

Discrete Mathematics 156 (1996) 243-246

# Communication On a Vizing-like conjecture for direct product graphs<sup>1</sup>

Sandi Klavžar\*, Blaž Zmazek

Department of Mathematics, PEF, University of Maribor, Koroška cesta 160, 2000 Maribor, Slovenia

Received 5 February 1996 Communicated by C. Benzaken

#### Abstract

Let  $\gamma(G)$  be the domination number of a graph G, and let  $G \times H$  be the direct product of graphs G and H. It is shown that for any  $k \ge 0$  there exists a graph G such that  $\gamma(G \times G) \le \gamma(G)^2 - k$ . This in particular disproves a conjecture from [5].

## 1. Introduction

A set D of vertices of a simple graph G is called *dominating* if every vertex  $w \in V(G) - D$  is adjacent to some vertex  $v \in D$ . The *domination number* of a graph G,  $\gamma(G)$ , is the order of a smallest dominating set of G. A dominating set D with  $|D| = \gamma(G)$  is called a *minimum dominating set*.

The direct product  $G \times H$  of graphs G and H is a graph with  $V(G \times H) = V(G) \times V(H)$  and  $E(G \times H) = \{\{(a,x), (b,y)\} | \{a,b\} \in E(G) \text{ and } \{x,y\} \in E(H)\}$ . This product is also known as Kronecker product, tensor product, categorical product and graph conjunction. The Cartesian product  $G \Box H$  of graphs G and H is the graph with vertex set  $V(G) \times V(H)$  and  $(a,x)(b,y) \in E(G \Box H)$  whenever x = y and  $\{a,b\} \in E(G)$ , or a = b and  $\{x,y\} \in E(H)$ .

Most of the interest for domination in graph products is due to Vizing's conjecture [11] from 1963. Vizing conjectured that

 $\gamma(G \Box H) \ge \gamma(G) \, \gamma(H)$ 

hold for any graphs G and H. Despite considerable efforts (cf. [1-4, 6-9]) it seems that presently there is no 'winning way' to the conjecture.

0012-365X/96/\$15.00 © 1996 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved PII \$ 0012-365X(96)00032-5

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. E-mail: sandi.klavzar@uni-lj.si; blaz.zmazek@fmf.uni-lj.si.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This work was supported in part by the Ministry of Science and Technology of Slovenia under the grant J1-7036.

Another graph product which offers interesting and non-trivial problems on domination is the direct product. Gravier and Khelladi [5] posed the following Vizing-like conjecture for the direct product:

$$\gamma(G \times H) \ge \gamma(G) \, \gamma(H).$$

Here we show that for any  $k \ge 0$  there exists a graph G such that  $\gamma(G \times G) \le \gamma(G)^2 - k$ . This result in particular disproves the above-mentioned conjecture. Moreover, it also supports the following statement: although the direct product of graphs is the most natural graph product, it is also the most difficult and unpredictable among standard graph products.

In fact, as far as we know Nowakowski and Rall were the first who observed that the above-mentioned conjecture does not hold. In their manuscript [10] they report a graph with  $\gamma(G) = 2$  yet  $\gamma(G \times G) = 3$ . We wish to add that the paper of Nowakowski and Rall is a nice and relevant paper which considers several graph parameters (related to independence, domination and irredundance) of all main associative graph products.

### 2. The construction

Let  $G_1$  be the graph depicted in Fig. 1 and let H be the graph  $G_1 \setminus \{u, w\}$  (see Fig. 1 again). Then we have:

Lemma 2.1. (i)  $\gamma(G_1) = \gamma(H) = 3$ . (ii)  $\gamma(G_1 \times G_1) \le 7$ .

**Proof.** (i) Partition  $V(G_1)$  into the sets  $V_1 = \{x, y, z, \bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}\}, V_2 = \{u, v, w\}$  and  $V_3 = \{\bar{u}, \bar{v}, \bar{w}\}$  and note that the domination number of the subgraph of  $G_1$  induced by the set  $V_1$  is equal 2.



Fig. 1. Graphs  $G_1$  and H.



Fig. 2. Graph G<sub>n</sub>.

Suppose that  $\gamma(G_1) = 2$  and let *D* be a minimum dominating set. Since any pair of vertices from the set  $\{\bar{x}, y, \bar{z}\}$  have no common neighbour in  $V_2$ , at least one vertex of  $V_1$  must belong to *D*. Therefore, the other vertex of *D* must lie in  $V_2$ . But this means that at least one vertex of  $V_3$  is not dominated by *D*, a contradiction. Clearly,  $\gamma(G_1) \leq 3$ .

Analogous argument (with  $V_2 = \{v\}$ ) also gives  $\gamma(H) = 3$ .

(ii) It is straightforward to check that the set

$$\{(u, u), (v, v), (w, w), (v, y), (y, v), (u, z), (z, u)\}$$

constitutes a dominating set of  $G_1 \times G_1$ .  $\Box$ 

For any  $i \ge 1$  let  $G_1^{(i)}$  be an isomorphic copy of the graph  $G_1$  (where  $G_1^{(i)} = G_1$ ). Label the vertices of the graphs  $G_1^{(i)}$  as it is shown in Fig. 2. Let  $G_n$  be the graph which we obtain from the disjoin union of the graphs  $G_1^{(1)}, G_1^{(2)}, \ldots, G_1^{(n)}$  with the addition of edges  $\{w_i, u_{i+1}\}, 1 \le i < n$  (see Fig. 2).

Theorem 2.2. (i)  $\gamma(G_n) = 3n$ . (ii)  $\gamma(G_n \times G_n) \leq 7n^2$ .

**Proof.** (i) By Lemma 2.1(i) the domination number of any graph  $G_1^{(i)}$  does not depend on the vertices  $u_i$  and  $w_i$ . Therefore, each  $G_1^{(i)}$  must contain at least 3 vertices of a minimum dominating set of  $G_n$ .

(ii) Let  $G'_n = \bigcup_{i=1}^n G_1^{(i)}$  be the disjoint union of the graphs  $G_1^{(i)}$ . Clearly,  $G'_n \times G'_n$  is a (proper) subgraph of the product  $G_n \times G_n$  and hence

$$\gamma(G_n \times G_n) \leqslant \gamma(G'_n \times G'_n).$$

The graph  $G'_n \times G'_n$  consists of  $n^2$  connected components which are all isomorphic to the product  $G_1 \times G_1$ . Using Lemma 2.1(ii) we thus infer

 $\gamma(G'_n \times G'_n) = n^2 \gamma(G_1 \times G_1) \leqslant 7n^2,$ 

which completes the proof.  $\Box$ 

We can now state the main result of this note.

**Corollary 2.3.** For any  $k \ge 0$  there exists a graph G such that

$$\gamma(G \times G) \leq \gamma(G)^2 - k.$$

**Proof.** Set  $n = \lfloor \sqrt{k/2} \rfloor$ . Theorem 2.2 immediately gives

 $\gamma(G_n \times G_n) \leqslant \gamma(G_n)^2 - 2n^2$ 

which in turn implies that

 $\gamma(G_n \times G_n) \leq \gamma(G_n)^2 - k. \qquad \Box$ 

To conclude we wish to add that the above result indicates that domination problems are not only interesting on the Cartesian product graphs but also on the direct product graphs.

#### References

- [1] T. Chang and E. Clark, The domination numbers of the  $5 \times n$  and  $6 \times n$  grid graphs, J. Graph Theory 17 (1993) 81-107.
- [2] M. El-Zahar and C.M. Pareek, Domination number of products of graphs, Ars Combin. 31 (1991) 223-227.
- [3] R.J. Faudree and R.H. Schelp, The domination number for the product of graphs, Congr. Numer. 79 (1990) 29-33.
- [4] D.C. Fisher, Domination, fractional domination, 2-packing, and graph products, SIAM J. Discrete Math. 7 (1994) 493–498.
- [5] S. Gravier and A. Khelladi, On the domination number of cross products of graphs, Discrete Math. 145 (1995) 273-277.
- [6] B.L. Hartnell and D.F. Rall, On Vizing's conjecture, Congr. Numer. 82 (1991) 87-96.
- [7] M.S. Jacobson and L.F. Kinch, On the domination number of products of graphs: I, Ars Combin. 18 (1983) 33-44.
- [8] M.S. Jacobson and L.F. Kinch, On the domination of the products of graphs II: trees, J. Graph Theory 10 (1986) 97-106.
- [9] S. Klavžar and N. Seifter, Dominating Cartesian products of cycles, Discrete Appl. Math. 59 (1995) 129-136.
- [10] R.J. Nowakowski and D. Rall, Associative graph products and their independence, domination and coloring numbers, manuscript, June 1993.
- [11] V.G. Vizing, The Cartesian product of graphs, Vyc. Sis. 9 (1963) 30-43.