gamma(P_2 \Box P_n)$-set. Assume that $x_1, y_1 \notin D$, then it must be that $x_2, y_2 \in D$ (otherwise x_1 or y_1 would not be dominated by D). Since $n \geq 5$ is odd, then $\{x_3, y_3\} \subset V(P_2 \Box P_n)$. Moreover $x_3, y_3 \notin D$. Indeed, without loss of generality, suppose that $x_3 \in D$. Then $D \cup \{y_1\} - \{x_2, y_2\}$ is a dominating set of $P_2 \Box P_n$, having the cardinality $|D| - 1$. This contradicts the fact that D is the minimum dominating set of $P_2 \Box P_n$.

So, we have $x_1, y_1, x_3, y_3 \notin D$ and $x_2, y_2 \in D$. Consider two induced subgraphs of $P_2 \Box P_n$:

$$X_1 = \langle \{x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3\} \rangle_{P_2 \Box P_n} \quad \text{and}$$
$$X_2 = \langle \{x_4, y_4, \ldots, x_n, y_n\} \rangle_{P_2 \Box P_n} .$$

Since $X_2 \cong P_2 \square P_{n-3}$, then by Theorem 3 we have $\gamma(X_2) = \lceil \frac{n-2}{2} \rceil = \lceil \frac{2k-1}{2} \rceil = k$. Further $|D| = \gamma(X_1) + \gamma(X_2) = 2 + k = \lceil \frac{n+3}{2} \rceil > \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil = \gamma(P_2 \square P_n)$, — a contradiction, since D is a $\gamma(P_2 \square P_n)$-set.

Now, assume that x_1 and $y_1 \in D$, then $x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3 \notin D$ (otherwise there would exist a dominating set of $P_2 \square P_n$ with order strictly less than the cardinality of D). Arguing as above, for $X_1 = \langle \{x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2\} \rangle_{P_2 \square P_n}$ and $X_2 = \langle \{x_3, y_3, \ldots, x_n, y_n\} \rangle_{P_2 \square P_n}$, we also come to a contradiction. Hence the proof is complete. ■

In [2] the following was proved

Lemma 7 [2]. *If $n \geq 5$ and n is odd, then*

$$D = \{x_i : i \equiv 1(\text{mod}\, 4)\} \cup \{y_j : j \equiv 3(\text{mod}\, 4)\}$$

is the $\gamma(P_2 \square P_n)$-set with $|D| = \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil$. ■

Lemma 8. *Let $n \geq 5$ be odd and let D be a $\gamma(P_2 \square P_n)$-set. Then*

$$|D \cap \{x_i, y_i, x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}\}| = 1,$$

for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$.

Proof. We prove this lemma by induction. First consider the base case, when $n = 5$. By Lemma 6, either $x_1 \in D$ or $y_1 \in D$ and $x_5 \in D$ or $y_5 \in D$. Since $\gamma(P_2 \square P_5) = 3$, then

$$|D \cap \{x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3, x_4, y_4\}| = 1.$$

If $x_3, y_3 \notin D$, then x_3 or y_3 is not dominated by D in $P_2 \square P_5$. So it must be that either $x_3 \in D$ or $y_3 \in D$. Thus the result holds for $n = 5$.

Assume that the result holds for $n = 2k+1$ and consider $n = 2k+3$. By Lemma 6, either $x_1 \in D$ or $y_1 \in D$. If $x_2, y_2 \notin D$, then by the assumption

$$|D \cap \{x_i, y_i, x_{i+1}, y_{i+1}\}| = 1,$$

for $i = 3, 4, \ldots, n-1$. Moreover,

$$|D \cap \{x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2\}| = 1 \text{ and}$$
$$|D \cap \{x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3\}| = 1.$$

Thus the result holds for $n = 2k + 3$.

If $x_2 \in D$ or $y_2 \in D$, then $D_1 = D \cap \{x_i, y_i : i = 4, \ldots, n\}$ is a $\gamma(P_2 \Box P_{2k})$-set and $|D_1| = \lceil \frac{2k+1}{2} \rceil = k + 1$, by Theorem 3. Thus

$$|D| \geq |D_1| + 2 = k + 3 > \left\lceil \frac{2k+3}{2} \right\rceil = \gamma(P_2 \Box P_{2k+3})$$

but this is impossible, since D is a $\gamma(P_2 \Box P_{2k+3})$-set.

Hence the result is true for all odd $n \geq 5$. ■

Theorem 9. *For $n \geq 2$,*

$$\gamma_s(P_2 \Box P_n) = \begin{cases} \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil, & \textit{if } n \textit{ is even or } n = 3, \\ \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil + 1, & \textit{if } n \geq 5 \textit{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $n \geq 2$ be even. According to Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 the result is true.

If $n = 3$, then the set $\{x_2, y_2\}$ is the minimum split dominating set of $P_2 \Box P_3$, with the required cardinality.

Next, suppose that $n \geq 5$ is odd. Then $n = 2k + 1$, $(k \geq 2)$. According to Lemma 8 we have that the set D of Lemma 7 is unique (modulo the automorphism that exchanges paths P_n). Moreover, observe that D is not a split dominating set of $P_2 \Box P_n$. Thus $\gamma(P_2 \Box P_n) < \gamma_s(P_2 \Box P_n)$ and by Theorem 1 we obtain that $\gamma_s(P_2 \Box P_n) = \gamma(P_2 \Box P_n) + 1$. ■

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank the referees for many helpful corrections.

References

[1] R. Diestel, Graph Theory (Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., 1997).

[2] M.S. Jacobson and L.F. Kinch, *On the domination number of products of graphs:* I, Ars Combinatoria **18** (1983) 33–44.

[3] V.R. Kulli and B. Janakiram, *The split domination number of a graph*, Graph Theory Notes of New York **XXXII** (1997) 16–19.

Received 31 October 2003
Revised 12 May 2004