数理解析研究所講究録
第 427 巻 1981 年 68-82

Miscellaneous Properties on Equi-Eccentric Graphs

Jin Akiyama
Kiyoshi Ando
Dept. of Fundamental Sciences
Nippon Ika University
Kosugi, Kawasaki, 211, Japan

David Avis
Dept. of Computer Sciences
McGill University
Montreal, Canada

1. Introduction

We deal with only connected graphs throughout this paper. The eccentricity $e(v)$ of a vertex v of a connected graph G is the number $\max_{u\in V(G)} d(u,v)$, where $d(u,v)$ stands for the distance between u and v. A central vertex of a connected graph G is a vertex v with the property that the maximum possible distance between v and any other vertex is as small as possible, this distance being called the radius, denoted by $r(G)$, that is, $r(G) = \min_{v} \max_{w} d(v,w)$. The subgraph induced by the set of central vertices of G is called the center of G. Then a graph G is r-equi-eccentric (or briefly, r-equi) if $e(v) = r(G)$ for every vertex of G, that is, a graph whose center is itself. An r-equi-eccentric graph G is said r-minimal if $G - e$ is no longer r-equi for any edge e of G. An r-equi-eccentric graph G of order p is r-minimum if G has the least number of edges among all r-equi-eccentric graphs of order p. We denote by N(v) the neighborhood of a vertex v of G consisting of the vertices of G adjacent with v. The closed neighborhood N[v] of v is defined as $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$.

All other definitions and notations used in this paper can be found in [1] or [2].

We first present a few fundamental properties on equi-eccentric graphs.

Proposition 1.1. Every equi-eccentric graph G except K_2 is a block.

Proof. Every vertex of G is a central vertex by the definition and the center of every connected graphs lies in its single block. □

Proposition 1.2. Let G be r-equi of order p with maximum degree Δ, then the following inequality holds:

$$\Delta \leq p - 2(r - 1).$$

Proof. Let v be an arbitrary vertex of G and u be a vertex with $d(u,v) = r$. By Proposition 1.1, G is a block or K_2. If G is K_2 then the theorem is true. On the other hand, if G is a block there is at least one cycle containing both u and v. By C we denote the smallest one among those cycles. Then note that $|V(C)| \geq 2r$ since $d(u,v) = r$, and $|V(C) \cap N[v]| = 3$ since C is the smallest such cycle. Thus the following inequalities hold:

$$|V(G)| - |N[v]| \geq |V(C)| - |V(C) \cap N[v]| \geq 2r - 3.$$

Since $|V(G)| - |N[v]| = p - (\deg v+1)$, we have

$$\deg v \leq p - 2(r - 1) \text{ for every vertex } v \text{ of } G,$$

completing the proof. □

2. Operations producing equi-eccentric graphs

In this section, we exhibit several interesting operations to produce equi-eccentric graphs. We omit proofs when they are immediate from the constructions.

(I) Mycielski's operation

Generating Mycielski's operation to an arbitrary graph $G = (V,E)$ with p vertices and q edges, we define its (Mycielski) successor $\hat{G} = (\hat{V},\hat{E})$ as follows:

(i) For each $x \in V$, generate its twin x', call the set of twins V'.

(ii) Join x' to $N(x)$ in G, for every $x' \in V'$.

(iii) Create a new vertex z and join it to all twin vertices $x' \in V'$.

Example 1. Let G be the graph $K_4 - e$. Then its Mycielski successor $\hat{G}$ is as follows; see Figure 2.1.



Figure 2.1.

Let G be a (p,q)-graph, then $\hat{G}$ is a (2p+1, 3q+p)-graph.

Note that a graph with p+1 vertices is 2-equi if it contains no K(1,p) and the $\max_{u,v \in V(G)} d(u,v) = 2$.

Using the same notations above, we prove the following result.

Theorem 2.1. If G is 2-equi then $\hat{G}$ is 2-equi.

Proof. It is immediate from the construction that $\hat{G}$ does not contain $K(1,2p)$. We verify the second condition. Let $\hat{d}(u,v)$ denote distances in $\hat{G}$.

(i) $u, v \in V$: $\hat{d}(u,v) = d(u,v)$, provided that $d(u,v) \leqq 2$

(ii) $u', v' \in V'$: $\hat{d}(u',v') \leqq d(u',z) + d(v',z) = 2$

(iii) $u \in V$, z: $\hat{d}(u,z) = 1 + d(v',z) = 2$, where v is a neighbor of u in G.

(iv) $u' \in V'$, z: $\hat{d}(u',z) = 1$, by construction.

(v) $u \in V$, $v' \in V'$: If $d(u,v) = 1$ then $\hat{d}(u,v') = 1$. Otherwise let w be a common neighbor of u and v. There exists such a vertex w because G is 2-equi. Then $\hat{d}(u,v') = d(u,w) + \hat{d}(w,v') = 2$.

Thus $\hat{G}$ is 2-equi. □

(II) The join operation

Theorem 2.2. If G is 2-equi, then $G + \overline{K}_n$ $(n \geqq 2)$ is 2-equi. □ (see Figure 2.2).

$C_4 + \overline{K}_2$:



Figure 2.2.

(III) Operations to produce the minimal 2-equi-eccentric graphs

The corona $G_1 \circ G_2$ of two graphs G_1, G_2 with order p_1 and p_2 is defined as the graph obtained by taking one copy of G_1 and p_1 copies of G_2 and joining the i-th vertex of G_1 to each vertex in the i-th copy of G_2. In Figure 2.3, we illustrate $C_4 \circ K_2$.

$C_4 \circ K_2$:



Figure 2.3.

We define the graph $G_n = K_n \circ K_1 + K_1$ ($n \geqq 2$) as the graph obtained from $K_n \circ K_1$ by adding a new vertex z and joining z to the vertices of degree 1 of $K_n \circ K_1$. In Figure 2.4, we illustrate the graph $K_3 \circ K_1 + K_1$.

Theorem 2.3. The graph $G_n = K_n \circ K_1 + K_1$ ($n \geqq 2$) obtained by the operation above is minimal 2-equi. □

$K_3 \circ K_1 + K_1$:



Figure 2.4.

(IV) The cartesian product operation

All of the three operations mentioned above produce 2-equi-eccentric graphs, we now present other operations to produce r-equi-eccentric graphs for an arbitrary integer $r \geq 2$.

The <u>cartesian product</u> $G = G_1 \times G_2$ has $V(G) = V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$, and two vertices (u_1,u_2) and (v_1,v_2) of G are adjacent if and only if either

(1) $u_1 = v_1$ and $u_2v_2 \in E(G_2)$

or

(2) $u_2 = v_2$ and $u_1v_1 \in E(G_1)$.

<u>Theorem 2.4.</u> Let G_1, G_2 be r_1, r_2-equi, then their cartesian product $G = G_1 \times G_2$ is $(r_1 + r_2)$-equi. □

As an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.4, we obtain the next result.

<u>Corollary 2.4.1.</u> The r-cube $Q_r = (K_2)^r$ is r-equi. □

(V) <u>The shift operation by P_n</u>

Let F be any given graph, then define a graph $G_r(F)$ $(r \geq 2)$ consisting of F, a copy of P_{2r} and all edges joining two end-vertices of P_{2r} to the vertices of F. Figure 2.5 illustrates the graph $G_2(\overline{K}_3)$.

$G_2(\overline{K}_3)$:



<u>Figure 2.5.</u>

Theorem 2.5. Let F be an arbitrary graph, then the graph $G_r(F)$ $(r \geqq 2)$ is r-equi. □

Corollary 2.5.1. For any given nonempty graph F and an integer r, there exists an r-equi-eccentric graph containing F as an induced subgraph. □

Note that the above corollary suggests that it is impossible to characterize r-equi-eccentric graphs in terms of forbidden subgraphs.

3. 2-equi-eccentric graphs

We denote the degree of a vertex v_i by d_i for the sake of convenience.

Proposition 3.1. There are no 2-equi-eccentric graphs G with minimum degree $\delta = 3$ and $q \leqq 2p - 5$, other than the Petersen graph.

Proof. We show that G is isomorphic to the Petersen graph, if G is 2-equi with $\delta = 3$ and $q \leqq 2p - 5$. Let v_i be a vertex of degree 3. By v_2, v_3, v_4 we denote vertices adjacent to v_1, and the $(p - 4)$ remaining vertices in G by $v_5, v_6, \ldots, v_p$. Each vertex v_i $(5 \leqq i \leqq p)$ is adjacent to at least one vertex of v_2, v_3 and v_4, otherwise $d(v_i, v_1) \geqq 3$.
From this fact the inequality (1) follows:

(1) $$d_2 + d_3 + d_4 \geqq p - 1.$$

On the other hand, the inverse inequality of (1) follows from the facts that $\sum_{i=1}^{p} d_i = 2q \leqq 4p - 10$ and $\sum_{i=5}^{p} d_i \geqq 3(p - 4)$ since $d_i \geqq \delta = 3$:

(2) $$d_2 + d_3 + d_4 \leqq p - 1$$

Thus we obtain the following equalities (3) and (4):

(3) $d_2 + d_3 + d_4 = p - 1$

(4) $d_i = 3 \quad (5 \leqq i \leqq p)$

From (3) it follows at once that

$$N(v_i) \cap N(v_j) = \{v_1\} \quad (i \neq j,\ 2 \leqq i,j \leqq 4)$$



Figure 3.1. A stage of the proof of Proposition 3.1

Applying the same argument for each vertex v_i $(5 \leqq i \leqq p)$ instead of v_1 since $d_i = 3$ from (4), then we see that $d_i = 3$ for i $(2 \leqq i \leqq 4)$ and so G is cubic. Furthermore denoting by V_i' the vertex set $N(v_i) - \{v_1\}$ for i = 2, 3 and 4, we have that $|V_i'| = 2$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $V_2' = \{v_5, v_6\}$, $V_3' = \{v_7, v_8\}$ and $V_4' = \{v_9, v_{10}\}$. On a basis of the fact that G is 2-equi, we see that the graph $G' = G - \{v_1,v_2,v_3,v_4\}$ is connected, which implies that G' is a 6-cycle. Thus it is easy to verify that the graph with the properties mentioned above is isomorphic to the Petersen graph, see Figure 3.2. □



Figure 3.2. The Petersen graph

Theorem 3.1. If a (p,q)graph G is 2-equi, then $q \geq 2p - 5$.

Proof. Let G be 2-equi then G is a block by Proposition 1.1. Thus $\delta(G) \geq 2$. If $\delta(G) \geq 4$ the theorem is true since $q \geq 2p$. If $\delta(G) = 3$ then it follows from Proposition 3.1 that $q \geq 2p - 5$. We may thus assume that $\delta = 2$. Let v be a vertex of degree 2 and u, w be vertices adjacent to v in G. We define three vertex sets I, U, W, see Figure 3.3, and denote their cardinality by i, j, k respectively.

$$I = N(u) \cap N(w) - \{v\}.$$

$$U = N(u) - I - \{v\}.$$

$$W = N(w) - I - \{v\}.$$

Since $d(x,y) \leq 2$ for any pair of verices $x \in U$, $y \in W$, x is connected to y in the induced subgraph $G' = \langle G - \{v,u,w\} \rangle$. Thus the induced graph $G'' = \langle U \cup W \rangle$ is in a connected component of G', which implies that G'' has at least $j + k - 1$ edges. Therefore, we obtain the inequality as required, since $i + j + k = p - 3$.

$$q \geq 2 + j + 2i + k + (j + k - 1) = 2(i + j + k) + 1$$
$$= 2p - 5 \qquad \square$$



Figure 3.3.

Before presenting the characterization theorem for the minimum 2-equi-eccentric graphs, we require a definition.

For any tree T, we denote by T' the subtree obtained on deleting the endvertices of T. Then a double star is a tree T such that $T' = K_2$: it is denoted by T(m,n) when m endvertices are adjacent to one vertex of this K_2 and n to the other.

Lemma 3.1. Let T be a tree. If there is a partition {U,W} of V(T) such that

(1) $d(u,w) \leqq 2$ for any $u \in U$ and $w \in W$,

(2) both U and W are dominating sets of T.

Then T is either a star or a double star.

Proof. It is easy to see that if T is either a star or a double star then there is such a partition (see Figure 3.4).



Figure 3.4. A star and a double star

Let $U = \{u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_m\}$ and $W = \{w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n\}$. Since T is acyclic it follows from the condition (1) that T cannot contain P_4, $2P_3$ and $3P_2$ of the form in Figure 3.5.



Figure 3.5. Forbidden subgraphs P_4, $2P_3$ and $3P_2$.

We call them the forbidden subgraphs P_4, 2P3 and $3P_2$ for T. Without loss of generality we may assume that $|U| \leq |W|$.

Let $W(u_i) = N(u_i) \cap W$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. We first note that no sets $W(u_i)$ are empty. Since otherwise $u_i \notin N(w)$ for any $w \in W$, contradicting (2) of the lemma.

Using the assumption that $|U| \leq |W|$, we show that $W(u_i) \cap W(u_j) = \phi$ for any $i, j (i \neq j)$. Suppose that $W(u_i) \cap W(u_j) \neq \phi$ for some i and $j (i \neq j)$ then $W(u_i) = W(u_j)$ since otherwise T would contain the forbidden subgraph P_4. Furthermore $W(u_i)$ $(=W(u_j))$

consists of only a single vertex, otherwise T would contain the cycle C_4, contradicting T a tree. Then since $|U| \leq |W|$, there is a vertex u_k in U such that $|W(u_k)| \geq 2$. This implies that T contains the forbidden subgraph $2P_3$ (see Figure 3.6).



Figure 3.6.

Therefore $W(u_i) \cap W(u_j) = \phi$ for any i and j ($i \neq j$). Consequently if $|U| \geq 3$ then T would contain the forbidden subgraph $3P_2$. Finally we get that $|U| = 1$ or $|U| = 2$. And it is easy to see that T is either a star or a double star depending on whether $|U| = 1$ or 2. □

In the following theorem we use the next terminology.

The graph $K_3(\ell,m,n)$ is the graph obtained from K_3 adding ℓ, m, n pendent edges from each vertex of K_3, respectively, Figure 3.7 illustrates the graph $K_3(1,2,3)$.



Figure 3.7. $K_3(1,2,3)$

Theorem 3.2. Let G be a minimum 2-equi-eccentric graph other than the Petersen graph, then G is one of the followings:

(I) The graph obtained from the double star T(m,n) by adding a new vertex v and joining v to every vertex of degree 1 of T(m,n), where m, n are arbitrary positive integers, see Figure 3.8(a).

(II) The graph obtained from $K_3(\ell,m,n)$, ℓ, m, n $\geq$ 1, by adding a new vertex v and joing v to every vertex of degree 1 of $K_3(\ell,m,n)$, see Figure 3.8(b).



Figure 3.8.

Proof. If G is a minimum 2-equi-eccentric graph other than the Petersen graph, then the minimum degree δ of G is 2 by Theorem 3.1. Let v be a vertex of degree 2 in G and u, w be the vertices adjacent to v. Then every vertex of V(G) - {u,v} is adjacent to either u or w, since G is 2-equi. Set three vertex-subsets I, U, W as follows:

$$I = N(u) \cap N(w)$$
$$U = N(u) - I$$
$$W = N(w) - I$$



Figure 3.9.

Let $|I| = p_1$, $|U| = p_2$ and $|W| = p_3$, then neither p_2 nor p_3 is 0. Because if both p_2 and p_3 are 0 then

$$q = 2p_1 > 2p_1 - 1$$
$$= 2p - 5,$$ contradicting to the hypothesis

that G is minimum 2-equi. If one of U or W is empty and the other is not, then u or w would be a cutvertex of G contradicting to the fact that G is 2-equi by Proposition 1.1.

Set $G' = G - \{u,v\}$

$$= \langle I \cup U \cup W\rangle_G$$

and

$$T = \langle U \cup W\rangle_G$$
$$= \langle U \cup W\rangle_{G'}.$$

Then since G is 2-equi, $d'(x,y) \leq 2$ for any $x \in U$ and $y \in W$, where $d'(x,y)$ stands for the distance between x and y in G' (see Figure 3.9). So T lies in a connected component H of G'. On the other hand, we have

$$q(H) \leq q' \leq q - (\deg u + \deg w)$$
$$\leq 2p - 5 - (2p_1 + p_2 + p_3)$$
$$= p_2 + p_3 - 1.$$

So $p(H) \leqq p_2 + p_3$ since H is connected. The fact that $H \cong T$ follows immediately from the inequality $p(H) \leqq p_2 + p_3 = p(T)$ and that H   T. Thus we obtain the following facts:

(i) $T = \langle U \cup W \rangle_G$ is a tree

(ii) the vertices u and w are not adjacent in G

(iii) $\langle I \rangle = G' - T$ is totally disconnected.

It follows from that $d(u,y) = 2$ and the condition (ii) that $N_G(y) \cap U = N_T(y) \cap U \neq \phi$, for any $y \in W$. Similarly, we obtain that $N_T(x) \cap W \neq \phi$ for any $x \in U$. We thus obtain

(iv) both U and W are dominating sets of $T = \langle U \cup W \rangle_G$.

Applying Lemma 3.1 and (iv), we have that T is either a star or a double star. Then we obtain the graphs illustrated in Figure 3.8(a), (b) according to T is a star or a double star. □

References

[1] M. Behzad, G. Chartrand and L. Lesniak-Foster, Graphs and digraphs, Prindle, Weber & Schmidt, Reading(1979)

[2] F. Harary, Graph Theory, Addison-Wesley, Reading(1969)