

Hua Ming Xing; Hai-Long Liu
Minus total domination in graphs

Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, Vol. 59 (2009), No. 4, 861–870

Persistent URL: <http://dml.cz/dmlcz/140521>

Terms of use:

© Institute of Mathematics AS CR, 2009

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>

MINUS TOTAL DOMINATION IN GRAPHS

HUA-MING XING, Tianjin, and HAI-LONG LIU, Beijing

(Received January 28, 2008)

Abstract. A three-valued function $f: V \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ defined on the vertices of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a minus total dominating function (MTDF) if the sum of its function values over any open neighborhood is at least one. That is, for every $v \in V$, $f(N(v)) \geq 1$, where $N(v)$ consists of every vertex adjacent to v . The weight of an MTDF is $f(V) = \sum f(v)$, over all vertices $v \in V$. The minus total domination number of a graph G , denoted $\gamma_t^-(G)$, equals the minimum weight of an MTDF of G . In this paper, we discuss some properties of minus total domination on a graph G and obtain a few lower bounds for $\gamma_t^-(G)$.

Keywords: minus domination, total domination, minus total domination

MSC 2010: 05C69

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph and v be a vertex in V . The open neighborhood of v , denoted by $N(v)$, is the set of vertices adjacent to v , i.e., $N(v) = \{u \in V: uv \in E\}$. The closed neighborhood of v is the set $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$. The degree of v in G is $d_G(v) = |N(v)|$. A vertex v of a tree T is called a leaf of T if $d_T(v) = 1$. $\Delta(G)$ and $\delta(G)$ denote the maximum degree and the minimum degree of the vertices of G . When no ambiguity can occur, we often simply write $d(v)$, δ , Δ instead of $d_G(v)$, $\delta(G)$ and $\Delta(G)$, respectively. Let $S \subseteq V$, $G[S]$ denote the subgraph of G induced by S . For $S \subseteq V$ and $v \in V$, the degree of v in S , denoted by $d_S(v)$, is the number of neighbors v has in S .

In the following we introduce a definition of a dominating function on a graph G .

Definition 1. Let \mathbb{R} be the real numbers set and $Y \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. A function $f: V \rightarrow Y$ defined on the vertices of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a (Y, α) -dominating function if f satisfies some condition α . For $S \subseteq V$, let $f(S) = \sum_{v \in S} f(v)$. The weight of f is defined as $f(V)$. A (Y, α) -dominating function f is minimal (Y, α) -dominating

function if there does not exist a (Y, α) -dominating function g , $g \neq f$, for which $g(v) \leq f(v)$ for every $v \in V$. The (Y, α) -domination number of G is $\gamma_{(Y, \alpha)}(G) = \min \{f(V) : f \text{ is a } (Y, \alpha)\text{-dominating function of } G\}$.

From the above definition we can easily see the following facts:

(i) If $Y_1 = \{0, 1\}$ and $\alpha_1 = "f(N(v)) \geq 1 \text{ for every } v \in V"$, then a (Y_1, α_1) -dominating function is a *total dominating function* (TDF) of a graph G without isolated vertices and $\gamma_{(Y_1, \alpha_1)}(G) = \gamma_t(G)$ is the *total domination number* of G . (Total domination has been studied in [1]–[4], [8], [10], [11].)

(ii) If $Y_2 = \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and $\alpha_2 = "f(N[v]) \geq 1 \text{ for every } v \in V"$, then a (Y_2, α_2) -dominating function is a *minus dominating function* (MDF) and $\gamma_{(Y_2, \alpha_2)}(G) = \gamma^-(G)$ is the *minus domination number* of G . (Minus domination has been studied in [5]–[7], [10], [13].)

(iii) If $Y_3 = \{-1, 1\}$ and $\alpha_3 = "f(N(v)) \geq 1 \text{ for every } v \in V"$, then a (Y_3, α_3) -dominating function is a *signed total dominating function* (STDF) of a graph G without isolated vertices and $\gamma_{(Y_3, \alpha_3)}(G) = \gamma_t^s(G)$ is the *signed total domination number* of G . (Signed total domination has been studied in [12], [14]–[16].)

(iv) If $Y_4 = \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and $\alpha_4 = "f(N(v)) \geq 1 \text{ for every } v \in V"$, then a (Y_4, α_4) -dominating function is a *minus total dominating function* (MTDF) of a graph G without isolated vertices and $\gamma_{(Y_4, \alpha_4)}(G) = \gamma_t^-(G)$ is the *minus total domination number* of G . We call a MTDF of weight $\gamma_t^-(G)$ a $\gamma_t^-(G)$ -function. (Minus total domination has been defined in [9].)

In this paper, we discuss some properties of minus total domination on a graph G and obtain a few lower bounds for $\gamma_t^-(G)$. To ensure existence of an MTDF, we henceforth restrict our attention to graphs without isolated vertices.

2. PROPERTIES ON MINUS TOTAL DOMINATION

Theorem 1. *A MTDF f on a graph G is minimal if and only if for every vertex $v \in V$ with $f(v) \geq 0$, there exists a vertex $u \in N(v)$ with $f(N(u)) = 1$.*

Proof. Let f be a minimal MTDF and assume that there is a vertex v with $f(v) \geq 0$ and $f(N(u)) > 1$ for every vertex $u \in N(v)$. Define a new function $g: V \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ by $g(v) = f(v) - 1$ and $g(u) = f(u)$ for all $u \neq v$. Then for all $u \in N(v)$, $g(N(u)) = f(N(u)) - 1 \geq 1$. For $w \notin N(v)$, $g(N(w)) = f(N(w)) \geq 1$. Thus g is an MTDF on G . Since $g < f$, the minimality of f is contradicted.

Conversely, let f be an MTDF on G such that for every $v \in V$ with $f(v) \geq 0$, there exists a vertex $u \in N(v)$ with $f(N(u)) = 1$. Assume f is not minimal, i.e., there is an MTDF g on G such that $g < f$. Then $g(w) \leq f(w)$ for all $w \in V$, and there is at least a vertex $v_0 \in V$ with $g(v_0) < f(v_0)$. Therefore, $f(v_0) \geq 0$, and by assumption,

there exists a vertex $u_0 \in N(v_0)$ with $f(N(u_0)) = 1$. But since $g(w) \leq f(w)$ for all $w \in V$ and $g(v_0) < f(v_0)$, we know that $g(N(u_0)) < f(N(u_0)) = 1$. This contradicts the fact that g is a MTDf. Therefore f is a minimal MTDf. \square

Consider the graph in Fig. 1. One can see that the function f given in Fig. 1(a) is a minimal TDF but is not a minimal MTDf (cf. Fig. 1(b)). Notice that the vertex v in Fig. 1(a) satisfies $f(v) \geq 0$ and $N(v) = \{u\}$, but $f(u) = 2 > 1$, so the minimality condition of Theorem 1 is not satisfied.




Fig. 1

From [14] we know that γ_t and γ_t^s are not comparable in general. Furthermore, every TDF (or STDF) on a graph is an MTDf. Therefore, the total domination number, signed total domination number and minus total domination number of a graph are related as follows.

Theorem 2. For any graph G , $\gamma_t^-(G) \leq \min(\gamma_t(G), \gamma_t^s(G))$.

Theorem 3. For any positive integer k , there exists an outerplanar graph G with $\gamma_t^-(G) \leq -k$.

Proof. Consider the class of outerplanar graphs G_k which can be constructed as in Fig. 2. Then $|V(G_k)| = 3(k + 3) + 3 = 3k + 12$ and there are $2k + 8$ vertices of degree 1. By assigning to the $2(k + 3)$ vertices of degree 1 the value -1 and to the remaining vertices the value 1, we produce an MTDf f of G_k of weight $(k + 6) - 2(k + 3) = -k$ as illustrated. \square




Fig. 2 An outerplanar graph G_k with $\gamma_t^-(G_k) \leq -k$.

We introduce the following notation which we shall frequently use in the proofs that follow. For a given MTDF f on a graph G , let $P_f = \{v \in V(G) : f(v) = 1\}$, $M_f = \{v \in V(G) : f(v) = -1\}$, and let $Q_f = \{v \in V(G) : f(v) = 0\}$.

Lemma 1. *Let f be an MTDF of a tree T of order $n \geq 2$. Then $|P_f| \geq |M_f| + 2$.*

Proof. *Case 1:* $T[P_f]$ is connected.

Since every vertex in M_f must have a neighbor in P_f , we have $\sum_{v \in M_f} d_{P_f}(v) \geq |M_f|$. Since every vertex has higher degree in P_f than in M_f , it follows that $\sum_{v \in P_f} d_{M_f}(v) \leq \sum_{v \in P_f} (d_{P_f}(v) - 1)$. Thus $|M_f| \leq \sum_{v \in M_f} d_{P_f}(v) = \sum_{v \in P_f} d_{M_f}(v) \leq \sum_{v \in P_f} (d_{P_f}(v) - 1)$. But $\sum_{v \in P_f} d_{P_f}(v)$ is equal to twice the number of edges in the subgraph $T[P_f]$ induced by P_f . As $T[P_f]$ is connected, $T[P_f]$ is a subtree of T . Thus $|M_f| \leq \sum_{v \in P_f} (d_{P_f}(v) - 1) = 2|E(T[P_f])| - |P_f| = 2(|P_f| - 1) - |P_f| = |P_f| - 2$. Hence $|P_f| \geq |M_f| + 2$.

Case 2: $T[P_f]$ is disconnected.

Then $T[P_f]$ is a forest. Assume that P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k are the components of $T[P_f]$. Then $|V(P_i)| \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $M_i = \bigcup_{v \in V(P_i)} (N(v) \cap M_f)$ and let $T_i = T[V(P_i) \cup M_i]$. Then T_i is a subtree of T . Similarly to Case 1, we have $|V(P_i)| \geq |M_i| + 2$. Therefore, $|P_f| = \sum_{i=1}^k |V(P_i)| \geq \sum_{i=1}^k (|M_i| + 2) \geq |M_f| + 2k \geq |M_f| + 2$. \square

Theorem 4. *If T is a tree of order $n \geq 4$, then $\gamma_t(T) - \gamma_t^-(T) \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - 4)$.*

Proof. Let f be a $\gamma_t^-(G)$ -function of T . If $M_f = \emptyset$, then $\gamma_t(T) - \gamma_t^-(T) = 0 \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - 4)$. So assume that $M_f \neq \emptyset$. Let $v \in M_f$. Since $f(N(v)) \geq 1$, there is a vertex $u \in P_f \cap N(v)$ such that $|N(u) \cap P_f| \geq 2$. Let P' be the component of $T[P_f]$ which contains the vertex u . Then P' is a subtree of T and $|V(P')| \geq 3$. Moreover, by Lemma 1, $|P_f| \geq |M_f| + 2$. Hence $|M_f| = n - |P_f| - |Q_f| \leq n - (|M_f| + 2) - |Q_f| = n - |M_f| - |Q_f| - 2$. Thus, $|M_f| \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - |Q_f| - 2)$.

Case 1: $|Q_f| \geq 2$.

Since P_f is a total domination set of T , $\gamma_t(T) \leq |P_f|$. Furthermore, $\gamma_t^-(T) = |P_f| - |M_f|$. Thus $\gamma_t(T) - \gamma_t^-(T) \leq |P_f| - (|P_f| - |M_f|) = |M_f| \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - |Q_f| - 2) \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - 4)$.

Case 2: $|Q_f| \leq 1$.

Since P' is a subtree of T and $|V(P')| \geq 3$, there are at least two leaves in P' . Let w be a leaf of P' such that $N(w) \cap Q_f = \emptyset$. Since w is not adjacent to any vertex in M_f , it follows that $P_f - \{w\}$ is a total domination set of T . Hence $\gamma_t(T) \leq |P_f| - 1$. Thus $\gamma_t(T) - \gamma_t^-(T) \leq (|P_f| - 1) - (|P_f| - |M_f|) = |M_f| - 1 \leq \frac{1}{2}(n - 2) - 1 = \frac{1}{2}(n - 4)$. \square

Theorem 5. For any complete graph K_n on n ($n \geq 2$) vertices, $\gamma_t^-(K_n) = 2$.

Proof. Let f be a $\gamma_t^-(G)$ -function of K_n . Obviously, $|P_f| \geq 2$. Let $v \in P_f$. Since $f(N(v)) \geq 1$, $\gamma_t^-(K_n) = f(N[v]) = f(N(v)) + f(v) \geq 2$.

On the other hand, let g be the function of K_n defined as follows. Assign to a pair of vertices the value 1 and to the remaining vertices the value 0. It is easy to see that g is an MTDF of K_n and the weight $g(V) = 2$. Thus $\gamma_t^-(G) \leq g(V) = 2$. Consequently, $\gamma_t^-(K_n) = 2$. \square

Theorem 6. For any path P_n on n ($n \geq 2$) vertices,

$$\gamma_t^-(P_n) = \gamma_t(P_n) = \begin{cases} \lceil \frac{1}{2}n \rceil, & n \equiv 0, 1, 3 \pmod{4}, \\ \frac{1}{2}n + 1, & n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let f be a $\gamma_t^-(G)$ -function of P_n . We claim that for every vertex $v \in V(P_n)$, $f(v) \geq 0$. If this is not the case, then there exists a vertex $v \in V(P_n)$ such that $f(v) = -1$. Let $u \in N(v)$. Then $f(N(u)) \leq 0$, a contradiction. Thus f is a total dominating function of P_n . Then $\gamma_t(P_n) \leq f(V(P_n)) = \gamma_t^-(P_n)$. On the other hand, by Theorem 2, we have $\gamma_t^-(P_n) \leq \gamma_t(P_n)$. Consequently, $\gamma_t^-(P_n) = \gamma_t(P_n)$. \square

The proof of the following result is similar to that of Theorem 6 and is therefore omitted.

Theorem 7. For any cycle C_n on n ($n \geq 2$) vertices,

$$\gamma_t^-(C_n) = \gamma_t(C_n) = \begin{cases} \lceil \frac{1}{2}n \rceil, & n \equiv 0, 1, 3 \pmod{4}, \\ \frac{1}{2}n + 1, & n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 8. For any complete multipartite graph $G \cong K(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n)$, $\gamma_t^-(G) = 2$.

Proof. Let f be a $\gamma_t^-(G)$ -function on G and let A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n denote the partite sets of G . For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $P_i = \{v \in A_i : f(v) = 1\}$ and $M_i = \{v \in A_i : f(v) = -1\}$. Obviously, there exists an integer j ($1 \leq j \leq n$) such that $|P_j| > |M_j|$ (otherwise for every $v \in V(G)$, $f(N(v)) \leq 0$). Let $v_0 \in A_j$. Since $f(N(v_0)) = \sum_{v \in V - A_j} f(v) \geq 1$, it follows that $\gamma_t^-(G) = f(V) = \sum_{v \in V} f(v) = f(N(v_0)) + \sum_{v \in A_j} f(v) \geq 1 + |P_j| - |M_j| \geq 2$.

On the other hand, assume that $v_1 \in A_1$ and $v_2 \in A_2$. Let g be the function on G defined as follows. Assign to the vertices v_1 and v_2 the value 1 and to the remaining vertices the value 0. It is easy to see that g is an MTDF of G and the weight $g(V) = 2$. Thus $\gamma_t^-(G) \leq g(V) = 2$. Consequently, $\gamma_t^-(G) = 2$. \square

3. LOWER BOUNDS ON MINUS TOTAL DOMINATION NUMBER

Theorem 9. *If T is a tree of order $n \geq 2$, then $\gamma_t^-(T) \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let f be a $\gamma_t^-(G)$ -function of T . By Lemma 1, $|P_f| \geq |M_f| + 2$. Thus $\gamma_t^-(T) = |P_f| - |M_f| \geq 2$. □

Theorem 10. *For any graph G of order n , maximum degree Δ and minimum degree $\delta \geq 1$,*

$$\gamma_t^-(G) \geq \frac{\delta - \Delta + 2}{\delta + \Delta}n.$$

Proof. Let f be a $\gamma_t^-(G)$ -function on G . Let P_f , M_f and Q_f be the sets of vertices in G that are assigned the values $+1$, -1 and 0 under f , respectively. Let $P_f = P_\Delta \cup P_\delta \cup P_\Theta$ where P_Δ and P_δ are the sets of all vertices of P_f with degree equal to Δ and δ , respectively, and P_Θ contains all other vertices in P_f , if any. Similarly, we define $M_f = M_\Delta \cup M_\delta \cup M_\Theta$ and $Q_f = Q_\Delta \cup Q_\delta \cup Q_\Theta$. Further, for $i \in \{\Delta, \delta, \Theta\}$, let V_i be defined by $V_i = P_i \cup M_i \cup Q_i$. Thus $n = |V_\Delta| + |V_\delta| + |V_\Theta|$.

Since for each $v \in V$, $f(N(v)) \geq 1$, we have $\sum_{v \in V} f(N(v)) \geq |V| = n$. The sum $\sum_{v \in V} f(N(v))$ counts the value $f(v)$ exactly $d(v)$ times for each vertex $v \in V$, i.e., $\sum_{v \in V} f(N(v)) = \sum_{v \in V} f(v)d(v)$. Thus, $\sum_{v \in V} f(v)d(v) \geq n$. Breaking the sum up into the nine summations and replacing $f(v)$ by the corresponding value of $1, 0$ or -1 yields

$$\sum_{v \in P_\Delta} d(v) + \sum_{v \in P_\delta} d(v) + \sum_{v \in P_\Theta} d(v) - \sum_{v \in M_\Delta} d(v) - \sum_{v \in M_\delta} d(v) - \sum_{v \in M_\Theta} d(v) \geq n.$$

We know that $d(v) = \Delta$ for all v in P_Δ or M_Δ , and $d(v) = \delta$ for all v in P_δ or M_δ . For any vertex v in either P_Θ or M_Θ , $\delta + 1 \leq d(v) \leq \Delta - 1$. Thus

$$\Delta|P_\Delta| + \delta|P_\delta| + (\Delta - 1)|P_\Theta| - \Delta|M_\Delta| - \delta|M_\delta| - (\delta + 1)|M_\Theta| \geq n.$$

For $i \in \{\Delta, \delta, \Theta\}$, we replace $|P_i|$ with $|V_i| - |M_i| - |Q_i|$ in the above inequality. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta|V_\Delta| + \delta|V_\delta| + (\Delta - 1)|V_\Theta| \\ & \geq n + 2\Delta|M_\Delta| + 2\delta|M_\delta| + (\Delta + \delta)|M_\Theta| + \Delta|Q_\Delta| + \delta|Q_\delta| + (\Delta - 1)|Q_\Theta|. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\Delta - 1)n &\geq 2\Delta|M_\Delta| + 2\delta|M_\delta| + (\Delta + \delta)|M_\Theta| + \Delta|Q_\Delta| + \delta|Q_\delta| + (\Delta - 1)|Q_\Theta| \\
 &\quad + (\Delta - \delta)(|P_\delta| + |Q_\delta| + |M_\delta|) + (|P_\Theta| + |Q_\Theta| + |M_\Theta|) \\
 &= 2\Delta|M_\Delta| + (\delta + \Delta)|M_\delta| + (\delta + \Delta + 1)|M_\Theta| \\
 &\quad + \Delta|Q_\Delta| + \Delta|Q_\delta| + \Delta|Q_\Theta| + (\Delta - \delta)|P_\delta| + |P_\Theta| \\
 &\geq (\Delta + \delta)|M_\Delta| + (\Delta + \delta)|M_\delta| + (\Delta + \delta)|M_\Theta| + \Delta|Q_f| \\
 &\geq (\Delta + \delta)|M_f| + \Delta|Q_f| \\
 &\geq \frac{1}{2}(\Delta + \delta)(2|M_f| + |Q_f|).
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus $2|M_f| + |Q_f| \leq 2(\Delta - 1)(\Delta + \delta)^{-1}n$.

Therefore, $\gamma_t^-(G) = n - (2|M_f| + |Q_f|) \geq n - (2\Delta - 2)(\Delta + \delta)^{-1}n = (\delta - \Delta + 2)(\Delta + \delta)^{-1}n$. \square

Corollary 1. *If G is an r -regular graph of order n , then $\gamma_t^-(G) \geq n/r$, and the bound is sharp.*

Proof. Since G is an r -regular graph, $\Delta = \delta = r$. By Theorem 10, the result follows.

That the bound is sharp may be seen by considering a complete bipartite graph $K_{r,r}$ of order $n = 2r$. By Theorem 8, $\gamma_t^-(K_{r,r}) = 2 = n/r$. \square

Corollary 2 ([12], [16]). *If G is an r -regular graph of order n , then $\gamma_t^s(G) \geq n/r$.*

In the following, we give a lower bound on the minus total domination number of a bipartite graph in terms of its order and characterize the graphs attaining this bound. For this purpose, we define a family \mathcal{G} of bipartite graphs as follows.

For $s \geq 2$, let G_s be the bipartite graph obtained from the disjoint union of $2s$ stars $K_{1,s-1}$ with centers $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_s, y_1, y_2, \dots, y_s\}$ by adding all edges of the type $x_i y_j$, $1 \leq i \leq j \leq s$. Then $|V(G_s)| = 2s^2$ and $|E(G_s)| = 3s^2 - 2s$. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{G_s : s \geq 2\}$.

Theorem 11. *If G is a bipartite graph of order n , then $\gamma_t^-(G) \geq 2\sqrt{2n} - n$, with equality if and only if $G \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Proof. Let f be a $\gamma_t^-(G)$ -function on G and let X and Y be the partite sets of G . Further, let $X^+ = \{v \in X : f(v) = 1\}$, $X^- = \{v \in X : f(v) = -1\}$, $Y^+ = \{v \in Y : f(v) = 1\}$, $Y^- = \{v \in Y : f(v) = -1\}$. Then $P_f = X^+ \cup Y^+$, $M_f = X^- \cup Y^-$. For convenience, let $x_1 = |X^+|$, $x_2 = |X^-|$, $y_1 = |Y^+|$, $y_2 = |Y^-|$, $p = |P_f|$, $m = |M_f|$, $q = |Q_f|$. Obviously, $x_1 \geq 1$, $y_1 \geq 1$. Then $x_1 + y_1 = p \geq 2$.

Since each vertex in X^- is adjacent to at least one vertex in Y^+ , by the Pigeonhole Principle, at least one vertex v_0 of Y^+ is adjacent to at least $\lceil x_2/y_1 \rceil$ vertices of X^- . Since $1 \leq f(N(v_0)) = |N(v_0) \cap X^+| - |N(v_0) \cap X^-| \leq |N(v_0) \cap X^+| - \lceil x_2/y_1 \rceil$, it follows that $x_1 = |X^+| \geq |N(v_0) \cap X^+| \geq \lceil x_2/y_1 \rceil + 1 \geq x_2/y_1 + 1$. Thus $x_1 y_1 \geq x_2 + y_1$. Using a similar argument, we may show that $x_1 y_1 \geq y_2 + x_1$. Thus $2x_1 y_1 \geq x_1 + y_1 + x_2 + y_2 = n - q$. Furthermore, since $2x_1 y_1 \leq \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + y_1)^2 = \frac{1}{2}p^2$, we have $\frac{1}{2}p^2 \geq n - q$. Thus $p^2 + 2q \geq 2n$. Since $p = x_1 + y_1 \geq 2$, it follows that $(p + \frac{1}{2}q)^2 \geq 2n$. So $2p + q \geq 2\sqrt{2n}$. Therefore

$$\gamma_t^-(G) = p - m = p - (n - p - q) = (2p + q) - n \geq 2\sqrt{2n} - n.$$

If G is a bipartite graph of order n such that $\gamma_t^-(G) = 2\sqrt{2n} - n$, then $2p + q = 2\sqrt{2n}$ and $q = 0$. Further, $2x_1 y_1 = \frac{1}{2}(x_1 + y_1)^2$ and $x_1 y_1 = x_1 + y_2 = x_2 + y_1$. Thus $x_1 = y_1$ and $x_2 = y_2 = x_1(x_1 - 1)$. Furthermore, each vertex of X^- (respectively, Y^-) has degree 1 and is adjacent to a vertex of Y^+ (respectively, X^+), while each vertex of X^+ is adjacent to all x_1 vertices of Y^+ and to $x_1 - 1$ vertices of Y^- and each vertex of Y^+ is adjacent to all x_1 vertices of X^+ and to $x_1 - 1$ vertices of X^- . Thus, if $\gamma_t^-(G) = 2\sqrt{2n} - n$, then $G \in \mathcal{G}$.

On the other hand, suppose $G \in \mathcal{G}$. Then $G = G_s$ for some $s \geq 2$. So G_s has order $n = 2s^2$. Assigning to the $2s$ central vertices of stars the value 1, and to all other vertices the value -1 , we produce an MTDf f of weight $f(V) = 2s - 2s(s - 1) = 2s - (n - 2s) = 4s - n = 2\sqrt{2n} - n$. Therefore, $\gamma_t^-(G) \leq f(V) = 2\sqrt{2n} - n$. Consequently, $\gamma_t^-(G) = 2\sqrt{2n} - n$. \square

Let $F_2 = K_2$ and for $s \geq 3$, let F_s be the graph obtained from the disjoint union of s stars $K_{1,s-2}$ by adding all edges between the central vertices of the s stars. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{F_s | s \geq 2\}$.

Theorem 12. *If G is a graph of order n , then $\gamma_t^-(G) \geq \sqrt{4n+1} + 1 - n$, with equality if and only if $G \in \mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. Let f be a $\gamma_t^-(G)$ -function on G and let $|P_f| = p$, $|M_f| = m$ and $|Q_f| = q$. Then $\gamma_t^-(G) = |P_f| - |M_f| = p - m = p - (n - p - q) = 2p + q - n$. Each vertex in M_f is adjacent to at least one vertex of P_f . Thus, by Pigeonhole Principle, at least one vertex v of P_f is adjacent to at least $\lceil |M_f|/|P_f| \rceil = \lceil m/p \rceil$ vertices of M_f . It follows, therefore, that $1 \leq f(N(v)) = |N(v) \cap P_f| - |N(v) \cap M_f| \leq (|P_f| - 1) - \lceil m/p \rceil = (p - 1) - \lceil m/p \rceil \leq p - 1 - m/p$, and so $p^2 - 2p - m \geq 0$. Hence, we have $p^2 - p + q - n \geq 0$. Thus $p \geq \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{4(n - q) + 1} + 1)$, and so $\gamma_t^-(G) = 2p + q - n \geq \sqrt{4(n - q) + 1} + 1 - (n - q)$.

Let $g(x) = \sqrt{4x + 1} + 1 - x$. Then $g'(x) = 2(4x + 1)^{-1/2} - 1$. For $x \geq 1$, $g'(x) < 0$. That is, $g(x)$ is a monotone decreasing function when $x \geq 1$. Furthermore, since

$p = |P_f| \geq 2$, we have $n - q = p + m \geq 2$. Therefore, $g(n - q) \geq g(n)$. Consequently, $\gamma_t^-(G) \geq \sqrt{4(n - q) + 1} + 1 - (n - q) \geq \sqrt{4n + 1} + 1 - n$.

If G is a graph of order n such that $\gamma_t^-(G) = \sqrt{4n + 1} + 1 - n$, then $2p + q = \sqrt{4n + 1} + 1$ and $q = 0$. Thus $n = p(p - 1)$ and $m = p(p - 2)$. Furthermore, each vertex of M_f has degree 1 and is adjacent to a vertex of P_f , while each vertex of P_f is adjacent to all the other $p - 1$ vertices of P_f and to $p - 2$ vertices of M_f . It follows that $G \in \mathcal{F}$.

On the other hand, suppose $G \in \mathcal{F}$. Then $G = F_s$ for some $s \geq 2$. So F_s has order $n = s(s - 1)$, and so $s = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{4n + 1} + 1)$. Assigning to the s central vertices of stars the value 1, and to all other vertices the value -1, we produce an MTDF f of weight $f(V) = s - s(s - 2) = s - (n - s) = 2s - n = \sqrt{4n + 1} + 1 - n$. Therefore, $\gamma_t^-(G) \leq f(V) = \sqrt{4n + 1} + 1 - n$. Consequently, $\gamma_t^-(G) = \sqrt{4n + 1} + 1 - n$. \square

Acknowledgements. Research supported in part by Natural Science Foundation of Tianjin University of Sci. & Tech. (20080419).

References

- [1] *R. B. Allan, R. C. Laskar and S. T. Hedetniemi*: A note on total domination. *Discrete Math.* 49 (1984), 7–13.
- [2] *D. Archdeacon, J. Ellis-Monaghan, D. Fisher and et al.*: Some remarks on domination. *Journal of Graph Theory* 46 (2004), 207–210.
- [3] *S. Arumugam and A. Thuraiswamy*: Total domination in graphs. *Ars Combin.* 43 (1996), 89–92.
- [4] *E. J. Cockayne, R. M. Dawes and S. T. Hedetniemi*: Total domination in graphs. *Networks* 10 (1980), 211–219.
- [5] *J. E. Dunbar, W. Goddard, S. T. Hedetniemi, M. A. Henning and A. A. McRae*: The algorithmic complexity of minus domination in graphs. *Discrete Appl. Math.* 68 (1996), 73–84.
- [6] *J. E. Dunbar, S. T. Hedetniemi, M. A. Henning and A. A. McRae*: Minus domination in regular graphs. *Discrete Math.* 149 (1996), 311–312.
- [7] *J. E. Dunbar, S. T. Hedetniemi, M. A. Henning and A. A. McRae*: Minus domination in graphs. *Discrete Math.* 199 (1999), 35–47.
- [8] *O. Favaron, M. A. Henning, C. M. Mynhart and et al.*: Total domination in graphs with minimum degree three. *Journal of Graph Theory* 32 (1999), 303–310.
- [9] *L. Harris and J. H. Hattingh*: The algorithmic complexity of certain functional variations of total domination in graphs. *Australas. Journal of Combin.* 29 (2004), 143–156.
- [10] *T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi and P. J. Slater*: *Fundamentals of domination in graphs*. New York, Marcel Dekker, 1998.
- [11] *M. A. Henning*: Graphs with large total domination number. *Journal of Graph Theory* 35 (2000), 21–45.
- [12] *M. A. Henning*: Signed total domination in graphs. *Discrete Math.* 278 (2004), 109–125.
- [13] *L. Y. Kang, H. K. Kim and M. Y. Sohn*: Minus domination number in k -partite graphs. *Discrete Math.* 227 (2004), 295–300.
- [14] *H. M. Xing, L. Sun and X. G. Chen*: On signed total domination in graphs. *Journal of Beijing Institute of Technology* 12 (2003), 319–321.

- [15] *H. M. Xing, L. Sun and X. G. Chen*: On a generalization of signed total dominating functions of graphs. *Ars Combin.* 77 (2005), 205–215.
- [16] *B. Zelinka*: Signed total domination number of a graph. *Czech. Math. J.* 51 (2001), 225–229.

Authors' addresses: H u a - M i n g X i n g, School of Sciences, Tianjin University of Sci. & Tech., Teda, Tianjin 300457, P.R. China, e-mail: hmxing@tust.edu.cn; H a i - L o n g L i u, Dept. of Mathematics, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing 100081, P.R. China.