Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal

Xue-Gang Chen

Vertices contained in all minimum paired-dominating sets of a tree

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 57 (2007), No. 1, 407–417

Persistent URL: http://dml.cz/dmlcz/128180

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 2007

Institute of Mathematics of the Czech Academy of Sciences provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use. Each copy of any part of this document must contain these *Terms of use*.

This document has been digitized, optimized for electronic delivery and stamped with digital signature within the project *DML-CZ: The Czech Digital Mathematics Library* http://dml.cz

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, 57 (132) (2007), 407–417

VERTICES CONTAINED IN ALL MINIMUM PAIRED-DOMINATING SETS OF A TREE

Xue-gang Chen, Beijing

(Received March 14, 2005)

Abstract. A set S of vertices in a graph G is called a paired-dominating set if it dominates V and $\langle S\rangle$ contains at least one perfect matching. We characterize the set of vertices of a tree that are contained in all minimum paired-dominating sets of the tree.

Keywords: domination number, paired-domination number, tree

MSC 2000: 05C69, 05C35

1. Introduction

Graph theory terminology not presented here can be found in [1]. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with $|V| = n$. The *neighborhood and closed neighborhood* of a vertex v in the graph G are denoted by $N(v)$ and $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$ respectively. For a set $X \subseteq V(G)$, let $N(X) = \bigcup\limits_{x\in X} N(x)$. The *minimum degree and maximum degree of the graph* G are denoted by $\delta(G)$ and $\Delta(G)$ respectively. The graph induced by $S \subseteq V$ is denoted by $\langle S\rangle$. We denote the distance between two vertices u and v by $d(u, v)$. The degree of a vertex v of a graph G is denoted by $d_G(v)$, or simply by $d(v)$. A path on n vertices is denoted by P_n.

A set $S \subseteq V$ is a *dominating set* of G if every vertex $u \in V - S$ is adjacent to a vertex of S. The *domination number* of G, denoted by $\gamma(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of G. A minimum dominating set of a graph G is called a $\gamma(G)$-set, or simply a γ-set, if the graph G is clear from the context. We use similar notation for other domination parameters.

Supported by National Natural Sciences Foundation of China (19871036).

A set $S \subseteq V$ is a *total dominating set* if every vertex $u \in V$ is adjacent to a vertex of S. The *total domination number of* G, denoted by $\gamma_t(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a total dominating set of G.

A *paired-dominating set* S *with matching* M is a dominating set $S = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2t-1}, v_{2t}\}$ with independent edge set $M = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_t\}$, where each edge e_i joins two elements of S, that is, M is a perfect matching of $\langle S \rangle$. If $v_j v_k = e_i \in M$ we say that v_j and v_k are *paired* in S. Let $S_p = \{\{v_j, v_k\}\colon\ v_j \text{ and } v_k \text{ are paired in } S\}$. The *paired-domination number* $\gamma_p(G)$ is the minimum cardinality of a paired-dominating set S in G.

We define the set $\psi(G)$ of a graph G by $\psi(G) = \{v \in V(G)\colon\ v \text{ is in every } \gamma_p\text{-set of } G\}$. For ease of presentation, we mostly consider *rooted trees*. For a vertex v in a (rooted) tree T, let $C(v)$ and $F(v)$ denote the set of children and descendants, respectively, of v. The maximal subtree at v is the subtree of T induced by $F(v) \cup \{v\}$, and is denoted by T_v. A *leaf* of T is a vertex of degree 1, while a *support vertex* of T is a vertex that is adjacent to a leaf. The set of leaves in T is denoted by $L(T)$ and the set of support vertices by $S(T)$. Let $L(v)$ denote the set of leaves in T_v distinct from v, i.e., $L(v) = F(v) \cap L(T)$. We define a *branch vertex* as a vertex of degree at least 3. The set of branch vertices of T is denoted by $B(T)$. For $j = 0, 1, 2, 3$, we define $L^j(v) = \{u \in L(v)\colon\ d(u, v) \equiv j (\operatorname{mod} 4)\}$. We sometimes write $L^j_T(v)$ to emphasize the tree (or subtree) concerned.

Paired-domination was introduced by Haynes and Slater[4] and is studied, for example, in [5]. For a survey of domination and variations, see the books by Haynes et al. [6], [7].

Hammer et al. [1] investigated vertices belonging to all or to no maximum stable sets of a graph. Mynhardt [2] characterized the set of vertices that are contained in all or in no minimum dominating sets of a tree. Cockayne et al. [3] characterized the set of vertices that are contained in all or in no minimum total dominating sets of a tree. In this paper, we characterize the set of vertices that are contained in all minimum paired-dominating sets of a tree.

2. Tree pruning

The technique of tree pruning was introduced by Cockayne et al. [3]. Let T denote an arbitrary tree. Given a vertex u of T, we say we *attach* a path of length q to u if we join u to a leaf of the path P_q.

Let v be a vertex of T that is not a support vertex. The pruning of T is performed with respect to the root. Hence, suppose T is rooted at v, i.e., $T = T_v$. If $d(u) \leqslant 2$ for each $u \in V(T_v) - \{v\}$, then let $\overline{T}_v = T$. Otherwise, let u be a branch vertex at

maximum distance from v; note that $|C(u)| \geqslant 2$ and $d(x) \leqslant 2$ for each $x \in F(u)$. We now apply the following pruning process:

- If $|L^2(u)| \geqslant 1$, then delete $F(u)$ and attach a path of length 2 to u.
- If $|L^1(u)| \geqslant 1$, $|L^2(u)| = 0$ and $u \in S(T)$, then delete $F(u)$ and attach a path of length 1 to u.
- If $|L^1(u)| \geqslant 1$, $|L^2(u)| = 0$ and $u \notin S(T)$, then delete $F(u)$ and attach a path of length 5 to u.
- If $L^1(u) = L^2(u) = \emptyset$ and $|L^3(u)| \geqslant 1$, then delete $F(u)$ and attach a path of length 3 to u.
- If $L^1(u) = L^2(u) = L^3(u) = \emptyset$, then delete $F(u)$ and attach a path of length 4 to u.

This step of the pruning process, where all the descendants of u are deleted and a path of length $1, 2, 3, 4$, or 5 is attached to u to give a tree in which u has degree 2, is called a pruning of T_v at u. Repeat the above process until a tree $\overline{T}_v$ is obtained with $d(u) \leqslant 2$ for each $u \in V(\overline{T}_v) - \{v\}$. The tree $\overline{T}_v$ is unique and is called the pruning of T_v. To simplify notation, we write $\bar{L}^j(v)$ instead of $L^j_{\overline{T}_v}(v)$.

We shall prove the following two theorems:

Theorem 1. *Let T be a tree rooted at a vertex v such that $d(u) \leqslant 2$ for each $u \in V(T) - \{v\}$. Then $v \in \psi(T)$ if and only if v is a support vertex or $|L^1(v)| \geqslant 1$ and $|L^1(v) \cup L^2(v)| \geqslant 2$.*

Theorem 2. *Let v be a vertex of a tree T. Then $v \in \psi(T)$ if and only if v is a support vertex or $|\bar{L}^1(v)| \geqslant 1$ and $|\bar{L}^1(v) \cup \bar{L}^2(v)| \geqslant 2$.*

3. Preliminary results

It is obvious that the following lemma holds.

Lemma 1. *Let T be a tree with order $n \geqslant 3$. Then every vertex of $S(T)$ is in every minimum paired-dominating set.*

Lemma 2. *Let T be a tree with order $n \geqslant 3$ and $v \in L(T)$. Then there exists a γ_p-set S of T such that $v \notin S$.*

Proof. Suppose that v is in every γ_p-set of T. Let S be a γ_p-set of T. Then $v \in S$. Let u be the support vertex that is adjacent to v. Then $\{v, u\} \in S_p$. Since $n \geqslant 3$, we have $d(u) \geqslant 2$. If there exists a vertex $w \in N(u) \setminus \{v\}$ such that $w \notin S$, then $(S_p - \{\{v, u\}\}) \cup \{\{u, w\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T that does not

contain v, which is a contradiction. Hence, $w \in S$ for every vertex $w \in N(u) \setminus \{v\}$. Without loss of generality, say $t \in N(w) \setminus \{u\}$ and $\{w,t\} \in S_p$. If $t \in L(T)$, then $(S_p - \{\{v,u\},\{w,t\}\}) \cup \{\{u,w\}\}$ would be a paired-dominating set of T with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T)$, which is a contradiction. So, $d(t) \geqslant 2$. If there exists a vertex $z \in N(t) \setminus \{w\}$ such that $z \notin S$, then $(S_p - \{\{v,u\},\{w,t\}\}) \cup \{\{u,w\},\{t,z\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T that does not contain v, which is a contradiction. Hence, $z \in S$ for every vertex $z \in N(t) \setminus \{w\}$. Then $(S_p - \{\{v,u\},\{w,t\}\}) \cup \{\{u,w\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T)$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 3. *Let T' be a tree with $v, u' \in V(T')$ and $d(v,u') \geqslant 2$. Let T be the tree obtained from T' by attaching a path of length 4 to u'. Then*
(a) $\gamma_p(T) = \gamma_p(T') + 2$;
(b) $v \in \psi(T')$ *if and only if* $v \in \psi(T)$.

Proof. Suppose T is obtained from T' by adding the path u, x, y, z and the edge uu'.

(a) Let S be a γ_p-set of T'. Then $S_p \cup \{\{x,y\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T. So, $\gamma_p(T) \leqslant \gamma_p(T') + 2$.

By Lemma 2, let D be a γ_p-set of T that does not contain z. Let $D_p = \{\{v_j, v_k\}\colon v_j$ and v_k are paired in $S, v_i, v_j \in D$ $\}$. Then $\{x,y\} \in D_p$. If $u \notin D$, then $D_p - \{\{x,y\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T'. Hence, $\gamma_p(T') \leqslant \gamma_p(T) - 2$. If $u \in D$, then $\{u,u'\} \in D_p$. Furthermore, there exists a vertex $t \in N(u') \setminus \{u\}$ such that $t \notin D$. Otherwise, $D_p - \{\{u,u'\}\}$ would be a paired-dominating set of T, which is a contradiction. Hence, $(D_p - \{\{x,y\},\{u,u'\}\}) \cup \{\{u',t\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T'. So, $\gamma_p(T') \leqslant \gamma_p(T) - 2$. Hence, $\gamma_p(T) = \gamma_p(T') + 2$.

(b) Suppose that $v \notin \psi(T')$. Let S' be a γ_p-set of T' that does not contain v. Then $S_p^{'} \cup \{\{x,y\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T that does not contain v. Hence, $v \notin \psi(T)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T')$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T.

If $z \notin D$, then $\{x,y\} \in D_p$. In a similar way as above, if $u \notin D$, then $D_p - \{\{x,y\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T'; if $u \in D$, then $(D_p - \{\{x,y\},\{u,u'\}\}) \cup \{\{u',t\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T', where $t \in N(u') \setminus \{u\}$. Since $v \in \psi(T')$ and $v \neq t$, it follows that $v \in D$.

If $z \in D$, then $\{y,z\} \in D_p$. If $x \notin D$, then $(D_p - \{\{y,z\}\}) \cup \{\{x,y\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T. In a similar way as above, we can prove that $v \in D$. If $x \in D$, then $\{x,u\} \in D_p$. Furthermore, $t \notin D$ for arbitrary vertex $t \in N[u'] \setminus \{u\}$. Otherwise, $(D_p - \{\{y,z\},\{x,u\}\}) \cup \{\{x,y\}\}$ would be a γ_p-set of T, which is a contradiction. Hence, $(D_p - \{\{y,z\},\{x,u\}\}) \cup \{\{u',t\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T', where $t \in N(u') \setminus \{u\}$. Since $v \in \psi(T')$ and $v \neq t$, it follows that $v \in D$. Hence, $v \in \psi(T)$.

4. Proof of Theorem 1

If v is a support vertex, then Theorem 1 holds by Lemma 1. Hence we may assume that v is not a support vertex of T. If v is a leaf, then $v \notin \psi(T)$ by Lemma 2. For each $w \in L(v)$, if $d(v,w) \geqslant 5$, then let T^* be the tree obtained from T by replacing the $v-w$ path in T by a $v-w$ path of length j, $j = 4,5,2,3$ if $w \in L^i(v)$, $i = 0,1,2,3$. By repeated application of Lemma 3 it now follows that $v \in \psi(T)$ if and only if $v \in \psi(T^*)$.

To prove Theorem 1 we may therefore assume without loss of generality that $v \notin S(T)$, $d(v) \geqslant 2$ and every leaf of T is at distance $2,3,4$ or 5 from v. We consider the following cases.

Case 1: $|L^1(v)| \geqslant 2$.

Let u_5 and w_5 be two leaves at distance 5 from v in T with $P_u\colon\ v, u_1, \ldots, u_5$ and $P_w\colon\ v, w_1, \ldots, w_5$ the $v-u_5$ and $v-w_5$ paths, respectively. If there exists a γ_p-set S of T such that $v \notin S$, then $|S \cap V(P_u)| = 4$ and $|S \cap V(P_w)| = 4$. Without loss of generality, say $\{u_1,u_2\},\{u_3,u_4\} \in S_p$ and $\{w_1,w_2\},\{w_3,w_4\} \in S_p$. Then $(S_p - \{\{u_1,u_2\},\{w_1,w_2\}\}) \cup \{\{v,u_1\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $v \in \psi(T)$.

Case 2: $|L^1(v)| = 1$ and $|L^2(v)| \geqslant 1$.

In a similar way as Case 1, it is easy to prove that $v \in \psi(T)$.

Case 3: $|L^1(v)| = 1$ and $|L^2(v)| = 0$.

Let u_5 be the leaf at distance 5 from v in T with $P_u\colon\ v, u_1, \ldots, u_5$ the $v-u_5$ path. Then every leaf distinct from u_5 is at distance 3 or 4 from v. For any γ_p-set S of T, S contains every support vertex and at least one neighbor of every support vertex. In order to dominate u_1, two vertices are necessary. It follows that $\gamma_p(T) \geqslant 2|L(v)|+2$. On the other hand, $D^* = S(T) \cup (N(S(T)) \setminus L(T)) \cup \{u_1,u_2\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T with cardinality $2|L(v)|+2$, and so $\gamma_p(T) = 2|L(v)|+2$. Since $v \notin D^*$, it follows that $v \notin \psi(T)$.

Case 4: $|L^1(v)| = 0$ and $|L^2(v) \cup L^3(v)| \geqslant 1$.

Then every leaf is at distance 2, 3 or 4 from v. Let $A = N(L^2(v))$, $B = N(L^3(v) \cup L^0(v))$ and $C = N(B) \setminus (L^3(v) \cup L^0(v))$. Let S be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T. If there exists a vertex $u \in A$ such that u and v are paired, then w must be paired with its leaf for arbitrary vertex $w \in A \setminus \{u\}$. Since S contains every support vertex and at least one neighbor of every support vertex, it follows that $\gamma_p(T) \geqslant 2|L(v)|$. On the other hand, $D^* = L^2(v) \cup A \cup B \cup C$ is a paired-dominating set of T with cardinality $2|L(v)|$, and so $\gamma_p(T) = 2|L(v)|$. Since $v \notin D^*$, it follows that $v \notin \psi(T)$.

Case 5: $L^1(v) = L^2(v) = L^2(v) = \emptyset$.

In a similar way as Case 4, we can prove that $v \notin \psi(T)$.

5. Proof of theorem 2

For $1 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant 5$, let $P\colon u_i, u_{i-1}, \ldots, u_1, w, z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_j$ be a path in a tree T_1 with $L(P) \subseteq L(T_1)$, $w \in V(P) \cap B(T_1)$ and $d(t) = 2$ for arbitrary vertex $t \in V(P) - (L(P) \cup \{w\})$. Assume $P_u\colon u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_i$ and $P_z\colon z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_j$. Let $v \in V(T_1) - V(P)$. For a set (to be defined) $X \subset V(P) - \{w\}$, let $T_2 = T_1 - X$.

Lemma 4. *If $j = 4$ and $X = V(P_z)$, then $v \in \psi(T_2)$ if and only if $v \in \psi(T_1)$.*

Proof. In a way similar to Lemma 3, we can prove that $\gamma_p(T_1) = \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$.

Suppose that $v \notin \psi(T_2)$. Let S be a γ_p-set of T_2 that does not contain v. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_2, z_3\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1 that does not contain v. Hence, $v \notin \psi(T_1)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T_2)$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_1.

If $z_4 \notin D$, then $\{z_2, z_3\} \in D_p$. If $z_1 \notin D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. Since $v \in \psi(T_2)$, it follows that $v \in D$. If $z_1 \in D$, then $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$. Furthermore, $i \neq 2$. Otherwise, $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$ and $(D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. We consider the following cases.

Case 1: $i = 1$. Then $(D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. Since $v \in \psi(T_2)$, it follows that $v \in D$.

Case 2: $i = 3$. Then $|D \cap V(P_u)| = 2$. If $u_1 \notin D$, then $(D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. If $u_1 \in D$, then $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$, and $(D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{w, z_1\}, \{u_1, u_2\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}, \{u_2, u_3\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. Since $v \in \psi(T_2)$, it follows that $v \in D$.

Case 3: $i = 4$. Then $u_1 \notin D$. Otherwise, if $u_1 \in D$, then $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$ and $\{u_3, u_4\} \in D_p$. So, $(D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{u_3, u_4\}\}) \cup \{\{u_2, u_3\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $(D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. Since $v \in \psi(T_2)$, it follows that $v \in D$.

Case 4: $i = 5$. Then $u_1 \notin D$. Otherwise, if $u_1 \in D$, then $|D \cap V(P_u)| = 4$. Without loss of generality, say $\{u_1, u_2\}, \{u_3, u_4\} \in D_p$. So, $D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $(D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. Since $v \in \psi(T_2)$, it follows that $v \in D$.

If $z_4 \in D$, then $\{z_3, z_4\} \in D_p$. If $z_2 \notin D$, then $(D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}) \cup \{\{z_2, z_3\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. In a way similar to the above, we can prove that $v \in D$. If $z_2 \in D$, then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$. Furthermore, $t \notin D$ for arbitrary vertex $t \in N[w] \setminus \{z_1\}$. Otherwise, $(D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}, \{z_3, z_4\}\}) \cup \{\{z_2, z_3\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $i \neq 1, 2$. If $i = 3$, then $\{u_2, u_3\} \in D_p$. So, $(D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}, \{z_3, z_4\}, \{u_2, u_3\}\}) \cup \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{u_1, u_2\}\}$

is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. If $i = 4$, then $(D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}, \{z_3, z_4\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. Since $v \in \psi(T_2)$, it follows that $v \in D$. If $i = 5$, then $\{u_2, u_3\}, \{u_4, u_5\} \in D_p$. So, $(D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}, \{z_3, z_4\}, \{u_2, u_3\}, \{u_4, u_5\}\}) \cup \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{w, u_1\}, \{u_3, u_4\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 5. *If $i = 2$ and $X = V(P_z)$, then $v \in \psi(T_2)$ if and only if $v \in \psi(T_1)$.*

Proof. We consider the following cases.

Case 1: $j = 1$. By Lemma 2, let S be a γ_p-set of T_2 that does not contain u_2. Then $\{w, u_1\} \in S_p$ and S is a paired-dominating set of T_1. So, $\gamma_p(T_1) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_2)$. Let D be a γ_p-set of T_1 that does not contain z_1. Then $w \in D$ and D is a paired-dominating set of T_2. So, $\gamma_p(T_2) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_1)$. Hence, $\gamma_p(T_1) = \gamma_p(T_2)$.

Suppose that $v \in \psi(T_1)$. Let S be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_2. If $w \in S$, then S is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. If $w \notin S$, then $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$ and $(S_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. So, $v \in \psi(T_2)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T_2)$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_1. Then $w, u_1 \in D$. If $z_1 \in D$, then $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$ and $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$. So, $(D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $z_1 \notin D$. Then D is a γ_p-set of T_2. Hence, $v \in D$. So, $v \in \psi(T_1)$.

Case 2: $j = 2$. Let S be a γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1. So, $\gamma_p(T_1) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$. Let D be a γ_p-set of T_1 that does not contain z_2. Then $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$ and $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$. Furthermore, $(D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2. So, $\gamma_p(T_2) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_1) - 2$. Hence, $\gamma_p(T_1) = \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$.

Suppose that $v \in \psi(T_1)$. Let S be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{z_1, z_2\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. So, $v \in \psi(T_2)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T_2)$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_1. If $z_2 \notin D$, then $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$ and $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$. Then $(D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. So, $v \in D$. If $z_2 \in D$, then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$ and $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. So, $v \in D$. Therefore, $v \in \psi(T_1)$.

Case 3: $j = 3$. Let S be a γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1. So, $\gamma_p(T_1) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$. Let D be a γ_p-set of T_1 that does not contain z_3. Then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$ and $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2. So, $\gamma_p(T_2) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_1) - 2$. Hence, $\gamma_p(T_1) = \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$.

Suppose that $v \in \psi(T_1)$. Let S be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. So, $v \in \psi(T_2)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T_2)$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_1. If $z_3 \notin D$, then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$ and $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. So, $v \in D$.

If $z_3 \in D$, then $\{z_2, z_3\} \in D_p$. Furthermore, $z_1 \notin D$. Otherwise, $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$, $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$ and $(D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Then $D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. So, $v \in D$. Therefore, $v \in \psi(T_1)$.

Case 4: $j = 4$. By Lemma 4, Lemma 5 holds.

Case 5: $j = 5$. By Lemma 2, let S be a γ_p-set of T_2 that does not contain u_2. Then $\{w, u_1\} \in S_p$ and $S_p \cup \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1. So, $\gamma_p(T_1) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$. Let D be a γ_p-set of T_1 that does not contain z_5. Then $\{z_3, z_4\} \in D_p$. If $z_2 \in D$, then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$. So, $w \notin D$. Otherwise, $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ would be a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$. But $(D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{z_1, z_2\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction.

Hence, $z_2 \notin D$. If $z_1 \in D$, then $\{w, z_1\}$, $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$. So, $(D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $z_1 \notin D$. So, $D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2 and $\gamma_p(T_2) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_1) - 2$. Hence, $\gamma_p(T_1) = \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$.

Suppose that $v \in \psi(T_1)$. Let S be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_2. If $w \in S$, then $S_p \cup \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. If $w \notin S$, then $\{u_1, u_2\} \in S_p$. Then $(S_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}, \{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. So, $v \in S$. Therefore, $v \in \psi(T_2)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T_2)$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_1. If $z_5 \notin D$, then $\{z_3, z_4\} \in D_p$. In a way similar to the above, $D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. Hence, $v \in D$. If $z_5 \in D$, then $\{z_4, z_5\} \in D_p$. If $z_3 \in D$, then $\{z_2, z_3\} \in D_p$. If $z_1 \notin D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{z_4, z_5\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_2)$, which is a contradiction. If $z_1 \in D$, then $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$ and $(D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{z_4, z_5\}\}) \cup \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $z_3 \notin D$. Then $(D_p - \{\{z_4, z_5\}\}) \cup \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. In a way similar to the above, we can prove that $v \in D$. So, $v \in \psi(T_1)$. $\square$

Lemma 6. *If $i = 1$, $j = 1, 3, 5$ and $X = V(P_z)$, then $v \in \psi(T_2)$ if and only if $v \in \psi(T_1)$.*

Proof. We consider the following cases.

Case 1: $j = 1$. It is easy to prove that the lemma holds.

Case 2: $j = 3$. Let S be a γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1. So, $\gamma_p(T_1) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$. Let D be a γ_p-set of T_1 that does not contain z_3. Then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$ and $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2. So, $\gamma_p(T_2) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_1) - 2$. Hence, $\gamma_p(T_1) = \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$.

Suppose that $v \in \psi(T_1)$. Let S be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. So, $v \in \psi(T_2)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T_2)$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_1. If $z_3 \notin D$, then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$ and $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. So, $v \in D$. If $z_3 \in D$, then $\{z_2, z_3\} \in D_p$. If $z_1 \notin D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. So, $v \in D$. If $z_1 \in D$, then $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$ and $(D_p - \{\{w, z_1\}, \{z_2, z_3\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. So, $v \in D$. Therefore, $v \in \psi(T_1)$.

Case 3: $j = 5$. Let S be a γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1. So, $\gamma_p(T_1) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$. Let D be a γ_p-set of T_1 that does not contain z_5. Then $\{z_3, z_4\} \in D_p$. If $z_2 \in D$, then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$ and $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $z_2 \notin D$. If $z_1 \in D$, then $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$ and $(D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2. If $z_1 \notin D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2. So, $\gamma_p(T_2) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_1) - 2$. Hence, $\gamma_p(T_1) = \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$.

Suppose that $v \in \psi(T_1)$. Let S be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. So, $v \in \psi(T_2)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T_2)$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_1. If $z_5 \notin D$, then $\{z_3, z_4\} \in D_p$. In a way similar to the above, $D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ or $(D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. Hence, $v \in D$.

If $z_5 \in D$, then $\{z_4, z_5\} \in D_p$. If $z_3 \in D$, then $\{z_2, z_3\} \in D_p$. If $z_1 \in D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. If $z_1 \notin D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{z_4, z_5\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_2)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $z_3 \notin D$. Then $(D_p - \{\{z_4, z_5\}\}) \cup \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. In a way similar to the above, we can prove that $v \in D$. So, $v \in \psi(T_1)$.

Lemma 7. *If $i = 3$, $j = 3$ and $X = V(P_z)$, then $v \in \psi(T_2)$ if and only if $v \in \psi(T_1)$.*

Proof. Let S be a γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1. So, $\gamma_p(T_1) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$. Let D be a γ_p-set of T_1 that does not contain z_3. Then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$. If $w \in D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2. If $w \notin D$, then $|D \cap V(P_u)| = 2$. Without loss of generality, say $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$. Then $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2. So, $\gamma_p(T_2) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_1) - 2$. Hence, $\gamma_p(T_1) = \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$.

Suppose that $v \in \psi(T_1)$. Let S be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. So, $v \in \psi(T_2)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T_2)$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_1. If $z_3 \notin D$, then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$. In a way similar to the above, $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2.

So, $v \in D$. If $z_3 \in D$, then $\{z_2, z_3\} \in D_p$. If $z_1 \notin D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. If $z_1 \in D$, then $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$ and $|D \cap V(P_u)| = 3$. Without loss of generality, say $\{u_1, u_2\} \in D_p$. Then $(D_p - \{\{w, z_1\}, \{z_2, z_3\}, \{u_1, u_2\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}, \{u_2, u_3\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. So, $v \in D$. Therefore, $v \in \psi(T_1)$. $\square$

Lemma 8. *If $i = 5$, $j = 3, 5$ and $X = V(P_z)$, then $v \in \psi(T_2)$ if and only if $v \in \psi(T_1)$.*

Proof. We consider the following cases.

Case 1: $j = 3$. Let S be a γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1. So, $\gamma_p(T_1) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$. Let D be a γ_p-set of T_1 that does not contain z_3. Then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$. If $w \in D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2. If $w \notin D$, then $|D \cap V(P_u)| = 4$. Without loss of generality, say $\{u_1, u_2\}, \{u_3, u_4\} \in D_p$. Then $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2. So, $\gamma_p(T_2) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_1) - 2$. Hence, $\gamma_p(T_1) = \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$.

Suppose that $v \in \psi(T_1)$. Let S be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_2. Then $S_p \cup \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. So, $v \in \psi(T_2)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T_2)$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_1. If $z_3 \notin D$, then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$. In a way similar to the above, $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. So, $v \in D$. If $z_3 \in D$, then $\{z_2, z_3\} \in D_p$. If $z_1 \notin D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. If $z_1 \in D$, then $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$. If $u_1 \in D$, then $|D \cap V(P_u)| = 4$. Without loss of generality, say $\{u_1, u_2\}, \{u_3, u_4\} \in D_p$. Then $D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $u_1 \notin D$. Then $(D_p - \{\{w, z_1\}, \{z_2, z_3\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. So, $v \in D$. Therefore, $v \in \psi(T_1)$.

Case 2: $j = 5$. By Lemma 2, let S be a γ_p-set of T_2 that does not contain u_5. If $w \in S$, then $S_p \cup \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1. If $w \notin S$, without loss of generality let us assume that $\{u_1, u_2\}$, $\{u_3, u_4\} \in D_p$. It follows that $(S_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}, \{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1. So, $\gamma_p(T_1) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$. Let D be a γ_p-set of T_1 that does not contain z_5. Then $\{z_3, z_4\} \in D_p$. If $z_2 \in D$, then $\{z_1, z_2\} \in D_p$. Furthermore, $w \notin D$, otherwise $D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}\}$ would be a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $|D \cap V(P_u)| = 4$. Without loss of generality, say $\{u_1, u_2\}, \{u_3, u_4\} \in D_p$. Then $(D_p - \{\{z_1, z_2\}, \{u_1, u_2\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $z_2 \notin D$. If $z_1 \in D$, then $\{w, z_1\} \in D_p$. If $u_1 \in D$, then $|D \cap V(P_u)| = 4$. Without loss of generality, say $\{u_1, u_2\}, \{u_3, u_4\} \in D_p$. Then $D_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. If $u_1 \notin D$, then $(D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a paired-dominating

set of T_2. If $z_1 \notin D$, then $D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2. So, $\gamma_p(T_2) \leqslant \gamma_p(T_1) - 2$. Hence, $\gamma_p(T_1) = \gamma_p(T_2) + 2$.

Suppose that $v \in \psi(T_1)$. Let S be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_2. If $w \in S$, then $S_p \cup \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. If $w \notin S$, then $|S \cap V(P_u)| = 4$. Without loss of generality, say $\{u_1, u_2\}, \{u_3, u_4\} \in S_p$. So, $(S_p - \{\{u_1, u_2\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}, \{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. Hence, $v \in S$. So, $v \in \psi(T_2)$.

Conversely, suppose that $v \in \psi(T_2)$. Let D be an arbitrary γ_p-set of T_1. If $z_5 \notin D$, then $\{z_3, z_4\} \in D_p$. In a way similar to the above, $D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ or $(D_p - \{\{z_3, z_4\}, \{w, z_1\}\}) \cup \{\{w, u_1\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_2. Hence, $v \in D$. If $z_5 \in D$, then $\{z_4, z_5\} \in D_p$. If $z_3 \in D$, then $\{z_2, z_3\} \in D_p$. Suppose that $z_1 \in D$. Then $D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_1 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_1)$, which is a contradiction. Suppose that $z_1 \notin D$. Then $D_p - \{\{z_2, z_3\}, \{z_4, z_5\}\}$ is a paired-dominating set of T_2 with cardinality less than $\gamma_p(T_2)$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $z_3 \notin D$. Then $(D_p - \{\{z_4, z_5\}\}) \cup \{\{z_3, z_4\}\}$ is a γ_p-set of T_1. In a way similar to the above, we can prove that $v \in D$. So, $v \in \psi(T_1)$. $\square$

By Theorem 1 and Lemmas 3–8, Theorem 2 holds.

References

[1] *P. L. Hammer, P. Hansen and B. Simeone*: Vertices belonging to all or to no maximum stable sets of a graph. SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Math. *3* (1982), 511–522.

[2] *C. M. Mynhardt*: Vertices contained in every minimum dominating set of a tree. J. Graph Theory *31* (1999), 163–177.

[3] *E. J. Cockayne, M. A. Henning and C. M. Mynhardt*: Vertices contained in all or in no minimum total dominating set of a tree. Discrete Math. *260* (2003), 37–44.

[4] *T. W. Haynes and P. J. Slater*: Paired-domination in graphs. Networks.

[5] *T. W. Haynes, M. A. Henning and P. J. Slater*: Strong equality of domination parameters in trees. Discrete Math. *260* (2003), 77–87.

[6] *T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi and P. J. Slater*: Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998.

[7] Domination in Graphs: Advanced Topics (T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi and P. J. Slater, eds.). Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998.

Author's address: Xue-gang Chen, Department of Mathematics, North China Electric Power University, Beijing 102206, China, e-mail: `gxc_xdm@163.com`.