

A LOWER BOUND ON THE ZERO FORCING NUMBER

RANDY DAVILA¹ AND THOMAS KALINOWSKI^{2,3} AND SUDEEP STEPHEN^{3,4}

ABSTRACT. In this note, we study a dynamic vertex coloring for a graph G . In particular, one starts with a certain set of vertices black, and all other vertices white. Then, at each time step, a black vertex with exactly one white neighbor forces its white neighbor to become black. The initial set of black vertices is called a *zero forcing set* if by iterating this process, all of the vertices in G become black. The *zero forcing number* of G is the minimum cardinality of a zero forcing set in G , and is denoted by $Z(G)$. Davila and Kenter have conjectured in 2015 that $Z(G) \geq (g-3)(\delta-2) + \delta$ where g and δ denote the girth and the minimum degree of G , respectively. This conjecture has been proven for graphs with girth $g \leq 10$. In this note, we present a proof for $g \geq 5$, $\delta \geq 2$, thereby settling the conjecture.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a two-coloring of the vertex set of a simple graph $G = (V, E)$ consider the following color-change rule: a white vertex u is converted to black if it is the only white neighbor of some black vertex v . We call such a black vertex v a *forcing vertex* and say v forces u . Given a two-coloring of G , the *derived set* is the set of black vertices obtained by applying the color-change rule until no more changes are possible. A *zero forcing set* for G is a subset of vertices $S \subseteq V$ such that if initially the vertices in S are colored black and the remaining vertices are colored white, then the derived set is the complete vertex set V . The minimum cardinality of a zero forcing set for the graph G is called the *zero forcing number* of G , denoted by $Z(G)$. This concept was introduced by the AIM Minimum Rank Special Graphs Work Group [3] as a tool to bound the minimum rank of matrices associated with the graph G . Since its introduction the zero-forcing number has been studied as an interesting graph invariant with various applications [4, 5, 9, 11, 12, 14]. Moreover, it has been established that the zero forcing problem is *NP*-complete [1], which motivates the search for easily computable bounds for $Z(G)$. The following conjecture was made by Davila and Kenter [7].

Conjecture 1. *If G is a graph with girth $g \geq 3$ and minimum degree $\delta \geq 2$, then $Z(G) \geq \delta + (\delta - 2)(g - 3)$.*

Genter et al. [11], Genter and Rautenbach [12] and Davila and Henning [6] have shown that the statement is true for $g \leq 10$. In this note we provide a complete proof for $g \geq 5$.

Theorem 1. *Let G be a graph with girth $g \geq 5$ and minimum degree $\delta \geq 2$. Then $Z(G) \geq \delta + (\delta - 2)(g - 3)$.*

Remark 1. A proof of the slightly weaker bound $Z(G) \geq 2 + (\delta - 2)(g - 3)$ has recently been found by Fürst and Rautenbach [10]. For large values of g and δ , a stronger bound has been proved by Kalinowski et al. [13].

For a positive integer n , we use $[n]$ to denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, and in addition we set $[0] = \emptyset$. We restrict ourselves to undirected finite simple graphs, and use the following notation, referring the reader to any graph theory textbook such as [8] for more details. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. Two vertices $v, w \in V$ are called *neighbors*, or *adjacent* vertices, whenever $\{v, w\} \in E$. The *neighborhood* of $v \in V$ is the set of neighbors of v , denoted by $N(v) = N_G(v)$. The *degree* of $v \in V$ is the cardinality of its neighborhood, and is denoted by $\deg_G(v) = |N(v)|$. The minimum vertex degree in G is denoted by $\delta(G)$. A cycle of length ℓ is denoted by C_ℓ . The girth of G , denoted $g = g(G)$, is the length of a shortest cycle in G .

¹DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON–DOWNTOWN, HOUSTON, TX 77002, USA

²SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF NEW ENGLAND, ARMIDALE, 2351 NSW, AUSTRALIA

³SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF NEWCASTLE, 2308 NSW, AUSTRALIA

⁴SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH, BHUBANESWAR, INDIA

E-mail addresses: davilar@uhd.edu, tkalinow@une.edu.au, sudeep.stephen@niser.ac.in.

Date: 3rd April 2018.

Our strategy for proving Theorem 1 is the same that was used in [6]. We assume that G has a zero forcing set S of size $|S| < \delta + (\delta - 2)(g - 3)$, use the minimum degree condition to bound the number of edges in the subgraph of G induced by the first $g - 2$ forcing vertices together with the union of their neighborhoods, and finally show that this implies the existence of a short cycle, contradicting the assumption on the girth of G . For this argument we need bounds on the *extremal number* $\text{ex}(n; \{C_3, C_4, \dots, C_\ell\})$, which is defined as the maximum number of edges in a simple graph with n vertices and girth at least $\ell + 1$. For $\ell = 3$ this number is given by Mantel's theorem [15] from 1907, which is a special case of Turán's theorem [16] (Proofs for this classic result which started the area of extremal graph theory can be found in most graph theory textbooks, for instance [8, Chapter 7]).

Theorem 2 (Mantel [15]). *For every positive integer n , $\text{ex}(n; \{C_3\}) = \lfloor n^2/4 \rfloor$.*

For $\ell \geq 4$ we will use the following more recent result by Abajo and Diáñez [2].

Theorem 3 (Theorem 1 in [2]). *Let $\ell \geq 4$ and $\ell + 1 \leq n \leq 2\ell$ be integers. Then*

$$\text{ex}(n; \{C_3, C_4, \dots, C_\ell\}) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } \ell + 1 \leq n \leq \lfloor 3\ell/2 \rfloor, \\ n + 1 & \text{if } \lfloor 3\ell/2 \rfloor + 1 \leq n \leq 2\ell - 1, \\ n + 2 & \text{if } n = 2\ell. \end{cases}$$

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

In order to prove Theorem 1, suppose $G = (V, E)$ is a graph with girth $g \geq 5$, minimum degree $\delta \geq 2$, and that $S \subseteq V$ is a zero forcing set with $|S| \leq (\delta - 2)(g - 3) + \delta - 1$. Let x_1, \dots, x_t be a chronological list of forcing vertices resulting in all of V becoming black starting with S as the initial set of black vertices, and let y_i be the vertex that is forced by x_i . Let C be a cycle of length g in G . Every vertex in C has at least $\delta - 2$ neighbors outside C , and from $g \geq 5$ it follows that no two vertices u and v in C have a common neighbor outside C , because otherwise the shorter path between u and v on C , together with the edges joining u and v to their common neighbor outside C give a cycle of length at most $\lfloor g/2 \rfloor + 2 < g$. As a consequence, $|V| \geq g + g(\delta - 2) = g(\delta - 1)$, and therefore

$$t = |V \setminus S| = |V| - |S| \geq g(\delta - 1) - (\delta - 2)(g - 3) - \delta + 1 = g + 2\delta - 5 \geq g - 1.$$

In particular $t \geq g - 2$, and this allows us to define the set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{g-2}\}$. Modifying the notation from [6], we define the sets $S_1 = S \cap N(x_1)$ and

$$S_i = (S \cap N(x_i)) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} N(x_j) = (S \cap N(x_i)) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} S_j$$

for $i = 2, 3, \dots, g - 2$. Equivalently, S_i is the set of initially black neighbors of x_i which are not adjacent to any x_j for $j < i$. In particular, the sets S_i are pairwise disjoint. We also define the sets

$$S_X^* = \bigcup_{i=1}^{g-2} S_i = S \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^{g-2} N(x_i), \quad S_X = (S \cap X) \setminus S_X^*.$$

In words, S_X^* is the set of vertices $v \in S$ which are adjacent to at least one of the vertices in X , and S_X is the set of vertices in X that are initially black and not adjacent to any vertex in X . In particular, the sets S_X^* and S_X are disjoint subsets of S , hence $|S| \geq |S_X^*| + |S_X|$.

We define two auxiliary graphs $H_1 = (X, E_1)$ and $H_2 = (X, E_2)$, both on the vertex set X . The graph H_1 is the subgraph of G induced by X , also denoted by $G[X]$, and two vertices $x_j, x_i \in X$ with $j < i$ are adjacent in H_2 if and only if (1) they have a common neighbor u in G , and (2) this common neighbor is not adjacent (in G) to any x_k with $k < j$. More formally, the edge sets of H_1 and H_2 are given by

$$E_1 = \{ \{x_j, x_i\} : 1 \leq j < i \leq g - 2, \{x_j, x_i\} \in E \}, \\ E_2 = \{ \{x_j, x_i\} : 1 \leq j < i \leq g - 2, N(x_i) \cap (S_j \cup \{y_j\}) \neq \emptyset \}.$$

The graph H_1 is a forest, because it is a subgraph with less than g vertices of the graph G which has girth g . We remark that S_X is precisely the set of isolated vertices in the graph H_1 : If x_i is not isolated in H_1 then

it is adjacent to some x_j , and therefore in S_X^* , and if x_i is isolated in H_1 then it cannot be forced by any of the vertices x_j with $j < i$, and therefore it must have been black in the beginning which gives $x_i \in S_X$. The assumption $g \geq 5$ implies that two vertices which are adjacent in G do not have a common neighbor in G , and two vertices which are non-adjacent in G have at most one common neighbor in G . In particular, $E_1 \cap E_2 = \emptyset$ and $|N(x_j) \cap N(x_i)| = 1$ for every $\{x_j, x_i\} \in E_2$.

Lemma 1. *For every $i \in [g-2]$, $|S_i| = \deg_G(x_i) - 1 - |\{j \in [i-1] : \{x_j, x_i\} \in E_2\}|$.*

Proof. The vertex x_1 forces in the first step. So all but one of its neighbors are initially black, and this implies $|S_1| = \deg_G(x_1) - 1$. For $i \geq 2$, since x_i forces in step i , all but one of its neighbours are black after the first $i-1$ forcing steps: $|N(x_i) \cap (S \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}\})| = \deg_G(x_i) - 1$. The sets $S_j \cup \{y_j\}$ for $j \in [i-1]$ are pairwise disjoint, and we obtain a partition

$$N(x_i) \cap (S \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}\}) = S_i \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} (N(x_i) \cap (S_j \cup \{y_j\})).$$

In particular, for every vertex $v \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} (N(x_i) \cap (S_j \cup \{y_j\}))$, there is a unique index $j \in [i-1]$ with $v \in S_j \cup \{y_j\}$, and then $\{x_j, x_i\} \in E_2$ by definition of E_2 . Conversely, for every $j \in [i-1]$ with $\{x_j, x_i\} \in E_2$, there is a corresponding vertex $v \in N(x_i) \cap (S_j \cup \{y_j\})$, and this establishes a bijection between the sets $\bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} (N(x_i) \cap (S_j \cup \{y_j\}))$ and $\{j \in [i-1] : \{x_j, x_i\} \in E_2\}$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} |S_i| &= |N(x_i) \cap (S \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}\})| - \left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} (N(x_i) \cap (S_j \cup \{y_j\})) \right| \\ &= \deg_G(x_i) - 1 - |\{j \in [i-1] : \{x_j, x_i\} \in E_2\}|. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2. $|S_X^*| \geq (g-2)(\delta-1) - |E_2|$.

Proof. This is obtained by summing the equalities from Lemma 1 over $i \in [g-2]$, taking into account that the sets S_i are pairwise disjoint, and that $\deg_G(x_i) \geq \delta$ for all i :

$$\begin{aligned} |S_X^*| &= |S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \dots \cup S_{g-2}| = \sum_{i=1}^{g-2} |S_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{g-2} (\deg_G(x_i) - 1 - |\{j \in [i-1] : \{x_j, x_i\} \in E_2\}|) \\ &\geq (g-2)(\delta-1) - \sum_{i=1}^{g-2} |\{j \in [i-1] : \{x_j, x_i\} \in E_2\}| = (g-2)(\delta-1) - |E_2|. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Combining Lemma 2 with our assumption on $|S|$ we obtain

$$(\delta-2)(g-3) + \delta - 1 \geq |S| \geq |S_X^*| + |S_X| \geq (g-2)(\delta-1) - |E_2| + |S_X|,$$

and after rearranging,

$$|E_2| \geq (g-2)(\delta-1) + |S_X| - (\delta-2)(g-3) - \delta + 1 = g-3 + |S_X|. \quad (1)$$

Let X_1, \dots, X_k be the vertex sets of the connected components of H_1 such that $|X_1| \geq |X_2| \geq \dots \geq |X_k|$, and put $l = k - |S_X|$. Equivalently, $l = 0$ if $E_1 = \emptyset$ and $l = \max\{i : |X_i| \geq 2\}$ if $E_1 \neq \emptyset$. Let $E_s(X_p)$ for $s \in \{1, 2\}$ and $p \in [l]$ be the set of edges $\{x_j, x_i\} \in E_s$ with both vertices in X_p , and let $E_2(X_p, X_q)$ for $1 \leq p < q \leq k$ be the set of edges $\{x_j, x_i\} \in E_2$ with one vertex in X_p and the other in X_q . This provides a partition $E_2 = E_2' \cup E_2''$ where

$$E_2' = \bigcup_{1 \leq p \leq l} E_2(X_p), \quad E_2'' = \bigcup_{1 \leq p < q \leq k} E_2(X_p, X_q).$$

Lemma 3. *Let $u \in V$, and supposed that $N = N_G(u) \cap X$ is non-empty. Let $j = \min\{i : x_i \in N\}$. Then the subgraph of H_2 induced by N is a star with center x_j , that is,*

$$\{\{v, w\} \in E_2 : v, w \in N\} = \{\{x_j, v\} : v \in N \setminus \{x_j\}\}.$$

Proof. Vertex x_j is forcing in step j , and its neighbor u is not adjacent (in G) to any vertex x_i with $i < j$. This implies that either u was initially black, that is, $u \in S$, or u is the vertex forced by x_j , that is, $u = y_j$. In any case $u \in S_j \cap \{y_j\}$. For every $v \in N \setminus \{x_j\}$, we have $v = x_i$ for some $i > j$, and then $u \in N(x_i) \cap (S_j \cap \{y_j\})$ implies $\{x_j, x_i\} \in E_2$. Now fix two vertices $v, w \in N \setminus \{x_j\}$, say $v = x_i$ and $w = x_{i'}$ with $j < i < i'$. Since the unique common neighbor (in G) of v and w is in $S_j \cup \{y_j\}$ which is disjoint from $S_i \cup \{y_i\}$, we conclude $\{v, w\} \notin E_2$. \square

Lemma 4. *For every $p \in [l]$, $|E_2(X_p)| = |X_p| - 2$.*

Proof. Let $\{v, w\} \in E_2(X_p)$, and let u be the unique common neighbor (in G) of v and w . Then $u \in X_p$, because otherwise the path between v and w in the tree $(X_p, E_1(X_p))$ together with the edges $\{u, v\}$ and $\{u, w\}$ forms a cycle in G of length at most $|X_p| + 1 \leq g - 1$. Fix some $u \in X_p$ and consider the set $N = N_G(u) \cap X \subseteq X_p$. Let j be the smallest index with $x_j \in N$. By Lemma 3,

$$|\{\{v, w\} \in E_2 : v, w \in N\}| = |\{\{x_j, v\} : v \in N \setminus \{x_j\}\}| = \deg_{H_1}(u) - 1.$$

Since for every $\{v, w\} \in E_2(X_p)$ there is a unique $u \in X_p$ with $v, w \in N_G(u)$, we conclude that

$$|E_2(X_p)| = \sum_{u \in X_p} (\deg_{H_1}(u) - 1) = 2|E_1(X_p)| - |X_p| = 2(|X_p| - 1) - |X_p| = |X_p| - 2. \quad \square$$

As a consequence of Lemma 4,

$$|E'_2| = \sum_{p=1}^l |E_2(X_p)| = \sum_{p=1}^l (|X_p| - 2) = g - 2 - |S_X| - 2l.$$

Combining this with (1),

$$|E''_2| = |E_2| - |E'_2| \geq (g - 3 + |S_X|) - (g - 2 - |S_X| - 2l) = 2(|S_X| + l) - 1 = 2k - 1. \quad (2)$$

Next we consider the graph $H_3 = (X, E_1 \cup E''_2)$, that is, H_3 is obtained from H_1 by adding the edges of H_2 which connect distinct components of H_1 . The next lemma shows that short cycles in H_3 can be lifted to short cycles in G .

Lemma 5. *Let C be a cycle of length λ in H_3 which contains s edges from E''_2 . Then there exists a cycle C' of length at most $\lambda + s$ in G .*

Proof. Fix any $u \in V$ with $N = N_G(u) \cap X \neq \emptyset$, and let j be the smallest index with $x_j \in N$. By Lemma 3,

$$\{\{v, w\} \in E_2 : v, w \in N\} = \{\{x_j, v\} : v \in N \setminus \{x_j\}\}.$$

Let's call this set $E_2(u)$. It follows that for every vertex u , either $E_2(u) \cap C = \emptyset$, or $|E_2(u) \cap C| = 1$, or $E_2(u) \cap C$ consists of two adjacent edges $\{v, v'\}$ and $\{v', v''\}$. We obtain the required cycle C' by starting with C and doing the following replacements:

- For every u with $|E_2(u) \cap C| = 1$, say $E_2(u) \cap C = \{\{v, w\}\}$, replace $\{v, w\}$ by $\{u, v\}$ and $\{u, w\}$.
- For every u with $|E_2(u) \cap C| = 2$, say $E_2(u) \cap C = \{\{v, v'\}, \{v', v''\}\}$, replace $\{v, v'\}$ and $\{v', v''\}$ by $\{u, v\}$ and $\{u, v''\}$. \square

Lemma 6. *Every cycle in the graph H_3 has at least $\lceil (k+2)/2 \rceil$ edges in E''_2 .*

Proof. Since H_1 is a forest with $g - 2$ vertices and k connected components, we have $|E_1| = g - 2 - k$. Let C be a cycle in H_3 which has s edges in E''_2 , and let λ be the length of C . Then $\lambda \leq s + |E_1| = s + (g - 2 - k)$, and by Lemma 5, G contains a cycle of length at most $2s + (g - 2 - k)$. Since G has girth g , this implies $2s + (g - 2 - k) \geq g$, hence $2s \geq k + 2$. \square

Lemma 7. *For every pair (p, q) with $1 \leq p < q \leq k$, $|E''_2(X_p, X_q)| \leq 1$.*

Proof. Suppose $|E''_2(X_p, X_q)| \geq 2$. Then H_3 contains a cycle with 2 edges from E''_2 , and $2 \geq (k+2)/2$ by Lemma 6, which implies $k \leq 2$, hence $k = 2$. Then (2) implies $|E''(X_1, X_2)| = |E''| \geq 3$, and consequently, there is a cycle C in H_3 which has $s = 2$ edges in E''_2 and does not use all the edges in $|E_1|$, so its length is

$$\lambda \leq 2 + |E_1| - 1 = |E_1| + 1 = (g - 2 - 2) + 1 = g - 3.$$

Then Lemma 5 implies that G contains a cycle of length at most $\lambda + 2 \leq g - 1$ edges, which contradicts the assumption on the girth of G . \square

Lemma 8. $k \in \{5, 6\}$.

Proof. For this proof, we introduce another graph $H_4 = ([k], E_4)$ with $\{i, j\} \in E_4$ if and only if E_2'' contains an edge between X_i and X_j . By Lemma 7 there is a one-to-one correspondence between E_2'' and E_4 . It follows that $\binom{k}{2} \geq |E_4| = |E_2''| \geq 2k - 1$, hence $k \geq 5$. Suppose $k \geq 7$. Using (2) and Theorem 3 for $\ell = \lfloor (k+1)/2 \rfloor$, we have $|E_4| = |E_2''| \geq 2k - 1 > k + 2 \geq \text{ex}(k, \{C_3, \dots, C_{\lfloor (k+1)/2} \})$. As a consequence, H_4 contains a cycle of length $s \leq \lfloor (k+1)/2 \rfloor < \lceil (k+2)/2 \rceil$, and this corresponds to a cycle in H_3 which contains at most s edges from E_2'' , which is impossible by Lemma 6. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Let $H_4 = ([k], E_4)$ be the graph introduced in the proof of Lemma 8, and note that $k \in \{5, 6\}$ by Lemma 8. For both possible values for k , $|E_4| = |E_2''| \geq 2k - 1 > k^2/4$, and by Theorem 2 this implies that H_4 contains a triangle. As a consequence, H_3 contains a cycle with three edges from E_2'' . The length of this cycle is at most $3 + |E_1| = 3 + (g - 2 - k)$, and by Lemma 5 G contains a cycle of length at most $6 + (g - 2 - k) \leq g - 1$, which is the required contradiction. \square

3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Let $f(g, \delta)$ denote the minimum zero forcing number over all graphs of girth g and minimum degree δ . Theorem 1 provides a lower bound for f , and from [7] we know that this bound is tight in the following cases:

- $f(g, 2) = 2$ for all $g \geq 3$ (the g -cycle),
- $f(3, \delta) = \delta$ for all $\delta \geq 1$ (the complete graph $K_{\delta+1}$),
- $f(4, \delta) = 2\delta - 2$ for all $\delta \geq 2$ (the complete bipartite graph $K_{\delta, \delta}$),
- $f(4, 3) = 4$ (the 3-cube),
- $f(5, 3) = 5$ (the Petersen graph),
- $f(6, 3) = 6$ (the Heawood graph).

Consequently, the smallest open cases are the following.

Question 1. We know $7 \leq f(7, 3) \leq 8$ and $8 \leq f(8, 3) \leq 10$. Can we close these gaps?

Question 2. We know $f(5, 4) \geq 8$. What is the best upper bound we can come up with?

In general the bound $f(g, \delta) \geq \delta + (g - 3)(\delta - 2)$ is not sharp. For instance, using essentially the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 1, one can prove $f(g, \delta) \geq \delta + (g - 3)(\delta - 2) + 1$ for $g \geq 14$, $\delta \geq 3$, and more generally, for large values of δ and g the exponential lower bound established in [13] is stronger than the bound from the present note. This motivates the following questions.

Question 3. What are upper bounds for $f(g, \delta)$?

Question 4. What can be said about the asymptotic behavior of $f(g, \delta)$?

REFERENCES

1. Ashkan Aazami, *Hardness results and approximation algorithms for some problems on graphs*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Waterloo, 2008, uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/handle/10012/4147.
2. Encarnación Abajo and Ana Rosa Diáñez, *Exact value of $\text{ex}(n; \{C_3, \dots, C_s\})$ for $n \leq \lfloor 25(s-1)/8 \rfloor$* , *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **185** (2015), 1–7.
3. AIM Minimum Rank – Special Graphs Work Group, *Zero forcing sets and the minimum rank of graphs*, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **428** (2008), no. 7, 1628–1648.
4. Francesco Barioli, Wayne Barrett, Shaun M. Fallat, H. Tracy Hall, Leslie Hogben, Bryan Shader, Pauline Van Den Driessche, and Hein Van Der Holst, *Zero forcing parameters and minimum rank problems*, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **433** (2010), no. 2, 401–411.
5. Francesco Barioli, Wayne Barrett, Shaun M. Fallat, H. Tracy Hall, Leslie Hogben, Bryan Shader, Pauline van den Driessche, and Hein Van Der Holst, *Parameters related to tree-width, zero forcing, and maximum nullity of a graph*, *Journal of Graph Theory* **72** (2013), no. 2, 146–177.

6. Randy Davila and Michael A. Henning, *The forcing number of graphs with given girth*, *Quaestiones Mathematicae* (2017), 1–16.
7. Randy Davila and Franklin Kenter, *Bounds for the zero forcing number of graphs with large girth*, *Theory and Applications of Graphs* **2** (2015), no. 2, Article 1.
8. Reinhard Diestel, *Graph theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 173, Springer, 2017.
9. Christina J. Edholm, Leslie Hogben, Joshua LaGrange, and Darren D. Row, *Vertex and edge spread of zero forcing number, maximum nullity, and minimum rank of a graph*, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **436** (2012), no. 12, 4352–4372.
10. Maximilian Fürst and Dieter Rautenbach, *A short proof for a lower bound on the zero forcing number*, arXiv:1705.08365, 2017.
11. Michael Gentner, Lucia D. Penso, Dieter Rautenbach, and Uéverton S. Souza, *Extremal values and bounds for the zero forcing number*, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **214** (2016), 196–200.
12. Michael Gentner and Dieter Rautenbach, *Some bounds on the zero forcing number of a graph*, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **236** (2018), 203–213.
13. Thomas Kalinowski, Nina Kamčev, and Benny Sudakov, *Zero forcing number of graphs*, arXiv:1705.10391, 2017.
14. Leihao Lu, Baoyindureng Wu, and Zixing Tang, *Proof of a conjecture on the zero forcing number of a graph*, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* **213** (2016), 233–237.
15. W. Mantel, *Problem 28 (solution by h. gouwentak, w. mantel, j. teixeira de mattes, f. schuh and w.a. wythoff)*, *Wiskundige Opgaven* **10** (1907), 60–61.
16. Paul Turán, *On an extremal problem in graph theory*, *Matematikai és Fizikai Lapok* **48** (1941), 436–452, (in Hungarian).