

Grundy domination and zero forcing in regular graphs

Boštjan Brešar^{a,b} Simon Brezovnik^{a,c}

October 5, 2020

^a Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, University of Maribor, Slovenia

(bostjan.bresar@um.si, simon.brezovnik2@um.si)

^b Institute of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanics, Ljubljana, Slovenia

^c Faculty of Education, University of Maribor, Slovenia

Abstract

Given a finite graph G , the maximum length of a sequence (v_1, \dots, v_k) of vertices in G such that each v_i dominates a vertex that is not dominated by any vertex in $\{v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}\}$ is called the Grundy domination number, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G)$, of G . A small modification of the definition yields the Z-Grundy domination number, which is the dual invariant of the well-known zero forcing number. In this paper, we prove that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq \frac{n + \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 2}{k-1}$ holds for every connected k -regular graph of order n different from K_{k+1} and $2\overline{C}_4$. The bound in the case $k = 3$ reduces to $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq \frac{n}{2}$, and we characterize the connected cubic graphs with $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$. If G is different from K_4 and $K_{3,3}$, then $\frac{n}{2}$ is also an upper bound for the zero forcing number of a connected cubic graph, and we characterize the connected cubic graphs attaining this bound.

Keywords: Grundy domination number, zero forcing, regular graph, cubic graph

AMS subject classification (2010): 05C69, 05C35

1 Introduction

Zero forcing is defined by the following process that starts by choosing a set S of vertices of a graph G and all vertices of S are colored blue. Then the color-change operation is performed, in which a vertex, which is the only non-blue neighbor of a blue vertex, is colored blue. The color-change operation is performed as long as possible. If at the end of the process all vertices become blue, then the initial set S is called a *zero forcing set* of G . The minimum cardinality of a zero forcing set in G is the *zero forcing number*, $Z(G)$, of G . This concept arose in the study of minimum rank among symmetric matrices described by a graph [1], and was rediscovered independently in mathematical physics and in graph search algorithms; see [6] and the references therein. Zero forcing is closely related to power domination, which was introduced in [21] as a model for monitoring electrical networks; cf. [6]. It is also related to path-width and tree-width parameters [4, 5, 25], and recently its relation with the inverse eigenvalue problem was presented [17].

In the last decade, several Grundy domination invariants were introduced [7, 11, 12], which were motivated by the domination games introduced in [13, 22]. An additional motivation for Grundy domination comes from the process of expanding a dominating set in a graph that is built on-line [10]. The process can be presented by a sequence of vertices in a graph, and the basic version of Grundy domination from [11] is defined as follows. A sequence $S = (v_1, \dots, v_k)$ of vertices in a graph G is a *closed neighborhood sequence* if for every $i \in \{2, \dots, k\}$,

$$N_G[v_i] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} N_G[v_j] \neq \emptyset, \quad (1)$$

where $N_G[v_j]$ is the *closed neighborhood* of v_j (note that $N_G[v_j] = N_G(v_j) \cup \{v_j\}$, where $N_G(v_j)$ is the set of neighbors of v_j). The corresponding set of vertices from the closed neighborhood sequence S will be denoted by \widehat{S} . The maximum length $|\widehat{S}|$ of a closed neighborhood sequence S in a graph G is the *Grundy domination number*, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G)$, of G . Every maximal sequence S enjoying the property (1) for all of its vertices is a *dominating sequence* in G . A vertex $x \in V(G)$ *dominates* a vertex y if $y \in N_G[x]$, and we then also say that y is *dominated* by x . If $D \subset V(G)$, then $y \in V(G)$ is *dominated* by D if there exists $x \in D$ that dominates y . A set D is a *dominating set* of a graph G if every vertex in G is dominated by D . Note that a closed neighborhood sequence S is a dominating sequence in G if and only if \widehat{S} is a dominating set of G . If (v_1, \dots, v_k) is a closed neighborhood sequence, then we say that v_i *footprints* the vertices from $N_G[v_i] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} N_G[v_j]$, and that v_i is the *footprinter* of every vertex $u \in N_G[v_i] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} N_G[v_j]$, for any $i \in [k]$ (where $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$).

Now, let G be a graph with no isolated vertices. A closed neighborhood sequence S in G is a *Z-sequence* if, in addition, every vertex v_i in S footprints a vertex distinct from itself. Equivalently, S is a Z-sequence in G if

$$N_G(v_i) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} N_G[v_j] \neq \emptyset$$

holds for every $i \in \{2, \dots, k\}$. The maximum length of a Z-sequence in G is the *Z-Grundy domination number*, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G)$, of G . Note that if S is a Z-sequence, then saying that $x \in \widehat{S}$ *footprints* a vertex y necessarily implies that vertices x and y are distinct. The Z-Grundy domination number was introduced in [7] as the dual of the zero forcing number. Notably, S is a Z-sequence if and only if the set of vertices outside S forms a zero forcing set [7]. In particular,

$$Z(G) = n(G) - \gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \quad (2)$$

for every graph G with no isolated vertices, where $n(G)$ is the order of G . In a subsequent paper, Lin presented a natural connection between four variants of Grundy domination and four variants of zero forcing [23]. The connections show that all versions of Grundy domination can be applied in the study of different types of minimum rank parameters of symmetric matrices.

One of the central problems concerning (domination) invariants is to find general bounds in terms of the order of a graph, possibly involving also the maximum degree or some other parameter. Interestingly, a general lower bound for the total version of the Grundy domination number of regular graphs was presented in [12], but for the standard Grundy domination number such a bound has not yet been known. On the other hand, the Grundy

domination number (and in some cases also its Z-variant) was studied in graph products [8, 24], Sierpiński graphs [10], and in Kneser graphs [14].

Several authors considered bounds on the zero forcing number in terms of the order, from which one can directly get dual bounds for the Z-Grundy domination number by using (2). Amos et al. [3] proved the general upper bound, $Z(G) \leq \frac{(\Delta-2)n+2}{\Delta-1}$, which holds for all connected graphs G with maximum degree Δ and order n . Gentner et al. [19] characterized the extremal graphs attaining the bound. Moreover, Gentner and Rautebach [18] improved the bound to $Z(G) \leq \frac{n(\Delta-2)}{\Delta-1}$, whenever G is a connected graph with $\Delta \geq 3$ that is not isomorphic to one of the five sporadic graphs presented by the authors. In particular, for graphs with $\Delta = 3$, the bound reduces to $Z(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Girão et al. [20] presented an infinite family of graphs G_n with maximum degree 3 such that the zero forcing number of G_n is at least $\frac{4}{9}n$. Davila and Henning studied the zero forcing number of connected claw-free cubic graphs G and proved that $Z(G) < \frac{n}{2}$ as soon as G has at least 10 vertices [15], and further improved this result in [16] to $Z(G) \leq \frac{n}{3} + 1$ by additionally excluding the 2-necklace graph (see the right graph N_{YY} in Figure 7).

In the next section, we will prove the following lower bound for the Grundy domination number of connected k -regular graphs of order n different from K_{k+1} and $\overline{2C_4}$:

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq \frac{n + \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 2}{k - 1}.$$

The result is similar to the bound from [12] for the total version of the Grundy domination number, and fills the gap in the study of the Grundy domination number. In Section 3 we prove a lower bound for the Z-Grundy domination number of regular graphs, which is similar to the bound from Amos et al. [3], yet it slightly improves it when G has a triangle. Then, for connected cubic graphs G different from K_4 and $K_{3,3}$ we prove that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq \frac{n}{2}$, which rediscovers (with a simpler proof) the bound of Gentner and Rautebach in [18] restricted to cubic graphs. Section 4 contains our main result, which is a characterization of connected cubic graphs G with $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) = \frac{n}{2}$. This result can be viewed as an extension of the results of Davila and Henning [15, 16] from connected claw-free cubic to all connected cubic graphs with $Z(G) = \frac{n}{2}$. As a by-product, we also get the family of connected cubic graphs with $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$. The extremal family in the former case contains 15 sporadic graphs (see Figures 2-4 and 6-9), while in the later case reduces to 8 graphs.

2 Grundy domination in regular graphs

In this section, we establish a lower bound on the Grundy domination number of a regular graph. The Grundy domination number of cycles can be easily established, namely, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(C_n) = n - 2$. Hence, we may restrict to k -regular graphs with $k > 2$.

First, a few more definitions. Vertices u and v in G are *twins* if $N_G[u] = N_G[v]$ and are *open twins* if $N_G(u) = N_G(v)$. We write kG for the disjoint union of k copies of a graph G . The complement of a graph G is denoted by \overline{G} .

Theorem 2.1 *If $k \geq 3$ and G is a connected k -regular graph of order n different from K_{k+1} and $\overline{2C_4}$, then*

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq \frac{n + \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 2}{k - 1}.$$

Proof. Let $k \geq 3$ and let G be a connected k -regular graph of order n different from K_{k+1} and $\overline{2C_4}$. Suppose that G is bipartite, and let $V(G) = A \cup B$ be the bipartition of the vertex set of G into independent sets A and B . Since $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq \alpha(G) \geq \frac{n}{2}$, we infer

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq \frac{n}{2} = \frac{n + \lceil \frac{3}{2} \rceil - 2}{3 - 1} \geq \frac{n + \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 2}{k - 1},$$

which is true for any $k \geq 3$. Thus, we may assume that G is non-bipartite.

It is clear that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) > 1$, because G is not a complete graph. In addition, $\gamma(G) > 1$, for otherwise G is not regular (since it is not complete). Suppose that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) = 2$. By [11, Theorem 3.6], $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) = 2 = \gamma(G)$ if and only if G is the join of one or more graphs $\overline{K_{r,s}}$. Since G is regular, all of these graphs are $\overline{K_{r,r}}$ for some fixed integer r . So let G be the join of ℓ graphs $\overline{K_{r,r}}$. Since G is connected, $\ell \geq 2$. Note that $k = (\ell - 1)2r + r - 1$, and $n = 2r\ell$, which implies

$$\frac{n + \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 2}{k - 1} = \frac{3r\ell - r + \lceil \frac{r-1}{2} \rceil - 2}{2r\ell - r - 2}.$$

Now, since $\ell \geq 2$, we have

$$\frac{3r\ell - r + \lceil \frac{r-1}{2} \rceil - 2}{2r\ell - r - 2} \leq 2 = \gamma_{\text{gr}}(G)$$

if and only if $(r, \ell) \notin \{(1, 2), (2, 2)\}$. The first case, $r = 1, \ell = 2$, gives $G = C_4$, which is 2-regular and not relevant for this proof. The second case, $r = 2, \ell = 2$, gives $G = \overline{2C_4}$, which is also excluded in the assumption of the statement of the theorem. In the rest of the proof we may thus assume that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) > 2$. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. G has a triangle.

It is clear that there exist two vertices that lie in a triangle in G that are not twins. (Indeed, if every two vertices that lie in a triangle in G were twins, then since G is connected, this would imply that G is complete, a contradiction.) Let v_1 and v_2 be chosen among all adjacent vertices in G that are not twins to have the maximum number of common neighbors (as noted above, they have at least one common neighbor). Clearly, there are at most $k - 2$ common neighbors of v_1 and v_2 , since they are not twins. We build the sequence S starting with (v_1, v_2) . Note that v_2 footprints at most $k - 2$ vertices, since v_1 and v_2 are already dominated when v_2 is added to the sequence. After the i th vertex is added to S , the sequence is (v_1, \dots, v_i) , where $i \geq 2$. Suppose that this is not yet the entire sequence S , that is, $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$ is not a dominating set of G . We choose v_{i+1} as a vertex, which footprints at least one, but a minimum number of vertices. We claim that such a vertex v_{i+1} exists.

Let x be any vertex not dominated by $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$. Since G is connected, there exists a path from a vertex v_j , where $j \in [i]$, to x , and consider a shortest possible such path P . Then the neighbor y of v_j on P has the desired property, since it footprints the neighbor on P different from v_j (this is because P is chosen as the shortest possible path between vertices of $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$ and x). Hence, such a vertex y exists, and footprints at most $k - 1$ vertices. Thus v_{i+1} is well defined and footprints at most $k - 1$ vertices.

By using the above construction, let $S = (v_1, \dots, v_t)$ be the resulting dominating sequence of G .

Claim A. *One of the vertices v_2 or v_t footprints at most $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$ vertices.*

Proof of Claim A. Suppose to the contrary that each of the vertices v_2 and v_t footprints at least $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor + 1$ vertices. In particular, this implies that v_1 and v_2 have at most $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 1$ common neighbors (recall that, by the choice of v_1 and v_2 , this is also the maximum number of common neighbors that two non-twin neighbors in G may have).

Let F be the set of vertices footprinted by v_t , and let $U = V(G) \setminus F$. First, suppose that $v_t \notin F$; that is, v_t has been dominated by vertices in $\{v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}\}$. Let $v_j, j \in [t-1]$, be the vertex that footprints v_t . We claim that F induces a complete graph. Suppose that there exists $x \in F$ that is not adjacent to all other vertices in F . Then x footprints less vertices than v_t , which is a contradiction, since x would be a better choice than v_t for adding to the sequence S . Now, vertices x and v_t are neighbors, which are not twins (since $xv_j \notin E(G)$ and $v_tv_j \in E(G)$), and have $|F| - 1 \geq \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$ common neighbors. This implies that x and v_t are non-twin neighbors with more common neighbors as v_1 and v_2 , which is a contradiction to the choice of v_1 and v_2 .

Now, suppose that $v_t \in F$. Since $F \neq V(G)$ and G is connected, there is a vertex $y \in U$, which is adjacent to a vertex in F . Note that y is adjacent to all vertices of F , for otherwise y would be a better choice than v_t to be added to S . Hence, instead of v_t we put y as the last vertex of S , and we are in the situation of the previous paragraph, where $v_t \notin F$. In either case, the assumption that each of the vertices v_2 and v_t footprints at least $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor + 1$ vertices leads us to a contradiction. \square

The next claim is about the case $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq t > 3$, however, along the way we will verify also the situation when $t = 3$.

Claim B. *If $t > 3$, then the sum of the numbers of vertices footprinted by v_2, v_3 and v_t is at most $2k - 3 + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$.*

Proof of Claim B. As noted in the beginning of the construction of the sequence S , vertex v_2 footprints at most $k - 2$ vertices. By Claim A, v_2 or v_t footprints at most $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$ vertices. If this is true for v_t , then the claim is proven, since v_3 footprints at most $k - 1$ vertices, which was proved to hold for all vertices of S except v_1 . It remains to consider the possibility when v_2 footprints exactly $\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$ vertices and v_t footprints exactly $k - 1$ vertices.

Let $A = N(v_1) \setminus N[v_2]$, $C = N(v_2) \setminus N[v_1]$, and let B be the set of common neighbors of v_1 and v_2 . Since $t > 2$ and G is connected, there exists $y \in V(G) \setminus (N[v_1] \cup N[v_2])$, which is adjacent to a vertex x in $A \cup B \cup C$. If $x \in B$, then we let $v_3 = x$, and note that x does not footprint v_1, v_2 , and itself, therefore it footprints at most $k - 2$ vertices. Thus, v_2, v_3 and v_t footprint at most $(\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor) + (k - 2) + (k - 1)$ vertices, as claimed. (Note that if $t = 3$, then $n \leq (k + 1) + (\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor) + (k - 2)$, which implies $\frac{n + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 2}{k - 1} \leq \frac{k + 1 + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor + k - 2 + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 2}{k - 1} = 3 \leq \gamma_{\text{gr}}(G)$, in which case the statement of the theorem is correct.)

We may thus assume that there is no such vertex $x \in B$, and so all vertices in B are adjacent only to vertices in $N[v_1] \cup N[v_2]$.

Suppose that $x \in A \cup C$, and without loss of generality let $x \in A$. Let $|A| = s = |C|$. Note that $|B| = k - s - 1$. If B induces a complete graph, then from a vertex $b \in B$, there are $k - 2 - (k - s - 2) = s$ edges connecting b to vertices in $A \cup C$. In any case, even if B is not a clique, there are at least s edges connecting each vertex $b \in B$ to vertices in $A \cup C$. Now, if there exists $b \in B$ such that all s edges from b to $A \cup C$ lead to vertices of A , then

b is adjacent also to x (since $|A| = s$). Then, $v_3 = x$, in which case v_3 footprints y , but it footprints at most $k - 2$ vertices, which again proves the claim. (Again, in the case $t = 3$, we derive the same inequality as earlier, confirming the correctness of the theorem.)

Finally, assume that there is an edge e from B to C , and let $z \in C$ be its endvertex. If $zx \in E(G)$, then we conclude the proof as in the previous paragraph, by taking $v_3 = x$. Hence, let us assume that z is adjacent to at most $s - 1$ vertices in A (that is, $zx \notin E(G)$). We may also assume that z does not have a neighbor in $V(G) \setminus (N[v_1] \cup N[v_2])$, because otherwise, by letting $v_3 = z$ we derive the same conclusion as before, since then z would footprint at most $k - 2$ vertices. Hence, z has $k - 1 - (s - 1) = k - s$ neighbors in $B \cup C$. Note that v_2 and z are neighbors, which are not twins (since $v_1v_2 \in E(G)$ and $v_1z \notin E(G)$), and have $k - s$ common neighbors. Since v_1 and v_2 have only $k - s - 1$ common neighbors, this is a contradiction with the choice of v_1 and v_2 . This implies the truth of the claim. \square

Note that in the proof of the above claim, we have also proved the statement of the theorem for the case $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) = t = 3$ (when G has a triangle), hence we may assume $t > 3$. Since v_1 footprints $k + 1$ vertices, and, by Claim B, v_2, v_3 and v_t together footprint at most $2k - 3 + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor$ vertices, and all other $t - 4$ vertices each footprints at most $k - 1$ vertices, we infer:

$$n \leq (k + 1) + (2k - 3 + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor) + (t - 4)(k - 1),$$

which gives

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq t \geq \frac{n + k - \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 2}{k - 1} = \frac{n + \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 2}{k - 1}.$$

Case 2. G is triangle-free.

The basic part of the construction of a dominating sequence $S = (v_1, \dots, v_t)$ is similar as in Case 1. Note that, since G has no triangles, no two adjacent vertices are twins. If $i < t$, and we have constructed (v_1, \dots, v_i) , then we choose v_{i+1} as a vertex, which footprints at least one, but a minimum number of vertices. In the same way as in Case 1 we can prove that such a vertex v_{i+1} exists and footprints at most $k - 1$ vertices.

The construction of S is based on the rule that each vertex added to the sequence footprints at least one, but the least possible number of vertices. Clearly, v_1 footprints $k + 1$ vertices, and as noted above, each further vertex in S footprints at most $k - 1$ vertices. Next, we will prove that the last vertex of the sequence footprints just one vertex.

Claim C. *Vertex v_t footprints only one vertex.*

Proof of Claim C. Suppose to the contrary that v_t footprints two distinct vertices x and y . Let us first assume that v_t is dominated before it is added to the sequence. Clearly, x and y are not adjacent, since G has no triangles. But then x would be a better choice than v_t for adding it to (v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}) , since it footprints less vertices than v_t , which is a contradiction. Second case is that v_t is not dominated by vertices of $\{v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}\}$. Hence, v_t footprints itself, and we may write $x = v_t$, and so v_t footprints also y . Since G is connected, there is a vertex u , adjacent to v_t , which is dominated by $\{v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}\}$. If $uy \notin E(G)$, then again u is a better choice than v_t to be added to (v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}) , which contradicts the construction. Thus, u is adjacent to both x and y , and we can put u at the end of the sequence S instead of v_t . But then we are in the previous case, where v_t does not footprint itself. \square

Suppose that $k \geq 4$. Then $1 \leq \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 1$. Summing the upper bounds on the number of vertices, which are footprinted at each step, we infer

$$n \leq k + 1 + (t - 2)(k - 1) + 1 \leq k + 1 + (t - 2)(k - 1) + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 1,$$

which implies

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq t \geq \frac{n + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor - 2}{k - 1}.$$

Finally, we are left with the case when G is a 3-regular (triangle-free) graph. Since G is non-bipartite, there exist odd cycles, and let C be a shortest odd cycle in G . This implies, in particular, that C is induced. Since G is connected and 3-regular, there are vertices outside C that are adjacent to vertices in C .

Suppose that there exists a vertex $x \in V(G)$, which is not on C , and is adjacent to two vertices of C , say u and v . Among all such possible vertices let x be chosen in such a way that two neighbors u and v on C are as close as possible with respect to the distance on C . Since G has no triangles, u and v are not adjacent. Let $u = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_r = v$ be a shortest path on C between u and v . We start the sequence S in the same way, that is, with (v_1, \dots, v_r) . Clearly, each of the vertices v_i , where $1 \leq i \leq r$ footprint v_{i+1} , because C is an induced cycle. Moreover, $v_r = v$ footprint only one vertex, namely, v_{r+1} , since x has already been footprinted by $v_1 = u$.

The second case is that every vertex $x \in V(G)$, which is not on C has at most one neighbor on C . Therefore, each vertex of C has a unique neighbor that is not on C . Therefore, letting $C : v_1, \dots, v_s, v_1$, where vertices are written in the natural order, we can start the sequence S with (v_1, \dots, v_s) . Clearly, v_s footprint only one vertex, the neighbor of v_s outside C . Now, if v_s is the last vertex of the sequence S , then $n = 2s$, and we derive that

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq s = \frac{n}{2} = \frac{n + \lfloor \frac{3}{2} \rfloor - 2}{3 - 1},$$

as desired. Otherwise, the sequence S has more vertices, that is, $t > s$.

In either of the above two cases (last two paragraphs), we found a vertex in S , which is not v_t , that footprint only one vertex. Noting that v_1 footprint $k + 1 = 4$ vertices, v_t footprint 1 vertex, and all other vertices footprint at most $k - 1 = 2$ vertices, we infer

$$n \leq 4 + 1 + 1 + 2(t - 3),$$

which implies

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq t \geq \frac{n}{2} = \frac{n + \lfloor \frac{3}{2} \rfloor - 2}{3 - 1}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

In the special case of Theorem 2.1 when $k = 3$ have the following result.

Corollary 2.2 *If $G \neq K_4$ is a cubic graph of order n , then $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq \frac{1}{2}n$, and the bound is sharp.*

The Petersen graph is a well-known example that attains the bound in Corollary 2.2. As we will see in Section 4, where we will characterize the cubic graphs G with $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$, there are 8 such graphs.

The question is, whether the bound of Theorem 2.1 is sharp also for $k \geq 4$, and to characterize all extremal graphs.

Problem 1 *If $k \geq 4$, determine all k -regular graphs G of order n such that*

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) = \frac{n + \lceil \frac{k}{2} \rceil - 2}{k - 1}.$$

3 Z-Grundy domination in regular graphs

In a similar way as in Theorem 2.1, we can prove the following bound for the Z-Grundy domination number of regular graphs.

Theorem 3.1 *If $k \geq 3$ and G is a connected k -regular graph of order n different from K_{k+1} , then*

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{n-1}{k-1}; & G \text{ has a triangle,} \\ \frac{n-2}{k-1}; & G \text{ triangle-free} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. Let $k \geq 3$ and let G be a connected k -regular graph of order n different from K_{k+1} . We distinguish two cases, depending of whether G is triangle-free.

First, let G have a triangle. As noted in the proof of Theorem 2.1, there exist two vertices that lie in a triangle in G that are not twins. Let v_1 and v_2 be chosen among all adjacent vertices in G that are not twins to have the maximum number of common neighbors. As noted above, they have at least one common neighbor, hence $|N_G[v_2] \setminus N_G[v_1]| \leq k - 2$. If $\{v_1, v_2\}$ is a dominating set of G , then $n \leq k + 1 + k - 2$, which implies

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq 2 \geq \frac{n-1}{k-1}.$$

We may thus assume that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > 2$, and we build a Z-sequence S starting with (v_1, v_2) . As noted above, v_2 footprints at most $k - 2$ vertices. After the i th vertex is added to S , the sequence is (v_1, \dots, v_i) , where $i \geq 2$. Suppose that this is not yet the entire sequence S , that is, $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$ is not a dominating set of G . We choose v_{i+1} as a vertex, which footprints at least one, but a minimum number of vertices. In the same way as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we can prove that such a vertex v_{i+1} exists. In addition, since it can be chosen among vertices, that have been dominated by the set $\{v_1, \dots, v_i\}$, we infer that v_{i+1} footprints at most $k - 1$ vertices. Let t be the length of S . Then,

$$n \leq (k + 1) + (k - 2) + (t - 2)(k - 1),$$

which implies

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq t \geq \frac{n-1}{k-1}.$$

The second case, when G is triangle-free can be proved almost in the same way. Note, however, that we cannot assume that v_2 footprints at most $k - 2$ vertices. Yet, we find that it footprints at most $k - 1$ vertices, because v_1 and v_2 can be chosen as neighbors that are not twins (since G is triangle-free and $k \geq 3$, every pair of adjacent vertices are good). Now, counting the number of vertices footprinted in each step, we infer

$$n \leq (k + 1) + (t - 1)(k - 1),$$

which implies

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq t \geq \frac{n - 2}{k - 1}.$$

□

The bound in Theorem 3.1 is sharp in the case of triangle-free graphs. Note that for every $k \geq 3$, we have $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(K_{k,k}) = 2 = \frac{2k-2}{k-1} = \frac{n-2}{k-1}$. When G has a triangle, we note that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G)$ is an integer, and so we infer the slightly improved bound $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq \lceil \frac{n-2}{k-1} \rceil$. In this case, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(K_3 \square K_2) = 3 = \lceil \frac{6-1}{3-1} \rceil = \lceil \frac{n-1}{k-1} \rceil$.

Applying (2), the following consequence for the zero forcing number of regular graphs is immediate.

Corollary 3.2 *If $k \geq 3$ and G is a connected k -regular graph of order n different from K_{k+1} , then*

$$Z(G) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{n(k-2)+1}{k-1}; & G \text{ has a triangle,} \\ \frac{n(k-2)+2}{k-1}; & G \text{ triangle-free} \end{cases}.$$

The bound in the triangle-free case coincides with the bound of Amos et al. [3] for connected graphs with maximum degree Δ :

$$Z(G) \leq \frac{(\Delta - 2)n + 2}{\Delta - 1}.$$

It was also proved in [19] that the bound is attained if and only if G is either K_n , C_n or $K_{\Delta,\Delta}$.

The lower bound on the Z-Grundy domination number of regular graphs obtained in Theorem 3.1 restricted to cubic graphs G states $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq \frac{n-2}{2}$. We next improve the bound for cubic graphs as soon as they are different from K_4 and $K_{3,3}$. For the proof of this result, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3 *Let G be a connected cubic graph of order n . If there exists a (not necessarily dominating) Z-sequence $S = (v_1, \dots, v_r)$ in G such that each vertex v_i , where $i \in \{2, \dots, r\}$, footprints at most two vertices, and there are at least two vertices in S that footprint only one vertex, then $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq \frac{n}{2}$.*

Proof. Note that v_1 footprints 4 vertices, and by the assumption of the lemma, vertices v_1, \dots, v_r together footprint at most $4 + 2 + 2(r - 3)$ vertices. If S is already a dominating sequence, then the proof can be continued in the last paragraph. Otherwise, we will prove

that S can be extended to a dominating sequence in such a way that for all the remaining vertices each footprints at most two vertices.

Let D be the set of vertices that are dominated by S , which is not a dominating sequence. Since G is connected, it contains a vertex $x \notin D$, which is adjacent to a vertex $y \in D$. Clearly, $y \notin \widehat{S}$, and let v_i be a vertex in S that dominates y . If y is added to S , that is, $v_{r+1} = y$, then y footprints at most two vertices, because $\{v_i, y\} \subset N_G[y]$ and $|N_G[y]| = 4$. Since y footprints x , we may let $v_{r+1} = y$. Repeating this argument, we can easily see that S can be extended to a dominating sequence of length t in such a way that each of v_{r+1}, \dots, v_t footprint at most two vertices.

In the same way as in the beginning of this proof we derive that vertices v_1, \dots, v_t together footprint at most $4 + 2 + 2(t - 3)$ vertices, which implies $n \leq 4 + 2 + 2(t - 3)$, and we infer

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq t \geq \frac{n}{2}.$$

□

We are ready for the proof of the lower bound for the Z-Grundy domination number of cubic graphs (see also [18], where a more general result is proved for the zero forcing number, but with a more difficult proof).

Theorem 3.4 *If G is a connected cubic graph of order n different from K_4 and $K_{3,3}$, then $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq \frac{n}{2}$ and the bound is sharp.*

Proof. Let G be a connected cubic graph of order n such that $G \neq K_4$ and $G \neq K_{3,3}$. In view of Lemma 3.3 it suffices to find a Z-sequence S (not necessarily dominating) in G such that each vertex of S except the first vertex footprints at most two vertices, and there are two vertices that footprint only one vertex. We distinguish two cases with respect to G having a triangle or not.

Suppose that G has a triangle, but G does not have a diamond. Let a triangle in G have vertices v_1, v_2, v_3 . Then each of $v_i, i \in [3]$, has a neighbor u_i , which is not a neighbor of v_j for $j \neq i$. Hence, the sequence (v_1, v_2, v_3) is a Z-sequence, and vertices v_2 and v_3 each footprints only one vertex, namely, u_2 and u_3 , respectively. On the other hand, it is possible that G has diamonds, and let v_1, v_2, v_3, a be a diamond in G such that $av_1 \notin E(G)$ (we may assume this, since G is not a complete graph). If $N_G(v_1) \neq N_G(a)$, then the sequence (v_1, v_2, a) is a Z-sequence, and v_2 and a each footprint only one vertex. Otherwise, let $N_G(v_1) = N_G(a) = \{v_2, v_3, x\}$. In this case, the sequence (v_1, v_2, x) is a Z-sequence, and note that each of the vertices v_2 and x footprint only one vertex.

Let $C : v_1, \dots, v_r, v_1$ be a shortest cycle in G , and let $k \geq 4$. Suppose that for each $i \in [r]$ there exists $u_i \in N(v_i)$ such that u_i is not a neighbor of v_j for any $j \neq i$. Then (v_1, \dots, v_r) is a Z-sequence, since v_i footprints u_i for all $i \in [r]$. In addition, v_{r-1} and v_r each footprint only one vertex, and applying Lemma 3.3, we are done. Note that if $r \geq 5$, then the vertices $v_i, i \in [r]$ indeed have the property that each of their neighbors $u_i, i \in [r]$ outside C is unique. Hence, we are left with the case when C is a 4-cycle. Since G has no triangles it is not possible that v_i and v_{i+1} have a common neighbor (where i is taken modulo 4). Hence, it is only possible that v_1 and v_3 have a common neighbor and/or v_2 and v_4 have a common neighbor. Taking symmetry into account, there are two possibilities.

First, if v_1 and v_3 have a common neighbor $b \notin V(C)$, but $N_G(v_2) = \{v_1, v_3, u_2\}$, $N_G(v_4) = \{v_1, v_3, u_4\}$, and $u_2 \neq u_4$. Note that b cannot be adjacent to both u_2 and u_4 , and

assume without loss of generality that $bu_2 \notin E(G)$. If also $bu_4 \notin E(G)$, then (v_1, b, v_2, v_4) is a Z-sequence, in which v_2 and v_4 each footprint only one vertex. On the other hand, let $bu_4 \in E(G)$. Now, if $u_2u_4 \in E(G)$, then in the sequence (v_1, b, u_4, u_2) , each of the vertices u_4 and u_2 footprint only one vertex. Otherwise, if $u_2u_4 \notin E(G)$, then in the sequence (v_1, b, v_2, u_4) , each of the vertices v_2 and u_4 footprint only one vertex.

Second, let v_1 and v_3 have a common neighbor $b \notin V(C)$, and let v_2 and v_4 have a common neighbor $c \notin V(C)$. Since $G \neq K_{3,3}$, b and c are not adjacent. Now, if b and c have no common neighbor, then in the sequence (v_1, v_2, b, c) , each of the vertices b and c footprint only one vertex. If, on the other hand, b and c have a common neighbor x , then in the sequence (v_1, v_2, b, x) , each of the vertices b and x footprint only one vertex. The proof is complete. \square

The sharpness of the bound in the above theorem is discussed in the next section, where we also characterize the graphs attaining the bound.

4 Cubic graphs attaining the $\frac{n}{2}$ -bound

We start with the following auxiliary result, which is a slight modification of Lemma 3.3.

Lemma 4.1 *Let G be a connected cubic graph of order n . If there exists a (not necessarily dominating) Z-sequence $S = (v_1, \dots, v_r)$ in G such that each vertex v_i , where $i \in \{2, \dots, r\}$, footprint at most two vertices, and there are at least three vertices in S that footprint only one vertex, then $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$.*

Proof. Note that v_1 footprint 4 vertices, and by the assumption of the lemma, vertices v_1, \dots, v_r together footprint at most $4 + 3 + 2(r - 3)$ vertices. If S is already a dominating sequence, then the bound $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$ holds, as argued in the last paragraph of this proof. Otherwise, we claim that S can be extended to a dominating sequence in such a way that for all the remaining vertices each footprint at most two vertices.

Let D be the set of vertices that are dominated by S , where S is a Z-sequence, but not a dominating sequence. Since G is connected, it contains a vertex $x \notin D$, which is adjacent to a vertex $y \in D$. Clearly, $y \notin \widehat{S}$, and let v_i be a vertex in S that dominates y . If y is added to S , that is, $v_{r+1} = y$, then y footprint at most two vertices, because $\{v_i, y\} \subset N_G[y]$ and $|N_G[y]| = 4$. Since y footprint x , we may choose $v_{r+1} = y$. Repeating this argument, we can easily see that S can be extended to a dominating sequence of length t in such a way that each of v_{r+1}, \dots, v_t footprint at most two vertices.

In the same way as in the beginning of this proof we derive that vertices v_1, \dots, v_t together footprint at most $4 + 3 + 2(t - 3)$ vertices, which implies $n \leq 4 + 3 + 2(t - 3)$, and we infer

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq t \geq \frac{n+1}{2} > \frac{n}{2}.$$

The proof is complete. \square

The above lemma will be continuously used in the subsequent proofs in this section. In many cases we will determine a Z-sequence in which there are three vertices each of which




Figure 1: Graphs X and Y with designated vertices marked.

footprints only one vertex while all other vertices, expect the first vertex of the sequence, footprint at most two vertices. By Lemma 4.1 this will imply that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$.

First, we will determine the graphs G that attain the value $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) = \frac{n}{2}$ within a special family \mathcal{M} of cubic graphs, which will be used in the proof of the main theorem. We need a couple of more definitions to introduce this family.

The graph X is obtained from the complete bipartite graph $K_{3,3}$ by subdividing one edge. The vertex of degree 2 in X is denoted by α_X . See Figure 1, where X is depicted on the left. The graph Y is obtained from the complete bipartite graph $K_{2,3}$ by adding an edge between two vertices of degree 2; note that Y has exactly one vertex of degree 2, which we denote by α_Y , while other four vertices of Y have degree 3. One can find the graph Y on the right side of Figure 1.

The family \mathcal{M} of (cubic) graphs is obtained from bi-regular trees T with $\deg(u) \in \{1, 3\}$ for every vertex $u \in V(T)$ in the following way. To every leaf of T associate either a graph X or a graph Y , and then attach a copy of the associated graph to that leaf. More precisely, $G \in \mathcal{M}$ if G can be obtained from a tree T whose non-leaf vertices have degree 3 by identifying each leaf ℓ of T with the vertex α_X or α_Y of a copy of X or Y , respectively, that is associated with ℓ .

Taking two copies of the graph X and connecting with an edge the vertices of degree 2 creates a cubic graph, which we denote by X_2 (it is obtained from the tree K_2 by using the above identification of leaves with the vertices α_X of their own copy of X). Figure 2 shows the graphs X_2 and X_3 , where the latter is obtained by the described operation from the tree $K_{1,3}$. In a similar way we construct the graphs Y_2 and Y_3 , see Figure 3. On the left of this figure the graph XY is depicted, which is obtained from a copy of X and a copy of Y by adding an edge between α_X and α_Y . The graphs obtained from $K_{1,3}$ by attaching to the three leaves two copies of X and a copy of Y or two copies of Y and a copy of X are denoted by X_2Y and XY_2 , respectively. They are depicted in Figure 4.

We follow with a characterization of the graphs in family \mathcal{M} that attain the bound in Theorem 3.4. The subfamily \mathcal{M}' of \mathcal{M} consists of the graphs $X_2, X_3, Y_2, Y_3, X_2Y, XY_2$ and XY .

Proposition 4.2 *If $G \in \mathcal{M}$, then $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) = \frac{n(G)}{2}$ if and only if $G \in \mathcal{M}'$.*

Proof. It is easy to see that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(X_2) = 7$, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(X_3) = 11$, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(Y_2) = 5$, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(Y_3) = 8$,




Figure 2: Graphs X_2 and X_3 .




Figure 3: Graphs XY , Y_2 and Y_3 .

$\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(XY) = 6$, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(XY_2) = 9$ and $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(X_2Y) = 10$. This shows that $G \in \mathcal{M}'$ implies $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) = \frac{n(G)}{2}$.

For the other direction, we will construct a Z-sequence in a graph $G \in \mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{M}'$ with length greater than $n(G)/2$. Note that G can be obtained from a tree T whose non-leaf vertices have degree 3 by identifying each leaf ℓ of T with the vertex x_M or y_M that corresponds to ℓ . In addition, since G is not in \mathcal{M}' , the tree T has more than four vertices and contains at least two leaves, say ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 , that are at distance greater than 2. Consider the two copies of graphs in $\{X, Y\}$ that are associated to the leaves ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 , and denote them by M_1 and M_2 , respectively; similarly, the identified vertices of M_1 and M_2 are denoted by α_{M_1} and α_{M_2} , respectively. Note that each of the graphs M_i can be isomorphic either to X or Y . In Figure 5, a graph M_i is depicted, on the left as a copy of X and on the right as a copy of




Figure 4: Graphs XY_2 and X_2Y .

Y . Consider also the notation of vertices on the same figure.




Figure 5: Graph M_i in the proof of Proposition 4.2 as a copy of X and a copy Y .

Let $\ell_1 = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_r = \ell_2$ be the shortest path in T (and also in G) between $\alpha_{M_1} = \ell_1$ and $\alpha_{M_2} = \ell_2$. Note that $r \geq 3$. Now, depending on which of the graphs are M_1 and M_2 , consider a sequence S , which starts in the subgraphs M_1 and M_2 as follows. If both M_i are isomorphic to X , then S starts with $(a_1, b_1, c_1, \alpha_{M_1}, a_2, b_2, c_2, \alpha_{M_2}, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{r-1})$, and note that a_1 and a_2 footprint four vertices, $c_1, c_2, \alpha_{M_1}, \alpha_{M_2}, u_{r-2}$ and u_{r-1} footprint only one vertex, while all other vertices footprint two vertices. In the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.1 we note that the Z -sequence S can be extended to a dominating Z -sequence of length t such that each the remaining vertices of the sequence footprints at most two vertices. We infer that the vertices of the sequence footprint at most $4 + 4 + 6 + 2(t - 8)$ vertices, which implies that $n \leq 4 + 4 + 6 + 2(t - 8)$, and so

$$\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) \geq t \geq \frac{n+2}{2} > \frac{n(G)}{2}.$$

The case when both M_i are isomorphic to Y , or one is isomorphic to X and the other to Y , can be proved in a similar way. For instance, in the former case, the appropriate sequence

S starts with $(a_1, b_1, \alpha_{M_1}, a_2, b_2, \alpha_{M_2}, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{r-1})$, and again there are six vertices that footprint only one vertex. The remainder of the proof is essentially the same as above. \square

The following lemma indicates a special role that is played by graphs X and Y in the study of Z-Grundy domination in cubic graphs. It will be used several times in the proof of the main theorem.

Lemma 4.3 *Let G be a connected cubic graph, uv a cut edge in G , and let u lie on a cycle. Denote by U the component of $G - uv$ that contains u .*

- (i) *If for every dominating Z-sequence S in which no vertex of $\widehat{S} \cap V(U)$ footprints more than two vertices, every vertex of $\widehat{S} \cap V(U)$ footprints exactly two vertices, then U is isomorphic to X or Y .*
- (ii) *If U is isomorphic to X or Y , then there exists a dominating Z-sequence S that starts with a vertex in U , two vertices of $\widehat{S} \cap V(U)$ footprint only one vertex, and all other vertices of $\widehat{S} \cap V(U)$, except the first vertex of S , footprint at most two vertices.*

Proof. (i) Let C be a cycle that contains u whose order p is as small as possible. In particular, C is an induced cycle. Let $C : u, c_2, \dots, c_p, u$. Assume first that $p = 3$. That is, u, c_2 and c_3 form a triangle, and each of c_2 and c_3 has a neighbor outside C . Then, if the sequence S starts with (v, u, c_2) , vertex c_2 footprints exactly one vertex. Clearly, in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.1, S can be extended to a dominating Z-sequence in which every vertex of C footprints at most two vertices, which is a contradiction.

Let $p = 4$. If c_3 has a neighbor outside C , which is not adjacent to c_2 , then starting the sequence S with (v, u, c_2, c_3) vertex c_3 footprints exactly one vertex, yielding again a contradiction. We may thus assume that c_3 and c_2 have a common neighbor w , and by symmetry (replacing the roles of c_4 and c_2), vertex c_4 is also adjacent to w . In that case, vertices u, c_2, c_3, c_4 and w induce a subgraph isomorphic to Y .

Now, let $p \geq 5$. Suppose that the neighbor w of c_{p-1} , which does not lie on C , is adjacent only to c_{p-1} among all vertices of C . Then in the sequence $(v, u, c_2, \dots, c_{p-1})$, as the starting part of S , c_{p-1} footprints exactly one vertex, which yields the same contradiction as earlier. On the other hand, assume that w is a common neighbor of another vertex from C . By the choice of C as a shortest possible cycle containing u , we infer that w can only be adjacent to c_p, c_{p-2} or c_{p-3} . If w is adjacent to c_p , then by the minimality of C it cannot be adjacent also to c_{p-3} ; also w cannot be adjacent to c_{p-2} , since then in the sequence (v, u, c_p, c_{p-1}) , the vertex c_{p-1} footprints only c_{p-2} . On the other hand, if w is not adjacent to c_{p-2} , then in the sequence (v, u, c_p, w) the vertex w footprints only one vertex. We thus infer that $wc_p \notin E(G)$. By w' we denote the neighbor of c_{p-2} , which does not lie on C .

Assume that $wc_{p-3} \in E(G)$. If $w'c_p \notin E(G)$, then in $(v, u, c_2, \dots, c_{p-2}, c_p)$ vertex c_p footprints exactly one vertex. Hence, let $w'c_p \in E(G)$. (Note that then $w \neq w'$, since C is a shortest cycle containing u .) If $ww' \notin E(G)$, then in the sequence $(v, u, c_2, \dots, c_{p-2}, w')$ the vertex w' footprints exactly one vertex. Now, let $ww' \in E(G)$. If $p \geq 6$, then in the sequence $(v, u, c_p, c_{p-1}, c_{p-2})$, vertex c_{p-2} footprints exactly one vertex. Finally, if $p = 5$, then C is isomorphic to X .

(ii) The proof is straightforward: by using the notation from Figure 5, the corresponding sequence for graph X starts with $(a_i, b_i, c_i, \alpha_{M_i})$, and corresponding sequence for graph Y starts with (a_i, b_i, α_{M_i}) . (Note that the role of vertex u is played by α_{M_i} .) \square

We next present several special (cubic) graphs that appear in the characterization. We start with the cubic graph on 8 vertices, which we denote by TK , and is depicted on the left side of Figure 6. On the right side of the same figure one can see the Hamming graph $K_3 \square K_2$.




Figure 6: Graphs TK and $K_3 \square K_2$.

The *diamond* is the graph $K_4 - e$ obtained from the complete graph on 4 vertices by deleting an edge. We next define three cubic graphs, which we will refer to as *necklaces*. We denote them by N_{XX} , N_{XY} and N_{YY} , see Figure 7. In particular, the cubic graph obtained from the disjoint union of two copies of the diamond by adding two edges is known as the 2-necklace, it is depicted on the right side of Figure 7, and we will denote it by N_{YY} .




Figure 7: Graphs necklaces N_{XX} , N_{XY} , and N_{YY} .

We follow with two non-bipartite triangle-free graphs. The *twisted cube* TQ_3 is the graph obtained from the disjoint union of two 4-cycles, say $C : a, b, c, d, a$ and $C' : a', b', c', d', a'$ by adding the edges aa' , bb' , cd' and dc' . Clearly, TQ_3 is a non-bipartite cubic graph of order 8; see Figure 8. On the right side of the same figure the Petersen graph is shown.

Finally, two bipartite graphs relevant for this section are the 3-cube Q_3 , and the complete bipartite graph $K_{3,3}$, shown in Figure 9.

We are ready to formulate the characterization of the connected cubic graphs with Z-Grundy domination number half their order.

Theorem 4.4 *A connected, cubic, graph G of order n has $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) = \frac{n}{2}$ if and only if $G \in \mathcal{M}'$ or G is one of the graphs N_{XX} , N_{XY} , N_{YY} , $K_3 \square K_2$, TK , Q_3 , TQ_3 , or the Petersen graph.*




Figure 8: Twisted cube TQ_3 and the Petersen graph.




Figure 9: Graphs Q_3 and $K_{3,3}$.

Proof. Clearly, by using Proposition 4.2 for the class \mathcal{M}' , and noting that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(N_{XX}) = 6$, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(N_{XY}) = 5$, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(N_{YY}) = 4$, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(K_3 \square K_2) = 3$, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(TK) = 4$, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(Q_3) = 4$, $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(TQ_3) = 4$ and $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(P) = 5$, where P is Petersen graph, we see that the graphs that appear in the statement of the theorem attain the bound $\frac{n}{2}$ for their Z-Grundy domination numbers.

For the reverse direction, we distinguish four cases. The first case is that G contains Y as a subgraph, the second is that it does not contain Y , but contains a diamond as a subgraph (clearly, a diamond has to be an induced subgraph, since G is cubic and $G \neq K_4$), and the third case is that G has no diamond, but has a triangle. The final case is that G is triangle-free. In the first two cases, let G have an induced diamond with vertices a_1, a_2, b and c , where a_1 and a_2 are not adjacent.

Case 1. G has Y as a subgraph.

Let a_1 and a_2 have a common neighbor α_Y different from b and c , hence the subset $\{a_1, a_2, b, c, \alpha_Y\}$ induces Y as a subgraph. Let a sequence start with $S' = (a_1, c, \alpha_Y)$. Note that c and α_Y footprint only one vertex. By Lemma 4.1, it suffices to extend S' to a Z-sequence S such that it contains at least one more vertex that footprints only one vertex and all other vertices of S (except a_1) footprint at most two vertices of G .

Let $u' \notin \{a_1, a_2\}$ be the neighbor of α_Y . It is possible that u' lies on a cycle. Otherwise, u' has two neighbors, z and w , distinct from α_Y , and the only path between z and w is the one passing u' . Since G is cubic and finite, there exists a vertex a in $G - u'z$ (and also in $G - u'w$) such that a lies on a cycle, but all internal vertices on the path between α_Y and a do not lie on a cycle. Denote by A the set of all such vertices a in G that lie on a cycle and there is a path between α_Y and a passing through u' such that all internal vertices of the path do not lie on a cycle (note that if already u' lies on a cycle, then $A = \{u'\}$).

Take any $a \in A$, and let a' be the vertex on the path between α_Y and a , which is adjacent to a . Note that aa' is a cut-edge in G , and since a lies on a cycle, we can apply Lemma 4.3(i). We infer that unless the component U of $G - aa'$ that contains a is isomorphic to X or Y , there is a dominating Z-sequence S to which we can extend S' such that every vertex of $\widehat{S} \cap V(U)$ footprints at most two vertices and at least one vertex of $\widehat{S} \cap V(U)$ footprints exactly one vertex. Applying Lemma 4.1, and considering the assumption $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) = \frac{n}{2}$, we infer that G belongs to \mathcal{M} , and by Proposition 4.2 we get $G \in \mathcal{M}'$.

Case 2. G has a diamond, but has no Y as a subgraph.

Let G have a diamond with vertices a_1, a_2, b and c , let a_i be adjacent also to v_i , for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, and $v_1 \neq v_2$. If $v_1v_2 \in E(G)$, then (a_1, c, a_2, v_2) is a Z-sequence in which each of c, a_2 and v_2 footprints only one vertex. Thus, assume that $v_1v_2 \notin E(G)$. Suppose that $d(v_1, v_2) = 2$. First, let v_1 and v_2 have two common neighbors x_1 and x_2 . If $x_1x_2 \in E(G)$, then G is isomorphic to the necklace N_{YY} and we are done. Otherwise, if x_1 and x_2 are open twins with $N(x_i) = \{v_1, v_2, y\}$, then $(a_1, c, a_2, v_2, x_1, y)$ is a Z-sequence in which each of the vertices c, a_2 and y footprints only one vertex, which again implies $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$. Now, if x_1 and x_2 are not open twins, then (a_1, c, a_2, v_2, x_1) is a Z-sequence with c, a_2 and x_1 being such vertices that footprint only one vertex, and by using Lemma 4.1 we get a contradiction to the assumption $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) = \frac{n}{2}$. If v_1 and v_2 have only one common neighbor, say x , then (a_1, c, a_2, v_2, v_1) is a Z-sequence, in which each of c, a_2 and v_1 footprints only one vertex. We may thus assume that $d(v_1, v_2) \geq 3$.

Suppose that there is a path between v_1 and v_2 that does not pass a_1 (and a_2). Let $P : v_1 = z_0, z_1, \dots, z_r = v_2$, where $r \geq 3$, be a shortest such path. Let $u_i \in N(v_i) \setminus \{a_i\}$ be the neighbor of v_i that is not in P . Suppose that $u_i, i \in [2]$, is not dominated by a vertex from $V(P) \setminus \{v_i\}$. Without loss of generality we may assume that u_2 is not adjacent to any vertex in $V(P) \setminus \{v_2\}$. Then, the sequence $(a_2, c, a_1, v_1, z_1, \dots, z_r)$ is a Z-sequence, in which each of c, a_1 and v_2 footprints exactly one vertex (notably, $v_2 = z_r$ footprints only u_2), implying $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$, a contradiction. Now, we assume that u_i is adjacent to a vertex in $V(P) \setminus \{v_i\}$, for each $i \in [2]$. If u_1 is adjacent to z_1 , then the sequence (a_2, c, a_1, v_1, z_1) is a Z-sequence in which each of c, a_1 and z_1 footprints exactly one vertex, which again yields $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$. By a similar argument, if u_2 is adjacent to z_{r-1} we infer that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$. We may thus assume that u_1 is not adjacent to z_1 , but it is adjacent to z_2 , and that u_2 is not adjacent to z_{r-1} but it is adjacent to z_{r-2} . Now, if $r > 3$, consider the sequence $S = (a_2, c, a_1, v_1, z_1, z_2)$. It is easy to see that S is a Z-sequence in which c, a_1 and z_2 footprint only one vertex. In an analogous way as earlier we derive $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$, a contradiction. If $r = 3$, and $u_1u_2 \notin E(G)$, then the sequence $(z_1, u_1, z_2, v_2, a_2, c)$ is a Z-sequence, and each of z_2, v_2 and c footprints exactly one vertex, which again yields $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$. Finally, if $u_1u_2 \in E(G)$, then the resulting graph G is isomorphic to the necklace N_{XY} .

The remaining possibility is that the only path between v_1 and v_2 is through a_1 . Thus, a_1v_1 and a_2v_2 are cut-edges. Now, either v_1 already lies on a cycle, or there is a path between v_1 to a vertex u in $G - a_1v_1$ that lies on a cycle, and let u' be the vertex preceding u on this path. By using Lemma 4.3(i), we can extend the sequence (a_1, c, a_2) (in which c and a_2 footprint only one vertex) to a Z-dominating sequence in which all vertices, except a_1 , footprint at most two vertices, and there is an additional vertex in the component U of $G - u'u$ that contains u , which footprint only one vertex, unless U is isomorphic to X . The possibility that U is not isomorphic to X leads to a contradiction. By Lemma 4.3(ii), if U is isomorphic to X , then there exists a dominating Z-sequence S , which starts with a vertex in U , and two vertices in U of that sequence footprint only one vertex, while all other

vertices, except the first vertex of S , footprint at most two vertices. This sequence can be chosen in such a way that contains (v_1, a_1, c, a_2) as a consecutive subsequence, and so c and a_2 are two additional vertices that footprint only one vertex (yielding in total at least four such vertices of S). This again implies the contradiction with the assumption $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$.

Case 3. G has a triangle, but is diamond-free.

Let T be a triangle in G with vertices a_1, a_2, a_3 . Let v_i , where $i \in [3]$, be the neighbor of a_i that does not belong to T . We start a sequence with $S = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$, which is clearly a Z-sequence, since a_i footprints v_i . In addition, a_2 and a_3 footprint only one vertex. If S is a dominating Z-sequence, then $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) = 3$ and $G = K_3 \square K_2$. Assume that S is not a dominating Z-sequence, hence at least one of the vertices v_i has at least one neighbor that is not in $T' = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, v_1, v_2, v_3\}$. Assume that there is an edge between two vertices in $V(T') \setminus V(T)$, say $v_1 v_2 \in E(G)$. Then at least one of the vertices v_1 or v_2 has a neighbor outside T' . Thus, extending S with that vertex (that is, with v_1 or v_2) yields a Z-sequence in which three vertices footprint exactly one vertex. In a similar way as in the previous cases, we derive that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$.

Suppose that there is a path between v_1 and v_2 that does not go through a_1 and a_2 . Let $P : v_1 = z_0, z_1, \dots, z_r = v_2$ be a shortest such path. Let x_i be the vertex in $N(v_i) \setminus V(P)$, which is not in T , for each $i \in [2]$. If x_2 is not adjacent to a vertex in P , then $(a_1, a_2, a_3, v_1, z_1, \dots, z_r)$ is a Z-sequence in which each of a_2, a_3 and v_2 footprints exactly one vertex, yielding $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$. By an analogous argument we may also assume that x_1 is adjacent to a vertex in P . Suppose that x_1 is adjacent to z_1 . Then $(a_1, a_2, a_3, v_1, z_1)$ is a Z-sequence in which a_2, a_3 and z_1 footprint exactly one vertex, and we are done. Hence, let x_1 be adjacent to z_2 (x_1 cannot be adjacent to z_p for $p > 2$, because this would yield a path from v_1 to v_2 shorter than P). Suppose first that $x_1 \neq x_2$ (that is, the length r of P is greater than 2). If $r > 3$, then $(a_1, a_2, a_3, v_1, z_1, z_2)$ is a Z-sequence in which a_2, a_3 and z_2 each footprint only one vertex, and Lemma 3.3 can be applied to infer $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$, a contradiction. Next, if $r = 3$, then by symmetry we can also assume that x_2 is adjacent to z_1 (and v_2). If x_1 and x_2 are not adjacent, then the sequence $(a_1, a_2, a_3, v_1, x_1, v_2)$ is a Z-sequence, in which each of a_2, a_3 , and v_2 footprints exactly one vertex (note that v_2 footprints x_2). On the other hand, if $x_1 x_2 \in E(G)$, then the sequence $S = (z_1, z_2, v_2, a_2, a_3)$ is a Z-sequence in which z_1 footprints 4 vertices, z_2 footprints only v_2 , v_2 footprints only a_2 , and a_3 footprints only v_3 , and we are done. Finally, if $r = 2$, then z_1 is a common neighbor of v_1 and v_2 . In this case, $(a_1, a_2, a_3, v_1, z_1)$ is a Z-sequence, and this time z_1 footprints only one vertex, unless z_1 is adjacent to v_3 (note that z_1 cannot be adjacent to $x_1 = x_2$, since this would yield a diamond in G). The former possibility gives the desired bound, hence assume that $z_1 v_3 \in E(G)$. In addition, we may assume that x_1 is adjacent to v_3 for otherwise the roles of z_1 and x_1 can be reversed and we again get $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$. Now, this implies that G has 8 vertices, and is isomorphic to the graph TK depicted on the left in Figure 6.

The remaining case when there is no path between v_1 and v_2 that does not go through a_1 and a_2 . By symmetry, we may assume that $v_1 a_1$ is a cut-edge. This situation can be dealt with in a similar way as in the last paragraph of Case 2. By using Lemma 4.3(i), we infer that unless there is a subgraph X that lies in a component $G - v_1 a_1$ that contains v_1 , we get $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$. But, having X as a subgraph, we can apply Lemma 4.3(ii), and find a dominating Z-sequence S , which starts in X , two vertices of X footprint only one vertex, and then at some point S contains (v_1, a_1, a_2, a_3) as a consecutive subsequence, yielding $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$ again.

Case 4. G is triangle-free.

Let $C : v_1, \dots, v_p, v_1$ be a shortest cycle in G . Since G is triangle-free, $p \geq 4$, and obviously C is an induced cycle. Moreover, if $p \geq 5$, then we claim that no two vertices of C have a common neighbor outside C . Indeed, for $p = 5$, two vertices with a common neighbor would imply that there exists either a triangle or a square in G , which is not possible since C is a shortest cycle. When $p > 5$, two vertices with a common neighbor would also imply that there is a cycle in G with less vertices than C , a contradiction. Let us denote by a_i the neighbor of v_i , which does not lie on C .

Case 4.A. $p \geq 5$.

If there is a vertex a_i such that every path between a_i and any vertex a_j , where $j \in [p] \setminus \{i\}$, passes through C , then $v_i a_i$ is a cut-edge. We derive, by using both statements of Lemma 4.3, that there is a dominating Z-sequence, which starts in a subgraph isomorphic to X , and then eventually passes $(a_i, v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_p, v_1, \dots, v_{i-1})$ as a consecutive subsequence, in which there are at least four vertices that footprint only one vertex. This contradiction means that we may assume that for every v_i there exists a vertex v_j and a path between v_i and v_j that does not pass any vertex of C . Let $P : v_i = z_0, z_1 = a_i, \dots, z_{r-1} = a_j, z_r = v_j$ be a shortest such path over all $i, j \in [p]$. We observe that $z_k \neq a_k$, for any $k \in \{2, \dots, r-2\}$.

Now, we again consider different subcases.

Case 4.A.1. $|V(P)| = 4$.

Note that this is possible only in two different cases. The first one is that $p = 6$ and v_i and v_j are diametrical vertices of C . Therefore $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_6, a_i)$ is a Z-sequence in which v_5, v_6 and a_i footprint exactly one vertex, a contradiction due to Lemma 4.1. The second possibility is that $p = 5$. Without loss of generality, let $v_i = v_1$ and $v_j = v_3$. If $a_1 a_4 \notin E(G)$, then $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_5, a_1)$ is a Z-sequence in which v_4, v_5 and a_1 footprint exactly one vertex. Suppose now that $a_1 a_4 \in E(G)$. Then, if a_3 (resp. a_4) is not adjacent to a_5 (resp. a_2), the sequence $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_5, a_3$ (resp. a_4)) is Z-sequence and v_4, v_5 and a_3 (resp. a_4) footprint exactly one vertex. Now, if still a_2 and a_5 are not adjacent, the sequence $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_5, a_2)$ is a Z-sequence and v_4, v_5 and a_2 footprint exactly one vertex. But if they are adjacent, we obtain the Petersen graph.

Case 4.A.2. $|V(P)| = 5$.

Let $P : v_i, a_i, z_2, a_j, v_j$. Therefore $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p, a_i, a_j)$ is a Z-sequence in which v_{p-1}, v_p and a_j footprint exactly one vertex. (Note, that we may choose a_j , since it cannot be adjacent to any of the vertices a_k , where $k \in [p]$, otherwise there would exist a shorter path between two vertices of a cycle C , contradicting the minimality of P .)

Case 4.A.3. $|V(P)| \geq 6$.

The sequence $(v_1, v_2, \dots, v_p, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{r-2})$ is a Z-sequence in which v_{p-1}, v_p and z_{r-2} footprint exactly one vertex. By using Lemma 4.1 we get $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$, a contradiction.

Case 4.B. $p = 4$.

Suppose that there is a vertex a_i (that is, the neighbor of v_i outside C) such that $v_i a_i$ is a cut-edge in G . Similarly as in the previous case, we can apply both statements of Lemma 4.3, and deduce that there exists a dominating Z-sequence S , which starts in a subgraph isomorphic to X , and then later passes $(a_i, v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_p, v_1, \dots, v_{i-1})$ as a consecutive subsequence; in S there are at least four vertices that footprint only one vertex. This contradiction means that we may assume that $v_i a_i$ is not a cut-edge for all $i \in [4]$,

and let P be a shortest path between v_i and v_j , among all pairs $\{i, j\} \subset [4]$, such that all internal vertices of P are outside C . Let $P : v_i, z_1 = a_i, \dots, z_{r-1} = a_j, v_j$, and observe that $z_k \neq a_k$, for any $k \in \{2, \dots, r-2\}$.

Case 4.B.1. $|V(P)| \geq 6$.

Clearly, in the sequence $S = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{r-2})$ each of the vertices v_3, v_4 and z_{r-2} footprints exactly one vertex, a contradiction.

Case 4.B.2. $|V(P)| = 5$.

In that case, $S = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, a_i, a_j)$ is a Z-sequence in which v_{p-1}, v_p and a_j footprint exactly one vertex. (Indeed, since P is a shortest path with prescribed properties, there are no edges between a_k and a_ℓ for distinct indices k and ℓ , which approves the choice of last two vertices in the sequence S , which is thus a Z-sequence.)

Case 4.B.3. $|V(P)| = 4$.

Let v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 be the vertices of a cycle C and let a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 be their corresponding neighbors. (Note that $a_i \neq a_j$, for all $i, j \in [4]$, otherwise there would exist shorter path than P , a contradiction.)

First, consider the case when both vertices a_i and a_j are adjacent to some a_m and a_n , respectively, where $m, n \in [p] \setminus \{i, j\}$. (Note, that $m \neq n$, otherwise we would have a triangle.) If $a_m a_n \notin E(G)$, then $(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, a_m)$ is a Z-sequence in which v_3, v_4 and a_m footprint exactly one vertex. Otherwise, if $a_m a_n \in E(G)$, then G is isomorphic to either Q_3 or TQ_3 .

The second case is that some of the vertices a_i or a_j is not adjacent to any of a_m and a_n , where $m, n \in [p] \setminus \{i, j\}$. Without loss of generality, let a_i be such vertex. Hence, a_i has a neighbor, different from v_k and a_k for all $k \in [4]$. Thus the sequence $(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, a_i)$ is a Z-sequence, and v_3, v_4 and a_i footprint exactly one vertex, a contradiction.

Case 4.B.4. $|V(P)| = 3$.

In this case, we may assume without loss of generality that v_1 and v_3 are open twins. Let a be the common neighbor of v_1 and v_3 , which is not in C .

First, assume that v_2 and v_4 are also open twins, and let b be the common neighbor of v_2 and v_4 outside C . Clearly, $a \neq b$, since G has no triangles. Also, a and b are not adjacent, since then G has 6 vertices, and is isomorphic to $K_{3,3}$, which is a contradiction ($\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(K_{3,3}) = 2$). If a and b have common neighbor x , then x is a cut-vertex, has a neighbor $y \notin \{a, b\}$ such that xy is a cut-edge. In a similar way as in the previous cases, we apply Lemma 4.3 to derive that $G \in \mathcal{M}$ (more precisely, G is either X_2 or X_3). Suppose now, that a and b do not have common neighbor, and denote c and d their neighbors, respectively. If $cd \in E(G)$, then (v_1, v_2, a, b, c) is a Z-sequence and each of a, b and c footprints exactly one vertex. On the other hand, let $cd \notin E(G)$, and first suppose that there exist a path between c and d , which does not pass through the vertices a and b . Let $P : c = z_0, z_1, \dots, z_r = d$ be a shortest such path, and let us denote the neighbors of c and d , which do not belong to P by c' and d' , respectively. The rest of the proof of this situation goes along the same lines as in the second paragraph of Case 2 to obtain a third vertex that footprints only one vertex (noting that in the first part of the sequence there are two such vertices). The only case in that proof, which does not lead to a contradiction is when $r = 3$, $N(z_1) = N(d')$ and $N(z_2) = N(c')$ (which also implies $c'd' \in E(G)$). The resulting graph G is isomorphic to the necklace N_{XX} ; see Figure 7. Finally, if $cd \notin E(G)$, but the only path between c and d goes through a and b , then ac and bd are cut-edges. By using Lemma 4.3, we infer that there is

a dominating Z-sequence S , which starts in a subgraph isomorphic to X , two vertices of X footprint only one vertex, and then at some point S contains (c, a, v_1, v_2, b) as a consecutive subsequence, and b footprints only d , yielding $\gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G) > \frac{n}{2}$, which is a contradiction.

The remaining case is that v_1 and v_3 are open twins, while v_2 and v_4 are not open twins. In this case, vertices v_1, \dots, v_4 and a induce a $K_{2,3}$. Thus, v_2, v_4 and a are in a symmetric role, and each of them has exactly one neighbor outside the mentioned $K_{2,3}$: let x be the neighbor of v_2 , y the neighbor of v_4 and z the neighbor of a . Since $G \neq K_{3,3}$ not all of the vertices x, y , and z coincide. It is possible that two of them coincide, yet this case can be then reduced to the previous one, where v_2 and v_4 were also open twins (possibly by renaming a to v_2 or v_4). Hence, we may assume that x, y and z are pairwise distinct.

If one of the edges v_2x , v_4y or az is a cut-edge, then the proof can be completed by using Lemma 4.3 as in several previous cases. We find that there exists a subgraph isomorphic to X , start a sequence in that subgraph, and continue it to reach the mentioned $K_{2,3}$ in such a way that at least three vertices footprint exactly one vertex, which yields a contradiction by Lemma 4.1. We may therefore assume that none of the mentioned three edges is a cut-edge, and so there is a path between each of the pairs in $\{x, y, z\}$, which does not pass any vertex v_i . Assume that $P : x = z_0, z_1, \dots, z_r = y$ be a shortest such path, and let us denote the neighbors of x and y , which do not belong to P by x' and y' , respectively. The rest of the proof of this situation goes along the same lines as in the second paragraph of Case 2 to obtain a third vertex that footprints only one vertex (in the initial part of the sequence v_1, v_2, a, v_4), each of the vertices a and v_4 footprints only one vertex). The only case in that proof, which does not lead to a contradiction is when $r = 3$, $N(z_1) = N(x')$ and $N(z_2) = N(y')$ (which also implies $x'y' \in E(G)$). However, this implies that az is a cut-edge, which was already considered above. The proof is complete. \square

The consequence of Theorem 3.4 for the zero forcing number is immediate:

Corollary 4.5 *A connected, cubic, graph G of order n has $Z(G) = \frac{n}{2}$ if and only if $G \in \mathcal{M}'$ or G is one of the graphs $N_{XX}, N_{XY}, N_{YY}, K_3 \square K_2, TK, Q_3, TQ_3$, or the Petersen graph.*

The following corollary for the Grundy domination number of cubic graphs follows from the fact that $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) \geq \gamma_{\text{gr}}^Z(G)$ for all graphs G with no isolated vertices, the value $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(K_{3,3}) = 3$, and by verifying the values of the Grundy domination numbers of 15 extremal graphs from Theorem 4.4.

Corollary 4.6 *A connected, cubic, graph G of order n has $\gamma_{\text{gr}}(G) = \frac{n}{2}$ if and only if G is one of the graphs $K_{3,3}, Y_2, Y_3, N_{YY}, K_3 \square K_2, Q_3, TQ_3$, or the Petersen graph.*

Acknowledgments

The first author was supported by the Ministry of Science of Slovenia under the grants P1-0297, J1-9109, J1-1693 and J1-2452.

References

- [1] AIM Minimum Rank-Special Graphs Work Group, Zero forcing sets and the minimum rank of graphs, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 428 (2008) 1628–1648.
- [2] M. Alishahi, E. Rezaei-Sani, E. Sharifi, Maximum nullity and zero forcing number on graphs with maximum degree at most three, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 284 (2020) 179–194.
- [3] D. Amos, Y. Caro, R. Davila, R. Pepper, Upper bounds on the k -forcing number of a graph, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 181 (2015) 1–10.
- [4] F. Barioli, W. Barrett, S. M. Fallat, H. T. Hall, L. Hogben, B. Shader, P. van den Driessche, H. van der Holst, Zero forcing parameters and minimum rank problems, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 433 (2010) 401–411.
- [5] F. Barioli, W. Barrett, S. M. Fallat, H. T. Hall, L. Hogben, B. Shader, P. van den Driessche, H. van der Holst, Parameters related to tree-width, zero forcing, and maximum nullity of a graph. *J. Graph Theory* 72 (2013) 146–177.
- [6] K. F. Benson, D. Ferrero, M. Flagg, V. Furst, L. Hogben, V. Vasilevska, B. Wissman, Zero forcing and power domination for graph products, *Australas. J. Combin.* 70 (2018) 221–235.
- [7] B. Brešar, Cs. Bujtás, T. Gologranc, S. Klavžar, G. Košmrlj, B. Patkós, Zs. Tuza, M. Vizer, Grundy dominating sequences and zero forcing sets, *Discrete Optim.* 26 (2017) 66–77.
- [8] B. Brešar, Cs. Bujtás, T. Gologranc, S. Klavžar, G. Košmrlj, B. Patkós, Zs. Tuza, M. Vizer, Dominating sequences in grid-like and toroidal graphs, *Electron. J. Combin.* 23 (2016) P4.34.
- [9] B. Brešar, Cs. Bujtás, T. Gologranc, S. Klavžar, G. Košmrlj, B. Patkós, Zs. Tuza, M. Vizer, On Grundy total domination number in product graphs, *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory*, in press; doi.org/10.7151/dmgt.2184.
- [10] B. Brešar, T. Gologranc, T. Kos, Dominating sequences under atomic changes with applications in Sierpiński and interval graphs, *Appl. Anal. Discrete Math.* 10 (2016) 518–531.
- [11] B. Brešar, T. Gologranc, M. Milanič, D. F. Rall, R. Rizzi, Dominating sequences in graphs, *Discrete Math.* 336 (2014) 22–36.
- [12] B. Brešar, M. A. Henning, D. F. Rall, Total dominating sequences in graphs, *Discrete Math.* 339 (2016) 1665–1676.
- [13] B. Brešar, S. Klavžar, and D. F. Rall, Domination game and an imagination strategy. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 24 (2010) 979–991.
- [14] B. Brešar, T. Kos, P. Torres, Grundy domination and zero forcing in Kneser graphs, *Ars. Math. Contemp.* 17 (2019) 419–430.
- [15] R. Davila, M.A. Henning, Total forcing and zero forcing in claw-free cubic graphs, *Graphs Combin.* 34 (2018) 1371–1384.

- [16] R. Davila, M.A. Henning, Zero forcing in claw-free cubic graphs, *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.* 43 (2020) 673–688.
- [17] S. Fallat, L. Hogben, J.C.-H. Lin, B. Shader, The inverse eigenvalue problem of a graph, zero forcing, and related parameters, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* 67 (2020) 257–261.
- [18] M. Gentner, D. Rautenbach, Some bounds on the zero forcing number of a graph, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 236 (2018) 203–213.
- [19] M. Gentner, L.D. Penso, D. Rautenbach, U.S. Souza, Extremal values and bounds for the zero forcing number, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 214 (2016) 196–200.
- [20] A. Girão, G. Mészáros, S.G.Z. Smith, On a conjecture of Gentner and Rautenbach, *Discrete Math.* 341 (2018) 1094–1097.
- [21] T.W. Haynes, S.M. Hedetniemi, S.T. Hedetniemi, M.A. Henning, Domination in graphs applied to electric power networks, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 15 (2002) 519–529.
- [22] M.A. Henning, S. Klavžar, D.F. Rall, Total version of the domination game, *Graphs Combin.* 31 (2015) 1453–1462.
- [23] J.C.-H. Lin, Zero forcing number, Grundy domination number, and their variants, *Linear Alg. Appl.* 563 (2019) 240–254.
- [24] G. Nasini, P. Torres, Grundy dominating sequences on X -join product, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 284 (2020) 138–149.
- [25] F.A. Taklimi, S. Fallat, K. Meagher, On the relationships between zero forcing numbers and certain graph coverings, *Spec. Matrices* 2 (2014) 30–45.