

Secure domination number of k -subdivision of graphs

Nima Ghanbari

May 2, 2023

Department of Informatics, University of Bergen, P.O. Box 7803, 5020 Bergen,
Norway

Nima.ghanbari@uib.no

Abstract

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph. A dominating set of G is a subset $D \subseteq V$ such that every vertex not in D is adjacent to at least one vertex in D . The cardinality of a smallest dominating set of G , denoted by $\gamma(G)$, is the domination number of G . A dominating set D is called a secure dominating set of G , if for every $u \in V - D$, there exists a vertex $v \in D$ such that $uv \in E$ and $(D - \{v\}) \cup \{u\}$ is a dominating set of G . The cardinality of a smallest secure dominating set of G , denoted by $\gamma_s(G)$, is the secure domination number of G . For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the k -subdivision of G is a simple graph $G^{\frac{1}{k}}$ which is constructed by replacing each edge of G with a path of length k . In this paper, we study the secure domination number of k -subdivision of G .

Keywords: domination number, secure dominating set, k -subdivision.

AMS Subj. Class.: 05C38, 05C69, 05C75, 05C76

1 Introduction

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph with n vertices. Throughout this paper we consider only simple graphs. A set $D \subseteq V(G)$ is a dominating set if every vertex in $V(G) - D$ is adjacent to at least one vertex in D . The domination number $\gamma(G)$ is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set in G . There are various domination numbers in the literature. For a detailed treatment of domination theory, the reader is referred to [11].

Cockayne et al. introduced the concept of secure domination number [9] in 2004. By their definition, a dominating set D is called a secure dominating set of G , if for every $u \in V - D$, there exists a vertex $v \in D$ such that $uv \in E$ and $(D - \{v\}) \cup \{u\}$ is a dominating set of G . The cardinality of a smallest secure dominating set of G , denoted by $\gamma_s(G)$, is the secure domination number of G .

Secure domination number widely is studied in literature. In 2005, Mynhardt et al. used a simple constructive characterisation of γ -excellent trees to obtain a constructive

characterisation of trees with equal domination and secure domination numbers, where a graph G is said to be γ -excellent if each vertex of G is contained in some minimum dominating set of G [17]. Later, Cockayne found a sharp upper bound as $\frac{\Delta n + \Delta - 1}{3\Delta - 1}$, for trees with n vertices and maximum degree $\Delta \geq 3$ [8]. In 2008, Burger et al. by using vertex cover, showed in [6] that if G is a connected graph of order n with minimum degree at least two that is not a 5-cycle, then $\gamma_s(G) \leq \frac{n}{2}$. Merouane et al. in [15], showed that the problem of computing the secure domination number is in the NP-complete class, even when restricted to bipartite graphs and split graphs. Araki et al. proposed a linear-time algorithm for finding the secure domination number of proper interval graphs in 2018 [3]. Recently, Mohamed Ali et al. obtained the secure domination number of zero-divisor graphs [16]. More results on secure domination number can be found in [4, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14].

A *path graph* is a graph whose vertices can be listed in the order v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n such that the edges are $v_i v_{i+1}$, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$. A *bipartite graph* is a set of graph vertices decomposed into two disjoint sets such that no two graph vertices within the same set are adjacent. A *complete bipartite graph* is a bipartite graph such that every pair of graph vertices in the two sets are adjacent. If there are n and m graph vertices in the two sets, the complete bipartite graph is denoted $K_{n,m}$. A *star* S_k is the complete bipartite graph $K_{1,k-1}$.

The *k-subdivision* of G , denoted by $G^{\frac{1}{k}}$, is constructed by replacing each edge $v_i v_j$ of G with a path of length k , say $P^{\{v_i, v_j\}}$. These k -paths are called *superedges*, any new vertex is an internal vertex, and is denoted by $x_l^{\{v_i, v_j\}}$ if it belongs to the superedge $P^{\{v_i, v_j\}}$, with distance l from the vertex v_i , where $l \in \{1, 2, \dots, k - 1\}$. Note that for $k = 1$, we have $G^{1/1} = G^1 = G$, and if G has n vertices and m edges, then the graph $G^{\frac{1}{k}}$ has $n + (k - 1)m$ vertices and km edges. Some results about subdivision of a graph can be found in [1, 2, 5].

In this paper, we study the secure domination number, and present some results on it where the graph is modified by k -subdivision.

2 Main Results

In this section, we study the secure domination number of k -subdivision of a graph. In the following, by n consecutive vertices, we mean that we have path of order n as a subgraph of the graph. First we state some known results.

Proposition 2.1 [9] *For any graph G , $\gamma(G) \leq \gamma_s(G)$.*

Theorem 2.2 [9] *Let P_n be a path graph with n vertices. Then $\gamma_s(P_n) = \lceil \frac{3n}{7} \rceil$.*

Now, we consider the 2-subdivision of a graph and present an upper bound for its secure domination number.




Figure 1: Subgraphs H_1 and H_2 in the proof of Theorem 2.3

Theorem 2.3 *Let G be a graph which is not a star. Then,*

$$\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \min\{|E(G)|, |V(G)|\}.$$

Proof. Suppose that G is a graph which is not star. Since G is not a star, then three consecutive vertices $u, v,$ and w are either in a cycle of order 3, or in a path of order 4. So we have H_1 and H_2 , as we see in Figure 1, as subgraphs of G . Now, we consider $G^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Then each subgraph of $G^{\frac{1}{2}}$ with six consecutive vertices, is either $H_1^{\frac{1}{2}}$ or $H_2^{\frac{1}{2}}$ (Figure 1). For both cases, one can easily check that, $\{1, 2, 3\}$ is a secure dominating set for subgraphs. Now, by applying our choices to all subgraphs with six consecutive vertices of the graph, we don't consider any vertices of G in our set which its size is $|E(G)|$. By our argument, this is a secure dominating set. On the other hand, if we consider $V(G)$ as our set for $G^{\frac{1}{2}}$, then it is a secure dominating set too. Therefore $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \min\{|E(G)|, |V(G)|\}$. \square

The condition that G is not a star in Theorem 2.3, is necessary. Since a pendant vertex or its neighbour should be in a dominating set, then the dominating set with smallest size for $G^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where G is a star, is the number of edges by choosing $x_1^{\{u,v\}}$ for all $uv \in E(G)$. Note that we have other options to have such a dominating set, but none of them are secure dominating sets. Therefore we have the following result for star graphs:

Proposition 2.4 *For star graphs $S_n = K_{1,n-1}$, $\gamma_s(S_n^{\frac{1}{2}}) = n$.*

In the following, we show that both of $|V(G)|$ and $|E(G)|$ can be sharp upper bounds for Theorem 2.3:

Remark 2.5 *The upper bound in the Theorem 2.3 is attainable. First consider the path graph P_4 . Then $\gamma_s(P_4^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq 3$ which is the number of edges of P_4 . Also $P_4^{\frac{1}{2}} = P_7$, and by Theorem 2.2, $\gamma_s(P_7) = 3 = |E(P_4)|$. Now, consider graph G , as shown in Figure*




Figure 2: Graph G and $G^{\frac{1}{2}}$

2 (wheel graph). Then $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_7\}$ is a secure dominating set for $G^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and there is no set with smaller size, since in each three consecutive vertices in a path at least one vertex is in the dominating set. Therefore $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{2}}) = 7 = |V(G)|$.

Now, we consider $G^{\frac{1}{3}}$ and present an upper and lower bound for secure domination number of it.

Theorem 2.6 *Let G be a graph. Then,*

$$|V(G)| \leq \gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{3}}) \leq 2|E(G)|.$$

Proof. For every edge $uv \in E(G)$, we have a superedge $P^{\{u,v\}}$ with vertices $u, x_1^{\{u,v\}}, x_2^{\{u,v\}}$ and v in $G^{\frac{1}{3}}$. To have a dominating set in four consecutive vertices, we need at least two vertices. By choosing u and v , then we have a dominating set for $G^{\frac{1}{3}}$ with size $|V(G)|$. It is easy to see that there is no dominating set for $G^{\frac{1}{3}}$ with smaller size. Now, by Proposition 2.1, we have $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{3}}) \geq |V(G)|$. By choosing $x_1^{\{u,v\}}$ and $x_2^{\{u,v\}}$ in any superedge $P^{\{u,v\}}$, we have a secure dominating set with size $2|E(G)|$. Therefore $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{3}}) \leq 2|E(G)|$ and we have the result. \square

Remark 2.7 *The lower bound in the Theorem 2.6 is sharp. It suffices to consider star graph S_n . As we see in Figure 3, the set of white vertices in $S_n^{\frac{1}{3}}$ is a secure dominating set. Then $\gamma_s(S_n^{\frac{1}{3}}) = n = |V(S_n)|$. The upper bound in the Theorem 2.6 is attainable. It suffices to consider path graph P_2 . Then $P_2^{\frac{1}{3}} = P_4$ and $\gamma_s(P_4) = 2 = 2|E(P_2)|$.*

The following theorem gives the bounds of secure domination number of 4-subdivision of a graph.

Theorem 2.8 *Let G be a graph*

(i) *which is not P_2 . Then, $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{4}}) \leq 2|E(G)|$.*




Figure 3: Graph S_n and $S_n^{\frac{1}{3}}$




Figure 4: Vertex w with maximum degree Δ and corresponding superedges in $G^{\frac{1}{5}}$

(ii) with no pendant vertices. Then $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{4}}) \leq |V(G)| + |E(G)|$.

Proof.

(i) In any superedge $P^{\{u,v\}}$ in $G^{\frac{1}{4}}$, we choose $x_1^{\{u,v\}}$ and $x_3^{\{u,v\}}$ to put in our set D . It is a secure dominating set, because each vertex in $V - D$ can be replaced by its neighbour in D , if it is not $x_2^{\{u,v\}}$, and $x_2^{\{u,v\}}$ can be replaced by the neighbour which has another neighbour of degree at least 2, since G is not P_2 . Therefore we have the result.

(ii) The set $D = V(G) \cup C$ is a secure dominating set, where C is the central vertices of the new paths of length 4. \square

Now, we consider $G^{\frac{1}{5}}$, and present upper and lower bound for secure domination number of that regarding maximum degree and number of edges of G .




Figure 5: Superedges $P^{\{u,v\}}$ and $P^{\{u,t\}}$ in $G^{\frac{1}{5}}$

Theorem 2.9 *Let G be a graph and Δ be the maximum degree of its vertices. Then,*

$$2|E(G)| + 1 \leq \gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{5}}) \leq 3|E(G)| - \Delta + 1.$$

Proof. For every edge $uv \in G$, we consider the superedge $P^{\{u,v\}}$ in $G^{\frac{1}{5}}$. We choose $x_1^{\{u,v\}}, x_2^{\{u,v\}}$ and $x_4^{\{u,v\}}$ from the set $\{u, x_1^{\{u,v\}}, x_2^{\{u,v\}}, x_3^{\{u,v\}}, x_4^{\{u,v\}}, v\}$ and put in a new set, say D . So,

$$D = \bigcup_{uv \in E(G)} \{x_1^{\{u,v\}}, x_2^{\{u,v\}}, x_4^{\{u,v\}}\}.$$

Then D is a secure dominating set for $G^{\frac{1}{5}}$. Now, consider the vertex w with degree Δ (See Figure 4). We define a new set D' as

$$D' = D - \{x_1^{\{w,u_1\}}, x_1^{\{w,u_2\}}, x_1^{\{w,u_3\}}, \dots, x_1^{\{w,u_\Delta\}}\} \cup \{w\}.$$

It is easy to see that D' is a secure dominating set too. Therefore

$$\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{5}}) \leq 3|E(G)| - \Delta + 1.$$

Now, we consider the superedges $P^{\{u,v\}}$ and $P^{\{u,t\}}$ in $G^{\frac{1}{5}}$ as we see in Figure 5. In every twelve consecutive vertices, we need at least four vertices to have a dominating set. We have the following cases:

- (i) We choose $x_1^{\{u,v\}}, x_4^{\{u,v\}}, x_1^{\{u,t\}}$ and $x_4^{\{u,t\}}$ to put in domination set from these superedges. So we have a dominating set for $G^{\frac{1}{5}}$ with size at most $2|E(G)|$. On the other hand, by Proposition 2.1, $\gamma(G^{\frac{1}{5}}) \leq \gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{5}})$ but this set is not a secure dominating set because of vertex u .
- (ii) We choose $x_2^{\{u,v\}}, x_4^{\{u,v\}}, x_1^{\{u,t\}}$ and $x_4^{\{u,t\}}$ to put in domination set from these superedges. By the same argument as in the previous case, this process does not give us a secure dominating set because of the vertex $x_2^{\{u,t\}}$.
- (iii) Put u in our set. Then for having a dominating set regarding these edges, we need at least 4 other vertices and this makes our set bigger than $2|E(G)|$.

So $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{5}}) > 2|E(G)|$. Hence $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{5}}) \geq 2|E(G)| + 1$, and we are done. \square

Remark 2.10 *Upper Bound in the Theorem 2.9 is sharp. It suffices to consider the star graph S_n . Then by the argument in the proof of Theorem 2.9, and since from each three consecutive vertices, we need at least a vertex to be in dominating set, one can easily check that the equality holds.*




Figure 6: Graph $S_4^{\frac{1}{5}}$

Now, we consider the general case $G_n^{\frac{1}{n}}$ for $n \geq 6$.

Theorem 2.11 *Let G be a graph and $n = 7k + r$, where k is a positive number and $r \in \{-1, 1, 3, 5\}$. Then,*

$$\gamma_s(G_n^{\frac{1}{n}}) = \gamma_s(P_{n+1})|E(G)|.$$

Proof. First, Let $n = 7k + r$, where k is a positive odd number and $r \in \{-1, 1, 3, 5\}$. Consider the edge $uv \in E(G)$. As shown in Figure 7, we consider $u, x_1^{\{u,v\}}, x_2^{\{u,v\}}, \dots, x_{n-2}^{\{u,v\}}, x_{n-1}^{\{u,v\}}, v$ as vertex sequence of $P^{\{u,v\}}$. Now, we define

$$E_{uv} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{k-1} \{x_{7i+1}^{\{u,v\}}, x_{7i+3}^{\{u,v\}}, x_{7i+5}^{\{u,v\}}\},$$

and

$$F_{uv} = \begin{cases} \{\} & \text{if } r = -1, \\ \{x_{n-1}^{\{u,v\}}\} & \text{if } r = 1, \\ \{x_{n-3}^{\{u,v\}}, x_{n-1}^{\{u,v\}}\} & \text{if } r = 3, \\ \{x_{n-5}^{\{u,v\}}, x_{n-3}^{\{u,v\}}, x_{n-1}^{\{u,v\}}\} & \text{if } r = 5. \end{cases}$$

Let $D_{uv} = E_{uv} \cup F_{uv}$ and

$$D = \bigcup_{uv \in E(G)} D_{uv}.$$

It is easy to see that D is a secure dominating set for $G_n^{\frac{1}{n}}$. So $\gamma_s(G_n^{\frac{1}{n}}) \leq |E(G)| \lceil \frac{3n+3}{7} \rceil$. Hence $\gamma_s(G_n^{\frac{1}{n}}) \leq \gamma_s(P_{n+1})|E(G)|$ because of Theorem 2.2. Now, we show that we can




Figure 7: Superedge $P^{\{u,v\}}$ and $P^{\{v,w\}}$ in $G_n^{\frac{1}{2}}$ related to the proof of Theorem 2.11

not use less vertices to make a secure dominating set. In the way we choose D , we cannot choose less vertices among $x_2^{\{u,v\}}, \dots, x_{n-2}^{\{u,v\}}$ for each $P^{\{u,v\}}$. We use vertices u , v and w that are connected as in Figure 7. We only can remove $x_1^{\{v,w\}}$ and $x_{n-1}^{\{u,v\}}$ from D and put v in it to have a dominating set. So $D' = D - \{x_1^{\{v,w\}}, x_{n-1}^{\{u,v\}}\} \cup \{v\}$ is a dominating set which clearly is not a secure dominating set. By the same argument for $n = 7k + r$, where k is a positive even number and $r \in \{-1, 1, 3, 5\}$. \square

Now, we consider the other cases and present some bounds for them:

Theorem 2.12 *Let G be a graph and $n = 7k + r$, where k is a positive number and $r \in \{0, 2, 4\}$. Then,*

$$|V(G)| + \gamma_s(P_{n-3})|E(G)| \leq \gamma_s(G_n^{\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \gamma_s(P_{n+1})|E(G)|.$$

Proof. First consider every superedge $P^{\{u,v\}}$ and choose a secure dominating set for it, and then put all these vertices in a set. Therefore we have a secure dominating set for G with size at most $\gamma_s(P_{n+1})|E(G)|$. Now, for finding a lower bound, first we put every vertex of G in our set D but we do not consider their neighbours. Then we have a path P_{n-3} for every superedge and we should choose between these vertices. Obviously we can choose $\gamma_s(P_{n-3})$ of these vertices and add to D . Clearly, D is a dominating set which is not necessarily secure in some cases. Now, by Proposition 2.1, we conclude that $\gamma_s(G_n^{\frac{1}{2}}) \geq |V(G)| + \gamma_s(P_{n-3})|E(G)|$, and therefore we have the result. \square

At the beginning of this section, we presented a sharp upper bound for secure domination number of $G^{\frac{1}{2}}$ in Theorem 2.3. There are some graphs G , which show that $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{2}}) < \min\{|E(G)|, |V(G)|\}$. For example, consider path graph P_{11} . Then $P_{11}^{\frac{1}{2}} = P_{21}$, and by Theorem 2.2, $\gamma_s(P_{11}^{\frac{1}{2}}) = 9$. So, this inspires us to find a lower bound for $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{2}})$. We end this section with the following conjecture:

Conjecture 2.13 *For every graph G , $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{2}}) > \frac{4}{5}|V(G)|$.*

3 Conclusions

In this paper, we obtained the secure domination number of k -subdivision of graphs for some cases and presents some lower and upper bounds for other ones. Future topics of interest for future research include the following suggestions:

Proving Conjecture 2.13 or finding a better lower bound for $\gamma_s(G^{\frac{1}{2}})$.

What is the exact value of $\gamma_s(G_n^{\frac{1}{2}})$ for $n = 7k + r$, where k is a positive integer value and $r \in \{0, 2, 4\}$?

References

- [1] S. Alikhani, N. Ghanbari, Introduction to total dominator edge chromatic number, *TWMS J. App. and Eng. Math.*, 12(3) (2022) 786-798.
- [2] S. Alikhani, N. Ghanbari, S. Soltani, Total dominator chromatic number of k -subdivision of graphs, *Art Discrete Appl. Math.*, 6(1) (2023) paper 1.10.
- [3] T. Araki, H. Miyazaki, Secure domination in proper interval graphs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 247 (2018) 70-76.
- [4] T. Araki, R. Yamanaka, Secure domination in cographs, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 262 (2019) 179-184.
- [5] Ch. S. Babu, A. A. Diwan, Subdivisions of graphs: A generalization of paths and cycles, *Discrete Mathematics*, 308 (2008) 44794486.
- [6] A.P. Burger, M.A. Henning, J.H. van Vuuren, Vertex covers and secure domination in graphs, *Quaest. Math.*, 31 (2008) 163171.
- [7] E. C. Castellano, R. A. L. Ugbinada, Secure Domination in the Joins of Graphs, *Applied Mathematical Sciences* , 8 (2014) no.105, 5203-5211.
- [8] E.J. Cockayne, Irredundance, secure domination and maximum degree in trees, *Discrete Math.*, 307 (2007) 1217.
- [9] E.J. Cockayne, P.J.P. Grobler, W.R. Grundlingh, J. Munganga, J.H. Van Vuuren, Protection of a graph, *Utilitas Mathematica*, 67 (2005) 19-32.
- [10] P. J. P. Grobler, C. M. Mynhardt, Secure domination critical graphs, *Discrete Mathematics*, 309 (2009) 58205827.
- [11] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi, P.J. Slater, Fundamentals of domination in graphs, *Marcel Dekker*, NewYork, (1998).
- [12] A. Kišek, S. Klavžar, Correcting the algorithm for the secure domination number of cographs by Jha, Pradhan, and Banerjee, *Information Processing Letters*, 172 (2021) 106155.
- [13] W. F. Klostermeyer, C. M. Mynhardt, Secure domination and secure total domination in graphs, *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory* , 28 (2008) 267-284.
- [14] Z. Li, J. Xu, A characterization of trees with equal independent domination and secure domination numbers, *Information Processing Letters* , 119 (2017) 14-18.
- [15] H. B. Merouane, M. Chellali, On Secure Domination in Graphs, *Information Processing Letters*, 115 (2014) 786-790.
- [16] A. Mohamed Ali, S. Rajkumar, *Some results on secure domination in zero-divisor graphs*, *J. Math. Comput. Sci.*, 11 (2021), 4799-4809.

- [17] C.M. Mynhardt, H.C. Swart and E. Ungerer, Excellent trees and secure domination, *Util. Math.*, 67 (2005) 255267.