

Signed Double Roman Domination on Cubic Graphs

Enrico Iurlano^{a,*}, Tatjana Zec^b, Marko Djukanovic^b, Günther R. Raidl^a

^a*Algorithms and Complexity Group, TU Wien, Favoritenstraße 9/1921, Vienna, 1040, Austria*
^b*Faculty of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, University of Banja Luka, Mladena Stojanovića 2, Banja Luka, 78000, Bosnia and Herzegovina*

Abstract

The signed double Roman domination problem is a combinatorial optimization problem on a graph asking to assign a label from $\{\pm 1, 2, 3\}$ to each vertex feasibly, such that the total sum of assigned labels is minimized. Here feasibility is given whenever (i) vertices labeled ± 1 have at least one neighbor with label in $\{2, 3\}$; (ii) each vertex labeled -1 has one 3-labeled neighbor or at least two 2-labeled neighbors; and (iii) the sum of labels over the closed neighborhood of any vertex is positive. The cumulative weight of an optimal labeling is called signed double Roman domination number (SDRDN). In this work, we first consider the problem on general cubic graphs of order n for which we present a sharp $n/2 + \Theta(1)$ lower bound for the SDRDN by means of the discharging method. Moreover, we derive a new best upper bound. Observing that we are often able to minimize the SDRDN over the class of cubic graphs of a fixed order, we then study in this context generalized Petersen graphs for independent interest, for which we propose a constraint programming guided proof. We then use these insights to determine the SDRDNs of subcubic $2 \times m$ grid graphs, among other results.

Keywords: Signed Double Roman domination, Cubic graphs, Discharging method, Generalized Petersen graphs

2000 MSC: 05C78, 05C35, 90C27

1. Introduction

The signed double Roman domination problem (SDRDP) is a natural combination of the classical *signed domination problem* [7] and the so-called *double Roman domination problem* [5]. The latter, in turn, is a variant of the *Roman domination problem* (RDP) [20, 6] well-known from contexts, where it is required to economically distribute resources over a network while still ensuring to have a locally available backup resource; practical application scenarios are, e.g. optimal placement of servers [15], or the reduction of energy consumption in wireless sensor networks [9]. Originally, the RDP was motivated by a strategy of the Roman emperor Constantine (c.f. [20]) on how to secure his empire with minimum amount of legions. In [11], it is pointed out that one can use signed domination to model winning strategies for problems where it is required to locally obtain majority votes.

From the perspective of classical domination, studying cubic graphs has a long tradition. In fact, it was already shown in 1980 by Kikuno et al. [13] that the problem is NP-complete on planar cubic graphs. Another influential work was done by Reed [17] in 1996, who derived a sharp upper bound for graphs of minimum vertex degree three; one of his conjectures about the improbability on connected cubic graphs

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: eiurlano@ac.tuwien.ac.at (Enrico Iurlano), tatjana.zec@pmf.unibl.org (Tatjana Zec), marko.djukanovic@pmf.unibl.org (Marko Djukanovic), raidl@ac.tuwien.ac.at (Günther R. Raidl)

was later falsified and updated in [14]. Apart from the famous dominating set problem, during the last decades, considerable interest has emerged in solving also such more constrained variants of domination problems, in particular their restrictions on specific graph classes: Another important class studied under these aspects is the one of grid graphs for which the dominating set problem [10], the 2-domination problem [16], and the RDP [16] have been solved to optimality.

In the following, we consider undirected simple graphs. For such a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a vertex $v \in V$, we denote by $N(v) := \{w \in V \mid vw \in E\}$ the open neighborhood of v and by $N[v] := N(v) \cup \{v\}$ its closure. The order of a graph G refers to the cardinality $|V|$ of its set of vertices. Graph G is called d -regular, if $|N(v)| = d$, for any $v \in V$. A *cubic* graph is a 3-regular graph. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a labeling function $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, for any subset $S \subseteq V$, we define the *cumulative weight* of f restricted to S as $w_f(S) := \sum_{s \in S} f(s)$. We also write $w_f(G)$ for $w_f(V)$, and when the function f is clear from the context, we omit f in the subscript. Often we directly identify a function $f : V \rightarrow \{-1, 1, 2, 3\}$ with its associated preimages $V_i := f^{-1}(\{i\}) = \{v \in V \mid f(v) = i\}$, $i \in \{\pm 1, 2, 3\}$. We denote $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. In some definitions, for simplicity, the vertices will be indexed by \mathbb{Z}_m , the residue class ring modulo m . For a set A , by $\mathbb{1}_A(x)$, we refer to its indicator function.

Following [1], for a given graph $G = (V, E)$, a function $f : V \rightarrow \{\pm 1, 2, 3\}$ is called *signed double Roman domination function* (SDRDF) on G if the following conditions (1a)–(1c) are met.

$$\text{For all } u \in V_{-1}, \text{ there exists } v \in N(u) \cap V_3 \text{ or there exist distinct } v_1, v_2 \in N(u) \cap V_2. \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{For all } u \in V_1, \text{ there exists } v \in N(u) \cap (V_2 \cup V_3). \quad (1b)$$

$$\text{For all } u \in V, w_f(N[u]) \geq 1, \text{ i.e., the cumulative weight of } N[u] \text{ is positive.} \quad (1c)$$

We call $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G) := \min\{w_f(V) \mid f \text{ is a SDRDF on } G\}$ *signed double Roman domination number* of G (SDRDN). Existing vertices v , v_1 and v_2 in (1a) and (1b) are said to *defend* the respective vertex u .

A generalization of the SDRDP is the signed double Roman k -domination problem (SD k RDP), originally proposed in [3] ($k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ fixed), requiring the fulfillment of the conditions (1a)–(1c) plus the additional restriction $w_f(N[u]) \geq k$ for all vertices $u \in V$. The minimum weight taken over all labelings satisfying the latter property determines the so-called *SD k RD number* $\gamma_{\text{sdR},k}(G)$.

We introduce notation for special classes of (sub)cubic graphs in what follows: On the one hand, for $m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_m \setminus \{0\}$, the *generalized Petersen graph* $P_{m,k}$ comprises vertex set $\{u_i, v_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$ and has edge set $\{u_i u_{i+1}, v_i v_{i+k}, u_i v_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$. We refer to the value $k \in \mathbb{Z}_m$ as *shift parameter* and remark that $P_{m,1}$ is isomorphic to the m -prism graph.

On the other hand, we define the $\ell \times m$ *grid graph* $G_{\ell,m}$ on the set of vertices $\{0, \dots, \ell-1\} \times \{0, \dots, m-1\} \subseteq \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, for which two vertices are adjacent if their Euclidean distance equals one [6]. For $\ell = 2$ we introduce a briefer notation which identifies $(0, i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with the symbol u_i and $(1, i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with v_i , $i = 0, \dots, m-1$.

Finally, a flower snark FS_m ($m \geq 5$) is a graph with vertex set $V = \{a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$ and edge set E formed by the union of the three sets $\{a_i b_i, a_i c_i, a_i d_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$, $\{b_i b_{i+1} \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_m\}$, and $\{c_0 c_1, c_1 c_2, \dots, c_{m-2} c_{m-1}, c_{m-1} d_0, d_0 d_1, d_1 d_2, \dots, d_{m-2} d_{m-1}, c_0 d_{m-1}\}$.

These three specific graph classes are visualized in Figure 1.

The main contributions of this work are as follows.

- A lower bound for γ_{sdR} on cubic graphs twice as high as the so far best known one is derived via the discharging method. It turns out to even be optimally sharp, settling the missing case $k = 1$ of the collection of optimal lower bounds for the SD k RDP pointed out in [3].
- Tight or even optimal bounds on γ_{sdR} are established and proved for




Figure 1: Exemplary graphs for the special graph classes considered in this work.

- selected subclasses of generalized Petersen graphs,
- $2 \times m$ grid graphs,
- and flower snarks.

For some results we design an inductive proof relying on constraint programming [18].

- Additionally, best known upper bounds for γ_{sdR} and $\gamma_{\text{sdR},2}$ on (connected) cubic graphs are improved.

In the remainder of this introduction, we give an overview of relevant recent results from the literature.

For the SDRDP, it is shown that calculating γ_{sdR} on bipartite as well as on chordal graphs is NP-hard [1]. Moreover, exact values of γ_{sdR} are established for special classes of graphs, including complete graphs, paths, cycles, and complete bipartite graphs. In [2], lower bounds for γ_{sdR} are obtained in dependence of the minimum respectively maximum vertex degree; furthermore, it is shown that in the absence of isolated vertices $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G) \geq (19n - 24m)/9$, where n and m denote the order of G and the number of edges in G , respectively. For trees, in [1], it is shown that $\gamma_{\text{sdR}} \geq 4\sqrt{n/3} - n$ and that trees attaining the bound can be characterized. Calculating γ_{sdR} on digraphs is addressed in [4].

Results concerning upper bounds for the $\text{SD}k\text{RD}$ number $\gamma_{\text{sdR},k}$ on general graphs as well as on specific graph classes such as regular graphs and bipartite graphs are given in [3].

More specifically, we are interested in improving the following result.

Theorem 1 ([3, Theorem 3.4]). *In the setting of connected cubic graphs¹, the following bounds for $\gamma_{\text{sdR},k}$ apply. Moreover, the lower bounds are optimal for $k \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$.*

$$\frac{kn}{4} \leq \gamma_{\text{sdR},k} \leq \frac{13n}{8}. \quad (2)$$

In contrast to the trivial worst-case upper bound $\gamma_{\text{sdR}} \leq 2n$ on general graphs, this shows that a smaller upper bound can be achieved on cubic graphs. In fact, for $k = 1$ the latter result just affirms (for connected cubic graphs)

$$\frac{n}{4} \leq \gamma_{\text{sdR}} \leq \frac{13n}{8}. \quad (3)$$

¹The lower bound also applies for non-connected cubic graphs [3, Proposition 2].

As an auxiliary tool, we will fall back on the following concept from [12], the so-called α -total domination number $\gamma_{\alpha,t}(G)$. For $0 < \alpha < 1$, $\gamma_{\alpha,t}(G)$ is defined as the minimum cardinality of an α -total dominating set of G , i.e., a total dominating set $S \subseteq V$ satisfying that any vertex $v \in V \setminus S$ fulfills $|N(v) \cap S| \geq \alpha|N(v)|$.

Theorem 2 ([12, Theorem 10.b]). *Let G be a cubic graph of order n . For $1/3 < \alpha \leq 2/3$, we have $n/2 \leq \gamma_{\alpha,t}(G) < 3n/4$.*

2. Main results

We employ α -total domination to improve the upper bound in Theorem 1 (for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$) by a factor of approximately 0.77.

Proposition 1. *We have $\gamma_{\text{sdR},2}(G) < 5n/4$ and $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G) < 5n/4$ for cubic graphs G of order n .*

Proof. For $G = (V, E)$, we select a totally dominating subset $S \subseteq V$ such that each vertex $v \in V \setminus S$ has at least two neighbors in S , which corresponds to an α -total dominating set in G with $\alpha = 2/3$. Pick the labeling f satisfying $V_2 = S$ and $V_{-1} = V \setminus S$.

We check that the cumulative weight of any closed neighborhood is at least 2: In the neighborhood of any vertex $v \in V_2$, at least one neighbor must be labeled 2 by total domination. Consequently $w_f(N[v]) \geq 2$. On the other hand, each $v \in V_{-1}$ has at least two neighbors in V_2 (by the α -domination property), again verifying $w_f(N[v]) \geq 2$. Adding up all labels, according to Theorem 2 we obtain

$$w_f(V) = 2|V_2| - |V_{-1}| < 2 \cdot \frac{3n}{4} - \frac{n}{4} = \frac{5n}{4}.$$

□

Since we managed to reduce the upper bound (2), as in [3], we pose ourselves the question if $\gamma_{\text{sdR}} \leq n$ for connected cubic graphs; see Section 3 for further thoughts.

Let us add an observation stating that in the setting of *cubic graphs*, formulating that a labeling f is a SDRDF, is expressible in an arithmetic-free manner. It will be useful to abbreviate the verification of the SDRDF property in many situations.

Observation 1. *Condition (1c) can be replaced by the following equivalent one.*

$$\text{For all } v \in V, \text{ there are distinct } v_1, v_2 \in N[v] \text{ such that } -1 \notin \{f(v_1), f(v_2)\}. \quad (1c')$$

More precisely, it is possible to replace (1a)–(1c) by the conjunction of (1a)–(1b) and (1c').

Proof. We start by showing that our altered condition implies the original one (1a)–(1c). Firstly, if $v \in V_2 \cup V_3$ and there is at least one further positively labeled vertex in $N(v)$, positivity of $w_f(N[v])$ ensues. Secondly, any $v \in V_1$ verifying (1b) and (1c') implies the existence of a vertex in $(V_2 \cup V_3) \cap N[v]$ allowing to conclude $w_f(N[v]) \geq 1 + 2 + 2 \cdot (-1) = 1$. Thirdly, any $v \in V_{-1}$ with two distinct vertices $v_1, v_2 \in N(v) \setminus V_{-1}$ satisfying (1a) must fulfill $\{f(v_1), f(v_2)\} \in \{\{2\}, \{3, 1\}, \{3, 2\}, \{3\}\}$ implying (1c).

Now we address the other proof direction by proving its contrapositive: Suppose $|N[v] \cap V_{-1}| \geq 3$ for some $v \in V$. This automatically implies, for some $x \in \{\pm 1, 2, 3\}$, that $w_f(N[v]) = -3 + x \leq 0$. We can therefore certify invalidity of (1c) for the labeling. □

We come up with the subsequent lower bound on cubic graphs, which improves upon (3) by a factor of two. Later, in Remark 1, we will show this lower bound to even be optimal.

Theorem 3. *For any cubic graph G of order n we have*

$$\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G) \geq \begin{cases} n/2 & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \\ n/2 + 1 & \text{if } n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Proof. First, note that odd values for n in (4) are irrelevant, as it is well known that vertex sets of cubic graphs have even cardinality, according to the Handshaking Lemma. The proof is divided into two steps.

Step 1. The lower bound $n/2$ applies.

Let f be an arbitrary SDRDF on G . We define the function g as the final product of the following discharging rules (R0)–(R3), executed one by one in succession; cf. [19]. In these discharging rules, we think of the vertex v as transmitting the charge quantity $1/4$, $3/4$, respectively $5/4$ to each of its specified neighbors.

(R0) For each $v \in V$, let $g(v) = f(v)$ at the beginning of the procedure.

(R1) Update $g(v) \leftarrow g(v) - |N(v) \cap V_{-1}|/4$, for all $v \in V_1$, and
update $g(u) \leftarrow g(u) + 1/4$, for all $u \in N(v) \cap V_{-1}$.

(R2) Update $g(v) \leftarrow g(v) - 3|N(v) \cap V_{-1}|/4$, for all $v \in V_2$, and
update $g(u) \leftarrow g(u) + 3/4$, for all $u \in N(v) \cap V_{-1}$.

(R3) Update $g(v) \leftarrow g(v) - 5|N(v) \cap V_{-1}|/4$, for all $v \in V_3$, and
update $g(u) \leftarrow g(u) + 5/4$, for all $u \in N(v) \cap V_{-1}$.

We note that in this procedure, after any rule application, the equality $w_g(V) = w_f(V)$ is preserved. Observe that after the termination of this procedure, we have $g(v) \geq 1/2$ for each vertex $v \in V$: By cubicity, condition (1c') ensures that each $v \notin V_{-1}$ is adjacent to at most two vertices labeled -1 and each $v \in V_{-1}$ is adjacent to at most one vertex labeled -1 . Hence, after application of all the rules (R0)–(R3) on f , we obtain the subsequent implications.

$$v \in V_1 \implies g(v) \geq f(v) - 2 \cdot \frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (5)$$

$$v \in V_2 \implies g(v) \geq f(v) - 2 \cdot \frac{3}{4} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (6)$$

$$v \in V_3 \implies g(v) \geq f(v) - 2 \cdot \frac{5}{4} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (7)$$

$$v \in V_{-1} \wedge N(v) \cap V_3 = \emptyset \implies g(v) \geq f(v) + 2 \cdot \frac{3}{4} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad (8)$$

$$v \in V_{-1} \wedge N(v) \cap V_3 \neq \emptyset \implies g(v) \geq f(v) + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{5}{4} = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (9)$$

Bound (8) applies since the implication's premise enforces that v must have at least two neighbors labeled 2. On the other hand, bound (9) applies because, apart from one 3-labeled neighbor of v given by the premise, there must be one more neighbor from $V \setminus V_{-1}$ (the minimum value of $g(v)$ is obtained in the situation when this neighbor is labeled 1, and the remaining third neighbor is labeled -1 , yielding $g(v) = f(v) + 1/4 + 5/4 = 1/2$). Consequently, at the end of this procedure, we have $g(v) \geq 1/2$, for each $v \in V$, implying $w_f(V) = w_g(V) = \sum_{v \in V} g(v) \geq |V|/2$.

Step 2. The lower bound is refinable for $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$.

Let $g : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function arising from f via the discharging method in Step 1. We make a case distinction.

Case 1. There is a vertex $s \in V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$ having less than two neighbors in V_{-1} . We show that the bound $n/2$ cannot be attained by f : In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3} g(v) &= g(s) + \sum_{v \in V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3 \setminus \{s\}} g(v) \\ &\geq g(s) + \frac{|V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3| - 1}{2} \\ &\geq \mathbb{1}_{V_1}(s)(1 - \frac{1}{4}) + \mathbb{1}_{V_2}(s)(2 - \frac{3}{4}) + \mathbb{1}_{V_3}(s)(3 - \frac{5}{4}) + \frac{|V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3| - 1}{2} \\ &> \frac{|V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3|}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore $w_f(V) = \sum_{v \in V} g(v) > n/2$.

Case 2. Assume all vertices in $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$ have two neighbors in V_{-1} . Let $n = 4\ell + 2$ where $\ell \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. For $v \in V_{-1}$ having three neighbors in $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$, in (8) and (9), we face even strict majorization $g(v) > \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that we can estimate via (5)–(9),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V} g(v) &= \sum_{v \in V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3} g(v) + \sum_{\substack{v \in V_{-1} \\ |N(v) \cap (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3)|=2}} g(v) + \sum_{\substack{v \in V_{-1} \\ |N(v) \cap (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3)|=3}} g(v) \quad (10) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2}|V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3| + \frac{1}{2}|\{v \in V_{-1} : |N(v) \cap (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3)| = 2\}| \\ &\quad + (\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon)|\{v \in V_{-1} : |N(v) \cap (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3)| = 3\}|. \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

From (11) we obtain that whenever $|\{v \in V_{-1} : |N(v) \cap (V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3)| = 3\}| \neq \emptyset$, then we have even more strongly $w_f(V) = w_g(V) = \sum_{v \in V} g(v) > |V|/2$. Indeed, in our considered case, this non-emptiness occurs: An edge-counting argument applied to the fact that the vertices in $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$ have precisely two neighbors in V_{-1} and the fact that each vertex in V_{-1} must have *at least* two neighbors in $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$ shows that $|V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3| \geq |V_{-1}|$. The set $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$ must be of even cardinality, as for each of its vertices—apart from the two edges connecting the vertex with V_{-1} —the third edge must be incident to a vertex in $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$. Moreover, this implies that $|V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3| > 2\ell + 1 > |V_{-1}|$. The pigeonhole principle shows that at least one vertex labeled -1 must have three neighbors in $V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$. \square

Remark 1. *As we will see, the lower bound (4) for cubic graphs is optimally sharp, as, e.g., $P_{n/2,3}$ are (connected) cubic graphs attaining the bound.*

2.1. Cubic graphs with extremal properties: Generalized Petersen graphs

Let us start our considerations with the following result.

Theorem 4. *We have $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,k}) = m$ whenever $m \geq 4$ is even and k is odd.*

Proof. Choose the labeling with $V_{-1} = \{u_{2i}, v_{2i} \mid i = 0, \dots, m/2 - 1\}$ and $V_2 = V \setminus V_{-1}$. Then $w(V) = m$, and the SDRDF constraints are met. In fact, this function has for each vertex $u \in \{u_{2i} \mid i = 0, \dots, m/2 - 1\}$ the two 2-labeled defenders u_{2i-k}, u_{2i+k} . By the same index shift $i \mapsto i \pm k$, we see that $v \in \{v_{2i} \mid i = 0, \dots, m/2 - 1\}$ has two defenders. Recalling (1c'), the existence of these defenders also guarantees that the vertices u and v have positive cumulative weight on their closed neighborhoods. For the vertices $w \in V \setminus V_{-1} = V_2 = \{u_{2i+1}, v_{2i+1} \mid i = 0, \dots, m/2 - 1\}$, the positivity is guaranteed by the fact that $\{u_{2i+1}, v_{2i+1}\} \subseteq N[w] \cap V_2$.

Finally, as the weight of the constructed SDRDF coincides with the lower bound of the previous Theorem 3, the SDRDF is optimal. \square




Figure 2: Optimal SDRDFs for $P_{m,3}$ when $m = 4\ell + 1$ respectively $m = 4\ell + 3$. In both cases, a label pattern of width 4 is periodically repeated $\ell - 1$ respectively $\ell - 2$ times to finally be flanked by a termination pattern of width 5 respectively 11. The labeling is exemplarily illustrated for $m = 13$ respectively $m = 19$.

Theorem 5. For the generalized Petersen graph $P_{m,3}$, $m \geq 8$, we have

$$\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,3}) = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } m \equiv 0 \pmod{2}, \\ m + 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Proof. For even m , optimal constructions proving (12) have already been found, cf. Theorem 4 for $k = 3$. To show that the right-hand side of (12) is an *upper bound* for $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,3})$ for odd m , we distinguish two cases, both constructing a particular SDRDF on $P_{m,3}$; in Figure 2 supportive visualizations of the underlying scheme for both are given.

Case 1. $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$.

Let f be the labeling with $V_2 = \{u_{4i}, u_{4i+1}, v_{4i+2}, v_{4i+3} \mid i = 0, \dots, \frac{m-9}{4}\} \cup \{u_{m-5}, u_{m-4}, u_{m-2}, v_{m-2}\}$, $V_1 = \{v_{m-3}, v_{m-1}\}$, and $V_{-1} = V \setminus (V_2 \cup V_1) = \{u_{4i+2}, u_{4i+3}, v_{4i}, v_{4i+1} \mid i = 0, \dots, \frac{m-9}{4}\} \cup \{u_{m-3}, u_{m-1}, v_{m-5}, v_{m-4}\}$. The satisfaction of all SDRDF constraints by f is argued in Table A.1 in the appendix. This implies $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,3}) \leq w_f(P_{m,3}) = 2|V_2| + |V_1| - |V_{-1}| = 2(m-1) + 2 - (m-1) = m+1$.

Case 2. $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. We construct a labeling f satisfying $V_3 = \{v_{m-3}\}$, $V_2 = \{u_{4i+2}, u_{4i+3}, v_{4i}, v_{4i+1} \mid i = 0, \dots, \frac{m-15}{4}\} \cup \{u_{m-9}, u_{m-7}, u_{m-5}, u_{m-1}, v_{m-11}, v_{m-10}, v_{m-5}, v_{m-4}\}$, $V_1 = \{u_{m-2}, v_{m-9}, v_{m-7}\}$, and $V_{-1} = V \setminus (V_2 \cup V_1) = \{u_{4i}, u_{4i+1}, v_{4i+2}, v_{4i+3} \mid i = 0, \dots, \frac{m-15}{4}\} \cup \{u_{m-11}, u_{m-10}, u_{m-8}, u_{m-6}, u_{m-4}, u_{m-3}, v_{m-8}, v_{m-6}, v_{m-2}, v_{m-1}\}$. We check that f is a SDRDF in Table A.2 in the appendix. Therefore, we conclude $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,3}) \leq w_f(P_{m,3}) = 3|V_3| + 2|V_2| + |V_1| - |V_{-1}| = 3 + 2(m-3) + 3 - (m-1) = m+1$.

Finally, it remains to show that the right-hand side of (12) is also a *lower bound* for $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,3})$ when m is odd. However, this follows directly from Theorem 3 and concludes our proof. \square

In the following, we point out that the graph $P_{m,1}$ —with the exception of $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ —attains the lower bound in (4), too. For tackling the aforementioned exceptional case, we state in the following two technical results as Lemma 1 and Lemma 2. These results incorporate an approach to determine γ_{sdR} for a sufficiently structured rotationally symmetric graph. The method relies on a computer-aided exhaustive search for optima on fixed small subgraphs. It seems applicable to other domination-like problems, too.




Figure 3: The graph G' in (3b) is the result of deleting four of the vertical edges from G in (3a) and successively performing eight edge contractions.

Lemma 1. We consider vertex sets $L := \{\ell_b, \ell_{b,i}, \ell_t, \ell_{t,i}\}$, $R := \{r_b, r_{b,i}, r_t, r_{t,i}\}$, $C := \{u_i, v_i \mid i = 0, \dots, 7\}$, and $C' := \{u_i, v_i \mid i = 0, \dots, 3\}$. Let G and G' be the grid graphs having vertex sets $V := L \cup C \cup R$ and $V' := L \cup C' \cup R$, respectively, and edges as depicted in Figures 3a and 3b. Let $f : V \rightarrow \{\pm 1, 2, 3\}$, respectively $f' : V' \rightarrow \{\pm 1, 2, 3\}$ satisfy the SDRDP constraints (1a)–(1c) in all vertices except possibly for those in $\{\ell_t, \ell_b, r_t, r_b\}$. Moreover, let us assume that f attains minimal cumulative weight on C and f' attains minimal cumulative weight on C' .² Then, the following properties hold.

(i) For $k \leq 5$, $w_f(C) \neq k$.

(ii) For $k \in \{6, 7, 9\}$, whenever $w_f(C) = k$, then $w_{f'}(C') = k - 4$.

Proof. Exhaustively, per given parameter choice $d = (\ell_b, \ell_{b,i}, \ell_t, \ell_{t,i}, r_b, r_{b,i}, r_t, r_{t,i}) \in \{\pm 1, 2, 3\}^8$, i.e., by fixing the labels on the delimiting vertices in $L \cup R$, we can determine a SDRDF being minimal with respect to the cumulative weight restricted to C (respectively to C').

Algorithm 1 in the appendix explains how we carried this out computationally. After symmetry breaking (see Remark 2), the algorithm exhaustively examines several cases, ultimately showing that the smallest attainable optimal weight is 6, which proves claim (i). Furthermore, (ii) is valid, as we observe that all hereby obtained minima over C attaining the value $k \in \{6, 7, 9\}$ are accompanied by a respective minimum of $k - 4$ on the smaller center C' in G' with the same delimiting constellation d . \square

Remark 2 (Symmetry breaking). We employ vertical and horizontal flipping and point reflection through the center, i.e., a labeling for $\begin{bmatrix} \ell_t & \ell_{t,i} & r_{t,i} & r_t \\ \ell_b & \ell_{b,i} & r_{b,i} & r_b \end{bmatrix}$ is oftentimes represented by a respective labeling for $\begin{bmatrix} \ell_b & \ell_{b,i} & r_{b,i} & r_b \\ \ell_t & \ell_{t,i} & r_{t,i} & r_t \end{bmatrix}$, $\begin{bmatrix} r_{t,i} & r_t & \ell_t & \ell_{t,i} \\ r_{b,i} & r_b & \ell_b & \ell_{b,i} \end{bmatrix}$, or $\begin{bmatrix} r_b & r_{b,i} & \ell_{b,i} & \ell_b \\ r_t & r_{t,i} & \ell_{t,i} & \ell_t \end{bmatrix}$. Instead of the $4^8 = 65536$ constellations, it is herewith sufficient to fall back to only a fraction of them, which, after removal of the constellations placing more than two (-1) -labels inside $\langle \ell_t, \ell_{t,i}, \ell_b, \ell_{b,i} \rangle$ or inside $\langle r_{t,i}, r_t, r_{b,i}, r_b \rangle$ (hence violating (1c)), contains 14940 cases. To keep the argument conceptually simple, we did not eliminate further parameter constellations, which a priori might indicate non-optimality.

Given a fixed $P_{m,1}$, $m \geq 13$ with an optimal SDRDF function f defined on it, we say that a 2×12 subblock of $P_{m,1}$, i.e., a subset of vertices $\{v_{i+j}, u_{i+j} \mid j = 0, \dots, 11\}$ for some $i \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, has the *quality-transferring property w.r.t. f* , if the vertices $\{\ell_b, \ell_{b,i}, \ell_t, \ell_{t,i}, r_b, r_{b,i}, r_t, r_{t,i}\} \cup \{v_0, u_0, \dots, v_3, u_3\}$ of the

²I.e., f and f' can both not be improved by updating their values just on C and C' , respectively.

graph G' in Figure 3b can be labeled by a function \tilde{f} in such a way that³

$$\begin{bmatrix} \tilde{f}(\ell_t) & \tilde{f}(\ell_{t,i}) & \tilde{f}(r_{t,i}) & \tilde{f}(r_t) \\ \tilde{f}(\ell_b) & \tilde{f}(\ell_{b,i}) & \tilde{f}(r_{b,i}) & \tilde{f}(r_b) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} f(v_i) & f(v_{i+1}) & f(v_{i+10}) & f(v_{i+11}) \\ f(u_i) & f(u_{i+1}) & f(u_{i+10}) & f(u_{i+11}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

$$w_{\tilde{f}}(\{u_0, \dots, u_3\} \cup \{v_0, \dots, v_3\}) \leq w_f(\{u_{i+2}, \dots, u_{i+9}\} \cup \{v_{i+2}, \dots, v_{i+9}\}) - 4, \quad (14)$$

$$\text{and } \tilde{f} \text{ satisfies (1a)–(1c) on all vertices not contained in } \{\ell_t, \ell_b, r_t, r_b\}. \quad (15)$$

We say that f on $P_{m,1}$ is *quality-transferring* if there exists at least one 2×12 subblock having the quality-transferring property w.r.t. f .

Lemma 2. *Let $m > 1$ and $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Then $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,1}) = m + 2$.*

Proof. First, note that the labeling given in Figure 4a has cumulative weight $m + 2$, further implying for each $m > 1$ with $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ that

$$\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,1}) \leq m + 2. \quad (16)$$

For $m \leq 13$, i.e., for $m \in \{5, 9, 13\}$, $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,1}) = m + 2$ follows by exhaustion. By complete induction, we settle the case for $m > 12 \wedge m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. The base case $m = 13$ has already been verified. As induction hypothesis now assume that for each $\tilde{m} \in \{13, 17, \dots, m\}$, $\tilde{m} \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, the claim holds. In the inductive step, we prove that the claim is valid also for $m + 4$.

Let $f : V = \{u_i, v_i : i = 0, \dots, m + 4 - 1\} \rightarrow \{\pm 1, 2, 3\}$ be a minimum weight SDRDF for $P_{m+4,1}$. We know from (16) that its weight does not exceed $m + 4 + 2$. Seeking a contradiction, assume

$$w_f(P_{m+4,1}) = w_f(\{u_i, v_i \mid i = 0, \dots, m + 4 - 1\}) < m + 4 + 2. \quad (17)$$

This assumption enforces that no 2×12 subblock can have the quality-transferring property: If a subblock, say w.l.o.g. $\{u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \dots, u_9, v_9\}$, has this property, we can argue as follows: Let $\widetilde{P_{m,1}}$ be the graph resulting from $P_{m+4,1}$ after deleting vertices $\{u_4, v_4, \dots, u_7, v_7\}$ and adding the two edges u_3u_8, v_3v_8 . Clearly, this graph is isomorphic to $P_{m,1}$. By the quality-transferring property (13), there exists a function \tilde{f} through which we can define a SDRDF g on $\widetilde{P_{m,1}}$ via

$$g(z) := \begin{cases} \tilde{f}(z) & \text{if } z \in \{v_0, u_0, \dots, v_3, u_3\} \\ f(z) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

We conclude that

$$\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,1}) \leq w_g(\widetilde{P_{m,1}}) = w_f(P_{m+4,1}) - w_f(\{u_0, v_0, \dots, u_7, v_7\}) + w_{\tilde{f}}(\{u_0, v_0, \dots, u_3, v_3\}) \quad (19)$$

$$\leq w_f(P_{m+4,1}) - 4 \quad (20)$$

$$< m + 2, \quad (21)$$

where we apply (14) in step (20) and (17) in step (21). Thus, we obtain a contradiction to our assumption $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,1}) = m + 2$ from the inductive step, so that necessarily

$$f \in \{h \mid h : V \rightarrow \{\pm 1, 2, 3\} \text{ and } h \text{ on } P_{m+4,1} \text{ is not quality-transferring}\}. \quad (22)$$

By Lemma 1, we would face for each choice of $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{m+4}$, for each label constellation for $\{u_{i+j}, v_{i+j} \mid j \in \{-2, -1, 8, 9\}\}$ and any labeling of the 2×8 subblock $M_i := \{u_{i+j}, v_{i+j} \mid j = 0, \dots, 7\}$ of cumulative

³Entry-wise equality of 2×4 arrays is meant in (13).

weight $k \in \{6, 7, 9\}$, the quality-transferring property. It is therefore impossible, that any 2×8 subblock of P_{m+4} attains the cumulative weight 6, 7, or 9. In particular, we have shown that necessarily

$$w_f(M_i) \geq 8, \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{Z}_{m+4}. \quad (23)$$

By Theorem 3 we know $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m+4,1}) \geq m + 4 + 1$. Hence, there must exist an index i' such that $w_f(M_{i'}) \geq 9$ —otherwise, we would have $w_f(M_i) = 8$ for all i , implying $w_f(V) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{m+4}} w_f(M_i)/8 = 8(m+4)/8 = m+4$ and contradicting Theorem 3. However, for i' we even must have $w_f(M_{i'}) \geq 10$ according to our previously observed impossibility to attain weight 9.

To conclude that $w_f(P_{m+4,1}) < m + 4 + 2$ always leads to a contradiction, we distinguish two cases.

Case 1. Suppose $m + 4 = 8\ell + 5$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

Observation 3 (i) tells us that either f on $P_{m+4,1}$ has the quality-transferring property (immediate contradiction to (22)) or there exists a suitable index $i(5) \in \mathbb{Z}_{m+4}$ for which $A := \{u_{i(5)}, v_{i(5)}, \dots, u_{i(5)+12}, v_{i(5)+12}\}$ induces a 2×13 subblock of cumulative weight not smaller than 15 leading to a lower bound exceeding the upper bound in (17), as can be seen via the following argument: Partition the vertices of $V \setminus A$ into $\ell - 1$ subblocks of dimensions 2×8 , and apply (23) on them. Then, $w_f(V) = w_f(V \setminus A) + w_f(A)$ which can be bounded from below by $8(\ell - 1) + 15 = 8\ell + 5 + 2 = m + 4 + 2$ and contradicts (17).


Case 2. Suppose $m + 4 = 8\ell + 1$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

Observation 3 (ii) guarantees that either f on $P_{m+4,1}$ has the quality-transferring property (immediate contradiction to (22)) or there exists a suitable index $i(1) \in \mathbb{Z}_{m+4}$ for which $\{u_{i(1)}, v_{i(1)}, \dots, u_{i(1)+8}, v_{i(1)+8}\}$ induces a 2×9 subblock of cumulative weight not smaller than 11 leading to a lower bound exceeding the upper bound in (17), as can be seen via the following argument: Similarly as before we can estimate $w_f(P_{m+4,1}) \geq 8(\ell - 1) + 11 = 8\ell + 1 + 2 = m + 4 + 2$, yielding again a contradiction to (17). \square

Theorem 6. For the generalized Petersen graph $P_{m,1}$, $m \geq 3$, we have

$$\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,1}) = \begin{cases} m & \text{if } m \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ m + 1 & \text{if } m \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \\ m + 2 & \text{if } m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Proof. For even m , $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m,1}) = m$ follows directly from Theorem 4 for $k = 1$. For $m = 4\ell + 1$ the claim has been shown in Lemma 2. The *upper bound* for the case $m = 4\ell + 3$ is given in Figure 4b.



(a) Scheme for $P_{m,1}$ when $m = 4\ell + 1$. The graph is depicted for $(m, \ell) = (9, 2)$, and its SDRDF weight is $m + 2 = 11$. For general m the labeling satisfies $V_{-1} = \{u_i, v_i \mid i = 1, 3, 5, \dots, m - 4\} \cup \{u_{m-1}, v_{m-2}\}$, $V_1 = \{v_{m-1}\}$, $V_2 = \{0, 2, 4, \dots, m - 5\} \cup \{u_{m-3}, v_{m-3}, u_{m-2}\}$, and $V_3 = \emptyset$.

(b) Scheme for $P_{m,1}$ when $m = 4\ell + 3$. The graph is illustrated for $(m, \ell) = (11, 2)$, and its SDRDF weight is $m + 1 = 12$. For general m the labeling satisfies $V_{-1} = \{u_{4t}, u_{4t+1}, v_{4t+2}, v_{4t+3} \mid t = 0, \dots, \ell - 1\} \cup \{u_{m-3}, v_{m-1}\}$, $V_1 = \{u_{m-2}, v_{m-2}\}$, $V_2 = \{u_{4t+2}, u_{4t+3}, v_{4t}, v_{4t+1} \mid t = 0, \dots, \ell - 1\} \cup \{u_{m-3}, v_{m-1}\} \cup \{u_{m-1}, v_{m-3}\}$, and $V_3 = \emptyset$.

Figure 4: Schemes for optimal labelings given in Theorem 6 for the graph $P_{m,1}$.

For the *lower bound* for $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{4\ell+3,1})$, we apply Theorem 3 to $n = 8\ell + 6$ (the count of vertices in $P_{m,1}$) and conclude $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{4\ell+3,1}) \geq n/2 + 1 = 4\ell + 4 = m + 1$. \square




Figure 5: Extending $G_{2,m}$ to a cubic graph via different constructions.

2.2. Consequences for the grid graph $G_{2,m}$

As a byproduct of the results on cubic graphs, particularly on $P_{m,1}$, we obtain the following result about optimal SDRDFs on $2 \times m$ grid graphs.

Theorem 7. *For $m \geq 5$, we have*

$$\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) = \begin{cases} m + 1 & \text{if } m \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \\ m & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Proof. For values $m = 1, \dots, 13$, the sequence of respective $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m})$ -values can be calculated by exhaustion and corresponds to $\langle 2, 4, 2, 5, 6, 6, 7, 8, 10, 10, 11, 12, 14 \rangle$. This confirms (25) for $5 \leq m \leq 13$. For higher values of m , the fact that the right-hand side of (25) majorizes $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m})$ can be read off the labeling schemata given in Figure C.8 in the appendix. In all four cases, it is easy to recognize that the respective labelings give valid SDRDFs; thus, the respective upper bounds apply.

To show the optimality of the derived upper bounds, we use the subsequent principle, which extends the graph $G_{2,m}$ to a cubic graph. For even m , the argumentation is less subtle and is better suited to understand the principle.

Let $m \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$. Starting from an optimal SDRDF labeled graph $G_{2,m}$, counting $2m \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ vertices, we construct a SDRDF labeled cubic graph $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ with six additional fresh vertices having collective weight 4; see Figure 5a). In total, eleven fresh edges are added during this construction. As only new vertices labeled 1, both already defended by new vertices labeled 2, are neighbored to the initial graph $G_{2,m}$, the SDRDF requirements are satisfied. By cubicity and using the bound (4), this implies that $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) + 4 = w(V) + 4 = w(\tilde{V}) \geq |\tilde{V}|/2 + 1 = (2m + 6)/2 + 1$, and consequently $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) \geq m$.

The rest of the proof is now dedicated to the case $m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{2}$. Let $R := \{u_{m-2}, u_{m-1}, v_{m-2}, v_{m-1}\}$. In the following, we consider the sequence of vertices $s_p := \langle w_0, \dots, w_{p-1}; x_0, \dots, x_{p-1} \rangle$, $p = 4, 6$, to which we want to associate a respective sequence of labels. These vertices will be part of a $2 \times p$ grid graph H_p , which will be connected to our studied grid graph $G_{2,m}$, see Figure 5b). The argumentation for the lower bound m respectively $m + 1$ of $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m})$ is split into several cases, depending on the distribution of the vertices labeled -1 inside R , in which we extend $G_{2,m}$ to a suitably labeled version of $P_{m+p,1}$ when needed. In each of the following cases, the claimed bound holds. Note that it is enough, by condition (1c), to consider at most two vertices in $V_{-1} \cap R$.

Case 1. $|V_{-1} \cap R| = 1$.

Subcase 1.1. $V_{-1} \cap R \in \{\{u_{m-1}\}, \{v_{m-1}\}\}$. W.l.o.g. $V_{-1} \cap R = \{v_{m-1}\}$.

- If v_{m-1} is defended by its lower 3-labeled neighbor u_{m-1} , then in the extended graph in Figure 5b, for $p = 4$, we choose for s_4 the sequence of labels $\langle -1, -1, 2, 1; 1, 2, -1, 2 \rangle$, yielding additional weight 5. By this we get a SDRDF on $P_{m+4,1}$ with weight of $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) + 5$, which implies the

inequality $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) + 5 \geq \gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m+4,1})$. Since, for $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ by Theorem 6 we have $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m+4,1}) = (m+4) + 2 = m+6$, we obtain $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) + 5 \geq m+6$, i.e., $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) \geq m+1$. On the other hand, for $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ also by Theorem 6 we have $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m+4,1}) = (m+4) + 1 = m+5$, which yields $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) + 5 \geq m+5$, i.e., $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) \geq m$.

- If v_{m-1} is defended by its left 3-labeled neighbor v_{m-2} , the labeling of $G_{2,m}$ even cannot be optimal: either u_{m-1} is an unnecessary defender, or u_{m-1} is labeled 1 which implies that u_{m-2} has a label from $\{2, 3\}$ in turn implying that $\langle u_{m-2}, u_{m-1} \rangle$ should have received labels $\langle 3, -1 \rangle$ to reduce weight.
- Also the scenario of purely 2-labeled neighbors of v_{m-1} has to be considered: Recall that the label of u_{m-2} is positive by assumption. Hence, we can relabel R such that $\{u_{m-2}, v_{m-2}\} \subseteq V_3$ and $\{u_{m-1}, v_{m-1}\} \subseteq V_{-1}$. By Observation 4 in the appendix, we know that the latter boundary constraints imply that $w_f(G_{2,m})$ cannot under-run the bound $m+1$ respectively m when $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ respectively $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. Therefore, we do not need to come up with another construction here.

Subcase 1.2. $V_{-1} \cap R \in \{\{u_{m-2}\}, \{v_{m-2}\}\}$. W.l.o.g. let $V_{-1} \cap R = \{v_{m-2}\}$. We can just add the connecting edges $u_{m-1}u_0$ and $v_{m-1}v_0$. By positivity of the righter-most labels in R , this fulfills all SDRDF constraints at no additional weight cost.

Case 2. $|V_{-1} \cap R| = 0$. Replicate the construction of Subcase 1.2.

Case 3. $|V_{-1} \cap R| = 2$.

Subcase 3.1. Horizontal occurrences, i.e., $V_{-1} \cap R \in \{\{u_{m-2}, u_{m-1}\}, \{v_{m-2}, v_{m-1}\}\}$. W.l.o.g. assume $V_{-1} \cap R = \{v_{m-2}, v_{m-1}\}$. In this subcase, we proceed as in the first paragraph of Subcase 1.1 (in the extended graph in Figure 5b the sequence s_4 shall have associated labels $\langle -1, -1, 2, 1; 1, 2, -1, 2 \rangle$). Note that $\langle u_{m-2}, u_{m-1} \rangle$ must necessarily have the labels $\langle x, 3 \rangle$ where $x \geq 1$. Clearly, despite w_3, x_3 in H_4 are joined potentially both with vertices labeled -1 , they will not violate condition (1c) as abundantly defended. Therefore, the entire labeling is a SDRDF having an additional weight cost of 5 due to the vertices in H_4 .

Subcase 3.2. Vertical occurrences (interior), i.e., $V_{-1} \cap R = \{u_{m-2}, v_{m-2}\}$. We note that at least one label of the necessarily positively labeled vertices u_{m-1}, v_{m-1} must further have assigned label 2 or 3 – w.l.o.g. assume $v_{m-1} \in V_2 \cup V_3$ and $u_{m-1} \in V_1 \cup V_2 \cup V_3$.

We now consider the extended graph in Figure 5b, where for the sequence of vertices s_4 , we pick the sequence of labels $\langle -1, 3, -1, 1; -1, 2, -1, 2 \rangle$, costing additional weight 4. We now prove this subcase using Theorem 6 as in Subcase 1.1.

Subcase 3.3. Vertical occurrences (righter-most), i.e., $V_{-1} \cap R = \{u_{m-1}, v_{m-1}\}$. Necessarily, we have that $u_{m-2}, v_{m-2} \in V_3$. This situation is observed in the third paragraph of Subcase 1.1 and concluded by Observation 4.

Subcase 3.4. Diagonal occurrences, i.e., $V_{-1} \cap R \in \{\{u_{m-2}, v_{m-1}\}, \{v_{m-2}, u_{m-1}\}\}$. W.l.o.g. assume $V_{-1} \cap R = \{u_{m-2}, v_{m-1}\}$. Note that $\langle v_{m-2}, u_{m-1} \rangle$ must necessarily have associated label sequence $\langle x, 3 \rangle$ where $x \geq 1$. For $x \geq 2$, in the extended graph in Figure 5b, for $p = 4$, pick for s_4 the sequence of labels $\langle 1, -1, -1, 3; -1, 3, 1, 1 \rangle$, costing additional weight 6. Finally, we update the label value of u_{m-1} to 2 (not violating the SDRDF constraints). Hence, finally, we obtain a graph $P_{m+4,1}$ costing additional weight 5 and conclude this subcase again as in the first part of Subcase 1.1.

For the case $x = 1$ we observe how vertices v_0, v_1, u_0, u_1 are labeled.

- If neither $\{v_1, u_0\} \subseteq V_{-1}$ nor $\{v_0, u_1\} \subseteq V_{-1}$, i.e., we do not have a diagonal of vertices in V_{-1} on the left side of $G_{2,m}$, then for the horizontally flipped labeling⁴ the claim follows directly from one

⁴Formally we substitute each label of u_i and v_i by the label of u_{m-1-i} and v_{m-1-i} , respectively, $i = 0, \dots, m-1$. Bounds proven for this labeling clearly also apply for the non-flipped variant of the labeling.

△ label -1 ■ label 1 ◆ label 2




Figure 6: SDRDFs for FS_m when $m = 9$ (left) respectively $m = 11$ (right). Thinking of the vertices as placed on a grid, a labeling pattern of dimensions 4×3 , periodically repeated and finally flanked by an individual termination pattern of dimensions 4×3 (left), respectively 4×2 (right), can be read off. These labeling patterns generalize to higher values of m of congruency $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ and $m \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, respectively.

of the previously settled (sub)cases 1, 2, 3.1, 3.2, or 3.3 of this proof.

- If $\{u_0, v_1\} \subseteq V_{-1}$, then necessarily $v_0 \in V_3$ and $u_1 \notin V_{-1}$. Hence, making use of the construction given in Figure 5b ($p = 6$) to extend the graph $G_{2,m}$ to $P_{m+6,1}$, where we associate the sequence of labels $(1, -1, -1, 3, 3, -1; -1, 3, 1, -1, -1, 1)$ to s_6 , we obtain a SDRDF on $P_{m+6,1}$ of total weight $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) + 6$. For $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ by Theorem 6 we have $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m+6,1}) = (m+6) + 1 = m+7$, which implies $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) + 6 \geq m+7$, i.e. $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) \geq m+1$. On the other hand, for $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ also by Theorem 6 we have $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(P_{m+6,1}) = (m+6) + 2 = m+8$, which yields $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) + 6 \geq m+8$, i.e., $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) \geq m+2 > m$.
- If $\{u_1, v_0\} \subseteq V_{-1}$, then necessarily $u_0, v_1 \notin V_{-1}$. Hence we can add the edges $u_{m-1}u_0, v_{m-1}v_0$ to $G_{2,m}$ obtaining a SDRDF on $P_{m,1}$.

□

Proposition 2. For FS_m , $m \geq 5$, we have $2m \leq \gamma_{\text{sdR}}(FS_m) \leq 2m + 1$.

Proof. Let us first show the validity of the *upper bound*, i.e. $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(FS_m) \leq 2m + 1, m \geq 5$.

Case 1. $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$.

We choose the labeling with $V_1 = \{a_{m-1}, c_{m-1}\}$, $V_2 = \{b_{3i}, b_{3i+1}, c_{3i+1}, d_{3i}, d_{3i+2} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-3}{3}\} \cup \{c_{3i+2} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-6}{3}\}$, and $V_{-1} = V \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2) = \{b_{3i+2}, c_{3i}, d_{3i+1} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-3}{3}\} \cup \{a_i \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, m-2\}$; for $m = 9$, this is illustrated in Figure 6. One can easily check that the SDRDF properties are satisfied. Consequently, we have $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(FS_m) \leq w_f(FS_m) = 2|V_2| + |V_1| - |V_{-1}| = 2(2m - 1) + 2 - (2m - 1) = 2m + 1$.

Case 2. $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$.

We pick the labeling with $V_1 = \{a_{m-1}, b_{m-1}\}$, $V_2 = \{b_{3i}, b_{3i+2}, c_{3i}, c_{3i+1}, d_{3i+1}, d_{3i+2} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-4}{3}\} \cup \{c_{m-1}\}$, and $V_{-1} = V \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2) = \{a_i \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, m-2\} \cup \{b_{3i+1}, c_{3i+2}, d_{3i} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-4}{3}\} \cup \{d_{m-1}\}$; for $m = 13$, this is illustrated in Figure 7. Again one can quickly check that f is indeed a SDRDF. Therefore, $w_f(FS_m) = 2|V_2| + |V_1| - |V_{-1}| = 2(2m - 1) + 2 - (2m - 1) = 2m + 1$ is an upper bound for $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(FS_m)$.

Case 3. $m \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$.

Choose the labeling with $V_1 = \{a_{m-2}, d_{m-2}\}$, $V_2 = \{b_{3i}, b_{3i+1}, c_{3i+1}, c_{3i+2}, d_{3i}, d_{3i+2} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-5}{3}\} \cup \{b_{m-2}, c_{m-1}, d_{m-1}\}$, and $V_{-1} = V \setminus (V_1 \cup V_2) = \{a_i \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, m-3, m-1\} \cup \{b_{3i+2}, c_{3i},$

If we set our attention on the class $\mathcal{C}_{\text{conn}}$ of *connected* cubic graphs, the dynamic might change, and we pose ourselves the following question.

Problem 1. (i) *How large can $\rho > 1/2$ be chosen such that $c_{\text{sdR}}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{conn}}) \geq \rho$?*

(ii) *Is it possible that $c_{\text{sdR}}(\mathcal{C}_{\text{conn}}) \geq 9/16$?*

(iii) *Do the graphs $P_{m,2}$ attain the bound in (ii) (such an average weight is attained for $m = 8, 16$)?*

In preliminary work, we constructed optimal SDRDFs for $2 \times m$ grid graphs, and for paths of length m such graphs have been determined in [1]. This naturally raises the following challenge concerning general $\ell \times m$ grid graphs.

Problem 2. *Determine γ_{sdR} on $\ell \times m$ grid graphs for further (small) values $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and general $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

For solving Problem 2 it might be a reasonable strategy to obtain sharp bounds for γ_{sdR} on 4-regular graphs. Moreover, the fact that the signed domination problem is NP-hard on grids [21] leads to the following question when ℓ is kept general.

Problem 3. *Is it NP-hard to determine the existence of a SDRDF on an $\ell \times m$ grid graph with a weight not exceeding a given limit?*

From our experience in the setting of the SDRDP, the requirement of a particular “balance” of defenders and defendants, as well as the higher flexibility on how to defend, make it challenging in comparison to the domination-type problems mentioned earlier.

Acknowledgments

Enrico Iurlano and Günther Raidl are supported by Austria’s Agency for Education and Internationalization under grant BA05/2023. Tatjana Zec and Marko Djukanović are supported by the bilateral project between Austria and Bosnia and Herzegovina funded by the Ministry of Civil Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina under grant no. 1259074. Moreover, this project is partially funded by the Doctoral Program “Vienna Graduate School on Computational Optimization”, Austrian Science Fund (FWF), grant W1260-N35.

References

- [1] H. Abdollahzadeh Ahangar, M. Chellali, S. M. Sheikholeslami, Signed double Roman domination in graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 257 (2019) 1–11.
- [2] H. Ahangar Abdollahzadeh, M. Chellali, S. M. Sheikholeslami, Signed double Roman domination of graphs, *Filomat* 33 (1) (2019) 121–134.
- [3] J. Amjadi, H. Yang, S. Nazari-Moghaddam, S. M. Sheikholeslami, Z. Shao, Signed double Roman k -domination in graphs., *Australas. J Comb.* 72 (2018) 82–105.
- [4] J. Amjadi, F. Pourhosseini, Signed double Roman domination numbers in digraphs, *Annals of the University of Craiova – Mathematics and Computer Science Series* 48 (2) (2021) 194–205.
- [5] R. A. Beeler, T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, Double Roman domination, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 211 (2016) 23–29.
- [6] E. J. Cockayne, P. A. Dreyer, S. M. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, Roman domination in graphs, *Discrete Mathematics* 278 (1-3) (2004) 11–22.

- [7] J. E. Dunbar, S. T. Hedetniemi, M. A. Henning, P. J. Slater, Signed domination in graphs, *Graph theory, combinatorics, and applications 1* (1995) 311–322.
- [8] A. T. Egunjobi, T. W. Haynes, Perfect double Roman domination of trees, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 284 (2020) 71–85.
- [9] F. Ghaffari, B. Bahrak, S. P. Shariatpanahi, A novel approach to partial coverage in wireless sensor networks via the Roman dominating set, *IET Networks* 11 (2) (2022) 58–69.
- [10] D. Gonçalves, A. Pinlou, M. Rao, S. Thomassé, The domination number of grids, *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics* 25 (3) (2011) 1443–1453.
- [11] J. H. Hattingh, M. A. Henning, P. J. Slater, The algorithmic complexity of signed domination in graphs, *Australasian Journal of Combinatorics* 12 (1995) 101–112.
- [12] M. A. Henning, N. J. Rad, On α -total domination in graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 160 (7-8) (2012) 1143–1151.
- [13] T. Kikuno, N. Yoshida, Y. Kakuda, The NP-completeness of the dominating set problem in cubic planar graphs, *Trans. Institute of Electronics and Communication Engineers of Japan E63* (6) (1980) 443–444.
- [14] A. V. Kostochka, B. Y. Stodolsky, On domination in connected cubic graphs, *Discrete mathematics* 304 (1-3) (2005) 45–50.
- [15] A. Pagourtzis, P. Penna, K. Schlude, K. Steinhöfel, D. S. Taylor, P. Widmayer, Server placements, Roman domination and other dominating set variants, in: *Foundations of Information Technology in the Era of Network and Mobile Computing: IFIP 17th World Computer Congress—TC1 Stream/2nd IFIP International Conference on Theoretical Computer Science (TCS 2002)*, 2002, Montréal, Québec, Canada, Springer, 2002, pp. 280–291.
- [16] M. Rao, A. Talon, The 2-domination and Roman domination numbers of grid graphs, *Discrete Mathematics & Theoretical Computer Science* 21 (2019).
- [17] B. Reed, Paths, stars and the number three, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* 5 (3) (1996) 277–295.
- [18] F. Rossi, P. Van Beek, T. Walsh, *Handbook of constraint programming*, Elsevier, 2006.
- [19] Z. Shao, P. Wu, H. Jiang, Z. Li, J. Žerovnik, X. Zhang, Discharging approach for double Roman domination in graphs, *IEEE Access* 6 (2018) 63345–63351.
- [20] I. Stewart, Defend the Roman empire!, *Scientific American* 281 (6) (1999) 136–138.
- [21] Y. Zheng, J. Wang, Q. Feng, Kernelization and lower bounds of the signed domination problem, in: *Frontiers in Algorithmics and Algorithmic Aspects in Information and Management: Third Joint International Conference, FAW-AAIM 2013, Dalian, China, 2013. Proceedings*, Springer, 2013, pp. 261–271.

Appendix A. Look-up tables: satisfaction of SDRDP constraints for $P_{m,3}$

In Table A.1 respectively Table A.2, the fact that the function f defined in Theorem 5, Case 1 respectively Case 2 is a SDRDF can be read off.

$v \in V_{-1}$	Defenders of v	$v \in V_2$	Two vertices in $N[v] \cap (V \setminus V_{-1})$
$u_{4i+2}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-9}{4}\}$	u_{4i+1}, v_{4i+2}	$u_{4i}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-5}{4}\}$	u_{4i}, u_{4i+1}
$u_{4i+3}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-9}{4}\}$	u_{4i+4}, v_{4i+3}	$u_{4i+1}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-5}{4}\}$	u_{4i}, u_{4i+1}
u_{m-3}	u_{m-4}, u_{m-2}	$u_{m-2}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-5}{4}\}$	v_{m-2}
u_{m-1}	u_0, u_{m-2}	$v_{4i+2}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-9}{4}\}$	v_{4i-1}, v_{4i+2}
$v_{4i}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-9}{4}\}$	u_{4i}, v_{4i+3}	$v_{4i+3}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-9}{4}\}$	v_{4i+3}, v_{4i+6}
$v_{4i}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-5}{4}\}$	u_{4i}, v_{4i+3}	$v_{m-2}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-5}{4}\}$	u_{m-2}
$v_{4i+1}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-5}{4}\}$	u_{4i+1}, v_{4i-2}		

$v \in V_1$	Defenders of v
v_{m-3}	v_{m-6}
v_{m-1}	v_2

Table A.1: Fulfillment of (1a)–(1b) respectively (1c') for f defined in Theorem 5, Case 1. Here the validity of condition (1c') is often given implicitly: Note that since (1b) holds, the property (1c') automatically applies for vertices in V_1 . Since the condition (1a) holds and $V_3 = \emptyset$, we have that the property (1c') holds for all vertices in V_{-1} . Therefore, for all vertices in V_2 it remains to check validity of (1c'), which can be read off the right table.

$v \in V_{-1}$	Defenders of v	$v \in V_2$	Two vertices in $N[v] \cap (V \setminus V_{-1})$
$u_{4i}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-11}{4}\}$	u_{4i-1}, v_{4i}	$u_{4i+2}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-15}{4}\}$	u_{4i+2}, u_{4i+3}
$u_{4i+1}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-11}{4}\}$	u_{4i+2}, v_{4i+1}	$u_{4i+3}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-15}{4}\}$	u_{4i+2}, u_{4i+3}
u_{m-8}	u_{m-9}, u_{m-7}	u_{m-9}	u_{m-9}, v_{m-9}
u_{m-6}	u_{m-7}, u_{m-5}	u_{m-7}	u_{m-7}, v_{m-7}
u_{m-4}	u_{m-5}, v_{m-4}	u_{m-5}	u_{m-5}, v_{m-5}
u_{m-3}	v_{m-3}	u_{m-1}	u_{m-2}, u_{m-1}
$v_{4i+2}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-15}{4}\}$	u_{4i+2}, v_{4i+5}	$v_{4i}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-11}{4}\}$	v_{4i-3}, v_{4i}
$v_{4i+3}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-15}{4}\}$	u_{4i+3}, v_{4i}	$v_{4i+1}, i \in \{0, 1, \dots, \frac{m-11}{4}\}$	v_{4i+1}, v_{4i+4}
v_{m-8}	v_{m-11}, v_{m-5}	v_{m-5}	u_{m-5}, v_{m-5}
v_{m-6}	v_{m-3}	v_{m-4}	v_{m-7}, v_{m-4}
v_{m-2}	v_1, v_{m-5}		
v_{m-1}	u_{m-1}, v_{m-4}		

$v \in V_1$	Defenders of v	$v \in V_3$	Two vertices in $N[v] \cap (V \setminus V_{-1})$
u_{m-2}	u_{m-1}	v_{m-3}	v_0, v_{m-3}
v_{m-9}	u_{m-9}		
v_{m-7}	u_{m-7} (v_{m-10}, v_{m-4})		

Table A.2: Fulfillment of (1a)–(1b) respectively (1c') for f defined in Theorem 5, Case 2. Note that, as in Case 1, the vertices in V_1 satisfy (1c'). The vertices in V_{-1} which are defended by v_{m-3} are u_{m-3} and v_{m-6} , and they are also adjacent to $u_{m-2} \in V_1$ respectively $v_{m-9} \in V_1$. The remaining vertices in V_{-1} are defended by two vertices in V_2 . Hence, all vertices in V_{-1} fulfill (1c'). The tables on the right testify that (1c') is valid for the vertices in $V_2 \cup V_3$.

Appendix B. Results by constraint programming

Algorithm 1 shows how the results in Lemma 1 were obtained. We generated the models for the constraint programming framework MiniZinc⁵ in version 2.7.4, which in turn was configured to use the solver Chuffed⁶ in version 0.12.0 to determine the minima for the encountered optimization problems. Jointly with several observations on it used in the present paper, the database returned by Algorithm 1 is available online⁷.

Algorithm 1 Exhaustively comparing optima

Input: Constraint programming solver S ; empty database DB

Output: Populated database DB

```

1:  $C \leftarrow \{u_i, v_i \mid i = 0, \dots, 7\}$ ,  $C' \leftarrow C \setminus \{u_i, v_i \mid i = 4, \dots, 7\}$ 
2:  $L \leftarrow \{\ell_t, \ell_{t,i}, \ell_b, \ell_{b,i}\}$ ,  $R \leftarrow \{r_{t,i}, r_t, r_{b,i}, r_b\}$ 
3: Let  $G$  be the graph of Figure 3a with set of vertices  $L \cup C \cup R$ 
4: Let  $G'$  be the graph of Figure 3b with set of vertices  $L \cup C' \cup R$ 

5:  $Q \leftarrow []$  //already handled constellations modulo symmetry breaking

6: for each  $d = (d_0, \dots, d_7)$  in  $\{\pm 1, 2, 3\}^8$  do
7:   if  $d$  contained in  $Q$  modulo symmetry breaking then continue end if
8:   if  $d$  places more than two labels  $-1$  on  $L$  or on  $R$  then continue /*infeasible*/ end if
9:    $Q.add(d)$ 

10: Clear all label constraints  $\ell_t, \ell_{t,i}, \ell_b, \ell_{b,i}, r_t, r_{t,i}, r_b, r_{b,i}$  for  $S$ 
11:  $S.add\_constraint(\langle \ell_t, \ell_{t,i}, \ell_b, \ell_{b,i}, r_t, r_{t,i}, r_b, r_{b,i} \rangle = \langle d_0, \dots, d_7 \rangle)$ 
12: for each  $u$  in  $L \cup C \cup R$  do
13:    $S.add\_constraint(\text{label of } u \text{ is } \{\pm 1, 2, 3\}\text{-valued})$ 
14:   if  $u$  not in  $\{\ell_t, \ell_b, r_t, r_b\}$  then //ignores corners
15:      $S.add\_constraint(u \text{ satisfies (1a)–(1c) w.r.t. adjacency of } G)$ 
16:   end if
17: end for
18:  $minweight\_C \leftarrow S.minimize()$ 

19: Clear all label constraints of  $\ell_t, \ell_{t,i}, \ell_b, \ell_{b,i}, r_t, r_{t,i}, r_b, r_{b,i}$  for  $S$ 
20:  $S.add\_constraint(\langle \ell_t, \ell_{t,i}, \ell_b, \ell_{b,i}, r_t, r_{t,i}, r_b, r_{b,i} \rangle = \langle d_0, \dots, d_7 \rangle)$ 
21: for each  $u$  in  $L \cup C' \cup R$  do
22:    $S.add\_constraint(\text{label of } u \text{ is } \{\pm 1, 2, 3\}\text{-valued})$ 
23:   if  $u$  not in  $\{\ell_t, \ell_b, r_t, r_b\}$  then
24:      $S.add\_constraint(u \text{ satisfies (1a)–(1c) w.r.t. adjacency of } G')$ 
25:   end if
26: end for
27:  $minweight\_Cprime \leftarrow S.minimize()$ 

28:  $delta \leftarrow minweight\_C - minweight\_Cprime$ 

```

⁵<https://www.minizinc.org/>

⁶<https://github.com/chuffed/chuffed>

⁷https://www.ac.tuwien.ac.at/files/resources/instances/sdrdp/queries_sdrdp.zip

```

29:   DB.insert((⟨d0, . . . , d7⟩, minweight_C, minweight_Cprime, delta)
30:   if delta ≥ 4 then print("Quality-transferring constellation found:", d) end if
31: end for

```

Observation 3. For $m + 4 = 8\ell + r$ with $m + 4 \geq 17$ and $r \in \{1, 5\}$, consider $P_{m+4,1}$ with an optimal SDRDF f defined on it. Let $W_{\text{bdry}} := w_f(\{u_{-1}, u_{-2}, v_{-1}, v_{-2}\} \cup \{u_8, v_8, u_9, v_9\})$ and assume $W_{\text{cntr}} := w_f(\{u_j, v_j \mid j = 0, \dots, 7\}) \geq 10$. Set $W_t := W_{\text{cntr}} + W_{\text{bdry}} + w_f(\{u_{-3}, v_{-3}\})$. Suppose that for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{m+4}$, we have $w_f(\{u_{i+j}, v_{i+j} \mid j = 0, \dots, 7\}) \geq 8$. Then, the following assertions hold.

- (i) For $r = 5$, either f on $P_{m+4,1}$ has the quality-transferring property or there exists a 2×13 subblock in the vicinity of $\{v_{-1}, u_{-1}\}$ whose cumulative weight is at least 15.
- (ii) For $r = 1$, either f on $P_{m+4,1}$ has the quality-transferring property or there exists a 2×9 subblock in the vicinity of $\{v_{-1}, u_{-1}\}$ whose cumulative weight is at least 11.

Proof. (i) *Case 1.* $W_{\text{cntr}} + W_{\text{bdry}} \geq 17$. Then, as $f(u_{-3}) + f(v_{-3}) \geq -2$, we have that $\{u_{-3}, v_{-3}, u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \dots, u_9, v_9\}$ is a 2×13 subblock of weight at least 15.

Case 2. $W_{\text{cntr}} + W_{\text{bdry}} = 16$.

Subcase 2.1 $\{u_{-1}, u_{-2}, v_{-1}, v_{-2}\} \subseteq V_{-1} \cup V_1$ or $\{u_8, u_9, v_8, v_9\} \subseteq V_{-1} \cup V_1$ applies.

We can just extend the $\{u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \dots, u_9, v_9\}$ -induced subblock to a 2×13 subblock by taking into consideration the additional vertices u_{-3}, v_{-3} when $\{u_{-1}, u_{-2}, v_{-1}, v_{-2}\} \subseteq V_{-1} \cup V_1$, otherwise choosing the vertices u_{10}, v_{10} . Note that this principle of extension ensures that the cumulative weight of the additionally considered vertices is necessarily at least 4 (both vertices in $V_{-1} \cup V_1$ need to be defended by at least a 2-labeled neighbor). Consequently, the weight of our considered 2×13 subblock is at least 20.

Subcase 2.2 Negation of Subcase 2.1, i.e., $\{u_{-1}, u_{-2}, v_{-1}, v_{-2}\} \cap \{u_8, u_9, v_8, v_9\} \cap (V_2 \cup V_3) \neq \emptyset$.

Upon symmetry breaking, just five label constellations meet this particular subcase: They all have in common that $\{u_{-1}, v_{-1}\} \subseteq V_{-1}$ and $f(u_9) + f(v_9) \geq 3$.

We focus on the 2×12 subblock $B := \{u_{-1}, v_{-1}, \dots, u_{10}, v_{10}\}$, which results from a right-shift⁸ of the 2×12 subblock $\{u_{-2}, v_{-2}, \dots, u_9, v_9\}$. By construction, the leftmost column of B consists of vertices in V_{-1} , while the column preceding the last column has a cumulative weight of at least 3. It turns out by considering exhaustively all cases that—regardless of the labels assigned to the remaining vertices in $\{u_0, v_0, u_{10}, v_{10}\}$ —the subblock B has the quality-transferring property.

Case 3. $W_{\text{cntr}} + W_{\text{bdry}} \leq 15$.

Subcase 3.1. $\{u_{-1}, u_{-2}, v_{-1}, v_{-2}\} \subseteq V_{-1} \cup V_1$ or $\{u_8, u_9, v_8, v_9\} \subseteq V_{-1} \cup V_1$ applies.

Note that for all label-constellations for vertices in $\{u_{-1}, u_{-2}, v_{-1}, v_{-2}\} \cup \{u_8, u_9, v_8, v_9\}$ of this subcase, we have $W_{\text{cntr}} + W_{\text{bdry}} \geq 12$. Then, apparently (as in Subcase 2.1), either u_{-2}, v_{-2} or u_9, v_9 need to be defended by u_{-3}, v_{-3} respectively by u_{10}, v_{10} , i.e., these new defending vertices must have cumulative weight at least 4 such that we face a 2×13 subblock of weight at least 16.

Subcase 3.2. Negation of Subcase 3.1, i.e., $\{u_{-1}, u_{-2}, v_{-1}, v_{-2}\} \cap \{u_8, u_9, v_8, v_9\} \cap (V_2 \cup V_3) \neq \emptyset$.

Exhaustively one can see that this subcase occurs only when, after symmetry breaking, one of the six constellations of labels from Table B.3 applies. For each of these, the $\{u_{-3}, v_{-3}, \dots, u_9, v_9\}$ -induced subblock of dimensions 2×13 has a guaranteed lower bound of 15; again, see Table B.3.

- (ii) *Case 1.* There exists $t \in \{-1, 8\}$ such that $w_f(\{u_t, v_t\}) + w_f(\{u_0, v_0, \dots, u_7, v_7\}) \geq 11$.

The 2×9 subblock induced by the vertex subset $\{u_t, v_t\} \cup \{u_0, v_0, \dots, u_7, v_7\}$ has cumulative weight at least 11.

- Case 2.* For all $t \in \{-1, 8\}$ we have that $w_f(\{u_t, v_t\}) + w_f(\{u_0, v_0, \dots, u_7, v_7\}) < 11$.

⁸Modulo symmetry breaking we can here assume a right shift.

$\begin{bmatrix} f(v_{-2}) & f(v_{-1}) & f(v_8) & f(v_9) \\ f(u_{-2}) & f(u_{-1}) & f(u_8) & f(u_9) \end{bmatrix}$	W_{bdry}	LB for W_{cntr}	LB for $w_f(\{u_{-3}, v_{-3}\})$	LB for W_t
$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$	3	10	2	15
$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$	4	10	1	15
$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 3 & 3 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$	5	10	0	15
$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & -1 & 1 \\ 2 & -1 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$	2	13	3	18
$\begin{bmatrix} -1 & 1 & -1 & 2 \\ 2 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$	2	13	3	18
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$	5	10	1	16

Table B.3: Lower bounds (LBs) are summed up to obtain a total lower bound for W_t (last column).

For f on $P_{m+4,1}$ not having the quality-transferring property, this situation is only possible when f modulo symmetry breaking satisfies

$$\begin{bmatrix} f(v_{-2}) & f(v_{-1}) & f(v_8) & f(v_9) \\ f(u_{-2}) & f(u_{-1}) & f(u_8) & f(u_9) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \\ 3 & -1 & -1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

We now show that the present scenario implies that we can spot a 2×12 subblock testifying the quality-transferring property: Indeed, the neighboring 2×12 subblock resulting from a right-shift has this property: It is induced by $\{u_{-1}, v_{-1}, \dots, u_{10}, v_{10}\}$ and we know for it that $\{u_{-1}, v_{-1}\} \subseteq V_{-1}$ and $\{f(u_9), f(v_9)\} = \{1, 3\}$. Finally, we note that all such 2×12 subblocks have the quality-transferring property (exhaustively, we see that the behavior is invariant from the fact how the vertices $\{u_0, v_0, u_{10}, v_{10}\}$ are labeled). \square

Observation 4. Let L, R, C, C', f, f' be defined as in Lemma 1.

- (i) If f furthermore satisfies the constraints $f(r_{t,i}) = f(r_{b,i}) = 3$ and $f(r_t) = f(r_b) = -1$, then f automatically guarantees that $w_f(C) - 4 = w_{f'}(C')$.
- (ii) Let $m \geq 9$ be odd. If f is an optimal SDRDF for the grid graph $G_{2,m}$ with the additional property that $f(u_{m-2}) = f(v_{m-2}) = 3$ and $f(u_{m-1}) = f(v_{m-1}) = -1$, then $w_f(G_{2,m}) \geq m + 1$, when $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, otherwise, when $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, $w_f(G_{2,m}) \geq m$.

Proof. (i) After symmetry breaking there are 129 cases fitting these constraints. These all satisfy $w_f(C) - 4 = w_{f'}(C')$.

(ii) We show the assertions by complete induction: The base cases $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,9}) = 10$ for $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ and $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,11}) = 11$ for $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ are shown exhaustively. Our induction hypothesis is the claim stated in the assertion (ii). For the induction step we show that $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m+4}) \geq \gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m}) + 4$: Let f be the function testifying $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m+4}) = w_f(G_{2,m+4})$. On f , the argument from Lemma 2 (suitable removal of vertices and addition of two edges) can be applied on the righter-most 2×12 subblock $\{u_i, v_i \mid i = m - 12, m - 11, \dots, m - 1\}$: It shows that whenever $w_f(G_{2,m+4})$ is strictly better than $m + 4 + 1$ for $m \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ or better than $m + 4$ for $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ in the assertion, it would imply the possibility to attain a strictly better bound than the proven optimum on $G_{2,m}$ (cf. (i))—yielding a contradiction: This means, for $m \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, we must necessarily have $\gamma_{\text{sdR}}(G_{2,m+4}) \geq m + 4 + 1$, and, for $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, we have $w_f(G_{2,m+4}) \geq m + 4$. This concludes our inductive step. \square

Appendix C. Optimal labeling schemes for $G_{2,m}$




Figure C.8: Optimal labeling scheme for grid graphs depending on the congruence class of m modulo 4. All schemes have in common that a periodically repeating pattern of labeled 2×4 grid graphs is flanked from left and/or right by differently labeled grid graphs.