

# On the total Italian domination number in digraphs\*

Changchang Dong<sup>a,†</sup>, Yubao Guo<sup>b</sup>, Mei Lu<sup>a</sup>, Lutz Volkmann<sup>b</sup>

a. Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

b. Institute of Mathematics of Information Processing, RWTH Aachen University,  
Aachen 52056, Germany

## Abstract

Consider a finite simple digraph  $D$  with vertex set  $V(D)$ . An Italian dominating function (IDF) on  $D$  is a function  $f : V(D) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  satisfying every vertex  $u$  with  $f(u) = 0$  has an in-neighbor  $v$  with  $f(v) = 2$  or two in-neighbors  $w$  and  $z$  with  $f(w) = f(z) = 1$ . A total Italian dominating function (TIDF) on  $D$  is an IDF  $f$  such that the subdigraph  $D[\{u \mid f(u) \geq 1\}]$  contains no isolated vertices. The weight  $\omega(f)$  of a TIDF  $f$  on  $D$  is  $\sum_{u \in V(D)} f(u)$ . The total Italian domination number of  $D$  is  $\gamma_{tI}(D) = \min\{\omega(f) \mid f \text{ is a TIDF on } D\}$ .

In this paper, we present bounds on  $\gamma_{tI}(D)$ , and investigate the relationship between several different domination parameters. In particular, we give the total Italian domination number of the Cartesian products  $P_2 \square P_n$  and  $P_3 \square P_n$ , where  $P_n$  represents a dipath with  $n$  vertices.

**Keywords** Digraph, total Italian domination number, total Roman domination number

**AMS subject classification 2010** 05C20, 05C69.

## 1 Terminology and introduction

Let  $D = (V(D), A(D))$  denote a finite simple digraph throughout this paper. Undefined notations and terminologies will follow [5] for digraphs and [6] for graphs. The integers  $m(D) = |A(D)|$  and  $n(D) = |V(D)|$  represent the *size* and the *order* of  $D$ . The notation  $\langle v, w \rangle$  represent an arc oriented from a vertex  $v$  to a vertex  $w$  in a digraph,  $v$  is said to be an *in-neighbor* of  $w$  and  $w$  is an *out-neighbor* of  $v$ . If  $\langle v, w \rangle$  is an arc of  $D$ , then we say that

---

\*This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12171272, No. 12261016, No. 12261085).

†Corresponding author. E-mail: 374813014@qq.com

$w$  is dominated by  $v$  or  $v$  dominates  $w$ , and denote it by  $v \rightarrow w$ . Two vertices  $v$  and  $w$  are adjacent, if  $\langle v, w \rangle \in A(D)$  or  $\langle w, v \rangle \in A(D)$ .

For a vertex  $s \in V(D)$ ,  $N^+(s) = \{x \mid \langle s, x \rangle \in A(D)\}$  ( $N^-(s) = \{x \mid \langle x, s \rangle \in A(D)\}$ , respectively) denotes the *out-neighborhood* (*in-neighborhood*, respectively) of  $s$ . Likewise,  $N^+[s] = N^+(s) \cup \{s\}$  and  $N^-[s] = N^-(s) \cup \{s\}$ . In addition, let  $N(s) = N^-(s) \cup N^+(s)$  and  $N[s] = N^-[s] \cup N^+[s]$ .

Given a subset  $W \subseteq V(D)$ ,  $D[W]$  represents the subdigraph induced by  $W$ ,  $D - W = D[V(D) \setminus W]$ ,  $N^+(W) = \bigcup_{u \in W} N^+(u)$ , and  $N^+[W] = \bigcup_{u \in W} N^+[u]$ . For a set  $Q \subseteq V(D)$ ,  $Q$  is called a *packing* of  $D$  if  $N^-[x] \cap N^-[y] = \emptyset$  for any two different vertices  $x, y \in Q$ . The packing number  $\rho(D)$  is the maximum size of a packing in  $D$ . A set  $Q \subseteq V(D)$  is said to be a *strong packing* of  $D$  if  $N[x] \cap N[y] = \emptyset$  for any two different vertices  $x, y \in Q$ . For vertices  $v, w \in V(D)$ , if there is a dipath from  $v$  to  $w$  in  $D$ , then the *distance from  $v$  to  $w$*  in  $D$ , denoted  $d(v, w)$ , is the minimum length of a dipath from  $v$  to  $w$  in  $D$ . For an integer  $n > 0$ , let  $P_n$  denote a dipath of order  $n$ .

A digraph  $D$  is *connected* if its underlying graph is connected. The *Cartesian product* of two digraphs  $H_1$  and  $H_2$ , denoted by  $H_1 \square H_2$ , is the digraph with vertex set  $V(H_1) \times V(H_2)$  and for  $(v_1, w_1), (v_2, w_2) \in V(H_1 \square H_2)$ ,  $\langle (v_1, w_1), (v_2, w_2) \rangle \in A(H_1 \square H_2)$  if and only if either  $w_1 = w_2$  and  $\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle \in A(H_1)$ , or  $v_1 = v_2$  and  $\langle w_1, w_2 \rangle \in A(H_2)$ .

Let  $H$  be a graph (a digraph, respectively). A set  $X \subseteq V(H)$  is called a *dominating set* of  $H$  if  $N[X] = V(H)$  ( $N^+[X] = V(H)$ , respectively). A dominating set  $X$  of  $H$  is said to be a *total dominating set* of  $H$  if the subgraph  $H[X]$  contains no isolated vertices. The *domination number*  $\gamma(H)$  (*total domination number*  $\gamma_t(H)$ , respectively) is the number of vertices of a dominating set (a total dominating set, respectively) of  $H$  that has the minimum cardinality.

Let  $H$  be a graph or a digraph. We call  $g : V(H) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  a *Roman-Italian function* (RIF) on  $H$  and  $\omega(g) = \sum_{u \in V(H)} g(u)$  the weight of  $g$ . For  $X \subseteq V(H)$ , we define  $g(X) = \sum_{u \in X} g(u)$ . Note that  $w(g) = g(V(H))$ . Let  $V_j$  be the set of vertices assigned the value  $j$  under  $g$  for  $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ . Then we also write  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$ .

A *Roman dominating function* (RDF) on a graph (digraph, respectively)  $H$  is defined as a RIF  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  such that each vertex of  $V_0$  has a neighbor (an in-neighbor, respectively)  $x$  with  $g(x) = 2$ .

An *Italian dominating function* (IDF) on a graph (digraph, respectively)  $H$  is defined as a RIF  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  such that each vertex of  $V_0$  has at least two neighbors (two in-neighbors, respectively) assigned 1 or one neighbor (one in-neighbor, respectively) assigned 2 under  $g$ .

A RDF (IDF, respectively)  $g$  on  $H$ , where  $H$  is a graph or a digraph without isolated vertices, is said to be a *total Roman dominating function* (TRDF) (*total Italian dominating function* (TIDF), respectively) on  $H$ , if  $H[V_1 \cup V_2]$  contains no isolated vertices.

The *Roman domination number*  $\gamma_R(H)$  (*Italian domination number*  $\gamma_I(H)$ , *total Roman*

domination number  $\gamma_{tR}(H)$ , total Italian domination number  $\gamma_{tI}(H)$ , respectively) is the value of a RDF (an IDF, a TRDF, a TIDF, respectively) on  $H$  that has the minimum weight.

A RDF (an IDF, a TRDF, a TIDF, respectively) on  $H$  with weight  $\gamma_R(H)$  ( $\gamma_I(H)$ ,  $\gamma_{tR}(H)$ ,  $\gamma_{tI}(H)$ , respectively) is said to be a  $\gamma_R(H)$ -function ( $\gamma_I(H)$ -function,  $\gamma_{tR}(H)$ -function, respectively).

The definitions above lead to  $\gamma(D) \leq \gamma_I(D) \leq \gamma_R(D) \leq \gamma_{tR}(D)$  and  $\gamma_I(D) \leq \gamma_{tI}(D) \leq \gamma_{tR}(D)$ . There are lots of researches on the domination concepts in graphs and digraphs. For example, extensive researches have been studied on the (total) Roman domination in graphs and digraphs, as documented in, e.g., [2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 17]. The literature on Italian domination in graphs and digraphs has been reviewed in [7, 11, 18] and elsewhere. Additionally, the exploration of total Italian domination in graphs has been documented in [1]. Recently, Guo and Volkmann [13] initiated the investigation into total Italian domination in digraphs. In this paper, we will continue the study of total Italian domination in digraphs.

We present basic properties and sharp bounds for the total Italian domination number of digraphs in Sections 2 and 3. We bound the total Italian domination number of a rooted tree from below and characterize the rooted trees attaining the bound in Section 4. In Section 5, we give the total Italian domination number of the Cartesian products  $P_2 \square P_n$  and  $P_3 \square P_n$ , where  $P_n$  is the dipath with  $n$  vertices. The last section is devoted to some concluding remarks.

## 2 Preliminary results and first bounds

In this section, we will explore the connection between the total Italian domination number of digraphs and other domination parameters, including domination number, total domination number, total Roman domination number, and total 2-domination number.

**Theorem 2.1** ([15]) *If  $D$  is a digraph without isolated vertices, then*

$$\gamma_{tR}(D) \leq 3\gamma(D).$$

Recall that  $\gamma_t(D) \leq \gamma_{tI}(D) \leq \gamma_{tR}(D)$ . Next we discuss digraphs  $D$  with the property that  $\gamma_t(D) = \gamma_{tI}(D)$  or that  $\gamma_{tI}(D) = 3\gamma(D)$ .

**Proposition 2.1** *Let  $D$  be a digraph without isolated vertices. If  $\gamma_t(D) = \gamma_{tI}(D)$ , then  $V_2 = \emptyset$  for each  $\gamma_{tI}(D)$ -function  $(V_0, V_1, V_2)$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $\gamma_t(D) = \gamma_{tI}(D)$  and assume that there exists a  $\gamma_{tI}(D)$ -function  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  with  $V_2 \neq \emptyset$ . As  $V_1 \cup V_2$  forms a total dominating set of  $D$ , we obtain the contradiction

$$\gamma_t(D) \leq |V_1 \cup V_2| < |V_1| + 2|V_2| = \gamma_{tI}(D) = \gamma_t(D).$$

In [16], the authors defined a set  $Q \subseteq V(D)$  as a *total 2-dominating set* in a digraph  $D$  if  $D[Q]$  has no isolated vertex and every vertex in  $V(D) \setminus Q$  has at least two in-neighbors in  $Q$ . The *total 2-domination number*  $\gamma_2^t(D)$  is the minimum cardinality of a total 2-dominating set of  $D$ . ■

**Proposition 2.2** *Let  $D$  be a digraph without isolated vertices. If  $D$  has a  $\gamma_{tI}(D)$ -function  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  with  $V_2 = \emptyset$ , then  $\gamma_{tI}(D) = \gamma_2^t(D)$ .*

**Proof.** The definitions lead to  $\gamma_{tI}(D) \leq \gamma_2^t(D)$ . For the convers inequality, let  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_{tI}(D)$ -function with  $V_2 = \emptyset$ . Since  $|N^-(u) \cap V_1| \geq 2$  for each  $u \in V_0$  and  $D[V_1]$  is without isolated vertices, we see that the set  $V_1$  is a total 2-dominating set of  $D$ . Therefore  $\gamma_2^t(D) \leq \gamma_{tI}(D)$  and thus  $\gamma_{tI}(D) = \gamma_2^t(D)$ . ■

Propositions 2.1 and 2.2 lead to the next result immediately.

**Corollary 2.1** *Let  $D$  be a digraph without isolated vertices. If  $\gamma_t(D) = \gamma_{tI}(D)$ , then  $\gamma_t(D) = \gamma_2^t(D)$ .*

**Theorem 2.2** *Let  $D$  be a digraph without isolated vertices. If  $\gamma_{tI}(D) = 3\gamma(D)$ , then each  $\gamma(D)$ -set is a strong packing set.*

**Proof.** Assume that  $M$  is a  $\gamma(D)$ -set. Suppose on the contrary that  $M$  is not a strong packing set. Then there are two vertices  $y_1, y_2 \in M$  such that  $N[y_1] \cap N[y_2] \neq \emptyset$ .

Assume first that  $y_1$  and  $y_2$  are adjacent. Let  $X \subset M$  be a subset of maximum cardinality such that  $D[X]$  consists of isolated vertices. Since  $D$  has no isolated vertices, there exists a smallest subset  $R$  of  $V(D) \setminus M$  such that  $D[X \cup R]$  contains no isolated vertex and  $|R| \leq |X| \leq |M| - 1$ . Then the function  $g_1$  defined by  $g_1(u) = 2$  for  $u \in M$ ,  $g_1(u) = 1$  for  $u \in R$  and  $g_1(u) = 0$  otherwise, is a TIDF on  $D$  with weight

$$2|M| + |R| \leq 2|M| + |M| - 1 = 3|M| - 1 < 3\gamma(D),$$

which contradicts the hypothesis that  $\gamma_{tI}(D) = 3\gamma(D)$ .

Therefore  $M$  is an independent set. Now assume that there exists a vertex  $w \in V(D) \setminus M$  such that  $w$  is adjacent to  $y_1$  as well as to  $y_2$ . Let  $X = M \setminus \{y_1, y_2\}$ . As above, there exists a smallest subset  $R$  of  $V(D) \setminus M$  such that  $D[X \cup R]$  has no isolated vertex and  $|R| \leq |X| \leq |M| - 2$ . Then the function  $g_1$  defined by  $g_1(u) = 2$  for  $u \in M$ ,  $g_1(u) = 1$  for  $u \in R$ ,  $g_1(w) = 1$  and  $g_1(u) = 0$  otherwise, is a TIDF on  $D$  with weight

$$2|M| + |R| + 1 \leq 2|M| + |M| - 1 = 3|M| - 1 < 3\gamma(D),$$

a contradiction, and the proof is complete. ■

### 3 Rooted trees

A *rooted tree* is a connected digraph  $T$  containing a vertex  $r$  with in-degree 0 and every vertex different from  $r$  has in-degree 1. The vertex  $r$  is said to be the *root* of  $T$ .

**Theorem 3.1** *Let  $T$  be a rooted tree of order  $n \geq 2$ . Then  $\gamma_t(T) = \gamma_{tI}(T)$  if and only if  $n = 2$ .*

**Proof.** If  $n = 2$ , then  $\gamma_t(T) = \gamma_{tI}(T) = 2$ . Let now  $n \geq 3$ .

**Case 1.**  $\max_{x \in V(T)} d(r, x) = 1$ .

Then it is easy to see that  $\gamma_t(T) = 2 < 3 = \gamma_{tI}(T)$ .

**Case 2.**  $\max_{x \in V(T)} d(r, x) = 2$ .

Let  $\langle r, a_1 \rangle, \langle r, a_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle r, a_p \rangle \in A(T)$ ,  $\langle r, c_1 \rangle, \langle r, c_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle r, c_q \rangle \in A(T)$  and  $\langle a_1, b_1 \rangle, \langle a_2, b_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle a_p, b_p \rangle \in A(T)$  with  $p \geq 1$  and  $q \geq 0$ . If  $q = 0$ , then  $\gamma_t(T) = p + 1 < 2p + 1 = \gamma_{tI}(T)$ . If  $q \geq 1$ , then  $\gamma_t(T) = p + 1 < 2p + 2 = \gamma_{tI}(T)$ .

**Case 3.**  $\max_{x \in V(T)} d(r, x) = p \geq 3$ .

Let  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_{tI}(T)$ -function. Then  $V_1 \cup V_2$  is a total dominating set of  $T$ . Let  $P = rv_p v_{p-1} \dots v_2 v_1$  be a dipath from  $r$  to  $v_1$ , and let  $N^+(v_2) = \{v_1, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_s\}$  with  $s \geq 0$ . If  $|V(T)| = s + 4$ , then  $\gamma_t(T) = 3 < 4 = \gamma_{tI}(T)$ . If  $|V_2| \geq 1$ , then we have  $\gamma_t(T) \leq |V_1| + |V_2| \leq |V_1| + 2|V_2| - 1 = \gamma_{tI}(T) - 1$ .

So we assume that  $|V(T)| \geq s + 5$  and  $V_2 = \emptyset$ . Now we prove the inequality  $\gamma_t(T) < \gamma_{tI}(T)$  by induction on  $n$ . Let  $T_1 = T - \{v_1, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_s\}$ . Then  $|V(T_1)| \geq 3$  and by the induction hypothesis, we observe that  $\gamma_t(T_1) < \gamma_{tI}(T_1)$ .

First, we show that  $\gamma_t(T) \leq \gamma_t(T_1) + 1$ . Let  $S$  be a total dominating set of  $T_1$  such that  $|S| = \gamma_t(T_1)$ . If  $v_2 \in S$ , then  $S$  is a total dominating set of  $T$ . Therefore  $\gamma_t(T) \leq |S| = \gamma_t(T_1)$ . If  $v_2 \notin S$ , then  $v_3 \in S$ . Thus  $S \cup \{v_2\}$  is a total dominating set of  $T$  and  $\gamma_t(T) \leq |S| + 1 = \gamma_t(T_1) + 1$ .

Next, we prove that  $\gamma_{tI}(T) \geq \gamma_{tI}(T_1) + 1$ . Note that  $g(v_2) + g(v_1) + g(a_1) + \dots + g(a_s) \geq 2$ . If  $g(v_3) \geq 1$ , then  $g(v_2) + g(v_1) + g(a_1) + \dots + g(a_s) = 2$ . Now define the function  $g_1$  by  $g_1(v_2) = 1$  and  $g_1(x) = g(x)$  otherwise. Then  $g_1$  is a TIDF on  $T_1$  of weight  $\omega(g) - 1$ . Thus,  $\gamma_{tI}(T_1) \leq \omega(g) - 1 = \gamma_{tI}(T) - 1$ . If  $g(v_3) = 0$ , then  $g(a) = 2$ , where  $a$  is the vertex in  $T$  such that  $(a, v_3) \in A(T)$ . This implies that  $|V_2| \geq 1$ , a contradiction.

Hence  $\gamma_t(T) \leq \gamma_t(T_1) + 1$  and  $\gamma_{tI}(T) \geq \gamma_{tI}(T_1) + 1$ . This yields to

$$\gamma_{tI}(T) \geq \gamma_{tI}(T_1) + 1 > \gamma_t(T_1) + 1 \geq \gamma_t(T).$$

■

Let  $S_n$  be the rooted tree consisting of the root  $r$  and  $n-1$  further vertices  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n-1}$  such that  $r \rightarrow v_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ .

**Theorem 3.2** *Let  $T$  be a rooted tree with  $n \geq 3$  vertices. Then  $\gamma_{tI}(T) = 3\gamma(T)$  if and only if  $T = S_n$ .*

**Proof.** Clearly, if  $T = S_n$ , then  $\gamma_{tI}(T) = 3 = 3\gamma(T)$ . If  $T \neq S_n$ , then we observe that  $\max_{x \in V(T)} d(r, x) \geq 2$ .

**Case 1.**  $\max_{x \in V(T)} d(r, x) = 2$ .

Let  $\langle r, a_1 \rangle, \langle r, a_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle r, a_p \rangle \in A(T)$ ,  $\langle r, c_1 \rangle, \langle r, c_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle r, c_q \rangle \in A(T)$  and  $\langle a_1, b_1 \rangle, \langle a_2, b_2 \rangle, \dots, \langle a_p, b_p \rangle \in A(T)$  with  $p \geq 1$  and  $q \geq 0$ . If  $q = 0$ , then  $\gamma_{tI}(T) = 2p + 1$ ,  $\gamma(T) = p + 1$  and thus  $\gamma_{tI}(T) < 3\gamma(T)$ . If  $q \geq 1$ , then  $\gamma_{tI}(T) = 2p + 2$ ,  $\gamma(T) = p + 1$  and so  $\gamma_{tI}(T) < 3\gamma(T)$ .

**Case 2.**  $\max_{x \in V(T)} d(r, x) = p \geq 3$ .

Let  $P = rv_p v_{p-1} \dots v_2 v_1$  be a dipath from  $r$  to  $v_1$ , and let  $N^+(v_2) = \{v_1, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_s\}$  with  $s \geq 0$ . If  $|V(T)| = s + 4$ , then  $\gamma(T) = 2$ ,  $\gamma_{tI}(T) = 4$  and hence  $\gamma_{tI}(T) < 3\gamma(T)$ . Let now  $|V(T)| \geq s + 5$  and let  $T_1 = T - \{v_2, v_1, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_s\}$ . If  $T_1 = S_k$ , then  $\gamma(T) = 2$ ,  $\gamma_{tI}(T) = 5$  and therefore  $\gamma_{tI}(T) < 3\gamma(T)$ . If  $T_1 \neq S_k$ , then we prove the inequality  $\gamma_{tI}(T) < 3\gamma(T)$  by induction on  $n$ . We note that  $\gamma_{tI}(T) \leq \gamma_{tI}(T_1) + 3$  and  $\gamma(T) \geq \gamma(T_1) + 1$ . Since  $T_1 \neq S_k$ , the induction hypothesis leads to

$$\gamma_{tI}(T) \leq \gamma_{tI}(T_1) + 3 < 3\gamma(T_1) + 3 \leq 3\gamma(T).$$

■

## 4 The Cartesian product of dipaths

Consider the directed path  $P_n$  of order  $n$  with vertex set  $V(P_n) = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$  and arc set  $A(P_n) = \langle j, j + 1 \rangle | j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n - 2$ . In this section, our objective is to determine the precise values of  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$  and  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ . We start with some lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1** *Let  $n \geq 2$  be an integer and let  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$ -function with  $|V_0|$  minimized. Then the following hold:*

(a)  $g((0, 0)) = g((1, 0)) = 1$ .

(b) For each  $t \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n - 1\}$ ,  $g((0, t)) + g((1, t)) \geq 1$ .

**Proof.** (a) Let  $D = P_2 \square P_n$ . Since  $N^-((0, 0)) = \emptyset$ ,  $g((0, 0)) \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $g((0, 0)) = 2$ . As the subdigraph  $D[V_1 \cup V_2]$  contains no isolated vertices, we see that  $g((1, 0)) \geq 1$  or  $g((0, 1)) \geq 1$ . We assume, w.l.o.g., that  $g((1, 0)) \geq 1$ . If  $g((0, 1)) = 0$ , then the function  $h$  defined by  $h((0, 0)) = h((0, 1)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise, is a TIDF on  $P_2 \square P_n$  and  $\omega(h) = \omega(g)$ . Therefore,  $h$  is also a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$ -function, which contradicts the selection of  $g$ . If  $g((0, 1)) \geq 1$ , then the function  $h$  defined by  $h((0, 0)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise, is a TIDF on  $P_2 \square P_n$  and  $\omega(h) = \omega(g) - 1$ , a contradiction. Hence  $g((0, 0)) = 1$ .

As  $N^-((1, 0)) = \{(0, 0)\}$ ,  $g((1, 0)) \geq 1$ . Suppose that  $g((1, 0)) = 2$ . If  $g((1, 1)) = 0$ , then the function  $h$  defined by  $h((1, 0)) = h((1, 1)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise,

is a TIDF on  $P_2 \square P_n$  and  $\omega(h) = \omega(g)$ . Therefore,  $h$  is also a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$ -function, which contradicts the choice of  $g$ . If  $g((1, 1)) \geq 1$ , then the function  $h$  defined by  $h((1, 0)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise, is a TIDF on  $P_2 \square P_n$  of weight  $\omega(g) - 1$ , a contradiction. Thus  $g((1, 0)) = 1$ . Then (a) holds.

(b) Assuming the opposite, there exists some  $t_0 \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n-1\}$  such that  $g((0, t_0)) + g((1, t_0)) = 0$ . It is evident that  $g((0, t_0 - 1)) = g((1, t_0 - 1)) = 2$ . Now define the function  $h$  by  $h((0, t_0 - 1)) = h((0, t_0)) = h((1, t_0 - 1)) = h((1, t_0)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise. Subsequently,  $h$  can be identified as a TIDF on  $P_2 \square P_n$  with weight  $\omega(g)$ , serving as a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$ -function. This contradicts the selection of  $g$ . Therefore  $g((0, t)) + g((1, t)) \geq 1$  for any  $t \in \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n-1\}$ . Thus (b) holds.  $\blacksquare$

**Lemma 4.2** *Let  $n \geq 2$  be an integer,  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$ -function with  $|V_0|$  minimized, and let  $a_t = g((0, t)) + g((1, t))$  for any  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . Then for any  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$ ,*

$$a_t + a_{t+1} \geq 3.$$

**Proof.** Let  $D = P_2 \square P_n$ . By Lemma 4.1,  $a_0 + a_1 \geq 3$ . Now let  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-2\}$ . By Lemma 4.1 (b), we have  $a_t, a_{t+1} \geq 1$ . If  $a_t \geq 2$  or  $a_{t+1} \geq 2$ , then  $a_t + a_{t+1} \geq 3$ . So assume that  $a_t = 1$  and  $a_{t+1} = 1$ . Thus, we have the following two cases.

**Case 1.**  $g((0, t)) = 1$  and  $g((1, t)) = 0$ .

Since  $N^-((0, t+1)) = \{(0, t)\}$ , we have  $g((0, t+1)) \geq 1$ . Therefore  $g((0, t+1)) = 1$  and  $g((1, t+1)) = 0$  by  $a_{t+1} = 1$ . Because of  $N^-((1, t+1)) = \{(1, t), (0, t+1)\}$  and  $g((1, t)) + g((0, t+1)) = 1$ , we have  $g((1, t+1)) \geq 1$ , which contraries to  $g((1, t+1)) = 0$ .

**Case 2.**  $g((0, t)) = 0$  and  $g((1, t)) = 1$ .

It is easy to see that  $g((0, t-1)) = 2$ . Since  $N^-((0, t+1)) = \{(0, t)\}$ , it holds that  $g((0, t+1)) \geq 1$ . As  $a_{t+1} = 1$ , we see that  $g((0, t+1)) = 1$  and  $g((1, t+1)) = 0$ . Since the subdigraph  $D[V_1 \cup V_2]$  contains no isolated vertices, we have  $g((1, t-1)) \geq 1$ . Now define the function  $h$  by  $h((0, t-1)) = h((0, t)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise. Subsequently,  $h$  can be identified as a TIDF on  $P_2 \square P_n$  with weight  $\omega(g)$ . Furthermore, it serves as a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$ -function, which contradicts the choice of  $g$ .  $\blacksquare$

**Theorem 4.1** *For  $n \geq 2$ ,*

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n) = \begin{cases} \frac{3n}{2}, & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ \lceil \frac{3n}{2} \rceil, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** Let  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$ -function with  $|V_0|$  minimized, and let  $a_t = g((0, t)) + g((1, t))$  for any  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . By Lemma 4.2,  $a_t + a_{t+1} \geq 3$  for any

$t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$ . Hence, if  $n$  is even, then

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n) = \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} (a_{2k} + a_{2k+1}) \geq \frac{3n}{2};$$

if  $n$  is odd, then

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n) = a_0 + \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{n-1}{2}-1} (a_{2k+1} + a_{2k+2}) \geq 2 + \frac{3(n-1)}{2} = \left\lceil \frac{3n}{2} \right\rceil.$$

To demonstrate the upper bound of  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$ , we present a TIDF  $h$  on  $P_2 \square P_n$  as follows.

If  $n$  is odd, then define the function  $h$  by

$$h((s, t)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 2c + 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \lfloor \frac{n-2}{2} \rfloor, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and so

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n) \leq \omega(h) = 2n - \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor = \left\lceil \frac{3n}{2} \right\rceil.$$

If  $n$  is even, then define the function  $h$  by

$$h((s, t)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 2c + 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n-2}{2}, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which implies that

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n) \leq \omega(h) = 2n - \frac{n}{2} = \frac{3n}{2}.$$

This completes the proof. ■

**Lemma 4.3** *Let  $n \geq 2$  be an integer and let  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ -function with  $|V_0|$  minimized. If there are  $s \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$  such that  $g((s, t)) = 2$ , then  $g((s+1, t)) = g((s, t+1)) = 0$ .*

**Proof.** Suppose there exist  $s_0 \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $t_0 \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-2\}$  such that  $g((s_0, t_0)) = 2$ . If  $g((s_0+1, t_0)) \geq 1$  and  $g((s_0, t_0+1)) \geq 1$ , then define the function  $h$  by  $h((s_0, t_0)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise. Consequently,  $h$  is a TIDF on  $P_3 \square P_n$  of weight  $\omega(g)-1$ , a contradiction. So assume that  $g((s_0+1, t_0)) = 0$  or  $g((s_0, t_0+1)) = 0$ . If  $g((s_0+1, t_0)) \geq 1$  and  $g((s_0, t_0+1)) = 0$ , then define the function  $h$  by  $h((s_0, t_0)) = h((s_0, t_0+1)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise. Therefore,  $h$  can be identified as a TIDF on  $P_3 \square P_n$  of weight  $\omega(g)$ . Additionally, it is a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ -function, which contradicts the selection of  $g$ . By symmetry, the proof for  $g((s_0+1, t_0)) = 0$  and  $g((s_0, t_0+1)) \geq 1$  is similar. Thus  $g((s_0+1, t_0)) = g((s_0, t_0+1)) = 0$ . ■



**Lemma 4.4** *Let  $n \geq 3$  be an integer and let  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ -function with  $|V_0|$  minimized. Then the following hold:*

(a)  $g((0, 0)) = 1$  and  $g((2, 0)) + g((1, 0)) = 2$ .

(b) For any  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $g((0, t)) + g((1, t)) \geq 1$  and  $g((1, t)) + g((2, t)) \geq 1$ .

(c) For any  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $g((0, t)) + g((1, t)) + g((2, t)) \geq 2$ .

**Proof.** (a) Let  $D = P_3 \square P_n$ . Since  $N^-((0, 0)) = \emptyset$ ,  $g((0, 0)) \geq 1$ . If  $g((0, 0)) = 2$ , then by Lemma 4.3, we have  $g((0, 1)) = g((1, 0)) = 0$ . Now the subdigraph  $D[V_1 \cup V_2]$  contains an isolated vertex  $(0, 0)$ , a contradiction. Thus  $g((0, 0)) = 1$ . It is evidence that  $g((1, 0)) \geq 1$ . If  $g((1, 0)) = 2$ , then by Lemma 4.3, we have  $g((2, 0)) = 0$ . Thus  $g((2, 0)) + g((1, 0)) = 2$ . So assume that  $g((1, 0)) = 1$ . By  $N^-((2, 0)) = \{(1, 0)\}$ ,  $g((2, 0)) \geq 1$ . If  $g((2, 0)) = 2$  and  $g((2, 1)) = 0$ , then define the function  $h$  by  $h((2, 1)) = h((2, 0)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise. So  $h$  is a TIDF on  $P_3 \square P_n$  and  $\omega(h) = \omega(g)$ . Subsequently,  $h$  is a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ -function, contradicting the choice of  $g$ . If  $g((2, 0)) = 2$  and  $g((2, 1)) \geq 1$ , then define the function  $h$  by  $h((2, 0)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise. Therefore  $h$  is a TIDF on  $P_3 \square P_n$  and  $\omega(h) = \omega(g) - 1$ , a contradiction. Hence  $g((2, 0)) = 1$ , and consequently,  $g((1, 0)) + g((2, 0)) = 2$ . This justifies (a).

(b) If there exists some  $t_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$  such that  $g((0, t_0)) + g((1, t_0)) = 0$ , then  $g((0, t_0 - 1)) = g((1, t_0 - 1)) = 2$ . Now define the function  $h$  by  $h((0, t_0 - 1)) = h((0, t_0)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise. Then  $h$  is a TIDF on  $P_3 \square P_n$  and  $\omega(h) = \omega(g)$ . Therefore,  $h$  is a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ -function, which contradicts the choice of  $g$ . Hence for any  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $g((0, t)) + g((1, t)) \geq 1$ .

If there exists some  $t_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$  such that  $g((1, t_0)) + g((2, t_0)) = 0$ , then  $g((2, t_0 - 1)) = 2$ . Define the function  $h$  by  $h((2, t_0 - 1)) = h((2, t_0)) = 1$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise. So  $h$  is a TIDF on  $P_3 \square P_n$  and  $\omega(h) = \omega(g)$ . As a result,  $h$  is a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ -function, contradicting the selection of  $g$ . Therefore for any  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $g((1, t)) + g((2, t)) \geq 1$ .

(c) By contradiction, suppose that there exists some  $t_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$  such that  $g((0, t_0)) + g((1, t_0)) + g((2, t_0)) \leq 1$ . We may assume that  $g((0, t_0)) = g((2, t_0)) = 0$  and  $g((1, t_0)) = 1$  as (b). Note that  $g((0, t_0 - 1)) = 2$ . It follows from Lemma 4.3 that  $g((1, t_0 - 1)) = 0$ . Since the subdigraph  $D[V_1 \cup V_2]$  contains no isolated vertices, it holds that  $t_0 \leq n-2$ . According to  $N^-((0, t_0 + 1)) = \{(0, t_0)\}$ , we have  $g((0, t_0 + 1)) \geq 1$ . Now define the function  $h$  by  $h((0, t_0 - 1)) = h((0, t_0)) = h((1, t_0 - 1)) = 1$ ,  $h((1, t_0)) = 0$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise. Then  $h$  is a TIDF on  $P_3 \square P_n$  and  $\omega(h) = \omega(g)$ . Therefore,  $h$  is a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ -function, which contradicts the selection of  $g$ . Hence for any  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ ,  $g((0, t)) + g((1, t)) + g((2, t)) \geq 2$ . This justifies (c). ■

**Lemma 4.5** *Let  $n \geq 4$  be an integer,  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ -function with  $|V_0|$  minimized and let  $a_t = \sum_{s=0}^2 g((s, t))$  for any  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . Then for any  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-4\}$ ,*

$$a_t + a_{t+1} + a_{t+2} + a_{t+3} \geq 9.$$

**Proof.** Let  $D = P_3 \square P_n$ . It follows from Lemma 4.4 that  $a_t \geq 2$  for any  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . Conversely, suppose that for some  $t_0 \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-4\}$ ,  $a_{t_0} = a_{t_0+1} = a_{t_0+2} = a_{t_0+3} = 2$ . By Lemma 4.4 (a),  $t_0 \in \{1, \dots, n-4\}$ . By Lemma 4.4 (b), we have  $g((0, t_0)), g((0, t_0 + 1)), g((0, t_0 + 2)), g((0, t_0 + 3)) \leq 1$ . Since  $N^-((0, t_0 + 1)) = \{(0, t_0)\}$ ,  $N^-((0, t_0 + 2)) = \{(0, t_0 + 1)\}$  and  $N^-((0, t_0 + 3)) = \{(0, t_0 + 2)\}$ , it holds that  $g((0, t_0 + 1)) = g((0, t_0 + 2)) = g((0, t_0 + 3)) = 1$ . Then by Lemma 4.4 (b), we have the following two cases.

**Case 1.**  $g((0, t_0 + 1)) = g((1, t_0 + 1)) = 1$  and  $g((2, t_0 + 1)) = 0$ .

Recall that  $g((0, t_0 + 2)) = 1$  and  $a_{t_0+2} = 2$ . Then either  $g((1, t_0 + 2)) = 0$  and  $g((2, t_0 + 2)) = 1$ , or  $g((1, t_0 + 2)) = 1$  and  $g((2, t_0 + 2)) = 0$ . In the latter case, we have  $g((1, t_0 + 2)) + g((2, t_0 + 1)) = 1$ , which contradicts  $g((2, t_0 + 2)) = 0$  as  $N^-((2, t_0 + 2)) = \{(1, t_0 + 2), (2, t_0 + 1)\}$ . Hence  $g((1, t_0 + 2)) = 0$  and  $g((2, t_0 + 2)) = 1$ . Then by  $N^-((1, t_0 + 3)) = \{(1, t_0 + 2), (0, t_0 + 3)\}$  and  $g((1, t_0 + 2)) + g((0, t_0 + 3)) = 1$ , we obtain  $g((1, t_0 + 3)) \geq 1$ . Therefore  $g((1, t_0 + 3)) = 1$  and  $g((2, t_0 + 3)) = 0$  by  $a_{t_0+3} = 2$ . Now we see that the subdigraph  $D[V_1 \cup V_2]$  contains an isolated vertex  $(2, t_0 + 2)$ , a contradiction.

**Case 2.**  $g((0, t_0 + 1)) = g((2, t_0 + 1)) = 1$  and  $g((1, t_0 + 1)) = 0$ .

Since  $N^-((1, t_0 + 2)) = \{(1, t_0 + 1), (0, t_0 + 2)\}$  and  $g((1, t_0 + 1)) + g((0, t_0 + 2)) = 1$ , it holds that  $g((1, t_0 + 2)) \geq 1$ . Note that  $g((0, t_0 + 2)) = 1$  and  $a_{t_0+2} = 2$ . This yields to  $g((1, t_0 + 2)) = 1$  and  $g((2, t_0 + 2)) = 0$ . Since the subdigraph  $D[V_1 \cup V_2]$  contains no isolated vertices, we have  $g((2, t_0)) \geq 1$ . By Lemma 4.4 (b) and  $a_{t_0} = 2$ ,  $g((2, t_0)) = 1$ . Then either  $g((1, t_0)) = 1$  and  $g((0, t_0)) = 0$ , or  $g((1, t_0)) = 0$  and  $g((0, t_0)) = 1$ . Since  $N^-((1, t_0 + 1)) = \{(1, t_0), (0, t_0 + 1)\}$  and  $g((1, t_0 + 1)) = 0$ , we have  $g((1, t_0)) = 1$  and  $g((0, t_0)) = 0$ . Consequently,  $g((0, t_0 - 1)) = 2$ . That  $g((1, t_0 - 1)) = 0$  follows from Lemma 4.3. Now define the function  $h$  by  $h((0, t_0 - 1)) = h((1, t_0 - 1)) = h((0, t_0)) = 1$ ,  $h((1, t_0)) = 0$  and  $h((s, t)) = g((s, t))$  otherwise. Then  $h$  is a TIDF on  $P_3 \square P_n$  and  $\omega(h) = \omega(g)$ . Hence  $h$  is a  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ -function, which contradicts the choice of  $g$ .

Using the preceding arguments, we conclude that for any  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-4\}$ ,  $a_t + a_{t+1} + a_{t+2} + a_{t+3} \geq 9$ . ■

**Theorem 4.2** *For  $n \geq 2$ ,*

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) = \begin{cases} \frac{9n}{4} + 1, & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}, \\ \lceil \frac{9n}{4} \rceil, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Proof.** Let  $D = P_3 \square P_n$ ,  $g = (V_0, V_1, V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_{tI}(D)$ -function such that  $|V_0|$  is minimum, and let  $a_t = \sum_{s=0}^2 g((s, t))$  for any  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$ . If  $n = 2$ , then by Theorem 4.1,

$\gamma_{tI}(D) = 5 = \lceil \frac{9n}{4} \rceil$ . If  $n = 3$ , then by Lemma 4.4 (a) and (c), we have  $\gamma_{tI}(D) \geq 7$ . Now define the function  $h$  by  $h((1, 1)) = h((2, 2)) = 0$  and  $h((s, t)) = 1$  otherwise. Then  $h$  is a TIDF on  $D$  and  $\gamma_{tI}(D) \leq \omega(h) = 7$ . Thus, for  $n = 3$ ,  $\gamma_{tI}(D) = 7 = \lceil \frac{9n}{4} \rceil$ .

Now assume that  $n \geq 4$ . By Lemma 4.5, we see that  $a_t + a_{t+1} + a_{t+2} + a_{t+3} \geq 9$  for any  $t \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-4\}$ . Therefore  $a_0 = 3$  by Lemma 4.4 (a). Now we consider the following four cases.

If  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ , then

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) = \omega(g) = \sum_{k=0}^{(n-4)/4} (a_{4k} + a_{4k+1} + a_{4k+2} + a_{4k+3}) \geq \frac{9n}{4}. \quad (*)$$

If  $n \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) = \omega(g) &= a_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{(n-1)/4} (a_{4k-3} + a_{4k-2} + a_{4k-1} + a_{4k}) \\ &\geq 3 + \frac{9(n-1)}{4} = \left\lceil \frac{9n}{4} \right\rceil. \end{aligned}$$

If  $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) = \omega(g) &= a_0 + a_1 + \sum_{k=1}^{(n-2)/4} (a_{4k-2} + a_{4k-1} + a_{4k} + a_{4k+1}) \\ &\geq 5 + \frac{9(n-2)}{4} = \left\lceil \frac{9n}{4} \right\rceil. \end{aligned}$$

If  $n \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) = \omega(g) &= a_0 + a_1 + a_2 + \sum_{k=1}^{(n-3)/4} (a_{4k-1} + a_{4k} + a_{4k+1} + a_{4k+2}) \\ &\geq 7 + \frac{9(n-3)}{4} = \left\lceil \frac{9n}{4} \right\rceil. \end{aligned}$$

Actually, if  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ , then  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) \geq \frac{9n}{4} + 1$ . On the contrary, suppose that  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) = \frac{9n}{4}$ . This implies equality throughout the inequality chain (\*), indicating that  $a_{4k} + a_{4k+1} + a_{4k+2} + a_{4k+3} = 9$  for any  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, (n-4)/4\}$ . In particular,  $a_0 + a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = 9$ . By Lemma 4.4, we have  $a_0 = 3, a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = 2$  and  $g((0, 0)) = 1$ . Since  $N^-((0, 1)) = \{(0, 0)\}$ ,  $N^-((0, 2)) = \{(0, 1)\}$  and  $N^-((0, 3)) = \{(0, 2)\}$ , it holds that  $g((0, 1)), g((0, 2)), g((0, 3)) \geq 1$ . This follows from Lemma 4.4 (b) that  $g((0, 1)) = g((0, 2)) = g((0, 3)) = 1$ . By Lemma 4.4 (a), we have the following two cases.

**Case 1.**  $g((1, 0)) = 2$  and  $g((2, 0)) = 0$ .

By Lemma 4.3,  $g((1, 1)) = 0$ . That  $g((2, 1)) = 1$  follows from Lemma 4.4 (b). Since  $N^-((1, 2)) = \{(1, 1), (0, 2)\}$  and  $g((1, 1)) + g((0, 2)) = 1$ , it holds that  $g((1, 2)) \geq 1$ . By  $a_2 = 2$ , we see that  $g((1, 2)) = 1$  and  $g((2, 2)) = 0$ . Then we deduce that the subdigraph  $D[V_1 \cup V_2]$  contains an isolated vertex  $(2, 1)$ , a contradiction.

**Case 2.**  $g((1, 0)) = 1$  and  $g((2, 0)) = 1$ .

Since  $a_1 = 2$  and  $g((0, 1)) = 1$ , it follows that either  $g((1, 1)) = 1$  and  $g((2, 1)) = 0$  or  $g((1, 1)) = 0$  and  $g((2, 1)) = 1$ . If  $g((1, 1)) = 1$  and  $g((2, 1)) = 0$ , then the fact that  $a_2 = 2$  and  $g((0, 2)) = 1$  lead to either  $g((1, 2)) = 1$  and  $g((2, 2)) = 0$  or  $g((1, 2)) = 0$  and  $g((2, 2)) = 1$ . And it is clear that  $g((1, 2)) = 0$  and  $g((2, 2)) = 1$ . Then by  $N^-((1, 3)) = \{(1, 2), (0, 3)\}$  and  $g((1, 2)) + g((0, 3)) = 1$ ,  $g((1, 3)) \geq 1$ . In addition, we note that  $a_3 = 2$  and  $g((0, 3)) = 1$ . This yields to  $g((1, 3)) = 1$  and  $g((2, 3)) = 0$ . Now we see that the subdigraph  $D[V_1 \cup V_2]$  contains an isolated vertex  $(2, 2)$ , a contradiction. So assume that  $g((1, 1)) = 0$  and  $g((2, 1)) = 1$ .

As  $N^-((1, 2)) = \{(1, 1), (0, 2)\}$  and  $g((1, 1)) + g((0, 2)) = 1$  we have  $g((1, 2)) \geq 1$ . Recall that  $a_2 = 2$  and  $g((0, 2)) = 1$ . This leads to  $g((1, 2)) = 1$  and  $g((2, 2)) = 0$ . By  $a_3 = 2$ ,  $g((0, 3)) = 1$  and  $N^-((2, 3)) = \{(1, 3), (2, 2)\}$ , it is not difficult to verify that  $g((1, 3)) = 0$  and  $g((2, 3)) = 1$ .

Thus, we conclude that  $g((0, 0)) = g((0, 1)) = g((0, 2)) = g((0, 3)) = g((1, 0)) = g((2, 0)) = g((2, 1)) = g((1, 2)) = g((2, 3)) = 1$  and  $g((1, 1)) = g((2, 2)) = g((1, 3)) = 0$ . By repeating the previous process, we deduce that

$$g((s, t)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 4c + 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n}{4} - 1, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 2 \text{ and } t = 4c + 2 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n}{4} - 1, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 4c + 3 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n}{4} - 1, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

In particular,  $g((1, n-1)) = g((2, n-2)) = 0$  and  $g((2, n-1)) = 1$ . Now the subdigraph  $D[V_1 \cup V_2]$  contains an isolated vertex  $(2, n-1)$ , a contradiction. Therefore, if  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ , then we see that  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) \geq \frac{9n}{4} + 1$ .

To show the upper bound of  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$ , we consider a TIDF  $h$  on  $P_3 \square P_n$  as follows.

If  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ , then define the function  $h$  by

$$h((s, t)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 4c + 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n}{4} - 1, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 2 \text{ and } t = 4c + 2 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n}{4} - 1, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 4c + 3 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n}{4} - 2, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) \leq \omega(h) = 3n - \frac{n}{4} - \frac{n}{4} - \left(\frac{n}{4} - 1\right) = \frac{9n}{4} + 1.$$

If  $n \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , then define the function  $h$  by

$$h((s, t)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 4c + 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n-1}{4} - 1, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 2 \text{ and } t = 4c + 2 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n-1}{4} - 1, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 4c + 3 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n-1}{4} - 1, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and consequently

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) \leq \omega(h) = 3n - \frac{n-1}{4} - \frac{n-1}{4} - \frac{n-1}{4} = \frac{9n+3}{4} = \left\lceil \frac{9n}{4} \right\rceil.$$

If  $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ , then define the function  $h$  by

$$h((s, t)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 4c + 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n-2}{4} - 1, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 2 \text{ and } t = 4c + 2 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n-2}{4} - 1, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 4c + 3 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n-2}{4} - 1, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 2 \text{ and } t = n - 1, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which implies

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) \leq \omega(h) = 3n - \frac{n-2}{4} - \frac{n-2}{4} - \frac{n-2}{4} - 1 = \frac{9n+2}{4} = \left\lceil \frac{9n}{4} \right\rceil.$$

If  $n \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , then define the function  $h$  by

$$h((s, t)) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 4c + 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n-3}{4}, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 2 \text{ and } t = 4c + 2 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n-3}{4}, \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } s = 1 \text{ and } t = 4c + 3 \text{ for } 0 \leq c \leq \frac{n-3}{4} - 1, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

this yields the following immediately

$$\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n) \leq \omega(h) = 3n - \left(\frac{n-3}{4} + 1\right) - \left(\frac{n-3}{4} + 1\right) - \frac{n-3}{4} = \frac{9n+1}{4} = \left\lceil \frac{9n}{4} \right\rceil.$$

We have completed the proof of Theorem 4.2. ■

## 5 Concluding remarks

In Section 4, we give  $\gamma_{tI}(P_2 \square P_n)$  and  $\gamma_{tI}(P_3 \square P_n)$ , marking the initial exploration. Our next goal is to determine the total Italian domination number of  $P_4 \square P_n$ , and more generally, to give the total Italian domination number of  $P_k \square P_n$ , for any integers  $k \geq 4$  and  $n \geq 2$ .

## References

- [1] H.A. Ahangar, M. Chellali, S.M. Sheikholeslami, J.C. Valenzuela-Tripodoro, Total Roman  $\{2\}$ -dominating functions in graphs, *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory* 42 (2022) 937–958.
- [2] H.A. Ahangar, M.A. Henning, V. Samodivkin, I.G. Yero, Total Roman domination in graphs, *Appl. Anal. Discrete Math.* 10 (2016) 501–517.
- [3] J. Amjadi, S. Nazari-Moghaddam, S.M. Sheikholeslami, L. Volkmann, Total Roman domination number of trees, *Australas. J. Combin.* 69 (2017) 271–285.
- [4] J. Amjadi, S.M. Sheikholeslami, M. Soroudi, Nordhaus-Gaddum bounds for total Roman domination, *J. Comb. Optim.* 35 (2018) 126–133.
- [5] J. Bang-Jensen, G. Gutin, *Digraphs: Theory, Algorithms and Applications*, 2nd edn Springer, London 2009.
- [6] J.A. Bondy, U.S.R. Murty, *Graph Theory* Springer, New York 2008.
- [7] M. Chellali, T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi, A. MacRae, Roman  $\{2\}$ -domination, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 204 (2016) 22–28.
- [8] M. Chellali, N. Jafari Rad, S.M. Sheikholeslami, L. Volkmann, A survey on Roman domination parameters in directed graphs, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* 115 (2020) 141–171.
- [9] E.J. Cockayne, P.A. Dreyer, S.M. Hedetniemi, S.T. Hedetniemi, Roman domination in graphs, *Discrete Math.* 278 (2004) 11–22.
- [10] E.W. Chambers, B. Kinnersley, N. Prince, D.B. West, Extremal problems for Roman domination, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 23 (2009) 1575–1586.
- [11] H. Chen, C. Lu, A note on Roman 2-domination problem in graphs, arXiv:1804.09338.
- [12] X. Fu, Y. Yang, B. Jiang, Roman domination in regular graphs, *Discrete Math.* 309 (2009) 1528–1537.
- [13] Y. Guo, L. Volkmann, Total Italian domination in digraphs, submitted.
- [14] G. Hao, Z. Xi, X. Chen, A note on Roman domination of digraphs, *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory* 39 (2019) 13–21.
- [15] G. Hao, X.W. Zhuang, K. Hu, Total Roman domination in digraphs, *Quaest. Math.* 44 (2021) 351–368.

- [16] D.A. Mojdeh, B. Samadi, Total 2-domination number in digraphs and its dual parameter, *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory* 44 (2023) 1–20.
- [17] L. Ouldrabah, M. Blidia, A. Bouchou, Extremal digraphs for an upper bound on the Roman domination number, *J. Comb. Optim.* 38 (2019) 667–679.
- [18] L. Volkmann, Italian domination in digraphs, *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* 111 (2019) 269–278.