

Offensive k -alliances in graphs

Henning Fernau¹, Juan A. Rodríguez² and José M. Sigarreta³

¹*FB 4-Abteilung Informatik*

Universität Trier,

54286 Trier, Germany.

e-mail:fernau@uni-trier.de

²*Departament d'Enginyeria Informàtica i Matemàtiques*

Universitat Rovira i Virgili,

Av. Països Catalans 26, 43007 Tarragona, Spain.

e-mail:juanalberto.rodriguez@urv.cat

³*Departamento de Matemáticas*

Universidad Carlos III de Madrid,

Avda. de la Universidad 30, 28911 Leganés (Madrid), Spain.

e-mail:josemaria.sigarreta@uc3m.es

Abstract

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph. For a nonempty set $X \subset V$, and a vertex $v \in V$, $\delta_X(v)$ denotes the number of neighbors v has in X . A nonempty set $S \subset V$ is an *offensive r -alliance* in G if $\delta_S(v) \geq \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + r$, $\forall v \in \partial(S)$, where $\partial(S)$ denotes the boundary of S . An offensive r -alliance S is called *global* if it forms a dominating set. The *global offensive r -alliance number* of G , denoted by $\gamma_r^o(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a global offensive r -alliance in G . We show that the problem of finding optimal (global) offensive r -alliances is NP-complete and we obtain several tight bounds on $\gamma_r^o(G)$.

Keywords: Computational complexity, offensive alliances, alliances in graphs, domination.

AMS Subject Classification Numbers: 03D15; 05C69; 05A20

1 Introduction

The mathematical properties of alliances in graphs were first studied by P. Kristiansen, S. M. Hedetniemi and S. T. Hedetniemi [13]. They proposed different types of alliances: namely, defensive alliances [11, 12, 13, 21], offensive alliances [4, 5, 7, 17, 18] and dual alliances or powerful alliances [1]. A generalization of these alliances called r -alliances was presented by K. H. Shafique and R. D. Dutton [19, 20].

In this paper, we study the mathematical properties of offensive r -alliances. We begin by stating the terminology used. Throughout this article, $G = (V, E)$ denotes a simple graph of order $|V| = n$. We denote two adjacent vertices u and v by $u \sim v$. For a nonempty set $X \subseteq V$, and a vertex $v \in V$, $N_X(v)$ denotes the set of neighbors v has in X : $N_X(v) := \{u \in X : u \sim v\}$, and the degree of v in X will be denoted by $\delta_X(v) = |N_X(v)|$. We denote the degree of a vertex $v \in V$ by $\delta(v)$ and the degree sequence of G by $\delta_1 \geq \delta_2 \geq \dots \geq \delta_n$. The complement of the vertex-set S in V is denoted by \bar{S} and the boundary, $\partial(S)$, of S is defined by

$$\partial(S) := \bigcup_{v \in S} N_{\bar{S}}(v).$$

For $r \in \{2 - \delta_1, \dots, \delta_1\}$, a nonempty set $S \subset V$ is an *offensive r -alliance* in G if for every $v \in \partial(S)$,

$$\delta_S(v) \geq \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + r. \tag{1}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\delta(v) \geq 2\delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + r. \tag{2}$$

An offensive 1-alliance is an *offensive alliance* and an offensive 2-alliance is a *strong offensive alliance* as defined in [7, 17, 18].

The *offensive r -alliance number* of G , denoted by $a_r^o(G)$, is defined as the minimum cardinality of an offensive r -alliance in G . Notice that

$$a_{r+1}^o(G) \geq a_r^o(G). \tag{3}$$

The offensive 1-alliance number of G is known as the *offensive alliance number* of G and the offensive 2-alliance number is known as the *strong offensive alliance number* [7, 17, 18].

A set $S \subset V$ is a *dominating set* in $G = (V, E)$ if for every vertex $u \in \bar{S}$, $\delta_S(u) > 0$ (every vertex in \bar{S} is adjacent to at least one vertex in S). The

domination number of G , denoted by $\gamma(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set in G .

An offensive r -alliance S is called *global* if it forms a dominating set, i.e., $\partial(S) = \bar{S}$. The *global offensive r -alliance number* of G , denoted by $\gamma_r^o(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a global offensive r -alliance in G . Clearly,

$$\gamma_{r+1}^o(G) \geq \gamma_r^o(G) \geq \gamma(G) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_r^o(G) \geq a_r^o(G). \quad (4)$$

Notice that if every vertex of G has even degree and k is odd, $k = 2l - 1$, then every offensive $(2l - 1)$ -alliance in G is an offensive $(2l)$ -alliance. Hence, in such a case, $a_{2l-1}^o(G) = a_{2l}^o(G)$ and $\gamma_{2l-1}^o(G) = \gamma_{2l}^o(G)$. Analogously, if every vertex of G has odd degree and k is even, $k = 2l$, then every offensive $(2l)$ -alliance in G is an offensive $(2l + 1)$ -alliance. Hence, in such a case, $a_{2l}^o(G) = a_{2l+1}^o(G)$ and $\gamma_{2l}^o(G) = \gamma_{2l+1}^o(G)$.

2 On the complexity of finding optimal offensive r -alliances

For the class of complete graphs of order n , $G = K_n$, we have the exact value of $a_r^o(G)$. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} n - 1 &= a_{n-1}^o(K_n) = a_{n-2}^o(K_n) \\ &\geq a_{n-3}^o(K_n) = a_{n-4}^o(K_n) = n - 2 \\ &\quad \dots \\ &\geq a_{5-n}^o(K_n) = a_{4-n}^o(K_n) = 2 \\ &\geq a_{3-n}^o(K_n) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for every $r \in \{3 - n, \dots, n - 1\}$, $a_r^o(K_n) = \lceil \frac{n+r-1}{2} \rceil$. In this case, every offensive r -alliance is global and every vertex-set of cardinality $\lceil \frac{n+r-1}{2} \rceil$ is a (global) offensive r -alliance.

As we will see below, in general, the problem of finding optimal (global) offensive r -alliances is NP-complete. That is, we are interested in the computational complexity of the following optimization problems.

Offensive r -Alliance problem (r -OA):

Given: A graph $G = (V, E)$ and a positive integer $k \leq |V|$.

Question: Is there an offensive r -alliance in G of size k or less?

Global offensive r -Alliance problem (r -GOA):

Given: A graph $G = (V, E)$ and a positive integer $k \leq |V|$.

Question: Is there a global offensive r -alliance in G of size k or less?

2.1 Offensive alliances

Our reasoning will use and generalize the following observation:

Proposition 1. [7] *On cubic graphs, every vertex cover is a strong offensive alliance and vice versa.*

With some gadgetry, this was used in [9] to show NP-hardness of finding small offensive alliances. We will generalize those results in the following.

Theorem 2. $\forall r$: r -OA is NP-complete.

Proof. It is clear that r -OA is in NP.

Consider first the case that $r \geq 3$. For any connected r -regular graph $G = (V, E)$, it can be seen that $C \subseteq V$ is a minimum vertex cover iff C is a minimum r -offensive alliance. Clearly, any vertex cover is an r -OA. Let S be an r -OA. By definition, $S \neq \emptyset$. Discuss $x \in S$. Any neighbor of x must have r , i.e., all, neighbors in S , and we can continue the argument with those vertices taking the role of x , till the whole graph is exhausted (since it is connected by assumption). Hence, the complement of S forms an independent set, which means that S itself is a vertex cover. Since it is well-known that the vertex cover problem, restricted to r -regular graphs is NP-complete for any $r \geq 3$, see [8] for a recent account related to approximability results, the claim follows for $r \geq 3$.

Now, we show: if r -OA is NP-hard, then so is $(r - 1)$ -OA. By induction, the whole claim will follow.

Let $(G = (V, E), k)$ be an instance of r -OA, with $n = |V|$. We construct an instance of $(r - 1)$ -OA as follows: $G' = (V', E')$ with $V' = V \times \{1, 2, 3\} \cup \{c_1, \dots, c_{n-r+2}\}$. In E' , we find the following edges (and only those):

- $\{(u, 1), (v, 1)\} \in E'$ iff $\{(u, 2), (v, 2)\} \in E'$ iff $\{u, v\} \in E$;
- $\{(u, 1), (u, 3)\} \in E'$ and $\{(u, 2), (u, 3)\} \in E'$ for any $u \in V$;
- $\{(u, 3), c_j\} \in E'$ for any $u \in V$ and any $1 \leq j \leq n - r + 2$;

— $\{c_i, c_j\} \in E'$ for any $1 \leq i < j \leq n - r + 2$.

Let $k' = 2k$. As in [9], one can show that S is an r -OA of size at most k for G iff $S \times \{1, 2\}$ is a $(r - 1)$ -OA of size at most $2k$ for G' , and that there is no other possibility to form smaller $(r - 1)$ -OAs in G' due to the attached clique. \square

2.2 Global offensive alliances

Cami et al. [2] showed NP-completeness for $r = 1$. We are going to modify their construction to show NP-completeness for any fixed r . Since we are dealing with the degree of vertices both in G and within the new graph G' as constructed below, we are going to attach G and G' to δ to avoid confusion in our notation.

Theorem 3. $\forall r$: r -GOA is NP-complete.

Proof. Membership in NP is clear.

The construction in [2] can be modified to work for any case $r \leq 1$. Let (G, k) be an instance of Dominating Set with minimum degree $|r| + 1$, with $G = (V, E)$. To any $v \in V$, attach $\delta_G(v) + r - 1 \geq 0$ copies of K_2 with one edge per K_2 -copy, this way yielding a new graph $G' = (V', E')$ with G as a subgraph; call the new neighbors of vertices from V A -vertices and collect them into set A , and call $N(A) \setminus V$ B -vertices.

If $D \subseteq V$ is a dominating set in G , then $S = D \cup A$ is a r -GOA. Clearly, S is a dominating set in G' . Now, consider a B -vertex v . Obviously, $N(v) \subseteq A$, and therefore $|N_{G'}(v) \cap S| \geq |N_{G'}(v) \cap \bar{S}| + r$. Any vertex $v \in V \setminus D$ has a neighbor $d \in D$. Hence, $|N_{G'}(v) \cap \bar{S}| \leq \delta_G(v) - 1$, while $|N_{G'}(v) \cap S| \geq \delta_G(v) + (r - 1) + 1 = \delta_G(v) + r$. Therefore, S is a valid r -GOA.

Conversely, let S be a r -GOA of G' . Since S is a dominating set, for each K_2 -copy attached to G , either the corresponding A - or the corresponding B -vertex is in S . Consider some $v \in V \setminus S$. v must be dominated. If no neighbor of v in V is in S , then $|N_{G'}(v) \cap S| \leq \delta_G(v) + r - 1$, while $|N_{G'} \cap \bar{S}| \geq \delta_G(v)$, which leads to a contradiction. Hence, $S \cap V$ is a dominating set in G .

Combining the arguments, we obtain: $G = (V, E)$ has a dominating set of size at most k iff $G' = (V', E')$ has a r -GOA of size $k + \sum_v (\delta_G(v) + r - 1) = k + (r - 1)|V| + 2|E|$.

Now, we consider the case $r \geq 2$. Let (G, k) be an instance of Dominating Set with minimum degree 1, with $G = (V, E)$. To any $v \in V$, attach $\delta_G(v) + r - 1 \geq 1$ so-called A -vertices. All A -vertices together form an independent

set. Let $A(v) = \{(v, 1), \dots, (v, \delta_G(v) + r - 1)\}$ denote the set of A -vertices attached to $v \in V$. We denote the B -vertices attached to the A -vertices in $A(v)$ by $B(v)$ and can describe them as $B(v) = \binom{A(v)}{r}$, i.e., the r -element subsets of $A(v)$. Each $X \in B(v)$ has as neighbors exactly the A -vertices listed in X . This describes the graph $G' = (V', E')$ as obtained from G .

If $D \subseteq V$ is a dominating set in G , then $S = D \cup A$ is a r -GOA in G' . Clearly, S is a dominating set in G' . Now, consider a B -vertex v . Obviously, $N(v) \subseteq A(v)$, and therefore $|N_{G'}(v) \cap S| = r \geq |N_{G'}(v) \cap \bar{S}| + r$. Any vertex $v \in V \setminus D$ has a neighbor $d \in D$. Hence, $|N_{G'}(v) \cap \bar{S}| \leq \delta_G(v) - 1$, while $|N_{G'}(v) \cap S| \geq \delta_G(v) + (r - 1) + 1 = \delta_G(v) + r$. Therefore, S is a valid r -GOA.

Conversely, let S be a r -GOA of G' of size $k + |A|$. Notice that this bound is met if $S \cap V$ is a dominating set in G and all A -vertices go into S . Consider an $A(v)$ -vertex x and assume $x \notin S$. Then, either there is a $y \in S \cap N(x) \cap B(v)$, or $v \in S$, since otherwise x would not be dominated.

Altogether, x has $\binom{\delta_G(v) + r - 1}{r} + 1$ many neighbors. Since S is an r -GOA, more than $|A(v)| = \delta_G(v) + r - 1$ vertices from the gadget attached to v would be in S , this way violating the bound on the size of S . Consider some $v \in V \setminus S$. v must be dominated. If no neighbor of v in V is in S , then $|N_{G'}(v) \cap S| \leq \delta_G(v) + r - 1$, while $|N_{G'}(v) \cap \bar{S}| \geq \delta_G(v)$, which leads to a contradiction. Hence, $S \cap V$ is a dominating set in G .

Combining the arguments, we obtain: $G = (V, E)$ has a dominating set of size at most k iff $G' = (V', E')$ has a r -GOA of size $k + \sum_v (\delta_G(v) + r - 1) = k + (r - 1)|V| + 2|E|$. \square

3 Bounding the offensive r -alliance number

Theorem 4. *For any graph G of order n and minimum degree δ , and for every $r \in \{2 - \delta, \dots, \delta\}$,*

$$\left\lceil \frac{\delta + r}{2} \right\rceil \leq a_r^o(G) \leq \gamma_r^o(G) \leq n - \left\lfloor \frac{\delta - r + 2}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Proof. Let v be a vertex of minimum degree in G and let $Y \subset N_V(v)$ such that $|Y| = \left\lceil \frac{\delta + r}{2} \right\rceil$. Let $S = \{v\} \cup N_V(v) - Y$. Hence, \bar{S} is a dominating set and

$$\delta_{\bar{S}}(v) = \left\lceil \frac{\delta + r}{2} \right\rceil \geq \left\lfloor \frac{\delta + r}{2} \right\rfloor = \delta - \left\lfloor \frac{\delta + r}{2} \right\rfloor + r = \delta_S(v) + r.$$

Thus,

$$\delta_{\bar{S}}(u) \geq \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) \geq \delta_S(v) + r \geq \delta_S(u) + r, \quad \forall u \in S.$$

Therefore, \bar{S} is a global offensive r -alliance in G and, as a consequence, the upper bound follows.

On the other hand, let $X \subset V$ be an offensive r -alliance in G . For every $v \in \partial(X)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(v) &= \delta_X(v) + \delta_{\bar{X}}(v) \\ \delta(v) &\leq \delta_X(v) + \frac{\delta(v) - r}{2} \\ \frac{\delta(v) + r}{2} &\leq \delta_X(v) \leq |X| \\ \frac{\delta + r}{2} &\leq |X|. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the lower bound follows. \square

The bounds are attained for every r in the case of the complete graph $G = K_n$.

A set $S \subset V$ is a k -dominating set if for every $v \in \bar{S}$, $\delta_S(v) \geq k$. The k -domination number of G , $\gamma_k(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a k -dominating set in G . The following result generalizes, to r alliances, some previous results obtained for $r = 1$ and $r = 2$ [15, 18].

Theorem 5. *For any simple graph G of order n , minimum degree δ , and Laplacian spectral radius¹ μ_* ,*

$$\left\lceil \frac{n}{\mu_*} \left\lceil \frac{\delta + r}{2} \right\rceil \right\rceil \leq \gamma_r^o(G) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\gamma_r(G) + n}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Proof. Let $H \subset V$ be an r -dominating set of G of minimum cardinality. If $|\bar{H}| = 1$, then $\gamma_r(G) = n - 1$ and $\gamma_r^o(G) \leq n - 1$. If $|\bar{H}| \neq 1$, let $\bar{H} = X \cup Y$ be a partition of \bar{H} such that the edge-cut between X and Y has the maximum cardinality. Suppose $|X| \leq |Y|$. For every $v \in Y$, $\delta_H(v) \geq r$ and $\delta_X(v) \geq \delta_Y(v)$. Therefore, the set $W = H \cup X$ is a global offensive r -alliance in G , i.e., for every $v \in Y$, $\delta_W(v) \geq \delta_Y(v) + r$. Then we have,

$$2|X| + \gamma_r(G) \leq n \tag{5}$$

¹i.e., the largest Laplacian eigenvalue of G . The reader is referred to [6, 14] for a detailed study and survey on the Laplacian matrix of a graph and its eigenvalues.

and

$$\gamma_r^o(G) \leq |X| + \gamma_r(G). \quad (6)$$

Thus, by (5) and (6), we obtain the upper bound.

It was shown in [10] that the Laplacian spectral radius of G , μ_* , satisfies

$$\mu_* = 2n \max \left\{ \frac{\sum_{v_i \sim v_j} (w_i - w_j)^2}{\sum_{v_i \in V} \sum_{v_j \in V} (w_i - w_j)^2} : w \neq \alpha \mathbf{j} \text{ for } \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$, $\mathbf{j} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let $S \subset V$. From (7), taking $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ defined as

$$w_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v_i \in S; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

we obtain

$$\mu_* \geq \frac{n \sum_{v \in \bar{S}} \delta_S(v)}{|S|(n - |S|)}. \quad (8)$$

Moreover, if S is a global offensive r -alliance in G ,

$$\delta_S(v) \geq \left\lceil \frac{\delta(v) + r}{2} \right\rceil, \quad \forall v \in \bar{S}. \quad (9)$$

Thus, (8) and (9) lead to

$$\mu_* \geq \frac{n}{|S|} \left\lceil \frac{\delta + r}{2} \right\rceil. \quad (10)$$

Therefore, solving (10) for $|S|$ we obtain the lower bound. \square

The above-mentioned bounds are attained, for instance, in the case of the complete graph of order n .

Corollary 6. *For any simple graph G of order n , minimum degree δ , and for every $r \in \{1, \dots, \delta\}$,*

$$\gamma_r^o(G) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n(2r + 1)}{2r + 2} \right\rfloor.$$

Proof. The bound immediately follows from the following bound on $\gamma_r(G)$ [3]:

$$\delta \geq r \Rightarrow \gamma_r(G) \leq \frac{rn}{r+1}. \quad (11)$$

□

Corollary 7. *Let $\mathcal{L}(G)$ be the line graph of a δ -regular graph G of order n . Then*

$$\gamma_r^o(\mathcal{L}(G)) \geq \frac{n}{4} \left\lceil \frac{2(\delta-1)+r}{2} \right\rceil.$$

Proof. We denote by A the adjacency matrix of $\mathcal{L}(G)$ and by $2(\delta-1) = \lambda_0 > \lambda_1 > \dots > \lambda_b = -2$ its distinct eigenvalues. We denote by L the Laplacian matrix of $\mathcal{L}(G)$ and by $\mu_0 = 0 < \mu_1 < \dots < \mu_b$ its distinct Laplacian eigenvalues. Then, since $L = 2(\delta-1)I_n - A$, the eigenvalues of both matrices, A and L , are related by

$$\mu_l = 2(\delta-1) - \lambda_l, \quad l = 0, \dots, b. \quad (12)$$

Thus, the Laplacian spectral radius of $\mathcal{L}(G)$ is $\mu_b = 2\delta$. Therefore, the result immediately follows. □

There are some immediate bounds on $\gamma_r^o(G)$ derived from the following remarks.

Remark 8. *If S is an independent set in G , then \bar{S} is a global offensive r -alliance in G ($r \leq \delta$).*

Remark 9. *All global offensive r -alliance in G is a $\lceil \frac{\delta+r}{2} \rceil$ -dominating set in G ($r \geq 2 - \delta$).*

Therefore, the following bounds follow.

$$\gamma_{\lceil \frac{\delta+r}{2} \rceil}(G) \leq \gamma_r^o(G) \leq n - \alpha(G), \quad (13)$$

where $\alpha(G)$ denotes the independence number of G .

The reader is referred to our previous works [15, 16, 17, 18] for a more detailed study on offensive 1-alliances and offensive 2-alliances.

References

- [1] R. Brigham, R. Dutton and S. Hedetniemi, A sharp lower bound on the powerful alliance number of $C_m \times C_n$. *Congr. Numer.* **167** (2004) 57–63.
- [2] A. Cami, H. Balakrishnan, N. Deo and R. Dutton, On the complexity of finding optimal global alliances. *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **58** (2006).
- [3] E. J. Cockayne, B. Gamble and B. Shepherd, An upper bound for the k -domination number of a graph. *J. Graph Theory* **9** (4) (1985) 533–534.
- [4] M. Chellali and T. W. Haynes, Global alliances and independence in trees. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory*. In press.
- [5] M. Chellali, Offensive alliances in trees. Submitted.
- [6] D. M. Cvetković, M. Doob and H. Sachs, *Spectra of Graphs - Theory and Application*. Academic Press. New York, 1980.
- [7] O. Favaron, G. Fricke, W. Goddard, S. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, P. Kristiansen, R. C. Laskar and R. D. Skaggs, Offensive alliances in graphs. *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory* **24** (2) (2004) 263–275.
- [8] U. Feige, Vertex cover is hardest to approximate on regular graphs, Technical Report MCS 03-15 of the Weizmann Institute, 2003.
- [9] H. Fernau and D. Raible, Alliances in graphs: a complexity-theoretic study, Software Seminar SOFSEM 2007, Student Research Forum, Proceedings Vol. II, 61–70.
- [10] M. Fiedler, A property of eigenvectors of nonnegative symmetric matrices and its application to graph theory. *Czechoslovak Math. J.* **25** (100) (1975) 619–633.
- [11] G. H. Fricke, L. M. Lawson, T. W. Haynes, S. M. Hedetniemi and S. T. Hedetniemi, A note on defensive alliances in Graphs. *Bull. Inst. Combin. Appl.* **38** (2003) 37–41.
- [12] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi and M. A. Henning, Global defensive alliances in graphs. *Electron. J. Combin.* **10** (2003) 139–146.

- [13] P. Kristiansen, S. M. Hedetniemi and S. T. Hedetniemi, Alliances in graphs. *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **48** (2004) 157–177.
- [14] B. Mohar, The Laplacian spectrum of graphs. In Y. Alavi, G. Chartrand, O. Ollermann, and A. Schwenk, editors, *Graph Theory, Combinatorics, and Applications*, pages 871–898. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1991.
- [15] J. A. Rodríguez and J. M. Sigarreta, Spectral study of alliances in graphs. *Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory* **27** (1) (2007) 143–157.
- [16] J. A. Rodríguez and J. M. Sigarreta, Global alliances in planar graphs. *AKCE–International Journal of Graphs and Combinatorics*. In press.
- [17] J. A. Rodríguez and J. M. Sigarreta, Offensive alliances in cubic graphs. *International Mathematical Forum* **1 (36)** (2006) 1773–1782.
- [18] J. A. Rodríguez-Velázquez and J. M. Sigarreta, Global offensive alliances in graphs. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics* **25** (2006) 157–164.
- [19] K. H. Shafique and R. D. Dutton, Maximum alliance-free and minimum alliance-cover sets. *Congr. Numer.* **162** (2003) 139–146.
- [20] K. H. Shafique and R. Dutton, A tight bound on the cardinalities of maximum alliance-free and minimum alliance-cover sets. *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **56** (2006), 139–145.
- [21] J. M. Sigarreta and J. A. Rodríguez, On defensive alliance and line graphs. *Applied Mathematics Letters* **19 (12)** (2006) 1345–1350.