EDGE-VERTEX DOMINATION AND TOTAL EDGE DOMINATION IN TREES

H. NARESH KUMAR¹, Y. B. VENKATAKRISHNAN¹, §

ABSTRACT. An edge $e \in E(G)$ dominates a vertex $v \in V(G)$ if e is incident with v or e is incident with a vertex adjacent to v. An edge-vertex dominating set of a graph G is a set D of edges of G such that every vertex of G is edge-vertex dominated by an edge of D. The edge-vertex domination number of a graph G is the minimum cardinality of an edge-vertex dominating set of G. A subset $D \subseteq E(G)$ is a total edge dominating set of G if every edge of G has a neighbor in G. The total edge domination number of G is the minimum cardinality of a total edge dominating set of G. We characterize all trees with total edge domination number equal to edge-vertex domination number.

Keywords: Edge-vertex domination, Total Edge Domination, Tree.

AMS Subject Classification: 05C69

1. Introduction

Let G = (V, E) be a graph. By the neighborhood of a vertex v of G we mean the set $N_G(v) = \{u \in V(G) : uv \in E(G)\}$. The degree of a vertex v, denoted by $d_G(v)$, is the cardinality of its neighborhood. 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 strong (weak, respectively) if it is adjacent to at least two leaves (exactly one leaf, respectively). The edge incident with a leaf is called an end edge. The path on n vertices we denote by P_n . Let T be a tree, and let v be a vertex of T. We say that v is adjacent to a path P_n if there is a neighbor of v, say x, such that one of the components of T - vx is a path P_n containing x as a leaf. By a star we mean a connected graph in which exactly one vertex has degree greater than one called its center. Let uv be an edge of a graph G. By subdividing the edge uv we mean removing it, and adding a new vertex, say x, along with two new edges ux and xv. Subdivided star, SS_k is a graph obtained from a star, $K_{1,r}$ by subdividing each one of its edges.

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 a graph G, denoted by $\gamma(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of G. A subset $D \subseteq E(G)$ is a total edge dominating set, abbreviated TEDS, of G if every edge of G has a neighbor in D. The total edge domination number of

¹ Department of Mathematics, School of Arts, Science and Humanities, SASTRA Deemed University, Thanjavur, India, 613 401.

e-mail: nareshhari1403@gmail.com; ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1717-239X.

e-mail: venkatakrish2@maths.sastra.edu; ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4560-2040.

[§] Manuscript received: October 10, 2019; accepted: April 02, 2020.

TWMS Journal of Applied and Engineering Mathematics, Vol.11, Special Issue, © Işık University, Department of Mathematics, 2021; all rights reserved.

The second author is supported by DST-SERB (MATRICS), India - grant MTR/2018/000234.

a graph G, denoted by $\gamma'_t(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a total edge dominating set of G. For a comprehensive survey of domination in graphs, see [1].

An edge $e \in E(G)$ dominates a vertex $v \in V(G)$ if e is incident with v or e is incident with a vertex adjacent to v. A subset $D \subseteq E(G)$ is an edge-vertex dominating set, abbreviated EVDS, of a graph G if every vertex of G is edge-vertex dominated by an edge of D. The edge-vertex domination number of a graph G, denoted by $\gamma_{ev}(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of an edge-vertex dominating set of G. Edge-vertex domination in graphs was introduced in [4], and further studied in [2,3,5].

Trees with equal total domination number equal to edge-vertex domination number plus one were characterized in [2]. We characterize all trees with total edge domination number equal to edge-vertex domination number.

2. Results

We begin this section by proving that for any graph G, edge-vertex domination number is less than or equal to total edge domination number. Since the one-vertex graph does not have a total edge dominating set or an edge-vertex dominating set, we consider graphs with at least two vertices.

Proposition 2.1. For any graph G, $\gamma_{ev}(G) \leq \gamma'_t(G)$.

Proof. Let D be a $\gamma'_t(G)$ -set. For every edge $e \in E(G)$ there exist an edge $f \in D$ such that e and f are adjacent. Every vertex incident with every edge is dominated by an edge in D. Hence, D is an EVDS of the graph G. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(G) \leq \gamma'_t(G)$.

We now characterize all trees with equal edge-vertex domination number and total edge domination number. For the purpose we introduce a family \mathcal{T} of trees $T = T_k$ that can be obtained as follows. Let T_1 be a subdivided star $SS_k(k \geq 2)$. If k is a positive integer, then T_{k+1} can be obtained recursively from T_k by one of the following operations.

- Operation \mathcal{O}_1 : Attach a vertex by joining it to any support vertex of T_k .
- Operation \mathcal{O}_2 : Attach a vertex to a vertex of T_k not a leaf and adjacent to a support vertex.
- Operation \mathcal{O}_3 : Attach a center of a subdivided star $SS_k(k \geq 2)$ to a vertex not a leaf of T_k .
- Operation \mathcal{O}_4 : Attach a path P_5 by joining its support vertex to a vertex of T_k adjacent to P_5 through its support vertex.
- Operation \mathcal{O}_5 : Attach a path P_5 by joining its support vertex to a vertex of T_k adjacent to a path P_2 .

Now we prove that for every tree of the family \mathcal{T} , the total edge domination number is equal to the ev-domination number.

Theorem 2.1. If
$$T \in \mathcal{T}$$
, then $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma'_t(T)$.

Proof. We use the induction on the number k of operations performed to construct tree T. If $T = SS_k(k \geq 2)$, then obviously $\gamma_{ev}(T) = k = \gamma_t'(T)$. Let $k \geq 2$ be an integer. Assume that the result is true for every tree $T' = T_k$ of the family \mathcal{T} constructed by k-1 operations. Let $T = T_{k+1}$ be a tree of the family \mathcal{T} constructed by k operations.

First assume that T is obtained from T' by operation \mathcal{O}_1 . Let y be the vertex joined to a support vertex x. Let z be a leaf adjacent to x other than y. Let D be a $\gamma_{ev}(T)$ -set. To dominate the leaves y and z, the edge incident with x which is not xz and xy is in D. Obviously D is an EVDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T') \leq \gamma_{ev}(T)$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is obvious that D' is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T')$. This implies that $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T')$. Let S' be a $\gamma'_t(T')$ -set. The edge which dominates z

also dominates y. Hence S' is a TEDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_t'(T) \leq \gamma_t'(T')$. Let S be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. Obviously S is an TEDS of the tree T'. This implies that $\gamma_t'(T) = \gamma_t'(T')$. We now get $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T') = \gamma_t'(T') = \gamma_t'(T)$.

Assume that T is obtained from T' by operation \mathcal{O}_2 . The vertex to which a vertex is attached we denote by x. Let y be the attached vertex. Let α be the support vertex adjacent to x. Let β the leaf adjacent to α . Let D be a $\gamma_{ev}(T)$ -set. To dominate β , the edge $x\alpha \in D$. It is easy to observe that D is an EVDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T') \leq \gamma_{ev}(T)$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. To dominate β , the edge $x\alpha \in D$. The edge $x\alpha$ dominates y in the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T')$. This implies that $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T')$. Let S be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate the edge $x\alpha$, the edge incident with x other than $x\alpha$ and xy belongs to S. It is easy to observe that S is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_t'(T') \leq \gamma_t'(T)$. Let S' be a $\gamma_t'(T')$ -set. To dominate the edge $\alpha\beta$, the edge $x\alpha \in S'$. To dominate $x\alpha$, the edge incident with x other than $x\alpha$ belongs to S'. This obvious that S' is a TEDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_t'(T) \leq \gamma_t'(T')$. Now we get $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T') = \gamma_t'(T') = \gamma_t'(T)$.

Assume that tree T is obtained from T' by operation \mathcal{O}_3 . The vertex to which a subdivided star $SS_k(k \geq 2)$ is attached we denote by x. Let α be the center of the star. Let $u_{11}, u_{21}, \ldots, u_{k1}$ be the support vertices of the subdivided star. Let $u_{12}, u_{22}, \ldots, u_{k2}$ be the leaf adjacent to $u_{11}, u_{21}, \ldots, u_{k1}$ respectively. Let α be adjacent to x. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to see that $D' \cup \{u_{11}\alpha, u_{21}\alpha, \ldots, u_{k1}\alpha\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + k$. Let D be a $\gamma_{ev}(T)$ -set. To dominate the vertices $u_{12}, u_{22}, \ldots, u_{k2}$, the edges $u_{11}\alpha, u_{21}\alpha, \ldots, u_{k1}\alpha$ belongs to D. It is easy to observe that $D \setminus \{u_{11}\alpha, u_{21}\alpha, \ldots, u_{k1}\alpha\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T') \leq \gamma_{ev}(T) - k$. This implies that $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T') + k$. Let D' be a $\gamma'_t(T')$ -set. The set $D' \cup \{u_{11}\alpha, u_{21}\alpha, \cdots, u_{k1}\alpha\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma'_t(T) \leq \gamma'_t(T') + k$. Let D be a $\gamma'_t(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges $u_{11}u_{12}, u_{21}u_{22}, \ldots, u_{k1}u_{k2}$ the edges $u_{11}\alpha, u_{21}\alpha, \ldots, u_{k1}\alpha$ belongs to D. It is obvious that $D \setminus \{u_{11}\alpha, u_{21}\alpha, \ldots, u_{k1}\alpha\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) - k$. This implies that $\gamma'_t(T) = \gamma'_t(T') + k$. We now get $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T') + k = \gamma'_t(T') + k = \gamma'_t(T)$.

Assume that tree T is obtained from T' by operation \mathcal{O}_4 . The vertex to which a support vertex of a path P_5 is attached we denote by x. Let $u_1u_2u_3u_4u_5$ be the attached path. Let u_2 be adjacent to x. Let $v_1v_2v_3v_4v_5$ be a path different from $u_1u_2u_3u_4u_5$ adjacent to x. Let x and v_2 be adjacent. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to observe that $D' \cup \{u_2u_3, u_3u_4\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2$. Let S be a $\gamma_{ev}(T)$ -set. To dominate the vertices u_5, u_1, v_5 and v_1 the edges $u_3u_4, xu_2, v_3v_4, xv_2 \in S$. It is obvious that $S \setminus \{u_3u_4, xu_2\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T') \leq \gamma_{ev}(T) - 2$. This implies that $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2$. Let S be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate edges u_4u_5, u_1u_2, v_4v_5 and v_1v_2 the edges $u_2u_3, u_3u_4, v_2v_3, v_3v_4 \in S$. It is obvious that $S \setminus \{u_2u_3, u_3u_4\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_t'(T') \leq \gamma_t'(T) - 2$. Let S' be a $\gamma_t'(T')$ -set. It is obvious that $S \cup \{u_2u_3, u_3u_4\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_t'(T) \leq \gamma_t'(T) + 2$. This implies that $\gamma_t'(T) = \gamma_t'(T') + 2$. We now get $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2 = \gamma_t'(T') + 2$. This implies that

Assume that tree T is obtained from T' by operation \mathcal{O}_5 . The vertex to which a support vertex of P_5 is attached we denote by x. Let $u_1u_2u_3u_4u_5$ be the attached path. Let u_2 be adjacent to x. Let v_1v_2 be a path adjacent to x. Let x and v_1 be adjacent. Let D be a $\gamma_{ev}(T)$ -set. To dominate u_5, u_1 and v_2 the edges xu_2, u_3u_4 and xv_1 belongs to D. It is easy to observe that $D \setminus \{xu_2, u_3u_4\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T') \leq \gamma_{ev}(T) - 2$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to see that $D' \cup \{xu_2, u_3u_4\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2$. This implies that $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2$. Let S be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges v_1v_2, u_1u_2 and v_2v_3 the edges $v_1v_2, v_2v_3, v_3v_4 \in S$. To dominate

the edge xv_1 , the edge incident with x other than xu_2 is in the set S. It is obvious that $S \setminus \{u_2u_3, u_3u_4\}$ is a TEDS of the set T'. Thus $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) - 2$. Let S' be a $\gamma'_t(T')$ -set. It is clear that $S' \cup \{u_2u_3, u_3u_4\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma'_t(T) \leq \gamma'_t(T') + 2$. This implies that $\gamma'_t(T) = \gamma'_t(T') + 2$. We now get $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2 = \gamma'_t(T') + 2 = \gamma'_t(T)$. Now we prove that if the total edge domination number of a tree is equal to edge-vertex domination number, then the tree belongs to the family T.

Theorem 2.2. Let T be a tree. If $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma'_t(T)$, then $T \in \mathcal{T}$.

Proof. Let diam(T)=2, then T is a star. We get $\gamma_{ev}(T) = 1 < 2 = \gamma'_t(T)$. Now assume diam(T) ≥ 3 . Thus the order of the tree T is at least four. We prove the result by induction on n. Assume that the theorem is true for every tree T' of order n' < n.

First assume that some support vertex of T, say x, is strong. Let y be a leaf adjacent to x. Let T' = T - y. Let D be any $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is obvious that D is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T')$. Let D be a $\gamma'_t(T)$ -set. It is clear that D is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T)$. This implies that $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) = \gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T')$. On the other hand $\gamma'_t(T') \geq \gamma_{ev}(T')$. Thus we get $\gamma'_t(T') = \gamma_{ev}(T')$. By the inductive hypothesis $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. The tree T is obtained from T' by operation \mathcal{O}_1 . Thus $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Henceforth, we can assume that every support vertex of T is weak.

We now root T at a vertex r of maximum eccentricity $\operatorname{diam}(T)$. Let t be a leaf at maximum distance from r, v be the parent of t, and u be the parent of v in the rooted tree. If $\operatorname{diam}(T) \geq 4$, then let w be the parent of w. If $\operatorname{diam}(T) \geq 5$, then let d be the parent of w. If $\operatorname{diam}(T) \geq 6$, then let e be the parent of e. By e we denote the subtree induced by a vertex e and its descendants in the rooted tree e.

Assume that some child of u, say x, is a leaf. Let T' = T - x. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is obvious that D' is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T')$. Let D be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate the edge vt, the edge vt of the tree t. To dominate the edge t of the edge t of the tree t. Thus t of t of the edge t of the edge t of the tree t of the edge t of th

Assume that some child of u, other than v, say x, is at a distance two from a vertex of T_k . Let y be the leaf adjacent to x. If u=r and then $T=SS_k(k\geq 2)$. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T)=k=\gamma_t'(T)$, we have $T\in\mathcal{T}$. Assume that $u\neq r$. Let $T'=T-T_u$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to see that $D'\cup A$ where A is the set of edges incident with u other than uw is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T)\leq \gamma_{ev}(T')+|A|$. Let D be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges incident with the leaves, the support edges belongs to D. Obviously $A\subseteq D$. It is clear that $D\setminus A$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_t'(T')\leq \gamma_t'(T)-|A|$. We now get $\gamma_t'(T')\leq \gamma_t'(T)-|A|=\gamma_{ev}(T)-|A|\leq \gamma_{ev}(T')$. This implies that $\gamma_t'(T')=\gamma_{ev}(T')$. By the inductive hypothesis $T'\in\mathcal{T}$. The tree T is obtained by T' by operation \mathcal{O}_3 . Thus $T\in\mathcal{T}$.

Now assume $d_T(u) = 2$. Assume that some child of w, other than u, say x is at a distance three from a vertex of T_k . Let y be adjacent to x and z be adjacent to y. Let $T' = T - T_u$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to see that $D' \cup \{uv\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 1$. Let D be a $\gamma'_t(T)$ -set. To dominate the edge vt and yz the edges $uv, xy \in D$. To dominate uv, xy, the edge $wu, wx \in D$. It is easy to see that $D \setminus \{wu, vu\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) - 2$. We now get $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) - 2 = \gamma_{ev}(T) - 2 \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') - 2 + 1 < \gamma_{ev}(T')$.

Assume that some child of w, other than u, say x is at a distance two from a vertex of T_k . It suffices to consider the case that w is adjacent to path $P_2 = xy$. Let $T' = T - T_w$.

Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to see that $D' \cup \{wx, uv\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2$. Let D be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges vt, xy, the edges $uv, wx \in D$. To dominate the above two edges $uw \in D$. It is clear that $D \setminus \{uv, uw, wx\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_t'(T') \leq \gamma_t'(T) - 3 = \gamma_{ev}(T) - 3 \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2 - 3 < \gamma_{ev}(T')$.

Assume that some child of w, other than u, say x, is a leaf. Now fix $d_T(w)=3$. Now assume that some child of d, other than w, say x is at a distance four from a vertex of T_k . It suffices to consider the case T_k is isomorphic to T_w or T_k is $P_4=abcd$. First assume that T_k is $P_4=abcd$. Let $T'=T-T_a$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to observe that $D' \cup \{bc\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T')+1$. Let D be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges vt and vt the edges vt and vt the edges vt and vt to see that vt that vt is a TEDS of the tree vt. Thus vt the edges vt and vt to see that vt the edges vt and vt the edges vt to see that vt the edges vt the edges vt to see that vt the edges vt that vt the edges vt to see that vt the edges vt the edges vt the edges vt to see that vt the edges vt that vt the edges vt the edges vt that vt the edges vt that vt the edges vt the edges vt that vt the edges vt the edges vt that vt the edges vt t

Now assume that T_k is isomorphic to T_w . Let $T' = T - T_w$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to see that $D' \cup \{wu, uv\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2$. Let D be a $\gamma'_t(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges vt and vx, the edges vx, vx is easy to observe that $D \setminus \{uv, vx\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) - 2$. We now get $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) - 2 = \gamma_{ev}(T) - 2 \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') - 2 + 2 = \gamma_{ev}(T')$. This implies that $\gamma_{ev}(T') = \gamma'_t(T')$. By the inductive hypothesis $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. The tree T is obtained from T' by operation \mathcal{O}_4 . Thus $T \in \mathcal{T}$.

Assume that some child of d, other than w, say x is at a distance three from a vertex of T_k . Let d be adjacent to more than one P_3 paths. Let $u_1u_2u_3$ and $v_1v_2v_3$ be two paths adjacent to d. Let $T' = T - T_{u_1}$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is clear that $D' \cup \{u_1u_2\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 1$. Let D be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges u_2u_3 and v_2v_3 the edges $u_1u_2, v_1v_2 \in D$. To dominate the edges u_2u_3 and v_2v_3 , the edges $u_1d, v_1d \in D$. It is easy to observe that $D \setminus \{u_1d, u_2u_3\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_t'(T') \leq \gamma_t'(T) - 2$. We now get $\gamma_t'(T') \leq \gamma_t'(T) - 2 = \gamma_{ev}(T) - 2 \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 1 - 2 < \gamma_{ev}(T')$, a contradiction. Hence the vertex d is adjacent to exactly one path P_3 , say $v_1v_2v_3$. Let $T' = T - T_d$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is clear that $D' \cup \{v_1v_2, wu, uv\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 3$. Let D be an $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges u_2u_3, vt and wx, the edges $u_1u_2, vu, uw \in D$. To dominate the edge u_1u_2 , the edge $du_1 \in D$. It is obvious that $D \setminus \{u_1u_2, vu, vw, du_1\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_t'(T') \leq \gamma_t'(T) - 4$. We now get $\gamma_t'(T') \leq \gamma_t'(T) - 4 = \gamma_{ev}(T) - 4 \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 3 - 4 < \gamma_{ev}(T')$.

Assume that some child of d, other than w, say a, is at a distance two from a vertex of T_k . Let b be the vertex adjacent to a. Let $T' = T - T_w$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to see that $D' \cup \{uv, wd\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2$. Let D be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges vt and vt, the edges vt, vt is easy to observe that $D \setminus \{uv, uw\}$ is a TEDS of the tree tt. Thus $\gamma_t'(T') \leq \gamma_t'(T) - 2$. We now get $\gamma_t'(T') \leq \gamma_t'(T) - 2 = \gamma_{ev}(T) - 2 \leq \gamma_{ev}(T')$. This implies that $\gamma_{ev}(T') = \gamma_t'(T')$. By the inductive hypothesis tt is easy to obtained from tt by operation tt in tt in tt is easy to tt inductive hypothesis tt in tt

Assume that some child of d, other than w, say a, is a leaf. Let $T' = T - T_d$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to observe that $D' \cup \{dw, uv\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2$. Let D be a $\gamma'_t(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges vt, wx and da, the edges $uv, uw, wd \in D$. It is easy to see that $D \setminus \{uv, uw, wd\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) - 3$. We now get $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) - 3 = \gamma_{ev}(T) - 3 \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') - 3 + 2 < \gamma_{ev}(T')$.

Now assume that $d_T(d) = 2$. Let $T' = T - T_d$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is obvious to see that $D' \cup \{wu, uv\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T) \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2$. Let D be an $\gamma'_t(T)$ -set. To dominate the edges vt, wx and ed, the edges $dw, wu, uv \in D$. It is clear

that $D \setminus \{dw, uw, uv\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) - 3$. We now get $\gamma'_t(T') \leq \gamma'_t(T) - 3 = \gamma_{ev}(T) - 3 \leq \gamma_{ev}(T') + 2 - 3 < \gamma_{ev}(T')$. Now assume that $d_T(w) = 2$. Let $d_T(d) \geq 2$. Let $T' = T - T_w$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set.

Now assume that $d_T(w)=2$. Let $d_T(d)\geq 2$. Let $T'=T-T_w$. Let D' be a $\gamma_{ev}(T')$ -set. It is easy to see that $D'\cup\{uv\}$ is an EVDS of the tree T. Thus $\gamma_{ev}(T)\leq \gamma_{ev}(T')+1$. Let D be a $\gamma_t'(T)$ -set. To dominate vt, the edge $uv\in D$. To dominate uv, the edge $uu\in D$. It is easy to see that $D\setminus\{uu,uv\}$ is a TEDS of the tree T'. Thus $\gamma_t'(T')\leq \gamma_t'(T)-2$. We now get $\gamma_t'(T')\leq \gamma_t'(T)-2=\gamma_{ev}(T)-2\leq \gamma_{ev}(T')+1-2<\gamma_{ev}(T')$.

As an immediate consequence of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2, we have the following characterization of trees with total edge domination number equal to edge-vertex domination number.

Theorem 2.3. Let T be a tree. Then $\gamma_{ev}(T) = \gamma'_t(T)$ if and only if $T \in \mathcal{T}$.

References

- [1] Haynes, T.W., Hedetniemi, S., and Slater, P., (1998), Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs, Marcel Dekker, New York.
- [2] Krishnakumari, B., Venkatakrishnan, Y.B. and Krzywkowski, M., (2016), On trees with total domination number equal to edge-vertex domination number plus one, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math. Sci.) 126, pp. 153-157.
- [3] Lewis, J.R., Hedetniemi, S., Haynes, T. W., and Fricke, G., (2010), Vertex-edge domination, Utilitas Mathematica 81, pp. 193-213.
- [4] Peters, K.W., (1986), Theoretical and Algorithmic Results on Domination and Connectivity, Ph.D. Thesis, Clemson University.
- [5] Venkatakrishnan, Y.B., and Krishnakumari, B., (2018), An improved upper bound of edge-vertex domination number of a tree, Information Processing Letters 134, pp. 14-17.



H. Naresh Kumar received his M.Phil. degree in Mathematics from Ramanujan Institute for Advanced Study in Mathematics, University of Madras, Chennai, India, in 2016. He is currently pursuing the Ph.D. degree in Mathematics at SASTRA Deemed to be University, Thanjavur, India. His research interest includes Graph Theory and Graph Algorithms.



Y.B. Venkatakrishnan received the Ph.D. degree in Mathematics from Sri Chandrasekharendra Saraswathi Viswa Mahavidyalaya, Kanchipuram, India in 2009. He is currently Senior Assistant Professor in Mathematics Department, School of Arts, Science and Humanities at SASTRA Deemed to be University, Thanjavur, India. His research interest includes Graph Theory and Graph Algorithms.