

On the metric dimension, the upper dimension and the resolving number of graphs

Delia Garijo*

Antonio González*

Alberto Márquez*

Abstract

This paper deals with three resolving parameters: the metric dimension, the upper dimension and the resolving number. We first answer a question raised by Chartrand and Zhang asking for a characterization of the graphs with equal metric dimension and resolving number. We also solve in the affirmative a conjecture posed by Chartrand, Poisson and Zhang about the realization of the metric dimension and the upper dimension. Finally we prove that no integer $a \geq 4$ is realizable as the resolving number of an infinite family of graphs.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we study resolving sets for finite simple connected graphs. They were introduced in the 1970s independently by Slater [7], and Harary and Melter [4]. The usefulness of these sets comes from their multiple applications in several areas, among them: coin weighing problems, network discovery and verification, robot navigation, strategies for Mastermind game and chemical industry (we refer the reader to [1] for a number of references on this topic). Resolving sets are formally defined as follows.

Let $G = (V(G), E(G))$ be a finite, simple, connected graph of order $n = |V(G)|$. The *distance* $d(u, v)$ between two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ is the length of a shortest u - v path in G . A vertex $u \in V(G)$ *resolves* a pair $\{x, y\} \subset V(G)$ if $d(u, x) \neq d(u, y)$. A set of vertices $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a *resolving set* of G if every pair of vertices of G is resolved by some vertex of S . A resolving set S of minimum size is a *metric basis*, and $|S|$ is the *metric dimension* of G , denoted by $\dim(G)$.

Our aim is not only to deal with metric bases and metric dimension but also with two other resolving parameters defined by Chartrand et al. [3], *the upper dimension* and *the resolving number*, that give an insight of how dense the set of resolving sets of a graph is.

A resolving set S of G is *minimal* if no proper subset of S is a resolving set. An *upper basis* is a minimal resolving set containing the maximum number of vertices. The *upper dimension* $\dim^+(G)$ is the size of an upper basis. The *resolving number* $\text{res}(G)$ is the minimum k such that every k -subset of $V(G)$ is a resolving set of G .

Clearly, every $(n - 1)$ -subset of $V(G)$ is a resolving set and every resolving set contains a minimal resolving set. Hence,

$$1 \leq \dim(G) \leq \dim^+(G) \leq \text{res}(G) \leq n - 1.$$

*Department of Applied Mathematics I, University of Seville, Spain. Email addresses: {dgarijo,gonzalez,almar}@us.es.

When $\dim(G) = \text{res}(G) = k$, the graph G is called *randomly k -dimensional*, that is, every subset of size k is a metric basis and so G has the maximum number of metric bases.

Chartrand and Zhang [2] posed the problem of characterizing the randomly k -dimensional graphs. They solved the case $k \leq 2$, obtaining the complete graphs K_1 and K_2 (for $k = 1$) and odd cycles (for $k = 2$) which includes as a particular case the complete graph K_3 . Nevertheless, it remained open the main following question.

Problem 1.1. [2] *Are there randomly k -dimensional graphs other than complete graphs and odd cycles?*

Concerning the three parameters, Chartrand et al. [3] investigated some relationships among them. They proved that every pair a, b of integers with $2 \leq a \leq b$ is realizable as the metric dimension and the resolving number, respectively, of some connected graph G . It was also shown the analogous result for $\dim(G) = \dim^+(G) = a$ and $\text{res}(G) = b$. Moreover, the authors proved that every pair among the three parameters can differ by an arbitrarily large number. Thus, as remarked in [3], there was reason to believe that every pair a, b of integers with $2 \leq a \leq b$ is realizable as the metric dimension and the upper dimension, respectively, of some connected graph. This remained as a conjecture.

Conjecture 1.2. [3] *For every pair a, b of integers with $2 \leq a \leq b$, there exists a connected graph G with $\dim(G) = a$ and $\dim^+(G) = b$.*

In this paper, we provide a combinatorial proof avoiding the brute force casuistic analysis to solve Problem 1.1 (see Theorem 2.5). We also prove in the affirmative Conjecture 1.2 (see Theorem 3.5) and show that no integer $a \geq 4$ is realizable as the resolving number of an infinite family of graphs (see Theorem 3.7).

2 Graphs G with $\dim(G) = \text{res}(G)$.

In this section, we characterize the randomly k -dimensional graphs. The main difficulty in this problem is to avoid the casuistic analysis resulting from the intuitive idea of considering metric bases formed by k vertices close to a given vertex, and then to try to extend this local argument to the whole graph. In fact, while preparing this paper, we have learnt of [5], where the authors prove the same result going through this type of analysis and using also results related to the degree of the vertices, the connectivity and the induced subgraphs. Here, we present an alternative proof based on combinatorial arguments.

We start with some technical lemmas needed for the case $k = 3$. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_\lambda(V(G))$ the λ -subsets of $V(G)$ and let $N_i(u)$ be the set of vertices at distance i from $u \in V(G)$. For $\{u, v\}, \{x, y\} \in \mathcal{P}_2(V(G))$ we say that *the pair $\{u, v\}$ resolves the pair $\{x, y\}$* if either u or v resolves it.

Lemma 2.1. *Let G be a randomly 3-dimensional graph. Then, the following statements hold.*

- (a) *For every pair $\{u, v\} \in \mathcal{P}_2(V(G))$ there exist unique pairs $\{x, y\}, \{r, s\} \in \mathcal{P}_2(V(G))$ such that $\{x, y\}$ is not resolved by $\{u, v\}$, and $\{u, v\}$ is not resolved by $\{r, s\}$.*
- (b) *Every vertex $u \in V(G)$ satisfies that*

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \text{ecc}(u)} \binom{|N_i(u)|}{2} = n - 1 \quad (1)$$

where $\text{ecc}(u)$ denotes the eccentricity of u , i.e., the maximum distance from u to any other vertex.

Proof. To prove Statement (a), consider a graph G verifying that $\dim(G) = \text{res}(G) = 3$. Clearly, for every pair of vertices $\{u, v\}$ there is a pair $\{x, y\}$ that is not resolved by $\{u, v\}$ (otherwise $\dim(G) = 2$). Suppose on the contrary that there are two pairs $\{u, v\}, \{\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}\}$ that have the same associated pair $\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{P}_2(V(G))$, i.e., $\{x, y\}$ is not resolved by either $\{u, v\}$ or $\{\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}\}$, and assume that $u, v \neq \tilde{u}$. Then the set $\{u, v, \tilde{u}\}$ is not a metric basis, which is a contradiction. It is analogous to prove that there is a unique pair $\{r, s\} \in \mathcal{P}_2(V(G))$ such that $\{u, v\}$ is not resolved by $\{r, s\}$. Hence, the result follows.

As a consequence of Statement (a) we have that the size of the set of non-resolved pairs by a vertex $u \in V(G)$ is equal to $n - 1$ (it suffices to consider the $n - 1$ distinct pairs $\{u, v\}$ with $v \in V(G) \setminus \{u\}$). This set is formed by pairs of vertices at the same distance from u and so its size is equal to $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \text{ecc}(u)} \binom{|N_i(u)|}{2}$, which proves Statement (b). □

Remark 2.2. Fixed $u \in V(G)$, consider the partition $\mathcal{P}(u) = \{N_i(u) \mid 0 \leq i \leq \text{ecc}(u)\}$ of $V(G)$ into classes (where $N_0(u) = \{u\}$). Lemma 2.1(b) says that there is a compensation between vertices of $V(G) \setminus \{u\}$ and pairs of vertices located in the same class of $\mathcal{P}(u)$. For instance, classes of size at least 4 always contribute to Equation 1 with more pairs than vertices (6 pairs and 4 vertices in case of size 4) and so they have to be compensated with classes of size at most 2 whose contribution is bigger in terms of vertices than in pairs. Note that classes of size 3 which contribute with 3 pairs, are self-compensated. Therefore, the existence of a class of size at least 4 in the partition $\mathcal{P}(u)$ is equivalent to the existence of at least two classes of size at most 2.

The following straightforward lemma will be useful for the proofs of this paper.

Lemma 2.3. [6] Let $u, v, w \in V(G)$ such that $\{v, w\} \in E(G)$ and $d(u, v) = d$. Then $d(u, w) \in \{d - 1, d, d + 1\}$.

Lemma 2.1 and Remark 2.2 are the key tools to prove the following lemma which let us avoid the casuistic analysis to characterize the randomly 3-dimensional graphs.

Lemma 2.4. Let G be a randomly 3-dimensional graph of order n . Then, G is 3-regular and $n \in \{4, 7, 10\}$.

Proof. First, observe that G does not contain vertices of degree 1. Indeed, if a vertex u has a unique neighbour v , then the pair $\{u, v\}$ is resolved by every vertex of G , which contradicts Lemma 2.1(a).

Claim 1. The degree of every vertex of G is at most 3.

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that there exists $u \in V(G)$ of degree at least 4 and let $u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 \in N_1(u)$. By Lemma 2.1(a), each set $\mathcal{A}_{ij} = \{v \in V(G) \mid d(v, u_i) = d(v, u_j)\}$ with $1 \leq i < j \leq 4$ contains exactly two vertices of G . Moreover, Lemma 2.3 implies that every vertex of G belongs to at least one of the six sets \mathcal{A}_{ij} . Hence, $n \leq 7$ since $u \in \mathcal{A}_{ij}$ for all i, j .

Consider now the partition $\mathcal{P}(u)$ in which $N_1(u)$ is a class of size at least 4. By Remark 2.2, there are at least two classes of size at most 2. Even more, since $n \leq 7$ then there are exactly two classes of size 1 and so the furthest vertex from u has degree 1; a contradiction. Therefore, every vertex of G has degree at most 3. \square

Claim 2. $n \in \{4, 7, 10\}$.

Proof. Since $\dim(G) = 3$ then G is neither a path nor a cycle and so there is a vertex $u \in V(G)$ of degree 3 with neighbours, say u_1, u_2, u_3 . Arguing as in the proof of Claim 1 (defining the analogous sets \mathcal{A}_{ij} but for the vertices u, u_1, u_2, u_3) we have that $n \leq 10$.

The sets $\{u\}$ and $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ are the classes $N_0(u)$ and $N_1(u)$, respectively, in the partition $\mathcal{P}(u)$. If this partition does not contain more classes, then $n = 4$. Otherwise, Remark 2.2 says that the existence of a class of size at least 4 is equivalent to the existence of at least two classes of size at most 2, and classes of size 3 are self-compensated. Since $n \leq 10$, it is easy to check that there are two possibilities for $\mathcal{P}(u)$: (1) a class of size 4 and two classes of size 1 (plus $N_0(u)$ and $N_1(u)$); (2) two classes of size 3 (one being $N_1(u)$). This gives $n = 10$ and $n = 7$, respectively. \square

Claim 3. *There is no vertex of degree 2.*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that there is a vertex $u \in V(G)$ of degree 2. Then, $|N_1(u)| = 2$. By Remark 2.2, $\mathcal{P}(u)$ contains a class of size at least 4 and another class of size at most 2. Since $n \leq 10$ we have the following two possibilities for $\mathcal{P}(u)$: (1) one class of size 4, two classes of size 1 and one class of size 2; (2) one class of size 4, one class of size 1 and two classes of size 2. This gives, respectively, $n = 8$ and $n = 9$ which contradicts Claim 2. \square

The three previous claims prove that a graph G of order n satisfying $\dim(G) = \text{res}(G) = 3$ is 3-regular and $n \in \{4, 7, 10\}$. \square

Now, we reach the desired characterization that solves Problem 1.1.

Theorem 2.5. *A graph G is randomly k -dimensional if and only if G is a complete graph or an odd cycle.*

Proof. If G is isomorphic to a complete graph or an odd cycle, it is straightforward to prove that G is randomly k -dimensional.

Suppose now that G is a graph of order n satisfying $\dim(G) = \text{res}(G) = k$. We can assume $k \geq 3$ (as it was said before the case $k \leq 2$ is proved in [2], obtaining the complete graphs K_1 and K_2 (for $k = 1$) and odd cycles (for $k = 2$)). Suppose first that $k = 3$ and so $\dim(G) = \text{res}(G) = 3$. By Lemma 2.4, G is 3-regular and $n \in \{4, 7, 10\}$. We shall now prove that $n = 4$.

Clearly, $n \neq 7$ since there is no 3-regular graph with 7 vertices. Consider now two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ so that $d(u, v) = d(G)$, where $d(G)$ denotes the diameter of G . Let $N_1(u) = \{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$. By Lemma 2.3, the distance from v to every vertex of the set $\{u, u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ is either $d(G)$ or $d(G) - 1$. Hence, v belongs to at least two of the sets \mathcal{A}_{ij} defined as in the proof of Claim 1 but for the vertices u, u_1, u_2, u_3 . By Lemma 2.1(a), each set contains exactly two vertices of G and u belongs to three of them. This gives $n < 10$ and so $n = 4$ which implies that G is isomorphic to K_4 (the only 3-regular graph with 4 vertices).

Suppose now that $k \geq 4$ and assume $\dim(G) = \text{res}(G) = k$. Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 2.1(a) we have that for every $T \in \mathcal{P}_{k-1}(V(G))$, the non-empty set

$$S_T = \{\{x, y\} \mid T \text{ does not resolve } \{x, y\}\} \subset \mathcal{P}_2(V(G))$$

verifies that $S_T \cap S_{T'} = \emptyset$ whenever $T \neq T'$. Therefore $|\mathcal{P}_{k-1}(V(G))| \leq |\mathcal{P}_2(V(G))|$, i.e.,

$$\binom{n}{k-1} \leq \binom{n}{2} \implies k \in \{1, 2, 3, n-1, n, n+1\}.$$

Hence $k = n - 1$ since $4 \leq k = \dim(G)$. This implies that G is isomorphic to the complete graph K_n which is the only graph verifying that $\dim(G) = k = n - 1$. \square

3 Realization of graphs

3.1 Realization of the metric dimension and the upper dimension

This subsection is devoted to prove in the affirmative Conjecture 1.2. In order to do this, we compute the upper dimension of two families of graphs for which the metric dimension is easily obtained. These graphs are constructed from the grid graphs attaching at the origin either a triangle or a number of pendant vertices. We start with some notation and technical lemmas.

Let G_ℓ be the 2-dimensional grid graph of size $\ell \times \ell$ with $\ell \geq 2$, whose vertex set is the cartesian product $[0, \ell - 1] \times [0, \ell - 1]$ and distances given by $d((x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)) = |x_1 - y_1| + |x_2 - y_2|$. We shall use x_1, x_2 to indicate the coordinates of a vertex $x \in V(G_\ell)$ (analogously $y = (y_1, y_2)$, $z = (z_1, z_2)$, $r = (r_1, r_2)$, etc.) The following sets of vertices are called *quadrants* of $x \in V(G_\ell)$:

$$Q_1(x) = \{y \in V(G_\ell) \mid y_1 \geq x_1, y_2 \geq x_2\}, Q_2(x) = \{y \in V(G_\ell) \mid y_1 \leq x_1, y_2 \geq x_2\},$$

$$Q_3(x) = \{y \in V(G_\ell) \mid y_1 \leq x_1, y_2 \leq x_2\}, Q_4(x) = \{y \in V(G_\ell) \mid y_1 \geq x_1, y_2 \leq x_2\},$$

and the sets $D_i = \{x \in V(G_\ell) \mid x_1 + x_2 = i\}$ for $0 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ are the *diagonals* of G_ℓ (see Figure 1(a)). A pair of vertices $\{x, y\}$ is said to be a *diagonal pair* if $x, y \in D_i$ for some i . Note that a quadrant $Q_i(x)$ might be equal to $\{x\}$ and there is a total order $<_i$ in each diagonal D_i (or simply " $<$ " when no confusion can arise) given by

$$x <_i y \iff x_1 < y_1.$$

In the sequel, we shall assume without loss of generality that the order of the two elements of a diagonal pair $\{x, y\}$ is $x < y$ (analogously $r < s$ for $\{r, s\}$ or $t < z$ for $\{t, z\}$).

Let $R(x, y)$ be the set of vertices of G_ℓ that resolve the pair $\{x, y\} \subset V(G_\ell)$, and let S be a resolving set of G_ℓ . Note that the set $R(x, y) \cap S$ is non-empty for every pair $\{x, y\}$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\{x, y\}$ be a diagonal pair such that $d(x, y) = 2$. Then,*

$$R(x, y) = Q_2(x) \cup Q_4(y).$$




Figure 1: (a) Quadrants of x and a diagonal D_i , (b) The shadowed region is $R(x, y) = Q_2(x) \cup Q_4(y)$. The dotted edges form the two shortest paths P_1, P_2 .

Proof. Every vertex $u \in Q_2(x)$ has a shortest u - y path through x and so $d(u, y) = d(u, x) + d(x, y) = d(u, x) + 2$. Thus, u resolves $\{x, y\}$ (analogous for $u \in Q_4(y)$).

Let $u \in V(G_\ell) \setminus (Q_2(x) \cup Q_4(y))$, $z = (x_1, y_2)$ and $\tilde{z} = (y_1, x_2)$. Clearly, there are two shortest paths P_1, P_2 joining u to x and u to y , respectively, such that either $z \in P_1, P_2$ or $\tilde{z} \in P_1, P_2$ (see Figure 1(b)). Since z, \tilde{z} do not resolve the pair $\{x, y\}$ then $u \notin R(x, y)$. \square

A pair $\{x, y\}$ is said to be S -unique if there is a unique vertex $u \in S$ resolving $\{x, y\}$, i.e., $R(x, y) \cap S = \{u\}$. The vertex u is called the *associated vertex of the pair* $\{x, y\}$. The following remark is straightforward.

Remark 3.2. Let $\{x, y\}$ be an S -unique pair with associated vertex u . If there is a pair $\{r, s\}$ such that $R(r, s) \subseteq R(x, y)$ then $\{r, s\}$ is S -unique with associated vertex u .

Lemma 3.3. Let $\{x, y\} = \{(x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2)\}$ be an S -unique diagonal pair with associated vertex u such that $d(x, y) > 2$. Then there exist $y_1 - x_1$ S -unique diagonal pairs $\{r, s\}$ with associated vertex u and $d(r, s) = 2$.

Proof. A similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, considering $z = (x_1, y_2)$ and $\tilde{z} = (y_1, x_2)$ gives that every vertex $u \in Q_3(z) \cup Q_1(\tilde{z})$ does not resolve the pair $\{x, y\}$. We have to add the vertices $(x_1 + j, y_2 + j)$ with $0 < j < y_1 - x_1$ which clearly do not resolve the pair $\{x, y\}$ either (see Figure 2(a)). Thus, the expression of $R(x, y)$ for vertices at distance bigger than 2 is

$$R(x, y) = V(G_\ell) \setminus (Q_3(z) \cup Q_1(\tilde{z}) \cup \{(x_1 + j, y_2 + j) \mid 0 < j < y_1 - x_1\}).$$

This set can also be expressed as follows:

$$R(x, y) = \bigcup_{0 \leq j < y_1 - x_1} R(r^j, s^j)$$

where $r^j = (x_1 + j, y_2 + j + 1)$, $s^j = (x_1 + j + 1, y_2 + j)$ and $d(r^j, s^j) = 2$ (see Figure 2(b)). Since $R(r^j, s^j) \subseteq R(x, y)$, by Remark 3.2, the result holds. \square




Figure 2: (a) All the vertices in the shadowed region plus the two squared vertices do not resolve the pair $\{x, y\}$, (b) The shadowed region illustrates $R(x, y)$.

Two diagonal pairs $\{x, y\}$, $\{r, s\}$ with $d(x, y) = d(r, s) = 2$ are said to be *in the same row* if $x_2 = r_2$ and $y_2 = s_2$. Analogously, they are *in the same column* if $x_1 = r_1$ and $y_1 = s_1$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\{x, y\}$ be an S -unique diagonal pair with associated vertex u such that $d(x, y) = 2$. If there exist two S -unique diagonal pairs $\{r, s\}$, $\{t, z\}$ in the same row (column) than $\{x, y\}$ with associated vertices, respectively, v and w and $u \neq v, w$ then $v = w$.*

Proof. Suppose that the pairs $\{r, s\}$, $\{t, z\}$ are in the same row (analogous for columns) than $\{x, y\}$, i.e., $x_2 = r_2 = t_2$ and $y_2 = s_2 = z_2$. Assume also that $x_1 < r_1 < t_1$. Clearly, $R(r, s) \subset R(x, y) \cup R(t, z)$ and so $v = w$ since $v \neq u$. \square

Now, we reach our main result in this subsection which answers in the affirmative Conjecture 1.2.

Theorem 3.5. *For every pair a, b of integers with $2 \leq a \leq b$, there exists a connected graph G with $\dim(G) = a$ and $\dim^+(G) = b$.*

Proof. Let H_ℓ be the graph obtained from G_ℓ , $\ell \geq 2$, by attaching a triangle at the vertex $(0, 0)$, i.e., $V(H_\ell) = V(G_\ell) \cup \{\alpha, \beta\}$ and $E(H_\ell) = E(G_\ell) \cup \{\{\alpha, \beta\}, \{\alpha, (0, 0)\}, \{\beta, (0, 0)\}\}$. Observe that distances in H_ℓ behave as in G_ℓ , except for the new vertices α and β for which $d(\alpha, x) = d(\beta, x) = x_1 + x_2 + 1$ for every $x = (x_1, x_2) \in V(G_\ell)$. Thus, the previous lemmas can be applied to the graph H_ℓ .

Claim 1. $\dim(H_\ell) = 2$ and $\dim^+(H_\ell) = 2\ell - 2$.

Proof. It is well-known that $\dim(G_\ell) = 2$ being the set $\{(0, 0), (\ell - 1, 0)\}$ a metric basis (see for instance [6]). This set can be adapted to a metric basis of H_ℓ by considering $\{\alpha, (\ell - 1, 0)\}$. Hence, $\dim(H_\ell) = 2$.

To prove that $\dim^+(H_\ell) \geq 2\ell - 2$ one can easily check that the set

$$S = \{(x_1, x_2) \mid 1 \leq x_1 \leq \ell - 2, x_2 = x_1, x_1 + 1\} \cup \{(0, 1), \alpha\}$$

is a resolving set of H_ℓ of size $2(\ell - 1)$. Moreover, S is minimal because removing either a vertex (x_1, x_1) or $(x_1, x_1 + 1)$ from S gives that either the pair $\{(x_1, x_1), (x_1 - 1, x_1 + 1)\}$ or

the pair $\{(x_1, x_1 + 1), (x_1 + 1, x_1)\}$ is not resolved by any element of S . Clearly, $(0, 1)$ and α cannot be removed from S . Figure 3(a) illustrates this minimal resolving set of H_ℓ .

We next prove that $\dim^+(H_\ell) \leq 2\ell - 2$. Let S be a minimal resolving set of H_ℓ and consider the pair $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ which is only resolved by either α or β and so we can assume that $\alpha \in S$ (otherwise $\beta \in S$).

Since S is minimal, every vertex $u \in S$ has an associated S -unique pair, say $p(u)$. Observe that $\{\beta, (0, 0)\}$ is not an S -unique pair (every vertex of G_ℓ resolves it) and so there is no vertex $u \in S$ so that $p(u) = \{\beta, (0, 0)\}$. Note also that α resolves all the non-diagonal pairs of G_ℓ . Hence, every vertex $u \in S \setminus \{\alpha\}$ has an associated S -unique diagonal pair $p(u)$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.3, we can assume that the elements of $p(u)$ are at distance 2. Thus, Lemma 3.4 says that $|S \setminus \{\alpha\}| \leq 2(\ell - 1)$ and so we still need to reduce the bound in one unit.

By Lemma 3.1, $R((0, 1), (1, 0)) = Q_2((0, 1)) \cup Q_4((1, 0)) = \{(0, x_2) \mid 1 \leq x_2 \leq \ell - 1\} \cup \{(x_1, 0) \mid 1 \leq x_1 \leq \ell - 1\}$. Assume that there is a vertex $v \in S \cap Q_2((0, 1))$ (analogous for $v \in S \cap Q_4((1, 0))$ by rotating the situation). Since all the pairs in the same row than $\{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$ are resolved by v and S is minimal, there is no other vertex of S associated to pairs in such row and so $|S \setminus \{\alpha\}| \leq 2(\ell - 2) + 1$ which leads to $|S| \leq 2(\ell - 2) + 1 + 1 = 2\ell - 2$, the expected bound. \square

Consider now the graph $H_{\ell, m}$ obtained from G_ℓ by attaching a set of $m \geq 2$ pendant vertices $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\}$ at $(0, 0)$.

Claim 2. $\dim(H_{\ell, m}) = m + 1$ and $\dim^+(H_{\ell, m}) = m + 2\ell - 4$.

Proof. As it was said before, the set $\{(0, 0), (\ell - 1, 0)\}$ is a metric basis of G_ℓ [6]. Thus, it can be easily checked that the set $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, (\ell - 1, 0)\}$ is a resolving set of $H_{\ell, m}$ which gives $\dim(H_{\ell, m}) \leq m + 1$. To prove that $\dim(H_{\ell, m}) \geq m + 1$ it suffices to show that $|S| \geq m + 1$ for every metric basis S .

A metric basis S has to contain all the pendant vertices but at most one. Suppose that $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}\} \subset S$ and $\alpha_m \notin S$ (if $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m\} \subset S$ the result clearly follows). Since no pendant vertex resolves the pair $\{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$ then there is a vertex, say $u \in R((0, 1), (1, 0)) = Q_2((0, 1)) \cup Q_4((1, 0))$. But either the pair $\{\alpha_m, (1, 0)\}$ or the pair $\{\alpha_m, (0, 1)\}$ is not resolved by any vertex in the set $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}, u\}$ and so $|S| \geq m + 1$.

Mimicking the proof of Claim 1, only replacing α by $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}$ (compare Figures 3(a) and 3(b)) it is proved that $\dim^+(H_{\ell, m}) = m + 2\ell - 4$. We omit it for the sake of brevity. \square

Claims 1 and 2 give the connected graph G with $\dim(G) = a$ and $\dim^+(G) = b$ whenever $a = 2$ and b even ($G \cong H_\ell$ for $\ell = (b + 2)/2$) or $a > 2$ and $b - a$ odd ($G \cong H_{\ell, m}$ for $\ell = 2 + (b - a + 1)/2$ and $m = a - 1$).

In order to obtain the graph G in the remaining cases, we modify slightly the graphs H_ℓ and $H_{\ell, m}$ by removing the set of vertices $\{(x_1, x_2) \mid x_1 = \ell - 1\}$. Denote by \tilde{H}_ℓ and $\tilde{H}_{\ell, m}$ the resulting graphs. Note that a $(\ell - 2) \times (\ell - 1)$ grid, say \tilde{G}_ℓ , plays now the role of G_ℓ but all the tools developed above can also be applied in this case. Hence, one can follow the proofs of Claims 1 and 2 to compute the metric dimension and the upper dimension of \tilde{H}_ℓ and $\tilde{H}_{\ell, m}$. There are only three changes: (1) take the set $\{(0, 0), (\ell - 2, 0)\}$ as a metric basis of \tilde{G}_ℓ ; (2) remove the vertex $(\ell - 2, \ell - 1)$ from S obtaining a minimal resolving set of size $2\ell - 3$ (for \tilde{H}_ℓ) or $2\ell + m - 5$ (for $\tilde{H}_{\ell, m}$); (3) apply the column version of Lemma 3.4 to obtain




Figure 3: (a) A minimal resolving set of H_ℓ of size $2(\ell - 1)$, (b) A minimal resolving set of $H_{\ell,m}$ of size $m + 2\ell - 4$.

$|S \setminus \{\alpha\}| \leq 2(\ell - 2)$ or $|S \setminus \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1}\}| \leq 2(\ell - 2)$ which directly gives $|S| \leq 2\ell - 3$ (for \tilde{H}_ℓ) or $|S| \leq 2\ell + m - 5$ (for $\tilde{H}_{\ell,m}$). Thus, we have

Claim 3. $\dim(\tilde{H}_\ell) = 2$, $\dim(\tilde{H}_{\ell,m}) = m + 1$, $\dim^+(\tilde{H}_\ell) = 2\ell - 3$ and $\dim^+(\tilde{H}_{\ell,m}) = m + 2\ell - 5$.

It gives the graph G with $\dim(G) = a$ and $\dim^+(G) = b$ whenever $a = 2$ and b odd ($G \cong \tilde{H}_\ell$ for $\ell = 2 + (b - 1)/2$) or $a > 2$ and $b - a$ even ($G \cong \tilde{H}_{\ell,m}$ for $\ell = 3 + (b - a)/2$ and $m = a - 1$).

□

3.2 Realization of the resolving number

In Subsection 3.1, we have proved that any pair a, b of integers such that $2 \leq a \leq b$ is realizable as the metric dimension and the upper dimension of a certain graph. Modifying slightly the above constructions, one can easily prove that these two integers are realizable as the metric dimension and the upper dimension of an infinite family of graphs. It suffices to replace the vertex $(0, 0)$ in G_ℓ by a path of arbitrary length. If the resulting graph plays the role of G_ℓ in the study developed in the previous subsection, then the metric dimension and upper dimension are preserved.

Theorem 3.7 below says that, unlike the metric dimension and the upper dimension, no integer $a \geq 4$ is realizable as an infinite family of graphs with resolving number equal to a (note that the path P_2 is the only graph with resolving number 1 but there are infinite families of graphs with resolving number 2 and 3, concretely, odd cycles and paths (for $a = 2$) and even cycles (for $a = 3$)). In order to prove this result, we first relate the resolving number to the diameter of a graph, which is of independent interest.

Proposition 3.6. *Let G be a graph with diameter $d(G)$, girth $g(G)$ and resolving number $\text{res}(G) \geq 3$. If G is not an even cycle then $d(G) \leq 3 \text{res}(G) - 5$.*

Proof. Let us denote $r = \text{res}(G)$. Suppose on the contrary that $d(G) > 3 \text{res}(G) - 5$. Then we can assume that there are two vertices u, v such that $d(u, v) = 3r - 4 = 3(r - 1) - 1$. Consider

a shortest u - v path $P = \{u = u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{3(r-1)} = v\}$ and suppose that there is a vertex $w \notin P$ attached at some vertex u_i with $i \neq 1, 3(r-1)$ (otherwise it can be easily checked that $\{u_1, \dots, u_r\}$ is not a resolving set). Clearly, every vertex $u_j \in P$ does not resolve either $\{w, u_{i-1}\}$ or $\{w, u_i\}$ or $\{w, u_{i+1}\}$. Indeed, assume $i \leq j$ (analogous for $i > j$). By Lemma 2.3, u_j does not resolve at least one pair among those formed by the vertices u_{i-1}, u_i, u_{i+1}, w . Moreover, the pairs $\{u_{i-1}, u_i\}$, $\{u_{i-1}, u_{i+1}\}$ and $\{u_i, u_{i+1}\}$ are all resolved by u_j , since P is a shortest path. Thus, one pair among $\{w, u_{i-1}\}$, $\{w, u_i\}$, $\{w, u_{i+1}\}$ is not resolved by u_j .

Consider now the sets $A = \{u_j \in P : d(u_j, w) = d(u_j, u_{i-1})\}$, $B = \{u_j \in P : d(u_j, w) = d(u_j, u_i)\}$ and $C = \{u_j \in P : d(u_j, w) = d(u_j, u_{i+1})\}$. Since these sets are not resolving sets of G , then $|A|, |B|, |C| \leq r-1$. Furthermore, $A \cup B \cup C = P$ and $|P| = 3(r-1)$ and so $|A| = |B| = |C| = r-1$ which implies that A, B and C are pairwise disjoint but $u_i \in A \cap C$; a contradiction. \square

Observe that when $\text{res}(G) \leq 2$ or G is an even cycle, Proposition 3.6 does not hold. It suffices to consider the path P_2 (for $\text{res}(G) = 1$), an odd cycle of length at least 5 (for $\text{res}(G) = 2$) and an even cycle of length at least 6 (for $\text{res}(G) = 3$).

Theorem 3.7. *For every integer $a \geq 4$, the set of graphs with resolving number a is finite.*

Proof. A graph G of order n , diameter $d(G)$ and metric dimension $\text{dim}(G)$ satisfies the following relation [6]:

$$n \leq d(G)^{\text{dim}(G)} + \text{dim}(G).$$

Since $\text{dim}(G) \leq \text{res}(G)$ then

$$n \leq d(G)^{\text{res}(G)} + \text{res}(G)$$

and Proposition 3.6 gives

$$n \leq (3 \text{res}(G) - 5)^{\text{res}(G)} + \text{res}(G) = (3a - 5)^a + a.$$

This upper bound for n depends only on the value of a and so the result follows. \square

4 Concluding remarks and open questions

In this paper, we have characterized the randomly k -dimensional graphs. Our proof is based on combinatorial arguments which let us avoid the brute force casuistic analysis. Moreover, we have also proved in the affirmative a conjecture posed by Chartrand et al. [3] claiming that every pair a, b of integers with $2 \leq a \leq b$ is realizable as the metric dimension and the upper dimension, respectively, of some connected graph. We have concluded the paper showing that, surprisingly, no integer $a \geq 4$ is realizable as the resolving number of an infinite family of graphs.

It would be interesting to study the realization of triples of integers a, b, c as the metric dimension, the upper dimension and the resolving number, respectively, of some connected graph. Also, the question of bounding the size of the set of graphs (maybe restricting to specific families) with given resolving number a remains open.

References

- [1] J. Cáceres, C. Hernando, M. Mora, I.M. Pelayo, M.L. Puertas, C. Seara and D.R. Wood. On the metric dimension of cartesian products of graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, **21**(2) (2007), 423–441.
- [2] G. Chartrand and P. Zhang. On the chromatic dimension of a graph. *Congr. Numer.* **145** (2000), 97–108.
- [3] G. Chartrand, C. Poisson and P. Zhang. Resolvability and the upper dimension of graphs, *Computers and Mathematics with Applications* **39** (2000), 19–28.
- [4] F. Harary and R.A. Melter. On the metric dimension of a graph. *Ars Combin.* **2** (1976), 191–195.
- [5] M. Jannesari and B. Omoomi. Characterization of Randomly k-Dimensional Graphs. Arxiv.org/abs/1103.3570v1, 2011.
- [6] S. Khuller, B. Raghavachari and A. Rosenfeld. Landmarks in graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **70** (1996), 217–229.
- [7] P.J. Slater. Leaves of trees. *Congr. Numer.* **14** (1975), 549–559.