Indian J. pure appl. Math., **31**(5) : 545-550, May 2000

THE NONSPLIT DOMINATION NUMBER OF A GRAPH

V. R. KULLI AND B. JANAKIRAM

Department of Mathematics, Gulbarga University, Gulbarga 585 106, *India*

(*Received* 3 *April* 1996; *after final revision* 9 *February* 1998; *Accepted* 7 *December* 1999)

A dominating set D of graph $G = (V, E)$ is a nonsplit dominating set if the induced subgraph $\langle V-D \rangle$ is connected. The nonsplit domination number $\gamma_{ns}(G)$ of G is the minimum cardinality of a nonsplit dominating set. In this paper, many bounds on $\gamma_{ns}(G)$ are obtained and its exact values for some standard graphs are found. Also its relationship with other parameters is investigated.

Key Words : Nonsplit Domination Number; Graph

1. INTRODUCTION

The graphs considered here are finite, undirected nontrivial and connected without loops or multiple edges.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. A set $D \subseteq V$ is a dominating set of G if every vertex in $V - D$ is adjacent to some vertex in D. The domination number $\gamma(G)$ of G is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set.

A dominating set D of G is a connected dominating set if the induced subgraph $\langle D \rangle$ is connected. The connected domination number $\gamma_c(G)$ of G is the minimum cardinality of a connected dominating set.

Recently Kulli and Janakiram introduced the concept of Split Domination[5].

A dominating set D of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a split dominating set if the induced subgraph $\langle V-D \rangle$ is disconnected. The split domination number $\gamma_s(G)$ of G is the minimum cardinality of a split dominating set.

The reader is referred to [1], [2], [3] for survey of results on domination.

Any undefined term in this paper may be found in Harary[4]. Unless stated, the graph has p vertices and q edges.

The purpose of this paper is to introduce the concept of Nonsplit Domination.

A dominating set D of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a nonsplit dominating set if the induced subgraph $\langle V-D \rangle$ is connected. The nonsplit domination number $\gamma_{ns}(G)$ of G is the minimum cardinality of a nonsplit dominating set.

We call a set of vertices a γ - set if it is a dominating set with cardinality $\gamma(G)$. Similarly, a γ_c-set, a γ_s-set and a γ_{ns} - set are defined.

2. Results

We start with some elementary results. Since their proofs are trivial, we omit the same.

***Theorem* 1** — *For any graph G,*

$$\gamma(G) \leq \gamma_{ns}(G). \qquad \dots (1)$$

***Theorem* 2** — *For any graph G,*

$$\gamma(G) = \min \{\gamma_s(G), \gamma_{ns}(G)\}. \qquad \dots (2)$$

In[3], Cockayne and Hedetniemi gave necessary and sufficient conditions for a minimal dominating set.

***Theorem* A[3]** — *A dominating set D of a graph G is minimal if and only if for each vertex $v \in D$ one of the following conditions is satisfied.*

(i) there exists a vertex $u \in V - D$ such that $N(u) \cap D = \{v\}$;

(ii) v is an isolated vertex in $\langle D \rangle$.

***Theorem* 3** — *A nonsplit dominating set D of G is minimal if and only if for each vertex $v \in D$ one of the following conditions is satisfied :*

(i) there exists a vertex $u \in V - D$ such that $N(u) \cap D = \{v\}$;

(ii) v is an isolated vertex in $\langle D \rangle$;

(iii) $N(v) \cap (V - D) = \phi$.

PROOF : Suppose D is minimal. On the contrary, if there exists a vertex $v \in D$ such that v does not satisfy any of the given conditions, then by Theorem A, $D' = D - \{v\}$ is a dominating set of G by (iii), $\langle V - D' \rangle$ is connected. This implies that D' is a nonsplit dominating set of G, a contradiction. This proves the necessity.

Sufficiency is straightforward.

Next we obtain a relationship between $\gamma_{ns}(G)$ and $\gamma_{ns}(H)$ where H is any spanning subgraph of G. We omit the proof.

***Theorem* 4** — *For any spanning subgraph H of G,*

$$\gamma_{ns}(G) \leq \gamma_{ns}(H). \qquad \dots (3)$$

In the following two results, we obtain lower and upper bounds on $\gamma_{ns}(G)$ respectively.

***Theorem* 5** — *For any graph G,*

$$\gamma_{ns}(G) \geq (2p - q - 1)/2. \qquad \dots (4)$$

PROOF : Let D be a γ_{ns} - set of G. Since $\langle V - D \rangle$ is connected,

$$q \geq |V - D| + |V - D| - 1.$$

This proves (4).

***Theorem* 6** — *For any graph G,*

$$\gamma_{ns}(G) \le p - \omega(G) + 1 \qquad \text{... (5)}$$

where $\omega(G)$ is the clique number of G.

PROOF : Let S be a set of vertices of G such that $\langle S \rangle$ is compete with $|S| = \omega(G)$. Then for any $u \in S$, $(V - S) \cup \{u\}$ is a nonsplit dominating set of G.

Thus (5) holds.

Now we list the exact values of $\gamma_{ns}(G)$ for some standard graphs.

Proposition 7 —

(i) For any complete graph K_p with $p \ge 2$ vertices,

$$\gamma_{ns}(K_p) = 1. \qquad \text{... (6)}$$

(ii) For any complete bipartite graph $K_{m,n}$ with $2 \le m \le n$,

$$\gamma_{ns}(K_{m,n}) = 2. \qquad \text{... (7)}$$

(iii) For any cycle

$$C_p, \gamma_{ns}(C_p) = p - 2. \qquad \text{... (8)}$$

(iv) For any wheel

$$W_p, \gamma_{ns}(W_p) = 1. \qquad \text{... (9)}$$

(v) For any path P_p with $p \ge 3$ vertices,

$$\gamma_{ns}(P_p) = p - 2. \qquad \text{... (10)}$$

Our next result sharpens the inequality (5) for trees.

Theorem 8 — *If T is a tree which is not a star, then,*

$$\gamma_{ns}(T) \le p - 2. \qquad \text{... (11)}$$

PROOF : Since T is not a star, there exist two adjacent cut vertices u and v with deg u, deg $v \ge 2$. This implies that $V - \{u, v\}$ is a nonsplit dominating set of T.

Thus (11) holds.

Theorem 9 — *If $\kappa(G) > \beta_0(G)$, then*

$$\gamma_{ns}(G) = \gamma(G) \qquad \text{... (12)}$$

where $\kappa(G)$ is the connectivity of G and $\beta_0(G)$ is the independence number of G.

PROOF : Let D be a γ-set of G. Since $\kappa(G) > \beta_0(G) \ge \gamma(G)$, it implies that $\langle V - D \rangle$ is connected. This proves that D is a γ_{ns} - set of G. Hence (12) follows.

***Theorem* 10** — *Let D be a γ_{ns} - set of a connected graph G. If no two vertices in V – D are adjacent to a common vertex in D, then*

$$\gamma_{ns}(G) + \varepsilon(T) \geq p \quad \ldots (13)$$

where $\varepsilon(T)$ is the maximum number of endvertices in any spanning tree T of G.

PROOF : Let D be a γ_{ns} - set of G, given in the hypothesis. Since for any two vertices $u, v \in V - D$, there exist two vertices $u_1, v_1 \in D$ such that u_1 is adjacent to u but not to v and v_1 is adjacent to v but not to u_1, this implies that there exists a spanning tree T of $\langle V - D \rangle$ in which each vertex of $V - D$ is adjacent to a vertex of D. This proves that $\varepsilon(T) \geq |V - D|$.

Thus (13) holds.

***Theorem* 11** — *If $\delta(G) + \omega(G) \geq p + 1$, then*

$$\gamma_c(G) + \gamma_{ns}(G) \leq p \quad \ldots (14)$$

where δ (G) is the minimum degree of G.

PROOF : By (5), $\gamma_{ns}(G) \leq p - \omega(G) + 1 \leq \delta(G)$.

Let D be a γ_{ns} - set of G. Then every vertex in D is adjacent to some vertex in $V - D$. Thus $\langle V - D \rangle$ is a connected dominating set of G, since $\langle V - D \rangle$ is connected. This proves (14).

In the next result we obtain another upper bound on γ_{ns} (G).

***Theorem* 12** — *For any graph G,*

$$\gamma_{ns}(G) \leq p - \text{diam}(G) + h + 1 \quad \ldots (15)$$

where diam (G) is the diameter of G and h is the minimum number of vertices in a γ_{ns}-set of G which lie in between shortest u-v path and d(u, v) = diam (G).

PROOF : Let diam $(G) = k$. We consider the following cases.

Case 1 — Suppose $u, v \in V - D$. Then $V - D$ has at least $k + 1$ vertices.

Case 2 — Suppose $u \in D$ and $v \in V - D$. If there exists a vertex $u_1 \in V - D$ such that u_1 is connected to u through the vertices of D then, $d(u_1, v) \geq k - (h + 1)$ and hence $V - D$ has at least k-h vertices. For otherwise, for every vertex $u_1 \in V - D$ there exists a vertex w adjacent to u_1 such that $d(u, w) = d(u, v) + d(v, u_1) + d(u_1, w) \geq k + 1$, a contradiction.

This implies that $V - D = \{v\}$ and hence $G = K_2$ or $K_{1,2}$.

Case 3 — Suppose $u, v \in D$. If there exist two vertices $u_1, v_1 \in V - D$ such that u is connected to u_1 and v is connected to v_1 through the vertices of D, then $d(u_1, v_1) \geq k - (h + 2)$ and hence $V - D$ has at least $k - h - 1$ vertices. For otherwise, there exists exactly one vertex $u_1 \in V - D$ which is adjacent to both u and v and $\{u_1\} = (V - D)$. This implies that G is a star with at least three vertices.

Thus from the above all the three cases, it follows that $V - D$ has at least $k - h - 1$ vertices and hence (15) follows.

Now we obtain a lower bound on γ_{ns} (T).

Theorem 13 — *For any tree T,*

$$\gamma_{ns}(T) \geq p - m \qquad \text{... (16)}$$

where m is the number of vertices adjacent to endvertices.

PROOF : If T is K_2, the result is trivial. If T has at least three vertices and D is a γ_{ns} - set of T, then each vertex of $V - D$ is a cutvertex of T. Let S be the set of all cutvertices which are adjacent to endvertices with $|S| = m$. Let $u \in V - D$. If $u \in S$, then $D = V - S$ and (16) holds. If $u \notin S$, then there exists a cutvertex $v \in D$ adjacent to u. Further, all vertices which are connected to v not through u also belonging to D. This implies that $V - D$ has at most m vertices and (16) holds.

Corollary 13.1 — For any tree T,

$$\gamma_c(T) \leq \gamma_{ns}(T). \qquad \text{... (17)}$$

Further if T is a path, then equality holds.

PROOF : If T has no cut vertices, then $T = K_2$ and hence $\gamma_c(T) = \gamma_{ns}(T) = 1$.

Let S be the set of all cut vertices of T with $|S| = p_1$ and $S_1 \subseteq S$ be the set of all cut vertices such that each vertex of S_1 is adjacent to an endvertex with $|S_1| = p_2$.

Thus, $V(T) = p \geq p_1 + p_2$.

Due to Sampath Kumar and Walikar[6],

$$\gamma_c(T) = p_1.$$

Hence (17) follows from (16).

If T is path with $p \geq 3$ vertices, then by (10) and the fact that $v_c(T) = p_1$, the equality holds.

Next we obtain an upper bound on $\gamma_{ns}(T)$.

Theorem 14 — *For any tree T,*

$$\gamma_{ns}(T) \leq p - \max_v \{deg\ v - |e(v)|\}$$

where e(v) is the set of all endvertices adjacent to v.

PROOF : Let v be a vertex with deg $v - |e(v)|$ being maximum. Let $u \in N(v)$. Then it follows that $V - N[v] \cup e(v) \cup \{u\}$ is a nonsplit dominating set of T. Hence (18) holds.

Corollary 14.1 — For any tree T,

$$\gamma_{ns}(T) \leq p - \Delta(T) + p_0 \qquad \text{... (19)}$$

where $\Delta(T)$ is the maximum degree of T and p_0 is the maximum number of endvertices adjacent to a vertex of maximum degree.

Corollary 14.2 — For any graph G,

$$\gamma_{ns}(G) \leq p - \max_v \{\deg\ v - |e(v)|\} \qquad \text{... (20)}$$

where $e(v)$ is the set of all vertices which are adjacent to v but not adjacent to any vertex of $V - N(v)$.

PROOF : This follows from the fact that for any $v \in V$, there exists a spanning tree T such that $\deg_G v = \deg_T v$ and from (3) and (18).

The next result relates to $\gamma_{ns}(G)$ and $\gamma_s(\overline{G})$ where $\overline{G}$ is the complement of G.

Theorem 15 — *If diam (G) = 5, then*

$$\gamma_s(G) \geq \gamma_{ns}(\overline{G}). \qquad \ldots (21)$$

PROOF : Let D be a γ_s-set of G. Then every vertex in $V - D$ is not adjacent to at least one vertex in D, since diam $(G) = 5$. Thus D is a dominating set of $\overline{G}$ and further it is a nonsplit dominating set of $\overline{G}$, as $\langle V - D \rangle$ is connected in $\overline{G}$.

This proves (21).

The following result is obvious. Hence we omit its proof.

Theorem 16 — *Let G be a graph such that both G and $\overline{G}$ are connected. Then*

(i) $\gamma_{ns}(G) + \gamma_{ns}(\overline{G}) \leq 2(p-2)$; ... (22)

(ii) $\gamma_{ns}(G) \cdot \gamma_{ns}(\overline{G}) \leq (p-2)^2$. ... (23)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thanks are due to the referees for their valuable comments and suggestions.

REFERENCES

1. G. Chartrand and L. Lesniak, Graphs and Digraphs, Chapman and Hall, Madras. (1996).
2. E. J. Cockayne, Domination of undirected graphs-A survey. In Theory and Applications of Graphs. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 642, Spring - Verlag (1978) 141-47.
3. E. J. Cockayne and S. T. Hedetniemi, Towards a theory of domination in graphs. Networks 7 (1977) 247-61.
4. F. Harary, Graph Theory. Addison-Wesley, Reading Mass. (1969).
5. V. R. Kulli and B. Janakiram, The split domination number of a graph. Graph Theory Notes of New York, New York Academy of Sciences (1997) XXXII, 16-19.
6. E. Sampathkumar and H. B. Walikar, *J Math. Phys. Sci.* **13** (1979) 607-13.