

# Lower bounds for the total (distance) $k$ -domination number of a graph

<sup>1,2</sup>Randy Davila

<sup>1</sup>Research and Development  
RelationalAI  
Berkeley, CA 94704, USA

Email: `randy.davila@relational.ai`

<sup>2</sup>Department of Computational Applied  
Mathematics & Operations Research  
Rice University  
Houston, TX 77005, USA

Email: `randy.r.davila@rice.edu`

## Abstract

For  $k \geq 1$  and a graph  $G$  without isolated vertices, a *total (distance)  $k$ -dominating set* of  $G$  is a set of vertices  $S \subseteq V(G)$  such that every vertex in  $G$  is within distance  $k$  to some vertex of  $S$  other than itself. The *total (distance)  $k$ -domination number* of  $G$  is the minimum cardinality of a total  $k$ -dominating set in  $G$ , and is denoted by  $\gamma_k^t(G)$ . When  $k = 1$ , the total  $k$ -domination number reduces to the *total domination number*, written  $\gamma_t(G)$ ; that is,  $\gamma_t(G) = \gamma_1^t(G)$ . This paper shows that several known lower bounds on the total domination number generalize nicely to lower bounds on total (distance)  $k$ -domination.

**Keywords:** Total distance  $k$ -domination; total domination.

**AMS subject classification:** 05C69

## 1 Introduction

Distance domination in graphs is a well-known concept, with a recent survey estimating that there are more than 100 papers on the topic to date, including a chapter in the domination monograph by Haynes, Hedetniemi, and Henning [6]. This paper considers a specific, widely applicable variant of distance domination called *total distance  $k$ -domination*, and from hereon, referred to as *total  $k$ -domination* for simplicity. This

concept was introduced by Henning, Oellermann, and Swart in [9], where they define a *total  $k$ -dominating set* of a graph  $G$  to be a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  of vertices so that every vertex is within distance  $k$  from some vertex of  $S$  other than itself. More specifically, let  $k \geq 1$  be an integer. A set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  is total  $k$ -dominating in  $G$  if for every vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , we have  $d_G(v, S \setminus \{v\}) \leq k$ . The *total  $k$ -domination number* of  $G$  is the cardinality of a minimum total  $k$ -dominating set in  $G$  and is denoted by  $\gamma_k^t(G)$ . A total  $k$ -dominating set of  $G$  with cardinality  $\gamma_k^t(G)$  is called a  $\gamma_k^t$ -set of  $G$ . Since every vertex  $v$  of  $G$  must be within distance  $k$  to some vertex different from  $v$  in a total  $k$ -dominating set, we note that total  $k$ -domination is not defined for any graph with isolated vertices. We further remark that when  $k = 1$ , total  $k$ -domination reduces to a well-known and heavily studied notion of total domination. In particular, we note that  $\gamma_t(G) = \gamma_1^t(G)$ , where  $\gamma_t(G)$  is the *total domination number* of  $G$ . For more on total domination, see the excellent monograph by Henning and Yeo [8].

As with the total domination number of a graph, the computation of the total  $k$ -domination number is NP-hard [6]. For this reason, many of the results on the total  $k$ -domination have focused primarily on finding tight upper and lower bounds. For example, the upper bound of Henning, Oellermann, and Swart [9], which states that  $\gamma_k^t(G) \leq \frac{2n}{2k+1}$ , whenever  $G$  is a connected graph with order  $n \geq 2k + 1 \geq 3$ . However, there do not seem to be many well-known lower bounds for the total  $k$ -domination number in the literature, which differs from that of the non-total distance dominating variant [3]. This observation motivates our contributions. In particular, we extend several known lower bounds on the total domination number to lower bounds on the total  $k$ -domination number.

**Notation and Terminology.** In this paper, we only consider finite and simple graphs. Let  $G$  be a graph with vertex set  $V(G)$  and edge set  $E(G)$ . The order and size of  $G$  will be denoted by  $n(G) = |V(G)|$  and  $m(G) = |E(G)|$ , respectively. A nontrivial graph is a graph of order at least 2. Two vertices  $v, w \in V(G)$  are neighbors or adjacent whenever  $vw \in E(G)$ . The open neighborhood of a vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , written  $N_G(v)$ , is the set of all neighbors of  $v$ , whereas the closed neighborhood of  $v$  is  $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$ . The degree of a vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , written  $d_G(v)$ , is the number of neighbors of  $v$  in  $G$ ; and so,  $d_G(v) = |N_G(v)|$ . A subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  is a graph where  $V(H) \subseteq V(G)$  and  $E(H) \subseteq E(G)$ . If  $H$  is a subgraph of  $G$ , we write  $H \subseteq G$ . The complete graph, path, and cycle on  $n$  vertices will be denoted by  $K_n$ ,  $P_n$ , and  $C_n$ , respectively.

A graph  $G$  is connected if, for all vertices  $v$  and  $w$  in  $G$ , a  $(v, w)$ -path exists. A *tree* is a connected graph that contains no cycle as a subgraph. A *forest* is any graph that does not contain a cycle as a subgraph. If a forest is connected, it is necessarily a tree; if not, it is a disjoint union of trees called its components. A vertex of degree 1 in a tree is called a leaf, and a vertex with a leaf neighbor is a *support vertex*. The *distance* from a vertex  $v$  to a vertex  $w$  in  $G$ , denoted  $d_G(v, w)$ , is the length of a shortest  $(v, w)$ -path in  $G$ . The distance from a vertex  $v$  to a set  $S \subseteq V(G)$ , denoted  $d_G(v, S)$ , is the length of a shortest  $(v, w)$ -path for all  $w \in S$ . A vertex  $v$  is said to  *$k$ -dominate* a vertex  $w$  different than  $v$  if the distance from  $v$  to  $w$  is at most  $k$ . The *eccentricity* of  $v \in G$ , written

$\text{ecc}_G(v)$  is the distance between  $v$  and a vertex farthest from  $v$  in  $G$ . The minimum eccentricity among all vertices of  $G$  is the *radius* of  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{rad}(G)$ , while the maximum eccentricity among all vertices of  $G$  is the *diameter* of  $G$ , denoted by  $\text{diam}(G)$ . Thus, the diameter of  $G$  is the maximum distance among all pairs of vertices of  $G$ . A vertex  $v$  with  $\text{ecc}_G(v) = \text{diam}(G)$  is called a *peripheral vertex* of  $G$ . A *diametrical path* in  $G$  is the shortest path in  $G$  whose length is equal to the graph's diameter. Thus, a diametrical path is a path of length  $\text{diam}(G)$  joining two peripheral vertices of  $G$ .

For notation and graph terminology not introduced here, we refer the reader to [7]. We will also use the standard notation  $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section we provide tools for our main results in the next section. To begin, recall that every total  $k$ -dominating set of a spanning subgraph of the graph  $G$  is a total  $k$ -dominating set of  $G$ , and thus, we immediately have the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** *For  $k \geq 1$ , if  $H$  is a spanning subgraph of a graph  $G$  without isolated vertices, then*

$$\gamma_k^t(G) \leq \gamma_k^t(H).$$

We now present our first generalization from total domination to total  $k$ -domination. More specifically, recall that in 2007 DeLaViña et al. [4] showed every non-trivial connected graph  $G$  has a spanning tree  $T$  satisfying  $\gamma_t(G) = \gamma_t(T)$ . This result generalizes from total domination to total  $k$ -domination, as shown by the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** *For  $k \geq 1$ , if  $G$  is a connected graph of order  $n \geq 2$ , then  $G$  has spanning tree  $T$  such that*

$$\gamma_k^t(T) = \gamma_k^t(G).$$

*Proof.* Let  $k \geq 1$  and let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n \geq 2$ . Next let  $S \subseteq V(G)$  be a  $\gamma_k^t$ -set of  $G$ . Thus, every vertex  $v$  of  $G$  is within distance to  $k$  to the set  $S \setminus \{v\}$  and  $\gamma_k^t(G) = |S|$ . For each  $i \in [k]$ , define the set  $D_i$  to be the set of all vertices  $v \in V(G)$  for which  $d_G(v, S \setminus \{v\}) = i$ ; that is,

$$D_i = \left\{ v \in V(G) : d_G(v, S \setminus \{v\}) = i \right\}.$$

Since  $S$  is a total  $k$ -dominating set of  $G$ , every vertex  $v \in V(G)$  belongs to some  $D_i$  for  $i \in [k]$ . Moreover, if  $v \in D_i$ , then  $v$  has at least 1 neighbor in  $D_{i-1}$ , since otherwise  $v$  would not be at distance  $i$  with  $S \setminus \{v\}$ . Note that it is also possible that if  $v \in D_i$ , then  $v$  could have neighbors in  $D_i$  and  $D_{i+1}$ . We next construct a spanning subgraph  $F \subseteq G$  as follows. For each  $i \in [k]$ , apply the following rules:

1. For each vertex  $v \in D_i$ , delete all but 1 of the edges joining  $v$  to the set  $D_{i-1}$ .

2. For each vertex  $v \in D_i$ , delete all edges, if any, that join  $v$  to other vertices in the set  $D_i$ .

Since we did not delete any vertices in the above steps, we note that  $F$  is a spanning subgraph of  $G$ . We next show that  $F$  is necessarily a spanning forest of  $G$ .

**Claim 1.** *The subgraph  $F$  is a spanning forest.*

*Proof.* By way of contradiction, suppose that  $F$  is not a forest. Thus,  $F$  contains at least one cycle as a subgraph. Let  $C$  be one such cycle in  $F$  and let  $v$  be a vertex of  $C$  of maximum distance (noninclusive) to the set  $S$  in  $G$ ; that is,  $d_G(v, S \setminus \{v\}) \geq d_G(w, S \setminus \{w\})$  for all  $w \in S$ . Suppose now that  $d_G(v, S \setminus \{v\}) = \ell$ , and so,  $v \in D_\ell$ . If there were a vertex  $w$  on  $C$  with  $d_G(w, S \setminus \{w\}) > \ell$ , then  $v$  would not be a vertex of  $C$  at maximum (noninclusive) distance from  $S$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $d_G(w, S \setminus \{w\}) \leq \ell$  for all vertices  $w$  in  $C$ .

Let  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  be the 2 neighbors of  $v$  on the cycle  $C$ . Next recall that when constructing  $F$  from  $G$ , we removed any edges connecting  $v$  to other vertices in  $D_\ell$ . Thus,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  cannot be elements of the set  $D_\ell$ . Hence, the neighbors  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  of  $v$  on  $C$  are both elements of the set  $D_{\ell-1}$ , a contradiction since  $v$  will have at most one neighbor in the set  $D_{\ell-1}$  by construction of  $F$ . Therefore,  $F$  cannot contain a cycle as a subgraph, and so,  $F$  is a spanning forest of  $G$ .  $\square$

We now construct a spanning tree  $T$  from  $F$  as follows. If  $F$  is a tree, then let  $T = F$ . Otherwise,  $F$  is a disjoint union of  $\ell$  tree components for some  $\ell \geq 2$ . In the case that  $F$  consists of  $\ell$  components, we let  $T$  be the tree obtained from  $F$  by adding to  $F$   $\ell - 1$  so that the resulting graph  $T$  is connected. Note that  $T$  is necessarily a spanning tree of  $G$ . Moreover, for  $i \in [k]$  and  $v \in V(G)$ , if  $v \in D_i$ , then there is a path from  $v$  to  $S \setminus \{v\}$  of length  $i$  in  $T$ , and so,  $d_T(v, S \setminus \{v\}) \leq d_G(v, S \setminus \{v\})$ . However,  $T$  is a spanning subgraph of  $G$ , which implies  $d_G(v, S \setminus \{v\}) \leq d_T(v, S \setminus \{v\})$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . Thus,  $T$  is a spanning tree of  $G$  that is distance-preserving from  $S$ , in the sense that  $d_T(v, S \setminus \{v\}) = d_G(v, S \setminus \{v\})$  for all  $v \in V(G)$ . It follows that since  $S$  is a total  $k$ -dominating set of  $G$ , it must be that  $S$  is also a total  $k$ -dominating set of  $T$ . Thus,  $\gamma_k^t(T) \leq |S| = \gamma_k^t(G)$ . However, Proposition 1 states  $\gamma_k^t(G) \leq \gamma_k^t(T)$ . Hence,  $\gamma_k^t(G) = \gamma_k^t(T)$ .  $\square$

### 3 Lower Bounds for $\gamma_k^t(G)$

In this section we generalize several known lower bounds for the total domination number to those for the total  $k$ -domination number. To begin, recall that for  $k \geq 1$ , the  $k$ -neighborhood of a vertex  $v \in V(G)$  is the set of all vertices different from  $v$  that are at distance at most  $k$  to  $v$ ; that is,  $N_{G,k}(v) = \{w : 1 \leq d_G(v, w) \leq k\}$ . The  $k$ -degree of a vertex  $v \in V(G)$  is defined as  $d_{G,k}(v) = |N_{G,k}(v)|$ . The *maximum  $k$ -degree* and

*minimum  $k$ -degree* of a graph  $G$  are denoted  $\Delta_k(G)$  and  $\delta_k(G)$ , respectively. The  *$k$ -degree sequence* of  $G$  is the list of all vertex  $k$ -degrees of  $G$  in nonincreasing order and is written  $D_k(G) = (\Delta_k(G) = d_k^1, \dots, d_k^n = \delta_k(G))$ .

For  $k \geq 1$  and a graph  $G$  of order  $n$ , we define the *sub-total (distance)  $k$ -domination number* of  $G$ , written  $\text{sub}_k^t(G)$ , as the smallest integer  $j$  such that  $d_k^1 + \dots + d_k^j \geq n$ ; that is,

$$\text{sub}_k^t(G) = \min \left\{ j : \sum_{i=1}^j d_k^i \geq n \right\}$$

When  $k = 1$ , the sub-total  $k$ -domination number reduces to the *sub-total domination number*, written  $\text{sub}_t(G)$  and introduced by Davila in [2], and simultaneously introduced by Gentner and Rautenbach in [5], where they adopt the notation  $sl_t(G)$  to emphasize the connection to the well-known *Slater number* of a graph [10]. Regardless of notation,  $\text{sub}_t(G)$  (and  $sl_t(G)$ ) serve as simple lower bounds for the total domination number. That is,  $\gamma_t(G) \geq \text{sub}_t(G)$  for any isolate-free graph  $G$  [2, 5]; which is notably a simple application of the *degree sequence index strategy (DSI-strategy)* formally introduced by Caro and Pepper in [1]. The following theorem shows that this bound can easily be generalized from total domination to one for total  $k$ -domination.

**Theorem 3.** *For  $k \geq 1$ , if  $G$  is a isolate-free graph, then*

$$\gamma_k^t(G) \geq \text{sub}_k^t(G).$$

*Proof.* Let  $k \geq 1$  and let  $G$  be an isolate-free graph of order  $n$ . Next let  $j = \text{sub}_k^t(G)$  and let  $S \subseteq V(G)$  be a  $\gamma_k^t$ -set of  $G$ . Thus, every vertex  $v$  of  $G$  is within distance to  $k$  to the set  $S \setminus \{v\}$  and  $\gamma_k^t(G) = |S|$ . Hence,  $V(G) = \bigcup_{v \in S} N_{G,k}(v)$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} n &= |V(G)| \\ &= \left| \bigcup_{v \in S} N_{G,k}(v) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{v \in S} |N_{G,k}(v)| \\ &= \sum_{v \in S} d_{G,k}(v), \end{aligned}$$

and so,  $\sum_{v \in S} d_{G,k}(v) \geq n$ . Since the sum of the  $k$ -degrees from the vertices in  $S$  is at most the sum of the first  $|S|$  entries from the  $k$ -degree sequence  $D_k(G)$ , we obtain the following inequality,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{|S|} d_k^i \geq \sum_{v \in S} d_{G,k}(v) \geq n.$$

Since  $j$  is the smallest integer satisfying  $\sum_{i=1}^j d_k^i \geq n$ , it follows that

$$\gamma_k^t(G) = |S| \geq j = \text{sub}_k^t(G),$$

and the desired inequality is established.  $\square$

A trivial lower bound for the total domination number of any isolate-free graph of order  $n \geq 2$  and maximum degree  $\Delta$  is  $\gamma_t(G) \geq \frac{n}{\Delta}$ . As a simple application of Theorem 3, we next show that this lower bound on the total domination number also generalizes to a bound for the total  $k$ -domination number.

**Corollary 4.** *For  $k \geq 1$ , if  $G$  is an isolate-free graph with order  $n$  and maximum  $k$ -degree  $\Delta_k$ , then*

$$\gamma_k^t(G) \geq \frac{n}{\Delta_k}$$

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be an isolate-free graph of order  $n$  and maximum  $k$ -degree  $\Delta_k$ . Next let  $j = \text{sub}_k^t(G)$ , and note that Theorem 3 implies  $\gamma_k^t(G) \geq j$ . For each  $i \in [n]$  observe that  $d_k^i \leq \Delta_k$ . Thus, we obtain the following chain of inequalities,

$$j\Delta_k = \sum_{i=1}^j \Delta_k \geq \sum_{i=1}^j d_k^i \geq n.$$

Hence,

$$\gamma_k^t(G) \geq j \geq \frac{n}{\Delta_k},$$

and the desired bound is established.  $\square$

In [4] DeLaViña et al. proved  $\gamma_t(G) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\text{diam}(G) + 1)$  for any connected graph  $G$  of order  $n \geq 2$ . The following theorem extends this lower bound from the total domination number to a lower bound on the total  $k$ -domination number.

**Theorem 5.** *For  $k \geq 1$ , if  $G$  is a connected graph of order  $n \geq 2$ , then*

$$\gamma_k^t(G) \geq \frac{\text{diam}(G) + 1}{2k}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a connected graph with order  $n \geq 2$  and let  $d = \text{diam}(G)$ . Let  $P : u_0u_1 \dots u_d$  be a diametrical path in  $G$ , joining two peripheral vertices  $u = u_0$  and  $v = u_d$  of  $G$ , and so,  $d_G(u, v) = d$  and let  $S$  be a  $\gamma_k^t$ -set of  $G$  of  $G$ . Thus, every vertex  $v$  of  $G$  is within distance to  $k$  to the set  $S \setminus \{v\}$  and  $\gamma_k^t(G) = |S|$ . We proceed by first proving the following claim about the number of vertices of  $P$  that any vertex of  $S$  may  $k$ -dominate.

**Claim 2.** *Any vertex of  $S$  will  $k$ -dominate at most  $2k$  vertices in  $P$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $q \in S$  be a vertex of  $S$  that  $k$ -dominates at least one vertex from the path  $P$ . Next let  $Q$  be the set of all vertices in  $P$  that are  $k$ -dominated by  $q$  and then let  $i$  and  $j$  be the smallest and largest integers in the set  $[d]$ , respectively, such that  $u_i \in Q$  and  $u_j \in Q$ . Since every vertex of  $Q$  is a vertex in the path  $P$  and since we choose a smallest integer  $i$  with  $u_i \in Q$ , and largest integer  $j$  with  $u_j \in Q$ , it must be the case that  $Q \subseteq \{u_i, u_{i+1}, \dots, u_j\}$ .

Let  $P' : u_i \dots d_j$  be the path subgraph of  $P$  connecting  $u_i$  to  $u_j$  in  $P$  and note that since  $P$  is a shortest  $(u, v)$ -path in  $G$ , it must be the case that  $P'$  is a shortest  $(u_i, u_j)$ -path in  $G$ . Next let  $P_i$  be a shortest  $(u_i, q)$ -path in  $G$  and let  $P_j$  be a shortest  $(q, u_j)$ -path in  $G$ , and observe that since  $q$  will  $k$ -dominate both  $u_i$  and  $u_j$  in  $G$ , both paths  $P_i$  and  $P_j$  have at length most  $k$ . Therefore, the  $(u_i, u_j)$ -path, say  $P''$ , obtained by following the path  $P_i$  from  $u_i$  to  $q$ , and then proceeding along the path  $P_j$  from  $q$  to  $u_j$ , has length at most  $2k$ , for otherwise, the vertices  $u_i$  and  $u_j$  on the path  $P$  would not be the vertices with minimum and maximum indices so that  $u_i \in Q$  and  $u_j \in Q$ , respectively. Thus,  $P''$  has order at most  $2k + 1$ . Since  $q$  does not  $k$ -dominate itself,  $q$  will  $k$ -dominate at most  $(2k + 1) - 1 = 2k$  vertices on  $P''$ , which in-turn implies that  $q$  will  $k$ -dominate at most  $2k$  vertices on  $P'$ . Since  $Q \subseteq V(P')$ ,  $q$  will  $k$ -dominate at most  $2k$  vertices in the path  $P$ .  $\square$

By Claim 2, each vertex in  $S$  will  $k$ -dominate at most  $2k$  vertices of the diametrical path  $P$ . Further, since  $P$  has  $d + 1$  vertices, we observe  $2k|S| \geq d + 1$ . Hence,

$$\gamma_k^t(G) \geq \frac{d + 1}{2k} = \frac{\text{diam}(G) + 1}{2k},$$

and the desired bound is established.  $\square$

Another bound for the total domination number is  $\gamma_t(G) \geq \text{rad}(G)$  [4]. We generalize this radius lower bound for the total domination number to a lower bound for the total  $k$ -domination number by applying Theorem 5 and Lemma 2.

**Theorem 6.** *For  $k \geq 1$ , if  $G$  is a connected graph of order  $n \geq 2$ , then*

$$\gamma_k^t(G) \geq \frac{1}{k} \text{rad}(G).$$

*Proof.* Let  $k \geq 1$  and let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n \geq 2$ . By Lemma 2,  $G$  has a spanning tree  $T$  such that  $\gamma_k^t(G) = \gamma_k^t(T)$ . Adding edges to  $T$  will not increase the radius, and so  $\text{rad}(G) \leq \text{rad}(T)$ . Moreover, since  $T$  is a tree,  $\text{diam}(T) \geq 2\text{rad}(T) - 1$ . Thus, by applying Theorem 5, we obtain the following chain of inequalities,

$$\gamma_k^t(G) = \gamma_k^t(T) \geq \frac{\text{diam}(T) + 1}{2k} \geq \frac{2\text{rad}(T)}{2k} \geq \frac{1}{k} \text{rad}(G).$$

Hence,  $\gamma_k^t(G) \geq \frac{1}{k} \text{rad}(G)$ , and the desired bound is established.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Y. Caro and R. Pepper, Degree sequence index strategy, *Australas. J. Comb.*, **59(1)** (2014), 1–23.
- [2] R. Davila, A note on the sub-total domination number of a graph, ArXiv Preprint: arXiv:1701.07811 (2017).

- [3] R. Davila, C. Fast, M. A. Henning, and F. Kenter, Lower bounds on the distance domination number of a graph, *Contrib. Discrete Math.*, **12** (2017), 476–485.
- [4] E. DeLaViña, Q. Liu, R. Pepper, B. Waller, and D. B. West, Some conjectures of Graffiti.pc on total domination, *Congressus Numer.*, **185** (2007), 81–95.
- [5] M. Gentner and D. Rautenbach, Some comments on the Slater number, *Discrete Math.*, **340(7)** (2017), 1497–1502.
- [6] T. Haynes, S. Hedetniemi, and M. A. Henning, *Topics in Domination in Graphs (Springer Developments in Mathematics, 64)*. ISBN: 978-3-031-09495-8 (2021).
- [7] T. Haynes, S. Hedetniemi, and M. A. Henning, *Domination in Graphs: Core Concepts (Springer Monographs in Mathematics)*. ISBN: 978-3-031-09495-8 (2023).
- [8] M. A. Henning and A. Yeo, *Total Domination in Graphs (Springer Monographs in Mathematics)*. ISBN: 978-1-4614-6524-9 (2010).
- [9] M. A. Henning, O. R. Oellermann, and H. C. Swart, Bounds on distance domination parameters, *J. Combin. Comput. Inf. Sys. Sciences* **16** (1991), 11–18.
- [10] P. J. Slater, Locating dominating sets and locating-dominating sets. *Graph Theory, Combinatorics, and Algorithms, Vol. 1, 2(Kalamazoo, MI 1992)*, 1073–1079. Wiley-Intersci. Publ. (Wiley, New York, 1995)