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Abstract
A path \( \pi = [v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k] \) in a graph \( G = (V, E) \) is an uphill path if \( \deg(v_i) \leq \deg(v_{i+1}) \) for every \( 1 \leq i \leq k \). A subset \( S \subseteq V(G) \) is an uphill dominating set if every vertex \( v \in V(G) \) lies on an uphill path originating from some vertex in \( S \). The uphill domination number of \( G \) is denoted by \( \gamma_{up}(G) \) and is the minimum cardinality of the uphill dominating set of \( G \). In this paper, we introduce the uphill domination polynomial of a graph \( G \). The uphill domination polynomial of a graph \( G \) of \( n \) vertices is the polynomial \( \sum_{i=\gamma_{up}(G)}^{n} up(G,i)x^i \), where \( up(G,i) \) is the number of uphill dominating sets of size \( i \) in \( G \), and \( \gamma_{up}(G) \) is the uphill domination number of \( G \). We compute the uphill domination polynomial and its roots for some families of standard graphs. Also, \( UP(G,x) \) for some graph operations is obtained.
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1. Introduction
In this paper, we are concerned with simple graphs which are finite, undirected with no loops nor multiple edges. Throughout this paper, we let \( |V(G)| = n \) and \( |E(G)| = m \). In a graph \( G = (V, E) \), the degree of \( v \in V(G) \) denoted by \( \deg(v) \) is the number of edges that incident with \( v \). A path in \( G \) is an alternating sequence of distinct vertices. A path is an uphill path if for every \( 1 \leq i \leq k \) we have \( \deg(v_i) \leq \deg(v_{i+1}) \) [1].

The bistar graph \( S_{k_1,k_2} \) with \( n = 2k_1 + 2k_2 \) vertices is obtained by joining the non-pendant vertices of two copies of star graph \( S_{k_1} \) by new edge. The corona of two graphs \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) with \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) vertices, respectively, denoted by
The corona $G \circ K_i$ (in particular) is the graph constructed by a copy of $G$, where for each vertex $v \in V(G)$ a new vertex $v'$ and a pendant edge $vv'$ are added. The **tadpole** graph $T_{s,k}$ is a graph consisting of a cycle graph $C_s$ on at least three vertices and a path graph $P_k$ on $k$ vertices connected with bridge. The **wheel** graph $W_s$ is a graph formed by connecting a single vertex to all vertices of a cycle graph $C_s$. The **book** graph is a Cartesian product $B_m = S_m \times P_2$, where $S_m$ is the star graph with $m+1$ vertices and $P_2$ is the path graph on two vertices. Also, the **windmill** graph $W_{s,k}$ is a graph constructed for $s \geq 2$ and $k \geq 2$ by joining $k$ copies of the complete graph $K_s$ at a shared universal vertex. The **dutch windmill** graph $(s,k)$ is the graph obtained by taking $k$ copies of the cycle graph $C_s$ with a vertex in common. Also, the **friendship** $F_k$ is a graph that constructed by joining $k$ copies of the cycle graph $C_s$ and observes that $F_k$ is a special case of $D(s,k)$. Finlay, the **firefly** graph $F_{s,t,k}$ with $s,t,k \geq 0$ and $n = 2s + 2t + k + 1$ vertices is defined by consisting of $s$ triangles, $t$ pendant paths of length 2 and $k$ pendant edges, sharing a common vertex. Any terminology not mentioned here we refer the reader to [2].

A set $S \subseteq V$ of vertices in a graph $G$ is called a domination set if every vertex $v \in V$ is either $v \in S$ or $v$ is adjacent to an element of $S$. The uphill dominating set (UDS) is a set $S \subseteq V$ having the property that every vertex $v \in V$ lies on an uphill path originating from some vertex in $S$. The uphill domination number of a graph $G$ is denoted by $\gamma_{up}(G)$ and is defined to be the minimum cardinality of the UDS of $G$. Moreover, it’s customary to denote the UDS having the minimum cardinality by $\gamma_{up}(G)$-set, for more details in domination see [3] and [4].

Representing a graph by using a polynomial is one of the algebraic representations of a graph to study some of algebraic properties and graph’s structure. In general graph polynomials are a well-developed area which is very useful for analyzing properties of the graphs.

The domination polynomial [5] and the uphill domination of a graph [6], motivated us to introduce and study the uphill domination polynomial and the uphill domination roots of a graph.

### 2. Uphill Domination Polynomial

**Definition 2.1.** For any graph $G$ of $n$ vertices, the uphill domination polynomial of $G$ is defined by

$$UP(G, x) = \sum_{i=\gamma_{up}(G)}^{n} \ up(G,i)x^i,$$

where $\ up(G,i)$ is the number of uphill dominating sets of size $i$ in $G$. The set of roots of $UP(G,x)$ is called uphill domination roots of graph $G$ and denoted by $Z_{up}(G)$.

**Example 2.2.** The uphill domination polynomial of House graph $H$ (as shown
in Figure 1) with 6 vertices and \( \gamma_{up}(H) = 2 \) is given by

\[ \text{UP}(H,x) = 2x^2 + 7x^3 + 9x^4 + 5x^5 + x^6. \]

Furthermore, \( Z_{up}(H) = \{0, -1, -2\} \).

The following theorem gives the sufficient condition for the uphill domination polynomial of \( r \)-regular graph.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( G \) be connected graph with \( n \geq 2 \) vertices. Then, \( \text{UP}(G,x) = (1+x)^n - 1 \) if and only if \( G \) is \( r \)-regular graph.

**Proof.** Let \( G \) be a connected graph of \( n \geq 2 \) vertices. Suppose that the uphill domination polynomial of \( G \) is given by

\[ \text{UP}(G,x) = nx + \binom{n}{2} x^2 + \cdots + x^n. \]

Since the first coefficient of the polynomial is \( n \), then it is easily verified that for every \( v \in V(G) \), the singleton vertex set \( \{v\} \) is an UDS in \( G \). Assume that \( G \) is not \( r \)-regular graph. Hence there exists a vertex \( u \in V(G) \) such that \( \text{deg}(u) = s \neq r \). Now, we have two cases:

**Case 1:** If \( s > r \), then the set \( \{u\} \) is not UDS which contradict that every singleton vertex set is an UDS in \( G \).

**Case 2:** If \( s < r \), then for all \( u \neq v \) with \( \text{deg}(v) = r \), we get the set \( \{v\} \) is not UDS which is also contradict that every singleton vertex set is an UDS in \( G \).

Thus, \( G \) must be \( r \)-regular graph.

On the other hand, suppose that \( G \) is \( r \)-regular graph with \( n \geq 2 \) vertices. We have \( \gamma_{up}(G) = 1 \), then there exist \( n \) UDS of size one, while for \( i = 2 \) there are \( \binom{n}{2} \) UDS and so on. Thus, we can write the uphill domination polynomial as

\[ \text{UP}(G,x) = nx + \binom{n}{2} x^2 + \binom{n}{3} x^3 + \cdots + \binom{n}{n} x^n = (1+x)^n - 1. \]

**Corollary 2.4.** Let \( G \) be a graph with \( s \) vertices. If \( G \) is a cycle \( C_s \) or complete graph \( K_s \), then \( \text{UP}(G,x) = (1+x)^s - 1 \).

**Corollary 2.5.** The uphill domination polynomial for the regular graph \( G = C_s \times C_s \) with \( sk \) vertices is given by \( \text{UP}(G,x) = (1+x)^k - 1 \).

**Corollary 2.6.** [6] Let \( G \) be a graph with \( m \) components. Then,

\[ \gamma_{up}(G) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \gamma_{up}(G_j). \]

**Proposition 2.7.** If a graph \( G \) with \( n \) vertices consists of \( m \) components \( G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_m \), then

\[ \gamma_{up}(G) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \gamma_{up}(G_j). \]

**Figure 1.** The House graph.
\[ UP(G,x) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} UP(G_i,x). \]

**Proof.** By using mathematical induction we found that for \( m = 1 \) the statement is true and the proof is trivial. Suppose that the statement is true when \( m = k \) such that

\[ UP(G,x) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} UP(G_i,x). \]

Now, we prove that the statement is true when \( m = k + 1 \). Let \( G \) consists of \( k + 1 \) components that mean \( G = G_1 \cup G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_{k+1} \). If the set \( \{r_1, r_2, \cdots, r_{k+1}\} \) represent the uphill domination number for the components of \( G \) respectively, such that \( \gamma_{up}(G_i) = r_i \) \( \forall 1 \leq i \leq k + 1 \). Then, by Corollary (2.6) it easily to see that

\[ \gamma_{up}(G) = \gamma_{up}\left( \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k+1} G_i \right) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k+1} \gamma_{up}(G_i) = r_1 + \cdots + r_{k+1} = r. \]

Thus, \( up(G,r) \) is exactly equal the number of way for choosing an UDS of size \( r_i \) in \( G_i \) and an UDS of size \( r_2 \) in \( G_2 \) and so on. Hence, \( up(G,r) \) is the coefficient of \( x^r \) in \( UP(G_1,x)UP(G_2,x) \cdots UP(G_{k+1},x) \) and in \( UP(G,x) \).

In the same argument we can proof for all \( up(G,j) \), where \( r \leq j \leq n \) that

\[ up(G,j) = up(G_1,j) \cdots up(G_{k+1},j) = \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} up(G_i,j). \]

Thus, for \( m = k + 1 \) the statement is true and the proof is done.

**Theorem 2.8.** For any path \( P_n \) with \( n \geq 3 \) vertices,

\[ UP(G,x) = x^2 (1 + x)^{n-2}. \]

Furthermore, \( Z_{up}(P_n) = \{0, -1\} \).

**Proof.** Let \( G \) be a path graph \( P_n \) with \( n \geq 3 \). We know that \( \gamma_{up}(P_2) = 2 \), then there is only one UDS of size two. For \( i = 3 \) there are \( n-2 \) UDS of size three and so on. Thus, we get

\[
UP(G,x) = x^2 + \left( \frac{n-2}{1} \right) x^3 + \left( \frac{n-2}{2} \right) x^4 + \cdots + \left( \frac{n-2}{n-2} \right) x^n \\
= x^2 \left[ 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \left( \frac{n-2}{i} \right) x^i \right] \\
= x^2 \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \left( \frac{n-2}{i} \right) x^i \right] \\
= x^2 (1 + x)^{n-2}.
\]

**Theorem 2.9.** For any graph \( G \), \( UP(G,x) = x^n \) if and only if \( G \cong K_n \).

**Proof.** Let \( G \) be a graph with \( UP(G,x) = x^n \). Since, \( UP(K_1,x) = x \), then we can write that

\[
UP(G,x) = x^n \\
= \underbrace{x \cdot x \cdots x}_{n \text{ times}} \\
= \underbrace{UP(K_1,x) \cdot UP(K_1,x) \cdots UP(K_1,x)}_{n \text{ times}} \\
= UP(K_n,x).
\]
Thus, \( G \cong K_n \). On the other hand if \( G \cong K_n \), then by Proposition (2.7) we get \( UP(G,x) = x^n \).

**Corollary 2.10.** A graph \( G \) has one uphill domination root if and only if \( G \cong K_n \).

**Theorem 2.11.** Let \( G \) be a bistar graph \( S_{k_1,k_2} \) with \( n = 2k_1 + 2 \) vertices. Then, \( UP(G,x) = x^{2k_1}(1 + x)^3 \). Furthermore, \( Z_{up}(G) = \{0,-1\} \).

**Proof.** Let \( G \) be a bistar graph \( S_{k_1,k_2} \) with \( n = 2k_1 + 2 \) vertices, we have \( \gamma_{up}(G) = 2k_1 \). Then, there is only one UDS of size \( 2k_1 \), and for \( i = 2k_1 + 1 \) there are two UDS. Finally, for \( i = 2k_1 + 2 = n \) there is only one UDS. Thus, the result will be as following

\[
UP(G,x) = x^{2k_1} + 2x^{2k_1+1} + x^{2k_1+2} = x^{2k_1}(1 + 2x + x^2) = x^{2k_1}(1+x)^2.
\]

**Theorem 2.12.** For any graph \( G \cong K_{r,s} \) with \( r < s \) and \( r+s \geq 3 \) vertices, \( UP(G,x) = x^r(1+x)^s \). Furthermore, \( Z_{up}(K_{r,s}) = \{0,-1\} \).

**Proof.** Let \( G \) be a complete bipartite graph \( K_{r,s} \) with \( r < s \), then we have \( \gamma_{up}(K_{r,s}) = s \). There is only one UDS of size \( s \). Now, for \( i = s+1 \) there exist \( r \) UDS. For \( i = s+2 \) there exist \( \binom{r}{2} \) UDS and so on. Thus, we get

\[
UP(G,x) = x^r + \binom{r}{1}x^{s+1} + \binom{r}{2}x^{s+2} + \ldots + \binom{r}{r}x^{s+r} = x^r + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \binom{r}{i}x^{s+i} = x^r \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{r} \binom{r}{i}x^i \right] = x^r (1+x)^s.
\]

**Corollary 2.13.** For any graph \( G \cong S_r \) with \( r+1 \) vertices, \( UP(G,x) = x^r(1+x) \). Furthermore, \( Z_{up}(G) = \{0,-1\} \).

The generalization of Theorem 0.12 is the following result.

**Theorem 2.14.** For any graph \( G \cong K_{r_1 \cdots r_k} \) where \( r_1 < r_2 < \ldots < r_k \) with \( n = \sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i \) vertices, \( UP(G,x) = x^{r_1}(1+x)^{r_k} \). Furthermore, \( Z_{up}(K_{r_1 \cdots r_k}) = \{0,-1\} \).

**Proof.** Let \( G \) be a complete \( k \)-partite graph \( K_{r_1 \cdots r_k} \) with \( r_1 < r_2 < \ldots < r_k \), we have \( \gamma_{up}(K_{r_1 \cdots r_k}) = r_k \). There is only one UDS of size \( r_k \) for \( i = r_k + 1 \) there are \( n-r_k \) UDS of size \( r_k + 1 \). Also, for \( i = r_k + 2 \) there are \( \binom{n-r_k}{2} \) and so on. Thus,
\[ \text{Proposition 2.15. For any graph } G \cong K_{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_k} \text{ with } n = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \text{ vertices we have the following:} \\
1) \text{If } n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \cdots \leq n_{k-1} < n_k \text{, such that at least two partite sets of the same size, then } \text{UP}(G, x) = x^n (1+x)^{n-k}.
\]

2) \text{If } n_1 = n_2 = \cdots = n_k \text{, then the graph is regular and } \text{UP}(G, x) = (1+x)^n - 1.

\[ \text{Theorem 2.16. For any graph } G \cong K_{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_k} \text{ with } n = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \text{ vertices, where } n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \cdots < n_{k-1} = n_k \text{. Then,} \\
\text{UP}(G, x) = \sum_{h=1}^{n_k} \sum_{n_1 \leq 1 \leq n_{h-1}} \left( \binom{2n_1}{1} \binom{n_2 - 2n_1}{1} \right) x^h.
\]

\[ \text{Proof. Let } G \text{ be a complete } k \text{-partite graph } K_{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_k} \text{ with } n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \cdots < n_{k-1} = n_k \text{, then we have } \gamma_{wp}(K_{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_k}) = 1. \text{ Let divide the vertices of a graph into two sets } R_1 \text{ and } R_2 \text{ where } R_1 \text{ contains the vertices of } n_1 \text{ and } n_{k-1} \text{ which means } R_1 \text{ is of cardinality } 2n_1 \text{ while } R_2 = V(G) \setminus R_1 \text{ this implies that } R_2 \text{ is of cardinality } n_2. \text{ Thus, we get}\]

\[ \text{up}(G, 1) = \binom{2n_1}{1} \binom{n_2 - 2n_1}{1} = 2n_1.
\]

We have for \text{up}(G, 2),

\[ \text{up}(G, 2) = \binom{2n_1}{2} \binom{n_2 - 2n_1}{0} + \binom{2n_1}{0} \binom{n_2 - 2n_1}{1}.
\]

Also, for \text{up}(G, 3) we get

\[ \text{up}(G, 3) = \binom{2n_1}{3} \binom{n_2 - 2n_1}{0} + \binom{2n_1}{2} \binom{n_2 - 2n_1}{1} + \binom{2n_1}{1} \binom{n_2 - 2n_1}{2}.
\]

And so on we get for all \text{up}(G, h), where \( 1 \leq h \leq n \)

\[ \text{up}(G, h) = \sum_{n_1 \leq 1 \leq n_{h-1}} \binom{2n_1}{h} \binom{n_2 - 2n_1}{r_2}.
\]

Thus, the proof is done.

\[ \text{Theorem 2.17. For any graph } G = W_s \text{ with } s + 1 \text{ vertices and } s > 3, \text{ then } \text{UP}(G, x) = (1+x)(1+x)^{s-1}.
\]

\[ \text{Proof. Let } G \text{ be a wheel graph } W_s \text{ (} s > 3 \text{), then we have } \gamma_{wp}(W_s) = 1. \text{ There}
\]
are \( s \) UDS of size one. For \( i = 2 \) there are \( \binom{s+1}{2} \) UDS of size two and so on.

Thus,
\[
UP(G, x) = sx + \binom{s+1}{2}x^2 + \binom{s+1}{3}x^3 + \cdots + \binom{s+1}{s+1}x^{s+1}
\]
\[
= \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{s+1} \binom{i}{s}x^i \right] - (x+1)
\]
\[
= (x+1)^{s+1} - (x+1)
\]
\[
= (x+1)^{s}((x+1)^{i} - 1).
\]

**Corollary 2.18.** For any wheel graph \( W_s \) and \( s > 3 \) we have
\[
Z_{up}(W_s) = \begin{cases} 
\{0, -1, 2\}, & \text{if } s \text{ is even.} \\
\{0, -1\}, & \text{if } s \text{ is odd.}
\end{cases}
\]

### 3. Uphill Domination Polynomials of Graphs under Some Binary Operations

**Theorem 3.1.** Let \( G \cong P_r \times P_s \) be a grid graph with \( rs \) vertices and \( r, s \geq 4 \). Then, \( UP(G, x) = x^r(1+x)^{r-s+4} \).

**Proof.** Let \( G \) be a grid graph with \( rs \) vertices and \( r, s \geq 4 \), then we have \( \gamma_{up}(G) = 4 \). Note that, there is only one UDS of size four. For \( i = 5 \), there are \( rs - 4 \) UDS of size five and so on. Thus, we get
\[
UP(G, x) = x^4 + \binom{rs-4}{1}x^5 + \cdots + \binom{rs-4}{rs}x^{rs}
\]
\[
= x^4 \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{rs-4} \binom{i}{rs-4}x^i \right]
\]
\[
= x^4(1+x)^{r-s+4}.
\]

**Theorem 3.2.** Let \( G \cong C_r \circ \overline{K}_s \) be a corona graph with \( rs+r \) vertices. Then, \( UP(G, x) = x^r(1+x)^r \).

**Proof.** Let \( G \cong C_r \circ \overline{K}_s \) with \( rs+r \) vertices, we have \( \gamma_{up}(C_r \circ \overline{K}_s) = rs \). For \( rs \) vertices, there is only one UDS of size \( rs \). For \( rs+1 \) vertices, there are \( r \) UDS and so on. Thus, we get
\[
UP(G, x) = x^{rs} + \binom{r}{1}x^{rs+1} + \cdots + \binom{r}{r}x^{rs+r}
\]
\[
= \sum_{i=0}^{r} \binom{r}{i}x^{rs+i}
\]
\[
= x^{rs} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{r} \binom{r}{i}x^i \right]
\]
\[
= x^{rs}(1+x)^r.
\]

**Corollary 3.3.** Let \( G \cong C_r \circ K_1 \) be a corona graph with \( 2r \) vertices. Then, \( UP(G, x) = x^r(1+x)^r \).

---
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Theorem 3.2 can generalize in the following result.

**Theorem 3.4.** For any nontrivial connected graph $H$ with $r$ vertices, if $G \cong H \circ \bar{K}_s$, then, $UP(G,x) = x^r (1+x)^s$.

**Proof.** The proof similarly to the proof of Theorem 3.2.

**Theorem 3.5.** Let $G$ be a book graph $B_m = P_2 \times S_m$ with $2m+2$ vertices. Then,

$$
UP(G,x) = 2^m x^m + \left[ m \left( 2^{m-1} \right) + 2^{m+1} \right] x^{m+1} + \sum_{i=2}^{2m+1} \left\{ \left( \frac{m}{i} \right) 2^{m-i} + \left( \frac{m}{i-1} \right) 2^{m-i+2} + \left( \frac{m}{i-2} \right) 2^{m-i+2} \right\} x^{m+i} + \left[ 1 + m 2^2 + \left( \frac{m}{2} \right) 2^2 \right] x^{2m} + (2m+2)x^{2m+2} + x^{2m+2}.
$$

**Proof.** Suppose we have the book graph $B_m = P_2 \times S_m$ with $2m+2$ vertices, then we have $\gamma_{up}(P_2 \times S_m) = m$. Let divide the vertices of $B_m$ into $m+1$ sets “as shown in Figure 2” let the set $R_i = \{ u_i, v_i \}$ i.e., $1 \leq i \leq m$ while $R_{m+1} = \{ u, v \}$. Since $\gamma_{up}(P_2 \times S_m) = m$, then for $up(G,m)$ we have to take one vertex from each $R_i$ $(i \neq m+1)$ so, there exist $2^m$ UDS of size $m$. For $up(G,m+1)$ we have,

$$
up(G,m+1) = \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \left[ \frac{2^i}{i} \right] + \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \left( \frac{2^i}{i} \right) + \left[ \frac{2^{m+1}}{m} \right] = 2^{m+1} + m \left( 2^{m-1} \right).
$$

Also, for $up(G,m+2)$ we get

$$
up(G,m+2) = \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \left[ \frac{2^i}{i} \right] + \sum_{i=1}^{m+1} \left( \frac{2^i}{i} \right) + \left[ \frac{2^{m+1}}{m} \right] = \left( \frac{m}{2} \right) 2^{m-2} + \left( \frac{m}{1} \right) 2^m + \left( \frac{m}{0} \right) 2^m = \frac{m}{2} 2^{m-2} + m 2^m + 2^m.
$$

![Figure 2](image) A Book Graph $B_m$. 
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Therefore, for \( \up(G, m + 3) \) we have
\[
\up(G, m + 3) = \sum_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \geq 0} \binom{2}{\eta_1} \cdots \binom{2}{\eta_3} \binom{2}{r_{\eta_1}} \cdots \binom{2}{r_{\eta_3}} + \sum_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \geq 1} \binom{2}{\eta_1} \cdots \binom{2}{\eta_3} \binom{2}{r_{\eta_1}} \cdots \binom{2}{r_{\eta_3}} \\
+ \sum_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \geq 1} \binom{2}{\eta_1} \cdots \binom{2}{\eta_3} \binom{2}{r_{\eta_1}} \cdots \binom{2}{r_{\eta_3}} \\
= \frac{m}{3} 2^{m-3} + \frac{m}{2} 2^m + \frac{m}{1} 2^m \\
= \frac{m}{3} 2^{m-3} + \frac{m}{2} 2^m + m 2^m.
\]

And so on, we use the same argument until \( \up(G, 2m-1) \). After that, for \( \up(G, 2m) \) we have
\[
\up(G, 2m) = \left( \frac{2m+2}{2m+1} \right) = 2m + 2 \quad \& \quad \up(G, 2m + 2) = 1.
\]

Finally,
\[
\up(G, 2m + 1) = \left( \frac{2m+2}{2m+1} \right) = 2m + 2 \quad \& \quad \up(G, 2m + 2) = 1.
\]

Thus, the proof is completed.

**Theorem 3.6.** Let \( G \) be a graph. If \( G \cong P_s \times C_t \) with \( sk \) vertices, then
\[
UP(G,x) = \sum_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \geq 0} \binom{s}{\eta_1} \left( \frac{sk-2s}{r_{\eta_1}} \right) \binom{s}{\eta_2} \left( \frac{sk-2s}{r_{\eta_2}} \right) \binom{s}{\eta_3} \left( \frac{sk-2s}{r_{\eta_3}} \right) x^\eta.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( G \cong P_s \times C_t \) with \( sk \) vertices, then we have \( \chi_{up}(P_s \times C_t) = 2 \). We first divide the vertices of \( G \) into three sets called them \( R_1, R_2 \) and \( R_3 \), where \( R_1 \) (resp. \( R_2 \)) is contains the vertices of the outer cycle (resp. inner cycle) which every vertex is of degree three. The third set \( R_3 \) contains the vertices of the middle cycles, where every vertex is of degree four. Note that, any UDS should contain at least one vertex form \( R_1 \) and one vertex from \( R_2 \). Thus, for \( \up(G,2) \)
\[
\up(G,2) = \left( \begin{array}{c} s \\ 1 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} sk-2s \\ 0 \end{array} \right) = s^2.
\]

For \( \up(G,3) \) we have
\[
\up(G,3) = \sum_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \geq 3} \binom{s}{\eta_1} \left( \frac{sk-2s}{r_{\eta_1}} \right) \binom{s}{\eta_2} \left( \frac{sk-2s}{r_{\eta_2}} \right) \binom{s}{\eta_3} \left( \frac{sk-2s}{r_{\eta_3}} \right).
\]

And so on, we use the same argument for all \( \up(G,t) \) i.e., \( 3 \leq t \leq sk \) and...
the proof is done.

**Theorem 3.7.** Let $G$ be a tadpole graph $T_{s,k}$ with $s+k$ vertices. Then,

$$UP(G,x) = (s-1)x^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{s+k} \left( \sum_{r_1 \neq r_2 \neq \cdots \neq r_{s+k} \geq 1} \left( \begin{array}{c} k \\ r_1 \\ r_2 \\ r_{s+k} \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} s-1 \\ r_1 \\ \cdots \\ r_{s+k} \end{array} \right) \right) x^r.$$ 

**Proof.** Let $G$ be a tadpole graph $T_{s,k}$ with $s+k$ vertices, we have $\gamma_{up}(T_{s,k}) = 2$. We first divide the vertices of $T_{s,k}$ into three sets called them $R_1, R_2$, and $R_3$ such that $R_1$ is a singleton set that contains the pendant vertex, $R_2$ has $k$ vertices each of them is of degree two except one vertex is of degree three while the last set $R_3$ has $s-1$ vertices each of them of degree two which are the vertices that lies in a cycle part of a graph. Notice that, any UDS of $T_{s,k}$ should contains the pendant vertex and at least one vertex from $R_3$. Now, for $up(G,2)$ we have to take the pendant vertex with one vertex from $R_3$, so there exist $s-1$ UDS of size two. For $up(G,3)$ we get

$$up(G,3) = \sum_{r_2 \neq r_3 \geq 2} \left( \begin{array}{c} k \\ r_2 \\ r_3 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} s-1 \\ r_2 \\ r_3 \end{array} \right).$$

And so on, we use the same argument for all $up(G,t)$ i.e., $3 \leq t \leq s+k$ and the proof is completed.

**Theorem 3.8.** Let $G$ be a windmill graph $Wd(s,k)$ with $k(s-1)+1$ vertices. Then,

$$UP(G,x) = (s-1)^k x^k + \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{k(s-1)+1}{k-1}} \left( \sum_{r_1 \neq r_2 \neq \cdots \neq r_{s+k+1} \geq 1} \left( \begin{array}{c} s-1 \\ r_1 \\ \cdots \\ r_{s+k+1} \end{array} \right) \right) x^r.$$ 

**Proof.** Let $G$ be a windmill graph with center vertex $w$, we have $\gamma_{w}(G) = k$. Any minimum uphill domination set must contains one vertex from each copy of $K_s$ without the center vertex $w$, that means, we have $(s-1)^k$ uphill dominating set of size $k$. Suppose $R_i$ be the set of vertices of the $i$-th copy of $K_s$ without the center vertex $w$ and $R_w$ be the singleton, with the center vertex $w$. To get the number of uphill dominating sets of size $t = k + j$, where $j = 1, 2, \cdots, (k(s-2)+1)$, we need to select $r_i$ vertices from each $R_i$, and $r_{k+1}$ from $R_w$ where $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, $\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} r_i = t$ and $r_i \geq 1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \cdots, k$. Hence,

$$up(G,t) = \sum_{r_1 \neq r_2 \neq \cdots \neq r_{k+1} \geq 1} \left( \begin{array}{c} s-1 \\ r_1 \\ \cdots \\ r_{k+1} \end{array} \right).$$

Thus,

$$UP(G,x) = (s-1)^k x^k + \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{k(s-1)+1}{k-1}} \left( \sum_{r_1 \neq r_2 \neq \cdots \neq r_{s+k+1} \geq 1} \left( \begin{array}{c} s-1 \\ r_1 \\ \cdots \\ r_{s+k+1} \end{array} \right) \right) x^r.$$ 

**Proposition 3.9.** Let $G$ be a dutch windmill graph $D(s,k)$ with $s > 3$ and $k(s-1)+1$ vertices. Then,
Theorem 3.10. Let \( G \) be a firefly graph \( F_{s,t,k} \) with \( n = 2s + 2t + k + 1 \) vertices and \( \gamma_{up}(G) = s + t + k = b \). Then,

\[
\text{Up}(G, x) = 2^t x^b + \left[ 2^t (t+1) + 2^{i-1}(s) \right] x^{i+1}
\]

\[
+ \sum_{k=bs+2}^{n} \sum_{s_t,s_{t+1},s_{t+2}=b+1} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} s & r_t & r_{t+1} r_{t+2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} s & r_t & r_{t+1} r_{t+2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)
\]

Proof. Let \( G \) be a firefly graph \( F_{s,t,k} \) with \( n \) vertices and \( \gamma_{up}(G) = s + t + k = b \). First, let us divide the vertices of \( G \) into \( 2s \) sets and let \( u \) be the shared vertex in \( G \). Suppose that \( R_1 \subset V(G) \) contains the vertices of the first triangle without \( u \), this implies \( R_1 \) has two vertices each of them are of degree two, also we mean by \( R_2 \subset V(G) \) the set that contains the vertices of the second triangle without \( u \) and so on for all \( R_i \), where \( 1 \leq i \leq s \). Now, the subset \( R_{s+1} \subset V(G) \) contains \( u \) in addition the \( t \) vertices of the pendant paths that adjacent to \( u \) which means \( R_{s+1} \) is of cardinality \( t+1 \). Finally, \( R_{s+2} \subset V(G) \) contains all the leaves vertices of \( G \) which be exactly of cardinality \( t+1 \). Notice that, any UDS of \( G \) should contain all the vertices of \( R_{s+2} \) with at least one vertex from each \( R_i \). Thus, for \( \text{up}(G,b) \) we have

\[
\text{up}(G,b) = \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^{l} (r_i + r_{i+1}) = b} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 2 & (t+1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 2 & (t+1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)
\]

For \( \text{up}(G,b+1) \) we get

\[
\text{up}(G,b+1) = \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^{l} (r_i + r_{i+1}) = (b+1)} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 2 & (t+1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 2 & (t+1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)
\]

\[
= 2^{i-1}(s) + 2^t(t+1).
\]

And for \( \text{up}(G,b+2) \) we have

\[
\text{up}(G,b+2) = \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^{l} (r_i + r_{i+1}) = (b+2)} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 2 & (t+1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 2 & (t+1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{\sum_{i=1}^{l} (r_i + r_{i+1}) = (b+2)} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 2 & (t+1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 2 & 2 & (t+1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{ccc} t+1 & t+k \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right)
\]

In the same argument we can find all \( \text{up}(G,h) \), where \( b+2 \leq h \leq n \) and the proof is completed.

Corollary 3.11. Let \( G \) be a friendship graph \( F_k \) with \( 2k+1 \) vertices. Then,
\[ UP(G,x) = 2^k x^k + \left[ 2^k + k2^{k+1} \right] x^{k+1} + \sum_{j=k+2}^{2k+1} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \left( 2^{\eta_j} \right) \left( \sum_{\eta, \eta, \ldots, \eta} \right) \right] \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\eta_j} \left( r_{j,1} \right) \right) x^j. \]

4. Open Problems

Finally, for feature work we state the following definition.

**Definition 4.1.** Two graphs \( G \) and \( H \) are said to be uphill-equivalent if \( UP(G,x) = UP(H,x) \). The uphill-equivalence classes of \( G \) noted by \( [G]_{up} = \{ H : H \text{ is uphill-equivalent to } G \} \).

**Example 4.2.**

1) \( [K_n]_{up} = \{ H : H \text{ is regular graph of } n \text{ vertices} \} \).
2) The windmill graph \( Wd(s,k) \) and Dutch windmill graph \( D(s,k) \) are uphill-equivalent.

We state the following open problems for feature work:

1) which graphs have two distinct uphill domination roots?
2) which families of graphs have only real uphill domination roots?
3) which graphs satisfy \( [G]_{up} = \{ G \} \)?
4) determine the uphill-equivalence classes for some new families of graphs.
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