DIMACS Technical Report 96-47
October 1996

On independent domination number of graphs with given minimum degree

by

N. I. Glebov[1]
Institute of Mathematics
630090 Novosibirsk, Russia

A. V. Kostochka[2]
Institute of Mathematics
630090 Novosibirsk, Russia

DIMACS is a partnership of Rutgers University, Princeton University, AT&T Research, Bellcore, and Bell Laboratories.
DIMACS is an NSF Science and Technology Center, funded under contract STC–91–19999; and also receives support from the New Jersey Commission on Science and Technology.

Abstract

We prove a new upper bound on the independent domination number of graphs in terms of the number of vertices and the minimum degree. This bound is slightly better than that by J. Haviland [3] and settles Case $\delta = 2$ of the corresponding conjecture by O. Favaron [2].

[1]This work was partially supported by the grant 96-01-01591 of the Russian Foundation for Fundamental Research.

[2]This work was partially supported by the grant 96-01-01614 of the Russian Foundation for Fundamental Research and by the Network DIMANET of the European Union

1 Introduction

The independent domination number $i(G)$ of a graph G is defined to be the minimum cardinality among all maximal (by inclusion) independent sets of G. Let $i(n,\delta)$ denote the maximum of the independent domination numbers over the graphs with n vertices and the minimum degree at least δ.

By a theorem of B. Bollobás and E. J. Cockayne in [1], $i(n,1) \leq n + 2 - 2\sqrt{n}$. Favaron [2] proved the bound $i(n,\delta) \leq n + 3\delta - 2\sqrt{\delta(n+2\delta)}$ and conjectured that

$$i(n,\delta) \leq n + 2\delta - 2\sqrt{\delta n}. \tag{1}$$

This last bound (if true), for every fixed positive integer δ, is attained on infinitely many graphs. Haviland [3] improved the bound of Favaron as follows: if $0 \leq \delta \leq (n-2)/7$, then

$$i(n,\delta) \leq n + 3\delta - \min\{1 + 2\sqrt{\delta(n+2\delta-2)}, 2\sqrt{\delta(n+9\delta/4)}\},$$

and if $(n-2)/7 \leq \delta \leq n/4$, then $i(n,\delta) \leq 2(n-\delta)/3$.

The aim of this note is to prove the following

Theorem 1 *For each integer* $\delta \geq 2$*,*

$$i(n,\delta) \leq n + 3\delta - 2\sqrt{\delta(n+2\delta-4)} - 2. \tag{2}$$

The bound in Theorem 1 is better than that of Haviland for $n > 7\delta + 2$ and for $\delta = 2$ is equivalent to (1). That means that for $\delta = 2$ the bound is sharp for infinitely many n.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

Let n and δ be positive integers with $2 \leq \delta < n$. Choose a graph G on n vertices with the minimum degree at least δ and $i(G) = i(n,\delta)$. In the sequel, I is an independent dominating set in G with $i = |I| = i(n,\delta)$, $K = V(G) \setminus I$, $k = |K| = n - i$. For $X, Y \subseteq V(G)$ and $v \in V(G)$, we denote $[X,Y] = \{(v,w) \in E(G) \mid v \in X,\ w \in Y\}$, $N(v) = \{w \in V(G) \mid (v,w) \in E(G)\}$, $N_I(v) = N(v) \cap I$, $d_I(v) = |N_I(v)|$, $N(X) = \bigcup_{v \in X} N(v)$.

In these terms, we need to prove that

$$k \geq 2\sqrt{\delta(n+2\delta-4)} - 3\delta + 2.$$

Assume that the opposite holds, i.e., that

$$k < 2\sqrt{\delta(n+2\delta-4)} - 3\delta + 2. \tag{3}$$

We shall show that this assumption leads to a contradiction. First, we observe that (3) yields that for each positive x,

$$k(x-1+\delta) < x^2 - 1 + \delta(n-x-1). \tag{4}$$

Indeed, for each positive x,

$$2\sqrt{\delta(n+2\delta-4)} - 3\delta + 2 \le (x-1+\delta) + \frac{\delta(n+2\delta-4)}{x-1+\delta} - 3\delta + 2 =$$

$$= \frac{x^2-1+\delta(n-x-1)}{x-1+\delta},$$

and so, (3) implies (4).

Inequality (4) can be rewritten also in the form

$$(k-x-1)(x-1) < \delta(n-k-x-1). \tag{5}$$

Since $E(G) \neq \emptyset$, $K \neq \emptyset$. For each $v \in K$, we define $S(v) = \{w \in K \mid N_I(w) \subseteq N_I(v)\}$ and $\widetilde{S}(v) = S(v) \setminus N(v)$. By definition, $v \in \widetilde{S}(v)$.

Proposition 1 *Let $v \in K$ and M be an arbitrary independent subset of $\widetilde{S}(v)$, containing v and dominating $\widetilde{S}(v)$. Then*

$$|M| \ge d_I(v).$$

Proof. Observe that $(I \setminus N_I(v)) \cup M$ is an independent dominating set in G. This yields the proposition. □

It follows from Proposition 1 that

$$|\widetilde{S}(v)| \ge d_I(v). \tag{6}$$

Choose $v_1 \in K$ with $|N_I(v_1)| = \max\{|N_I(v)| : v \in K\}$, and denote $x = |N_I(v_1)|$.

Proposition 2 $x \ge \delta + 1$.

Proof. If $x \leq \delta$, then

$$\delta k \geq xk \geq |[K, I]| \geq \delta |I| = \delta(n-k),$$

which gives $k \geq n/2$. But $n/2 \geq 2\sqrt{\delta(n+2\delta-4)} - 3\delta + 2$, since $(\sqrt{\delta(n+2\delta-4)} - 2\sqrt{\delta})^2 \geq 0$. This contradicts (3). □

Proposition 3 *If $v \in K$ and $d_I(v) = x$ then $N_I(v) \cap N_I(v_1) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Let m be the maximum integer for which there exist vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ in K such that $d_I(v_j) = x$ for each $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $N_I(v_j) \cap N_I(v_h) = \emptyset$ for each $1 \leq j < h \leq m$. Assume that $m > 1$. Denote $N = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} N_I(v_j)$ and $S = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m} S_I(v_j)$. Then $|(I \setminus N) \cap N(v)| \leq x - 1$ for each $v \in K \setminus S$, and by (6) we get

$$(k - mx)(x-1) \geq |[K \setminus S, I \setminus N]| \geq \delta(n - k - mx).$$

Rewriting this and applying Proposition 2, we obtain

$$k(x-1+\delta) \geq mx(x-1) + \delta(n-mx) = mx(x-\delta-1) + \delta n \geq 2x(x-\delta-1) + \delta n =$$

$$= x^2 - 1 + \delta(n-x-1) + (x-1)(x-\delta-1) \geq x^2 - 1 + \delta(n-x-1),$$

which contradicts (4). □

Proposition 4 *For each $v \in K$, $\widetilde{S}(v) \cap \widetilde{S}(v_1) \neq \emptyset$. In particular, $N_I(v) \cap N_I(v_1) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Assume that for some $v \in K$, $\widetilde{S}(v) \cap \widetilde{S}(v_1) = \emptyset$. Denote $y = d_I(v)$. Then, by Proposition 3, $(k - x - y)(x-1) \geq \delta(n - k - x - y)$, and hence

$$k(x-1+\delta) \geq x^2 - 1 + \delta(n-x-1) + (y-1)(x-1+\delta) \geq x^2 - 1 + \delta(n-x-1),$$

which again contradicts (4). □

Proposition 5 *There exists $v_2 \in K$ such that $d_I(v_2) = x$ and $|N_I(v_2) \cap N_I(v_1)| = 1$.*

Proof. Otherwise,

$$(k-x)(x-2) \geq |[K \setminus S(v_1), I \setminus N_I(v_1)]| \geq \delta(n-k-x).$$

It follows that

$$k(x-2+\delta) \geq x(x-2) + \delta(n-x) = (x-2\delta)(x-2+\delta) + \delta(n+2\delta-4),$$

$$k \geq (x-2+\delta) + \frac{\delta(n+2\delta-4)}{x-2+\delta} - 3\delta + 2 \geq 2\sqrt{\delta(n+2\delta-4)} - 3\delta + 2,$$

which contradicts (3). □

In view of Proposition 5, we can consider a vertex $z \in I$ and $Z \subseteq K$ such that $\{z\} = N_I(v_1) \cap N_I(v_2)$ and $Z = \{v \in K \mid N_I(v) = \{z\}\} = S(v_1) \cap S(v_2)$.

Proposition 6 *$|Z| = x - \delta$.*

Proof. If $|Z| \geq x - \delta + 1$, then

$$(k-x+\delta-1)(x-1) \geq |[K \setminus Z, I \setminus \{z\}]| \geq \delta(n-k-1).$$

Consequently, $(k-x-1)(x-1) \geq \delta(n-k-x)$, which contradicts (5).

If $|Z| \leq x - \delta - 1$, then

$$(k-x-\delta-1)(x-1) \geq |[K \setminus (S(v_1) \cup S(v_2)), I \setminus (N_I(v_1) \cup N_I(v_2))]| \geq \delta(n-k-2x+1).$$

Consequently, $(k-x-1)(x-1) \geq \delta(n-k-x)$, which again contradicts (5). □

Proposition 7 *For each $v \in K$, $z \in N(v)$. In particular, $Z \subseteq S(v)$.*

Proof. CASE 1. $v \in S(v_1)$. By definition, $N_I(v) \subseteq N_I(v_1)$. By Proposition 4, $N_I(v) \cap N_I(v_2) \neq \emptyset$. Since $N_I(v_1) \cap N_I(v_2) = \{z\}$, we get $N_I(v) \cap N_I(v_2) = \{z\}$.

CASE 2. $v \in K \setminus S(v_1)$. By Proposition 4, there exists $w \in S(v) \cap S(v_1)$. According to Case 1, $z \in N(w)$. Since $w \in S(v)$, $N_I(w) \subseteq N_I(v)$. □

Proposition 8 *For each $v \in K$, $|S(v) \setminus Z| \leq \delta$.*

Proof. Assume that $|S(v) \setminus Z| \geq \delta + 1$. Then, due to Propositions 7,6 and 4, $|S(v)| \geq |Z| + \delta + 1 \geq x + 1$, and

$$(k - x - 1)(x - 1) \geq |[K \setminus S(v), I \setminus N_I(v)]| \geq \delta(n - k - |N_I(v)|).$$

Thus, $(k - x - 1)(x - 1) \geq \delta(n - k - x)$ which contradicts (5). $\square$

Proposition 9 *For each $v \in Z$, $|N(v) \cap (K \setminus Z)| \geq \delta - 1$.*

Proof. If the statement is not fulfilled, then Z is not independent and $S(v_1)$ is bigger than any its independent subset. In this case, by Proposition 1, $|S(v_1)| \geq x + 1$. Consequently,

$$(k - x - 1)(x - 1) \geq |[K \setminus S(v_1), I \setminus N_I(v_1)]| \geq \delta(n - k - x),$$

which contradicts (5). $\square$

Proposition 10 *For each $v \in K$, $|(Z \cup I) \cap N(v)| \leq x$.*

Proof. By (6) and Propositions 6 and 8, we have

$$|(Z \cup I) \cap N(v)| = |Z \cap N(v)| + |N_I(v)| \leq |Z \cap N(v)| + |\widetilde{S}(v)| =$$

$$= |Z \cap N(v)| + |Z \cap \widetilde{S}(v)| + |\widetilde{S}(v) \setminus Z| \leq (x - \delta) + \delta = x. \quad \square$$

Now we come to the final part of the whole proof. By Propositions 10, 6 and 7,

$$|[Z \cup (I \setminus \{z\}), K \setminus Z]| \leq |K \setminus Z|(x - 1) = (k - x + \delta)(x - 1).$$

On the other hand, by Propositions 6 and 9,

$$|[Z \cup (I \setminus \{z\}), K \setminus Z]| = |[Z, K \setminus Z]| + |[I \setminus \{z\}, K \setminus Z]| \geq$$

$$\geq (\delta - 1)|Z| + \delta|I \setminus \{z\}| = (\delta - 1)(x - \delta) + \delta(n - k - 1).$$

Taking into account that $\delta \geq 2$ and $x \geq \delta + 1$, we obtain

$$k(x - 1 + \delta) \geq (x - \delta)(x - 1) + (\delta - 1)(x - \delta) + \delta(n - 1) =$$

$$= x^2 - 1 + (\delta - 2)(x - \delta) + \delta(n - x - 1) + 1 > x^2 - 1 + \delta(n - x - 1),$$

which contradicts (4). $\square$

References

[1] B. Bollobás and E. J. Cockayne, Graph theoretic parameters concerning domination, independence and irredunance, *J. Graph Theory*, 3(1979), 241-249.

[2] O. Favaron, Two relations between the parameters of independence and irredunance, *Discrete Math.*, 70(1988), 17-20.

[3] J. Haviland, On minimum maximal independent sets of a graph, *Discrete Math.*, 94(1991), 95-101.