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Abstract

A subset $D \subseteq V(G)$ is called an equitable dominating set of a graph $G$ if every vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus D$ has a neighbor $u \in D$ such that $|d_G(u) - d_G(v)| \leq 1$. An equitable dominating set $D$ is a degree equitable restrained double dominating set (DERD-dominating set) of $G$ if every vertex of $G$ is dominated by at least two vertices of $D$, and $(V(G) \setminus D)$ has no isolated vertices. The DERD-domination number of $G$, denoted by $\gamma_{dcl}^e(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a DERD-dominating set of $G$. We initiate the study of DERD-domination in graphs and we obtain some sharp bounds. Finally, we show that the decision problem for determining $\gamma_{dcl}^e(G)$ is NP-complete.
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1. Introduction

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. The number of vertices of $G$ we denote by $n$ and the number of edges we denote by $m$, thus $|V(G)| = n$ and $|E(G)| = m$. The complement of $G$, denoted by $\overline{G}$, is a graph which has the same vertices as $G$, and in which two vertices are adjacent if and
only if they are not adjacent in $G$. By the open neighborhood of a vertex $v$ of $G$ we mean the set $N_G(v) = \{u \in V(G): uv \in E(G)\}$. By the closed neighborhood of a vertex $v$ of $G$ we mean the set $N_G[v] = N_G(v) \cup \{v\}$. The degree of a vertex $v$, denoted by $d_G(v)$, is the cardinality of its open neighborhood. A vertex is called isolated if it has no neighbors, while it is called universal if it is adjacent to all other vertices. Let $S$ be a subset of the set of vertices of $G$, and let $u \in S$. A vertex $v$ is a private neighbor of $u$ with respect to $S$ if $N_G[v] \cap S = \{u\}$. The set of private neighbors of $u$ with respect to $S$ is the set $pn[u, S] = \{v: N_G[v] \cap S = \{u\}\}$. If $u \in pn[u, S]$ and $u$ is an isolated vertex in $(S)$, then $u$ is called its own private neighbor. By a leaf we mean a vertex of degree one, while a support vertex is a vertex adjacent to a leaf. We say that a support vertex is weak if it is adjacent to exactly one leaf. We say that a vertex is isolated if it has no neighbor. Let $\Delta(G)$ mean the maximum degree among all vertices of $G$. The path (cycle, respectively) on $n$ vertices we denote by $P_n$ (cycle $C_n$, respectively). A wheel $W_n$, where $n \geq 4$, is a graph with $n$ vertices, formed by connecting a vertex to all vertices of a cycle $C_{n-1}$. The distance between two vertices of a graph is the number of edges in a shortest path connecting them. The eccentricity of a vertex is the greatest distance between it and any other vertex. The diameter of a graph $G$, denoted by $diam(G)$, is the maximum eccentricity among all vertices of $G$. By $K_{p,q}$ we denote a complete bipartite graph with partite sets of cardinalities $p$ and $q$. By a star we mean the graph $K_{1,q}$. By a double star we mean a graph obtained from a star by joining a positive number of vertices to one of its leaves. Generally, let $K_{t_1,t_2,\ldots,t_k}$ denote the complete multipartite graph with vertex set $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \ldots \cup S_k$, where $|S_i| = t_i$ for positive integers $i \leq t$.

A subset $D \subseteq V(G)$ is a dominating set of $G$ if every vertex of $V(G) \setminus D$ has a neighbor in $D$. The domination number of $G$, denoted by $\gamma(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of $G$. For a comprehensive survey of domination in graphs, see [4, 5].

A subset $D \subseteq V(G)$ is a restrained dominating set of $G$ if every vertex of $V(G) \setminus D$ has a neighbor in $D$ as well as a neighbor in $V(G) \setminus D$. The restrained domination number of $G$, denoted by $\gamma_r(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a restrained dominating set of $G$. A restrained dominating set of $G$ of minimum cardinality is called a $\gamma_r(G)$-set.

A dominating set $D$ of a graph $G$ is said to be a cototal dominating set of $G$ if the induced subgraph $(V(G) \setminus D)$ has no isolated vertices. The cototal domination number of $G$, denoted by $\gamma_d(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a cototal dominating set of $G$. Restrained domination in graphs was introduced by Domke et. al [1]. Independently, Kulli et. al [9] initiated the study of cototal domination in graphs. The concepts of restrained domination and cototal domination are equivalent.

A subset $D \subseteq V(G)$ is a double dominating set of $G$ if every vertex of $G$ is dominated by at least two vertices of $D$. The double domination number of $G$, denoted by $\gamma_d(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a double dominating set of $G$. The study of double domination in graphs was initiated by Harary and Haynes [3].

A subset $D \subseteq V(G)$ is a restrained double dominating set of $G$ if every vertex of $G$ is dominated by at least two vertices of $D$, and no vertex of $(V(G) \setminus D)$ is isolated. The restrained double domination number of $G$, denoted by $\gamma_{dd}(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a restrained double dominating set of $G$. The study of restrained double domination in graphs was initiated by in [8].
A subset $D \subseteq V(G)$ is called an equitable dominating set of $G$ if every vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus D$ has a neighbor $u \in D$ such that $|d_G(u) - d_G(v)| \leq 1$. The equitable domination number of $G$, denoted by $\gamma^e(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of an equitable dominating set of $G$. The concept of equitable domination in graphs was introduced by V. Swaminathan and K. Dharmalingam [11] by considering the following real world situation. In a network, nodes with nearly equal capacity may interact with each other in a better way. In societies, persons with nearly equal statuses tend to be friendly. For more details on the domination refer [6, 7, 10, 12].

We introduce a new variant of equitable domination, namely the degree equitable restrained double domination (DERD-domination), and we initiate the study of this parameter. An equitable dominating set $D$ of a graph $G$ is said to be a DERD-dominating set of $G$ if every vertex of $G$ is dominated by at least two vertices of $D$, and $\langle V(G) \setminus D \rangle$ has no isolated vertices. The DERD-domination number of $G$, denoted by $\gamma^d_{cl}(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a DERD-dominating set of $G$.

2. Results

Since the one-vertex graph, as well as all graphs with an isolated vertex, does not have a DERD-dominating set, in this paper we consider only graphs without isolated vertices.

We begin with the following straightforward observations.

Observation 1. Let $G$ be a graph without isolated vertices. Then every DERD-dominating set of $G$ contains all leaves and support vertices of $G$.

Observation 2. There is no graph $G$ such that $\gamma^d_{cl}(G) = n - 1$.

Observation 3. For every positive integer $n$ we have

$$\gamma^d_{cl}(K_n) = \begin{cases} 3, & \text{if } n = 3; \\ 2, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Observation 4. For every integer $n \geq 2$ we have $\gamma^d_{cl}(P_n) = n$.

Observation 5. If $n \geq 3$ is an integer, then $\gamma^d_{cl}(C_n) = n$.

Observation 6. For every integer $n \geq 4$ we have $\gamma^d_{cl}(W_n) = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

Observation 7. If $m$ and $n$ are positive integers, then

$$\gamma^d_{cl}(K_{m,n}) = \begin{cases} 4, & \text{if } |m - n| \leq 1 \text{ and } 3 \leq m \leq n; \\ m + n, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We have the following property of regular and $(k, k+1)$-biregular graphs.

Theorem 8. If a graph $G$ is regular or $(k, k+1)$-biregular, for any integer $k$, then $\gamma^d_{cl}(G) = \gamma_{dcl}(G)$. 


Theorem 9. For every graph $G$ we have $2 \leq \gamma_{cl}(G) \leq n$. Further, the lower bound is attained if and only if $G = K_2$ or $G = K_n - \{x\}$ where $x$ is any vertex in $K_n$; $n \geq 5$ and the upper bound is attained if and only if $G$ does not contain an edge $uv \in E(G)$ which satisfies the following conditions:

(i) there are vertices $w \in N_G(u)$ and $z \in N_G(v)$ such that $|N_G(u)| \geq 3$ and $|N_G(v)| \geq 3$;

(ii) there are vertices $w \in N_G(u)$ and $z \in N_G(v)$ such that $|d_G(u) - d_G(v)| \leq 1$ and $|d_G(v) - d_G(z)| \leq 1$.

Proof. Lower bound follows from the definition of DERD-set. Now consider the equality of lower bound. Suppose $\gamma_{cl}(G) = 2$ and $G \neq K_n$ or $K_n - \{x\}$. Then $G$ contains at least two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$ such that $\langle\{u, v\}\rangle$ contains no edge. Let $D$ be DERD-set of $G$ such that $u, v \notin D$. Let $w, x \in D$. Since $u$ and $v$ are independent vertices in $G$, therefore $w$ and $x$ must be adjacent to both $u$ and $v$ also by the definition of DERD-set $\langle V - D\rangle$ contains no isolated vertices. Therefore, we need at least one more vertex to compliance the necessary conditions required to define DERD-set in $G$. Hence $|D| \geq 3$, a contradiction.

Conversely, suppose $G = K_n$, then by Observation 3, $\gamma_{cl}(G) = 2$ and if $G = K_n - \{x\}; n \geq 5$, then any two adjacent vertices will form a DERD-set for $G$. Hence $\gamma_{cl}(G) = 2$.

Now consider the upper bound. Suppose $\gamma_{cl}(G) = n$ and $G$ contains an edge which satisfied the conditions in the hypothesis of the theorem, then $V - \{w, z\}$ will form a DERD-set for $G$. Hence $\gamma_{cl}(G) = |V - \{w, z\}| = n - 2$. Hence $G$ must not contain an edge as stated in the hypothesis of the theorem.

We now characterize the trees $T$ such that $\gamma_{cl}(T) = n$.

Theorem 10. Let $T$ be a tree. We have $\gamma_{cl}(T) = n$ if and only if $T$ does not contain an edge $uv \in E(T)$ which is incident to exactly four weak support vertices $x, y, z, w$ such that $N(x) \cap N(y) = \{u\}$ and $N(z) \cap N(w) = \{v\}$.

Proof. Let $T$ be a tree and $\gamma_{cl}(T) = n$. Suppose $T$ does not satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem, then there exist at least an edge $uv \in E(T)$ incident to exactly four support vertices $x, y, z, w$ such that $N(x) \cap N(y) = \{u\}$ and $N(z) \cap N(w) = \{v\}$ which implies that $V - \{u, v\}$ is isomorphic to $K_2$. Therefore $|D| = n - 2$. Hence $\gamma_{cl}(T) = |D| = n - 2$, a contradiction.

Conversely, suppose $G$ does not contain an edge $uv \in E(T)$ as stated in the hypothesis of the theorem, then $\langle V - D\rangle = \pi$, which implies that $|D| = n$. Hence $\gamma_{cl}(T) = |D| = n$.

By Observation 2, there exists no graph with $\gamma_{cl}(T) = n - 1$.

We now consider trees $T$ such that $\gamma_{cl}(T) \leq n - 2$.
Let $S(n, k)$-star (where $n \geq 2$ and $k \geq 1$) be a tree obtained from a path $P_n$ making each vertex $v_i \in V(P_n)$ ($2 \leq i \leq n$) adjacent to least $k$ new leaves. We have $|V(S(n, k))| = n + k$ and $|E(S(n, k))| = n + k - 1$.

Operation $\mathcal{O}$: Let $v$ be a support vertex of a tree $T$. Attach $|d_G(v) - 1|$ or $|d_G(v) - 2|$ leaves to at least one leaf adjacent to $v$, and attach exactly one leaf to other leaves adjacent to $v$.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the family of trees such that $\mathcal{T} = \{T : T$ is obtained from a star by a finite sequence of operations $\mathcal{O}\}$.

We now characterize the trees with $\gamma_{cl}^e(T) = n - 2$.

**Theorem 11.** If $T$ is a tree with at least six vertices, then $\gamma_{cl}^e(T) = n - 2$ if and only if $T \in \mathcal{T}$ and $T$ is obtained from a $S(2, k)$-star ($k \geq 2$) by a finite sequence of operations $\mathcal{O}$.

Similarly, we can characterize the trees with $\gamma_{cl}^e(T) = k$ ($k \geq 3$) by $S(n, n - k)$-star by finite sequence of operations $\mathcal{O}$.

We need the following theorem to prove our further results.

**Theorem 12** ([4]). Let $G$ be a graph without isolated vertices. Then $\gamma(G) = n/2$ if and only if each component of $G$ is a cycle $C_4$ or $G = H \circ K_1$, for any connected graph $H$.

Next we characterize the class of graphs with $\gamma_{cl}^e(G) = 2\gamma(G)$.

**Theorem 13.** Let $G$ be a graph without isolated vertices, and which is not a tree. Then $\gamma_{cl}^e(G) = 2\gamma(G)$ if and only if each component of $G$ is a cycle $C_4$ or $G = H \circ K_1$, for any connected graph $H$.

**Proof.** Let $G$ be a graph without isolated vertices. Let $D$ be a DERD-dominating set of $G$. If each component of $G$ is a cycle $C_4$, then by Theorem 12, $\gamma(G) = \frac{n}{2}$ and by Observation 4, we have $\gamma_{cl}^e(G) = n$. If $G = H \circ K_1$, then $\gamma_{cl}^e(G) = n$ as every vertex of $H \circ K_1$ is a leaf or a support vertex. By Theorem 12 we have $\gamma(G) = n/2$. Hence $\gamma_{cl}^e(G) = n = n/2 + n/2 = \gamma(G) + \gamma(G) = 2\gamma(G)$. \qed

3. **Complexity issues for $\gamma_{cl}^e(G)$**

To show that the DERD-domination decision problem for arbitrary graphs is NP-complete, we shall use a well known NP-completeness result called Exact Three Cover ($X3C$), which is defined as follows.

**EXACT COVER BY 3-SETS ($X3C$).**

**Instance:** A finite set $X$ with $|X| = 3m$ and a collection $C$ of 3-element subsets of $X$.

**Question:** Does $C$ contain an exact cover for $X$, that is, a subcollection $C' \subseteq C$ such that every element of $X$ occurs in exactly one member of $C'$? Note that if $C'$ exists, then its cardinality is precisely $m$.

**Theorem 14** ([2]). $X3C$ is NP-complete.
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**DEGREE EQUITABLE RESTRAINED DOUBLE DOMINATING SET (DERD-dominating set).**

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

**Question:** Is there a DERD-dominating set of cardinality at most $k$?

**Theorem 15.** DERD-dominating set problem is NP-complete, even for bipartite graphs.

**Proof.** It is clear that the DERD-dominating set problem is NP. To show that it is NP-complete, we establish a polynomial transformation from $X3C$. Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{3m}\}$ and $C = \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_m\}$ be an arbitrary instance of $X3C$. We construct a bipartite graph $G$ and a positive integer $k$ such that this instance of $X3C$ will have an exact 3-cover if and only if $G$ has a DERD-dominating set of cardinality at most $k$. With each edge $x_i \in X$, associate a path $P_i$ with vertices $x_i, y_i, z_i, t_i$, with each $c_j$ associate a path $P_j$ with vertices $c_j, d_j, s_j$. Then add new vertices $u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_{2m}$, and make them adjacent to all $x_j$'s. The construction of a bipartite graph $G$ is completed by joining $x_i$ and $c_j$ if and only if $x_i \in c_j$. Finally, set $k = 2m + 9m$.

Assume that $C$ has an exact 3-cover, say $c'$. Then

$$\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq 3m} \{z_i, t_i\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq m} \{d_j, s_j\} \cup \{c_j \in c'\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq 2m} u_j$$

is a DERD-dominating set of $G$ of cardinality $2m + 9m$. This construction can clearly be determined in polynomial time.

Now assume that $D$ is a DERD-dominating set of cardinality at most $2m + 9m$. Then the vertices in the set $L$, defined by

$$\bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq 3m} \{z_i, t_i\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq j \leq m} \{d_j, s_j\}$$

are all leaves, and their neighbors have to be in $D$. Hence $|D| - |L| \leq (2m + 9m) - (2m + 6m) = 3m$. Let $I = \{i \in (1, 2, \ldots, 3m): x_i \in D \text{ or } y_i \in D\}$ and let $J = \{j \in (1, 2, \ldots, 2m): c_j \in D \text{ or } u_j \in D\}$. Then since $D$ is a double dominating set of $G$, we have

$$\bigcup_{i \in I} \{x_i, y_i\} \cup \bigcup_{j \in J} N_G[c_j] \cup \bigcup_{j \in J} \{u_j\} \supseteq \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{3m}\}.$$ 

We conclude that $|I| + 3|J| \geq 9m$. Also $|I| + |J| \leq |D| - |L| \leq 3m$. Hence $|3I| + 3|J| \leq |I| + 3|J|$, thus $I = \emptyset$. We conclude that $x_i, y_i \notin D$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 3m$. Since $x_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, 3m$) is dominated by $D$, we conclude that $|J| = 3m$ and $c' = \{c_j: j \notin J\}$ is an exact cover for $X$. □
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