

# Proof of a Conjecture on Wiener Index and Eccentricity of a graph due to edge contraction

Joyentanuj Das\* and Ritabrata Jana\*

## Abstract

For a connected graph  $G$ , the Wiener index, denoted by  $W(G)$ , is the sum of the distance of all pairs of distinct vertices and the eccentricity, denoted by  $\varepsilon(G)$ , is the sum of the eccentricity of individual vertices. In [4], the authors posed a conjecture which states that given a graph  $G$  with at least three vertices, the difference between  $W(G)$  and  $\varepsilon(G)$  decreases when an edge is contracted and proved that the conjecture is true when  $e$  is a bridge. In this manuscript, we confirm that the conjecture is true for any connected graph  $G$  with at least three vertices irrespective of the nature of the edge chosen.

**Keywords:** Wiener index, eccentricity, edge contraction.

**MSC:** 05C09, 05C12.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $G = (V(G), E(G))$  be a finite, simple, connected graph with  $V(G)$  as the set of vertices and  $E(G)$  as the set of edges in  $G$ . We write  $u \sim v$  to indicate that the vertices  $u$  and  $v$  are adjacent in  $G$ . We denote the complete graph on  $n$  vertices by  $K_n$  and the path graph on  $n$  vertices by  $P_n$ . A vertex  $u$  is said to be a neighbour of a vertex  $v$  if  $u \sim v$ . The collections of all such neighbours of  $v$  in  $G$  is denoted by  $N_G(v)$ .

For a given edge  $e$ , we write  $G.e$  to denote the graph obtained from  $G$  by contracting the edge  $e$ . More precisely, if  $e$  is the edge between two vertices  $x$  and  $y$  in  $G$  then, the vertices  $x$  and  $y$  are merged contracting the edge  $e$  in  $G.e$  and we rename the vertex as  $\alpha$ . Note that, due to this graph transformation we have  $N_{G.e}(\alpha) = N_G(x) \cup N_G(y)$ . For the vertices  $x$  and  $y$  we will use  $x$ (or  $y$ ) to denote inclusive or, *i.e.*  $x$  or  $y$  or both.

A  $uv$ -path in  $G$  is a path in  $G$  whose end vertices are  $u$  and  $v$ . Let  $u \in V(G)$  and  $P$  be a path in  $G$ . We say that a path  $P$  uses a vertex  $u$  if  $u \in V(P)$ . Similarly, by saying that a path  $P$  uses an edge  $e$  we mean that  $e \in E(P)$ .

A connected graph  $G$  is a metric space with respect to the metric  $d$ , where  $d_G(u, v)$  equals the length of a minimal  $uv$ -path. We set  $d_G(u, u) = 0$  for every vertex  $u$  in  $G$ . A  $uv$ -path in  $G$  is said to be of minimal length if the length of the path is equal to  $d_G(u, v)$ . The Wiener index of a graph  $G$ , denoted by  $W(G)$  is defined as

$$W(G) = \sum_{\{u,v\} \subset V(G)} d_G(u, v) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{u \in V(G)} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v).$$

---

\*School of Mathematics, IISER Thiruvananthapuram, Maruthamala P.O., Vithura, Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala - 695551, India.  
Emails: joyentanuj16@iisertvm.ac.in, ritabrata20@iisertvm.ac.in

The Wiener index is the oldest topological index studied in mathematical chemistry and is one of the most studied among such indices (for surveys one may refer to [8, 10]) and is an active area of research (for details see [1, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12] and the references there in).

If  $u \in V(G)$  then the eccentricity  $\varepsilon_G(u)$  is the distance from  $u$  to a farthest vertex from  $u$ . A vertex  $v$  is said to be an eccentric vertex of  $u$  if  $d_G(u, v) = \varepsilon_G(u)$ . The eccentricity of a graph  $G$  is

$$\varepsilon(G) = \sum_{u \in V(G)} \varepsilon_G(u)$$

which is also known as total eccentricity of a graph. The radius  $\text{rad}(G)$  of  $G$  and the diameter  $\text{diam}(G)$  of  $G$  are the minimum and maximum eccentricity, respectively. For studies related to total eccentricity of a graph and average eccentricity of a graph one may refer to [2]-[5] and [7]. In [1], the Wiener index and the average eccentricity has been studied on strong products of graphs. In [4], the authors studied the relation between Wiener index and eccentricity for certain classes of graphs and posed the following conjecture:

**Conjecture 1.1.** *If  $e$  is an edge of a graph  $G$  with number of vertices at least 3, then*

$$W(G.e) - \varepsilon(G.e) \leq W(G) - \varepsilon(G).$$

An edge in a connected graph is a bridge if and only if removing it disconnects the graph. In [4], the authors proved the following theorem when the edge is a bridge as partial support for the Conjecture 1.1.

**Theorem 1.2.** *If  $e$  is a bridge of a graph  $G$  with at least 3 vertices, then*

$$W(G.e) - \varepsilon(G.e) \leq W(G) - \varepsilon(G).$$

In this manuscript, we prove that the Conjecture 1.1 is true.

## 2 Proof of Conjecture 1.1

Let  $e$  be an edge in  $G$  between the vertices  $x$  and  $y$  and the graph obtained from  $G$  by contracting the edge  $e$  is denoted by  $G.e$ . Let  $\alpha$  be the vertex in  $G.e$ , which is formed by merging the vertices  $x$  and  $y$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $u, v$  be two vertices in  $G.e$  which is different from the vertex  $\alpha$  then*

$$d_{G.e}(u, v) = \begin{cases} d_G(u, v) & \text{or} \\ d_G(u, v) - 1. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Let  $P$  be a  $uv$ -path in  $G$  then, we have two possibilities; either  $P$  uses the edge  $e$  or it does not. Suppose all  $uv$ -paths of length  $d_G(u, v)$  does not use the edge  $e$  then, the paths remain preserved in  $G.e$  and we have  $d_{G.e}(u, v) = d_G(u, v)$ . If there exists a  $uv$ -path in  $G$  of length  $d_G(u, v)$  that uses the edge  $e$  then, the length of the  $uv$ -path in  $G.e$  is decreased by 1 and we have  $d_{G.e}(u, v) = d_G(u, v) - 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $u \neq \alpha$  be a vertex in  $G.e$  then*

$$d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) = \begin{cases} d_G(u, x) & \text{or} \\ d_G(u, x) - 1. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Let  $P$  be a path of minimal length in  $G.e$  between  $u$  and  $\alpha$ . Let  $u_n$  be the vertex on the path  $P$  which is adjacent to  $\alpha$ . Then in  $G$ , the vertex  $u_n$  is either adjacent to  $x$  or  $y$  or both. Next, we consider the following cases to complete the proof.

**Case 1:** Suppose for all minimal paths of length  $d_{G.e}(u, \alpha)$ , the vertex  $u_n$  adjacent to  $\alpha$  is not adjacent to  $x$  in  $G$ . Then  $u_n \sim y$  and the path  $P_1 = u \sim \dots \sim u_n \sim y \sim x$  from  $u$  to  $x$  is a path of minimal length in  $G$  and hence we have  $d_G(u, x) = d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) + 1$ .

**Case 2:** Suppose there exists a minimal path of length  $d_{G.e}(u, \alpha)$  such that the vertex  $u_n$  is adjacent to  $\alpha$  in  $G.e$  and is adjacent to  $x$  in  $G$ . Then it follows that  $d_G(u, x) = d_{G.e}(u, \alpha)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** *Let  $x$  (or  $y$ ) be the eccentric vertex (or vertices) of  $u$  in  $G$ . Then,  $\alpha$  is the eccentric vertex of  $u$  in  $G.e$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose on the contrary we assume that  $\alpha$  is not the eccentric vertex of  $u$  and  $w \neq \alpha$  is an eccentric vertex of  $u$  in  $G.e$ . Then we have

$$d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) \leq d_{G.e}(u, w) - 1 \text{ and} \quad (2.1)$$

$$d_G(u, w) \leq d_G(u, x) - 1. \quad (2.2)$$

Thus, combining Eqns. (2.1) and (2.2) we have

$$d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) + 1 \leq d_{G.e}(u, w) \leq d_G(u, w) \leq d_G(u, x) - 1,$$

which implies that  $d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) \leq d_G(u, x) - 2$ , but this is a contradiction by Lemma 2.2 and the result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** *If there is an eccentric vertex of  $u$  in  $G$  other than  $x$  and  $y$  then there exist an eccentric vertex of  $u$  that is common in both  $G$  and  $G.e$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the lemma by considering the following two cases:

**Case 1:** Let  $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k$  be the eccentric vertices of  $u$  in  $G$ , such that none of the  $w_i$ 's are equal to  $x$  or  $y$ . Suppose on the contrary, we assume that  $w \neq w_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$  is an eccentric vertex of  $u$  in  $G.e$ . Then, the following holds

$$d_{G.e}(u, w_i) \leq d_{G.e}(u, w) - 1 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k \text{ and} \quad (2.3)$$

$$d_G(u, w) \leq d_G(u, w_i) - 1 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k. \quad (2.4)$$

Combining Eqns. (2.3) and (2.4) we have

$$d_{G.e}(u, w_i) + 1 \leq d_{G.e}(u, w) \leq d_G(u, w) \leq d_G(u, w_i) - 1,$$

which implies that  $d_{G.e}(u, w_i) \leq d_G(u, w_i) - 2$ , but this is a contradiction by Lemma 2.1 and hence  $w = w_i$  for some  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .

**Case 2:** Let  $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k$  be the eccentric vertices of  $u$  in  $G$  other than  $x$  and  $y$ . Observe that for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , none of the minimal  $uw_i$ -paths in  $G$  use the edge  $e$ . If a  $uw_i$ -path uses the edge  $e$  then we have either  $u \sim \dots \sim x \sim y \sim \dots \sim w_i$  or  $u \sim \dots \sim y \sim x \sim \dots \sim w_i$  but in any of the cases  $d_G(u, w_i) > d_G(u, x)$ , which is a contradiction. Since the  $uw_i$ -path of minimal length does not use the edge  $e$  in  $G$  the same is preserved in  $G.e$ , i.e.  $d_G(u, w_i) = d_{G.e}(u, w_i)$ . If there are no other eccentric vertices  $w$  other than  $\alpha$  in  $G.e$  then,  $d_{G.e}(u, w) < d_{G.e}(u, \alpha)$  for all  $w \in V(G.e) \setminus \{\alpha\}$ . But all the  $uw$ -paths of minimal length in  $G.e$  are preserved in  $G$  which implies that  $x$  or  $y$  are the only eccentric vertices of  $u$  in  $G$ , which is a contradiction. Now suppose  $w \neq w_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , be an eccentric vertex of  $u$  in  $G.e$  then by similar arguments as in the previous case we arrive at a contradiction and hence the result follows.  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the Conjecture 1.1.

*Proof of Conjecture 1.1.* Let  $G$  be a connected graph on  $n$  vertices. If  $n = 3$  then,  $G$  is either the complete graph  $K_3$  or the path graph  $P_3$  of length 2. In either of the cases the resulting graph after contraction of an edge will lead to a single edge *i.e.*  $K_2$ . It is easy to see that  $W(K_2) - \varepsilon(K_2) \leq W(G) - \varepsilon(G)$ . Thus, the result is true when  $n = 3$ . Now we consider the case when  $n \geq 4$ . The difference between the Wiener index and eccentricity of  $G$  and  $G.e$  can be expressed as

$$W(G) - \varepsilon(G) = \sum_{u \in V(G)} \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) \right).$$

$$W(G.e) - \varepsilon(G.e) = \sum_{u \in V(G.e)} \left( \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) - \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) \right).$$

Let  $\tilde{V}$  denote the set of vertices that are common in both  $G$  and  $G.e$ , *i.e.*  $V(G) = \tilde{V} \cup \{x, y\}$  and  $V(G.e) = \tilde{V} \cup \{\alpha\}$ . We complete the prove by showing that for all  $u \in \tilde{V}$

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) - \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(x, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(x, v) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(y, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(y, v) \\ \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(\alpha, v) - \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(\alpha, v). \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

To prove Eqns. (2.5) and (2.6) we consider the following cases.

**Case 1:** Let  $u \in \tilde{V}$ .

**Subcase 1.1:** Let  $x$ (or  $y$ ) be the eccentric vertex (or vertices) of  $u$  in  $G$ . Thus, by Lemma 2.3  $\alpha$  is the eccentric vertex of  $u$  in  $G.e$ . To prove Eqn. (2.5) it is enough to show that

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) + \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) \geq 0.$$

Simplifying the left side of the inequality we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) + \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} d_G(u, v) + \frac{1}{2} d_G(u, x) + \frac{1}{2} d_G(u, y) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} d_{G.e}(u, v) - \frac{1}{2} d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) + \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} d_G(u, v) - \frac{1}{2} d_G(u, x) + \frac{1}{2} d_G(u, y) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} d_{G.e}(u, v) + \frac{1}{2} d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} d_G(u, v) - \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} d_{G.e}(u, v) \right) + \frac{1}{2} (d_G(u, y) + d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) - d_G(u, x)). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, using Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 and using the fact that  $u \neq y$  the result follows. Note that we have used the fact that  $x$  is an eccentric vertex of  $u$ . Similar calculations will follow if  $y$  is an eccentric vertex of  $u$ .

**Subcase 1.2:** Let  $w$  be an eccentric vertex of  $u$  in  $G$  other than  $x$  and  $y$ . Without loss of generality using Lemma 2.4, we can choose  $w \in \tilde{V}$  such that  $w$  is an eccentric vertex of  $u$  in both  $G$  and  $G.e$ . To prove Eqn. (2.5) it is enough to show that

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) + \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) \geq 0.$$

Simplifying the left side of the inequality we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) + \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} d_G(u, v) + \frac{1}{2} d_G(u, x) + \frac{1}{2} d_G(u, y) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} d_{G.e}(u, v) - \frac{1}{2} d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) + \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(u, v) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \tilde{V} \setminus \{w\}} d_G(u, v) + \frac{1}{2} d_G(u, x) + \frac{1}{2} d_G(u, y) - \frac{1}{2} d_G(u, w) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in \tilde{V} \setminus \{w\}} d_{G.e}(u, v) - \frac{1}{2} d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) + \frac{1}{2} d_{G.e}(u, w) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{v \in \tilde{V} \setminus \{w\}} d_G(u, v) - \sum_{v \in \tilde{V} \setminus \{w\}} d_{G.e}(u, v) \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2} (d_G(u, x) + d_G(u, y) - d_G(u, w) - d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) + d_{G.e}(u, w)). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\sum_{v \in \tilde{V} \setminus \{w\}} d_G(u, v) - \sum_{v \in \tilde{V} \setminus \{w\}} d_{G.e}(u, v) \geq 0$  follows from Lemma 2.1, it only remains to show that  $d_G(u, x) + d_G(u, y) - d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) \geq d_G(u, w) - d_{G.e}(u, w)$ . Note that, using Lemma 2.1 we have  $d_G(u, w) - d_{G.e}(u, w)$  is either 0 or 1. Similarly, by Lemma 2.2  $d_G(u, x) - d_{G.e}(u, \alpha)$  is either 0 or 1. Combining, we have  $d_G(u, x) + d_G(u, y) - d_{G.e}(u, \alpha) \geq 1$  since  $u \neq y$  and hence the result follows.

**Case 2:** In this case we prove the inequality (2.6). Let  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  be eccentric vertices of  $x$  and  $y$ , respectively. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $w_1$  is an eccentric vertex of  $\alpha$ . Then we

have the following

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(x, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(x, v) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(y, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(y, v) \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(\alpha, v) + \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(\alpha, v) \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G) \setminus \{w_1\}} d_G(x, v) - \frac{1}{2} d_G(x, w_1) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G) \setminus \{w_2\}} d_G(y, v) - \frac{1}{2} d_G(y, w_2) \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G.e) \setminus \{w_1\}} d_{G.e}(\alpha, v) + \frac{1}{2} d_{G.e}(\alpha, w_1) \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{v \in V(G) \setminus \{w_1, y\}} d_G(x, v) - \sum_{v \in V(G.e) \setminus \{w_1\}} d_{G.e}(\alpha, v) \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{v \in V(G) \setminus \{w_2\}} d_G(y, v) + d_G(x, y) - d_G(x, w_1) - d_G(y, w_2) + d_{G.e}(\alpha, w_1) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since the graph  $G$  is connected there exists a vertex  $w_3$  on the  $yw_2$ -path of minimal length such that  $d_G(y, w_2) = d_G(y, w_3) + 1$ . From Lemma 2.2 we have  $d_G(x, w_1) - d_{G.e}(\alpha, w_1)$  is at most 1. Thus, to show the fact that

$$\sum_{v \in V(G) \setminus \{w_2\}} d_G(y, v) + d_G(x, y) - d_G(y, w_2) \geq d_G(x, w_1) - d_{G.e}(\alpha, w_1) \quad (2.7)$$

it is enough to prove that

$$\sum_{v \in V(G) \setminus \{w_2, w_3\}} d_G(y, v) + d_G(x, y) \geq 2.$$

But this is always true since  $G$  has at least four vertices. Finally, using Lemma 2.2 and Eqn. 2.7 we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(x, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(x, v) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G)} d_G(y, v) - \max_{v \in V(G)} d_G(y, v) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(\alpha, v) - \max_{v \in V(G.e)} d_{G.e}(\alpha, v).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, combining all the above cases and using the inequalities (2.5) and (2.6) we have

$$W(G.e) - \varepsilon(G.e) \leq W(G) - \varepsilon(G).$$

□

**Remark 2.5.** In [4], the authors posed a second conjecture stating that the difference between the Wiener index of a graph and its eccentricity is largest possible on paths. If  $G$  be a graph of order  $n$  with  $\text{rad}(G) \geq 4$ , then

$$W(G) - \varepsilon(G) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{1}{6}n^3 - \frac{3}{4}n^2 + \frac{1}{3}n + \frac{1}{4} \right\rfloor$$

with equality holding if and only if  $G$  is a path. The Conjecture is still open.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Dr. Sumit Mohanty for his comments, suggestions and help in improving the presentation of the manuscript.

## References

- [1] R.M. Casablanca, P. Dankelmann, Distance and eccentric sequences to bound the Wiener index, Hosoya polynomial and the average eccentricity in the strong products of graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.*263 (2019) 105–117.
- [2] P. Dankelmann, W. Goddard, H.C. Swart, The average eccentricity of a graph and its subgraphs, *Util. Math.*65 (2004) 41–51.
- [3] P. Dankelmann, F.J. Osaye, Average eccentricity, minimum degree and maximum degree in graphs, *J. Comb. Optim.*40 (2020) 697–712.
- [4] H. Darabi, Y. Alizadeh, S. Klavzar and K.C. Das, On the Relation Between Wiener Index and Eccentricity of a Graph, (*preprint*: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.02307>).
- [5] K.C. Das, A.D. Maden, A. Dilek, I.N. Cangul, A.S. Cevik, On average eccentricity of graphs, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. India Sect.A87* (2017) 23–30.
- [6] K.C. Das, M.J. Nadjafi Arani, On maximum Wiener index of trees and graphs with given radius, *J. Comb. Optim.*34 (2017) 574–587.
- [7] N. De, Sk.Md. Abu Nayeem, A. Pal, Total eccentricity index of the generalized hierarchical product of graphs, *Int. J. Appl. Comput. Math.*1 (2015) 503–511.
- [8] A.A. Dobrynin, R. Entringer, I. Gutman, Wiener index of trees: theory and applications, *Acta Appl. Math.*66 (2001) 211–249.
- [9] A.A. Dobrynin, The Szeged and Wiener indices of line graphs, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.*79 (2018) 743–756.
- [10] M. Knor, R. Skrekovski, A. Tepeh, Mathematical aspects of Wiener index, *ArsMath. Contemp.*11 (2016) 327–352.
- [11] M. Knor, S. Majstorovic, R. Skrekovski, Graphs whose Wiener index does not change when a specific vertex is removed, *Discrete Appl. Math.*238 (2018) 126–132.
- [12] I. Peterin, P.Z. Pletersek, Wiener index of strong product of graphs, *Opuscula Math.*38 (2018) 81–94.