



## GLOBAL RAINBOW DOMINATION IN GRAPHS

J. AMJADI, S.M. SHEIKHOLESAMI, AND L. VOLKMANN

*Received 27 May, 2014*

*Abstract.* For a positive integer  $k$ , a  $k$ -rainbow dominating function (kRDF) of a graph  $G$  is a function  $f$  from the vertex set  $V(G)$  to the set of all subsets of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  such that for any vertex  $v \in V(G)$  with  $f(v) = \emptyset$ , the condition  $\bigcup_{u \in N(v)} f(u) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  is fulfilled, where  $N(v)$  is the neighborhood of  $v$ . The *weight* of a kRDF  $f$  is the value  $\omega(f) = \sum_{v \in V} |f(v)|$ . A kRDF  $f$  is called a *global  $k$ -rainbow dominating function* (GkRDF) if  $f$  is also a kRDF of the complement  $\overline{G}$  of  $G$ . The *global  $k$ -rainbow domination number* of  $G$ , denoted by  $\gamma_{grk}(G)$ , is the minimum weight of a GkRDF on  $G$ . In this paper, we initiate the study of the global  $k$ -rainbow domination number and we establish some sharp bounds for it.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* 05C69

*Keywords:*  $k$ -rainbow dominating function,  $k$ -rainbow domination number, global  $k$ -rainbow dominating function, global  $k$ -rainbow domination number

### 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper,  $G$  is a simple graph with vertex set  $V(G)$  and edge set  $E(G)$  (briefly  $V, E$ ). The order  $|V|$  of  $G$  is denoted by  $n = n(G)$ . Denote by  $K_n$  the *complete graph*, by  $C_n$  the *cycle* and by  $P_n$  the *path* of order  $n$ , respectively. For every vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , the *open neighborhood*  $N_G(v) = N(v)$  is the set  $\{u \in V(G) \mid uv \in E(G)\}$  and its *closed neighborhood* is the set  $N_G[v] = N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$ . The *degree* of a vertex  $v \in V$  is  $\deg_G(v) = \deg(v) = |N(v)|$ . The *open neighborhood* of a set  $S \subseteq V$  is the set  $N_G(S) = N(S) = \bigcup_{v \in S} N(v)$ , and the *closed neighborhood* of  $S$  is the set  $N_G[S] = N[S] = N(S) \cup S$ . The *minimum* and *maximum* degrees of  $G$  are respectively denoted by  $\delta(G) = \delta$  and  $\Delta(G) = \Delta$ . A *leaf* of a graph is a vertex of degree 1, a *support vertex* is a vertex adjacent to a leaf and a *strong support vertex* is a vertex adjacent to at least two leaves. For a vertex  $v$  in a rooted tree  $T$ , let  $C(v)$  denote the set of children of  $v$ . Let  $D(v)$  denote the set of descendants of  $v$  and  $D[v] = D(v) \cup \{v\}$ . The *maximal subtree* at  $v$  is the subtree of  $T$  induced by  $D[v]$ , and is denoted by  $T_v$ . We use [12, 19] for terminology and notation which are not defined here.

A subset  $S$  of vertices of  $G$  is a *dominating set* if  $N[S] = V$ . The *domination number*  $\gamma(G)$  is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set of  $G$ . A dominating set  $S$  of

$G$  is *global dominating set* of  $G$  if  $S$  is a dominating set both of  $G$  and  $\overline{G}$ . The *global domination number*  $\gamma_g(G)$  of  $G$  is the minimum cardinality of a global dominating set. The global domination number was introduced independently by Brigham and Dutton [7] (the term factor domination number was used) and Sampathkumar [15] and has been studied by several authors (see for example [3, 20]). Since then some variants of the global domination parameter, such as connected (total) global domination, global minus domination, and global Roman domination, have been studied [4, 5, 10, 13].

For a positive integer  $k$ , a  *$k$ -rainbow dominating function* (kRDF) of a graph  $G$  is a function  $f$  from the vertex set  $V(G)$  to the set of all subsets of the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  such that for any vertex  $v \in V(G)$  with  $f(v) = \emptyset$ , the condition  $\bigcup_{u \in N(v)} f(u) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  is fulfilled. The *weight* of a kRDF  $f$  is the value  $\omega(f) = \sum_{v \in V} |f(v)|$ . The  *$k$ -rainbow domination number* of a graph  $G$ , denoted by  $\gamma_{rk}(G)$ , is the minimum weight of a kRDF of  $G$ . A  $\gamma_{rk}(G)$ -*function* is a  $k$ -rainbow dominating function of  $G$  with weight  $\gamma_{rk}(G)$ . Note that  $\gamma_{r1}(G)$  is the classical domination number  $\gamma(G)$ . The  $k$ -rainbow domination number was introduced by Brešar, Henning, and Rall [6] and has been studied by several authors (see for example [1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16–18]). A 2-rainbow dominating function (briefly, rainbow dominating function)  $f : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2\})$  can be represented by the ordered partition  $(V_0, V_1, V_2, V_{1,2})$  (or  $(V_0^f, V_1^f, V_2^f, V_{1,2}^f)$  to refer  $f$ ) of  $V$ , where  $V_0 = \{v \in V \mid f(v) = \emptyset\}$ ,  $V_1 = \{v \in V \mid f(v) = \{1\}\}$ ,  $V_2 = \{v \in V \mid f(v) = \{2\}\}$  and  $V_{1,2} = \{v \in V \mid f(v) = \{1, 2\}\}$ . In this representation, its weight is  $\omega(f) = |V_1| + |V_2| + 2|V_{1,2}|$ .

A kRDF  $f$  is called a *global  $k$ -rainbow dominating function* (GkRDF) if  $f$  is also a kRDF of the complement  $\overline{G}$  of  $G$ . The *global  $k$ -rainbow domination number* of  $G$ , denoted by  $\gamma_{grk}(G)$ , is the minimum weight of a GkRDF on  $G$ . A  $\gamma_{grk}(G)$ -*function* is a GkRDF of  $G$  with weight  $\gamma_{grk}(G)$ . Since every global  $k$ -rainbow dominating function  $f$  of  $G$  is a kRDF of  $G$  and  $\overline{G}$ , and assigning 1 to the vertices with nonempty label under  $f$  is a global dominating set of  $G$ , and since assigning  $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  to the vertices of a global dominating set yields a GkRDF, we deduce that

$$\max\{\gamma_g(G), \gamma_{rk}(G), \gamma_{rk}(\overline{G})\} \leq \gamma_{grk}(G) \leq k\gamma_g(G). \quad (1.1)$$

We note that the global  $k$ -rainbow domination number can differ significantly from the  $k$ -rainbow domination number. For example, for  $n \geq k + 1$ ,  $\gamma_{rk}(K_n) = k$  and  $\gamma_{grk}(K_n) = n$ .

Our purpose in this paper is to initiate the study of the global  $k$ -rainbow domination number in graphs. We study basic properties of the global  $k$ -rainbow domination number and we establish some bounds for it.

We make use of the following results in this paper.

**Theorem A** ([14]). *For any graph  $G$  of order  $n$  and maximum degree  $\Delta(G) \geq 1$ ,*

$$\gamma_{rk}(G) \geq \frac{kn}{\Delta(G) + k}.$$

**Theorem B** ([6]). For  $n \geq 1$ ,

$$\gamma_{r2}(P_n) = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor + 1.$$

**Theorem C** ([6]). For  $n \geq 3$ ,

$$\gamma_{r2}(C_n) = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lceil \frac{n}{4} \right\rceil - \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor.$$

**Theorem D** ([1]). If  $G$  is a graph of order  $n$ , then  $\gamma_{rk}(G) \leq n - \Delta(G) + k - 1$ .

**Theorem E** ([9]). Let  $G$  be a connected graph. If there is a path  $v_3v_2v_1$  in  $G$  with  $\deg(v_2) = 2$  and  $\deg(v_1) = 1$ , then  $G$  has a  $\gamma_{r2}(G)$ -function  $f$  such that  $f(v_1) = \{1\}$ , and  $2 \in f(v_3)$ .

Since the function  $f$  defined by  $f(v) = \{1\}$  for each  $v \in V(G)$  is a GkRDF of a graph  $G$ , we have the first part of the following observation. The second part is easy to see and therefore its proof is omitted.

**Observation 1.** If  $G$  is a graph of order  $n$ , then  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq n$ . Furthermore, if  $1 \leq n \leq 4$ , then  $\gamma_{grk}(G) = n$ .

## 2. GRAPHS WITH $\gamma_{rk}(G) = \gamma_{grk}(G)$

In this section we provide some sufficient conditions for a graph to satisfy  $\gamma_{rk}(G) = \gamma_{grk}(G)$ .

**Proposition 1.** If  $G$  is a disconnected graph with at least two components of order at least  $k$ , then

$$\gamma_{grk}(G) = \gamma_{rk}(G).$$

*Proof.* Let  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k$  be the components of  $G$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that  $|V(G_i)| \geq k$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . Let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{rk}(G)$ -function. Obviously,  $\sum_{v \in V(G_i)} |f(v)| \geq k$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . If  $f(x) = \emptyset$  for some  $x \in V(G_i)$ , then clearly  $\bigcup_{v \in V(G_i)} f(v) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , otherwise we may assume  $\bigcup_{v \in V(G_i)} f(v) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  for  $i = 1, 2$  because  $|V(G_1)| \geq k$  and  $|V(G_2)| \geq k$ . Then  $f$  is a GkRDF of  $G$  and hence  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G)$ . Now the result follows from (1.1).  $\square$

According to Proposition 1, if  $G$  is the disjoint union of two copies of the complete graph  $K_n$  ( $n \geq k$ ), then  $\gamma_{grk}(G) = \gamma_{rk}(G)$ .

**Proposition 2.** If  $G$  is a disconnected graph with  $r \geq 2$  components  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_r$  of order at most  $k - 1$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^r |V(G_i)| \geq k$ , then

$$\gamma_{grk}(G) = \gamma_{rk}(G).$$

*Proof.* Assume that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^r V(G_i) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s\}$ , and let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{rk}(G)$ -function. Then clearly  $f(v_i) \neq \emptyset$  for each  $i$ . Define  $g : V(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, k\})$  by  $g(v_i) = \{k - i - 1\}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$ ,  $g(v_i) = \{1\}$  for  $i = k, k + 1, \dots, s$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$

for  $x \in V(G) - \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s\}$ . Then obviously  $g$  is a GkrRDF of  $G$  of weight  $\omega(g) = \gamma_{rk}(G)$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

According to Proposition 2, if  $G$  is the disjoint union of  $k$  copies of  $K_1$  and a copy of the complete graph  $K_n$  ( $n \geq k$ ), then  $\gamma_{grk}(G) = \gamma_{rk}(G)$ .

**Theorem 1.** For any connected graph  $G$  with radius  $\text{rad}(G) \geq 4$ ,  $\gamma_{gr2}(G) = \gamma_{r2}(G)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $f = (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_{1,2})$  be a  $\gamma_{r2}(G)$ -function such that  $|V_{1,2}|$  is maximum. We show that  $f$  is a G2RDF of  $G$ . Suppose to the contrary that  $f$  is not a 2RDF of  $\overline{G}$ . Then there exists a vertex  $v \in V_0$  such that  $V_{1,2} \subseteq N(v)$  and either  $V_1 \subseteq N(v)$  or  $V_2 \subseteq N(v)$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that  $V_1 \subseteq N(v)$ . Let  $u$  be an arbitrary vertex in  $V(G)$ . If  $u \in V_1 \cup V_{1,2}$ , then  $d(u, v) = 1$ . If  $u \in V_0$ , then  $u$  and  $v$  have a common neighbor in  $V_1$  or  $V_{1,2}$  implying that  $d(u, v) \leq 2$ . Let  $u \in V_2$ . If  $u$  has a neighbor in  $V_1 \cup V_{1,2}$ , then  $d(u, v) \leq 2$  as above. If  $u$  has a neighbor  $w$  in  $V_0$ , then  $d(u, v) \leq d(u, w) + d(w, v) \leq 3$ . Otherwise, since  $G$  is connected,  $u$  has a neighbor  $x$  in  $V_2$ . Then the function  $g$  defined by  $g(u) = \emptyset, g(x) = \{1, 2\}$  and  $g(y) = f(y)$  for  $y \in V(G) - \{u, x\}$ , is a  $\gamma_{r2}(G)$ -function which contradicts the choice of  $f$ . Thus  $f$  is a G2RDF of  $G$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.** Let  $G$  be a connected graph of diameter  $\text{diam}(G) \geq 7$ . Then

$$\gamma_{gr2}(G) = \gamma_{r2}(G).$$

The next results is an immediate consequence of Theorems B, C and 1.

**Corollary 2.** For  $n \geq 8$ ,

$$\gamma_{gr2}(P_n) = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor + 1.$$

**Corollary 3.** For  $n \geq 8$ ,

$$\gamma_{gr2}(C_n) = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lceil \frac{n}{4} \right\rceil - \left\lfloor \frac{n}{4} \right\rfloor.$$

### 3. BOUNDS ON THE GLOBAL $k$ -RAINBOW DOMINATION NUMBER

In this section we present some sharp lower and upper bounds on  $\gamma_{grk}(G)$ .

**Proposition 3.** For any integer  $k \geq 2$  and any graph  $G$  of order  $n \geq 2k$ ,

$$\gamma_{grk}(G) \geq 2k.$$

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{grk}(G)$ -function, and let  $V_0 = \{v \in V(G) \mid f(v) = \emptyset\}$ . If  $V_0 = \emptyset$ , then  $\gamma_{grk}(G) = n \geq 2k$ . Let  $V_0 \neq \emptyset$  and  $v \in V_0$ . Then  $\bigcup_{x \in N_G(v)} f(x) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and  $\bigcup_{x \in N_{\overline{G}}(v)} f(x) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . Since  $N_G(v) \cap N_{\overline{G}}(v) = \emptyset$ , we obtain  $\gamma_{grk}(G) = \omega(f) \geq 2k$ , as desired.  $\square$

This bound is sharp for the disjoint union of two copies of the complete graph  $K_n$  ( $n \geq k + 1$ ).

**Proposition 4.** For any graph  $G$  of order  $n \geq 4$ ,  $\gamma_{gr2}(G) = 4$  if and only if of  $G$  satisfies one of the following properties.

- (i)  $n = 4$ ,
- (ii) there exist two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  in  $G$  such that  $N(u) \cap N(v) = \emptyset$  and  $N[u] \cup N[v] = V$ ,
- (iii) there exist three distinct vertices  $u, v, w$  in  $G$  such that  $N(u) \cap (N(v) \cup N(w)) = \emptyset$  and  $N(u) \cup (N(v) \cap N(w)) = V - \{u, v, w\}$ ,
- (iv) there exist four distinct vertices  $u, v, w, x$  in  $G$  such that  $(N(u) \cap N(v)) \setminus \{w, x\} = \emptyset$ ,  $(N(w) \cap N(x)) \setminus \{u, v\} = \emptyset$ ,  $(N[u] \cup N[v]) \setminus \{w, x\} = V - \{w, x\}$  and  $(N[w] \cup N[x]) \setminus \{u, v\} = V - \{u, v\}$ .

*Proof.* If  $n = 4$ , then it is clear that  $\gamma_{gr2}(G) = 4$ . Let  $n \geq 5$ . If (ii) holds, then the function  $f : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2\})$  defined by  $f(u) = f(v) = \{1, 2\}$  and  $f(z) = \emptyset$  for  $z \in V(G) - \{u, v\}$ , is a 2RDF of  $G$  and  $\bar{G}$  which yields  $\gamma_{gr2}(G) = 4$  by Proposition 3. If (iii) holds, then the function  $f : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2\})$  defined by  $f(u) = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $f(v) = \{1\}$ ,  $f(w) = \{2\}$  and  $f(z) = \emptyset$  for  $z \in V(G) - \{u, v, w\}$ , is a 2RDF of  $G$  and  $\bar{G}$  which yields  $\gamma_{gr2}(G) = 4$  again. Let (iv) hold. Then the function  $f : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2\})$  defined by  $f(u) = f(v) = \{1\}$ ,  $f(w) = f(x) = \{2\}$  and  $f(z) = \emptyset$  for  $z \in V(G) - \{u, v, x, w\}$ , is a 2RDF of  $G$  and  $\bar{G}$ . This implies that  $\gamma_{gr2}(G) = 4$ .

Conversely, Let  $\gamma_{gr2}(G) = 4$  and let  $f = (V_0, V_1, V_2, V_{1,2})$  be a  $\gamma_{gr2}(G)$ -function such that  $|V_{1,2}|$  is maximum. We consider three cases.

**Case 1.**  $|V_{1,2}| = 2$ .

Let  $V_{1,2} = \{u, v\}$ . Then  $V_0 = V(G) - \{u, v\}$ . Since  $f$  is a G2RDF, each vertex in  $w \in V(G) - \{u, v\}$  must be adjacent to a vertex in  $\{u, v\}$  in both  $G$  and  $\bar{G}$ . It follows that  $N[u] \cup N[v] = V$  and  $N(u) \cap N(v) = \emptyset$ , i.e.  $G$  satisfies (ii).

**Case 2.**  $|V_{1,2}| = 1$ .

Then  $|V_1| = |V_2| = 1$ . Let  $V_{1,2} = \{u\}$ ,  $V_1 = \{v\}$  and  $V_2 = \{w\}$ . Hence  $V_0 = V(G) - \{u, v, w\}$ . Every vertex of  $w \in V(G) - \{u, v, w\}$  must be adjacent to  $u$  or both of  $v, w$  in  $G$  and  $\bar{G}$  because  $f$  is a 2RDF of  $G$  and  $\bar{G}$ . This yields  $N(u) \cap (N(v) \cup N(w)) = \emptyset$  and  $N(u) \cup (N(v) \cap N(w)) = V - \{u, v, w\}$ . Thus  $G$  satisfies (iii) in this case.

**Case 3.**  $|V_{1,2}| = 0$ .

If  $V_0 = \emptyset$ , then  $V_1 \cup V_2 = V(G)$  which implies that  $4 = \gamma_{gr2}(G) = |V_1 \cup V_2| = n$ , i.e.  $G$  satisfies (i). Now assume that  $V_0 \neq \emptyset$  and let  $z \in V_0$ . Since  $f$  is a 2RDF of  $G$  and  $\bar{G}$ ,  $\bigcup_{v \in N_G(z)} f(v) = \{1, 2\}$  and  $\bigcup_{v \in N_{\bar{G}}(z)} f(v) = \{1, 2\}$ . Assume that  $u, w \in N_G(z)$  and  $x, v \in N_{\bar{G}}(z)$  such that  $f(u) = f(v) = \{1\}$  and  $f(w) = f(x) = \{2\}$ . Since  $f$  is a G2RDF, each vertex in  $V(G) - \{u, v, w, x\}$  must be adjacent to a vertex in  $\{u, v\}$  and a vertex in  $\{w, x\}$  in  $G$  and  $\bar{G}$ . It follows that  $(N(u) \cap N(v)) \setminus \{w, x\} = \emptyset$ ,  $(N(w) \cap N(x)) \setminus \{u, v\} = \emptyset$ ,  $(N[u] \cup N[v]) \setminus \{w, x\} = V - \{w, x\}$  and  $(N[w] \cup N[x]) \setminus \{u, v\} = V - \{u, v\}$ . Thus  $G$  satisfies (iv). This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.** Let  $k \geq 2$  be an integer. If the graph  $G$  has  $r \geq 1$  components  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_r$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^r |V(G_i)| \leq k - 1$  then

$$\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + k - \sum_{i=1}^r |V(G_i)|.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\bigcup_{i=1}^r V(G_i) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s\}$ , and let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{rk}(G)$ -function. Clearly,  $f(v_i) \neq \emptyset$  for each  $i$ . Define  $g : V(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, k\})$  by  $g(v_s) = \{s, s + 1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $g(v_i) = \{i\}$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, s - 1$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$  for  $x \in V(G) - \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_s\}$ . Then obviously  $g$  is a GkRDF of  $G$  with weight  $\omega(g) = \gamma_{rk}(G) + k - s$  and so  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + k - \sum_{i=1}^r |V(G_i)|$ .  $\square$

Let  $H$  be the disjoint union of  $r \leq k - 1$  isolated vertices and a star  $K_{1,s}$  with  $s \geq k$ . Then  $\gamma_{rk}(H) = r + k$  and  $\gamma_{grk}(H) = 2k$ . This example demonstrates that Proposition 5 is tight.

**Proposition 6.** Let  $G$  be a graph of order  $n \geq 4$  and  $u, v \in V(G)$ . If  $uv \notin E(G)$ , then

$$\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq n - \deg(u) - \deg(v) + 2|N(u) \cap N(v)| + 2k - 2,$$

and if  $uv \in E(G)$ , then

$$\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq n - \deg(u) - \deg(v) + 2|N(u) \cap N(v)| + 2k.$$

*Proof.* Define  $f : V(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, k\})$  as follows

$$f(z) = \begin{cases} \{1, 2, \dots, k\} & \text{if } z \in \{u, v\} \\ \emptyset & \text{if } z \in ((N(u) \cup N(v)) - \{u, v\}) \setminus (N(u) \cap N(v)) \\ \{1\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that  $f$  is a GkRDF of  $G$  which attains the bound. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.** If  $G$  is a connected triangle-free graph of order  $n \geq 4$ , then

$$\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \min\{n - \Delta(G) - \delta(G) + 2k, \gamma_{rk}(G) + 2k - 1\}.$$

*Proof.* By considering a vertex of maximum degree and one of its neighbors, it follows from Proposition 6 that  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq n - \Delta(G) - \delta(G) + 2k$ . Hence, it is sufficient to show that  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + 2k - 1$ . If  $n \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + 2k - 1$ , the result is immediate. Let  $n > \gamma_{rk}(G) + 2k - 1$  and let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{rk}(G)$ -function. Then there exists a vertex  $u$  such that  $f(u) = \emptyset$ . Then  $u$  has a neighbor  $v$  such that  $|f(v)| \geq 1$ . Define  $g : V(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, k\})$  by  $g(u) = g(v) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$  otherwise. Clearly,  $g$  is a GkRDF of  $G$  and hence  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + 2k - 1$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.** Let  $k \geq 2$  be an integer, and let  $G$  be a graph of diameter  $\text{diam}(G) \geq 5$ . Then

$$\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + 2k - 2.$$

*Proof.* If  $G$  is disconnected, then the result follows from Propositions 1 and 5. Henceforth, we assume that  $G$  is connected. Let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{rk}(G)$ -function. Let  $v_1v_2\dots v_d$  be a diametral path in  $G$ . If  $f(v_1) = f(v_d) = \emptyset$ , then we have  $\bigcup_{x \in N(v_1)} f(x) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and  $\bigcup_{x \in N(v_d)} f(x) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . Since  $\text{diam}(G) \geq 5$ , we have  $N(v_1) \cap N(v_d) = \emptyset$ . It follows that  $f$  is a GkRDF of  $G$  and hence  $\gamma_{grk}(G) = \gamma_{rk}(G)$ . If  $f(v_1) \neq \emptyset$  and  $f(v_d) \neq \emptyset$ , then the function  $g : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, k\})$  defined by  $g(v_1) = g(v_d) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$  for  $x \in V(G) - \{v_1, v_d\}$ , is a GkRDF of  $G$  of weight at most  $\omega(f) + 2k - 2$  and so  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + 2k - 2$ . Now let  $f(v_1) = \emptyset$  and  $f(v_d) \neq \emptyset$  (the case  $f(v_1) \neq \emptyset$  and  $f(v_d) = \emptyset$  is similar). Define  $g : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, k\})$  by  $g(v_d) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$  for  $x \in V(G) - \{v_d\}$ . Obviously,  $g$  is a GkRDF of  $G$  of weight at most  $\omega(f) + k - 1$  and so  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + k - 1$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 8.** If  $G$  is a graph of diameter 3 or 4, then

$$\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + 2k.$$

*Proof.* Let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{rk}(G)$ -function, and let  $u$  and  $v$  be two vertices of  $G$  such that  $d(u, v) = \text{diam}(G)$ . Then the function  $g : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, k\})$  defined by  $g(u) = g(v) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$  for  $x \in V(G) - \{u, v\}$ , is a GkRDF of  $G$  and therefore  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + 2k$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.** If  $G$  is a graph of order  $n \geq 4$  with minimum degree  $\delta(G)$ , then

$$\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + \delta(G) + k - 1.$$

This bound is sharp for stars  $K_{1,t}$  ( $t \geq 2k - 1$ ) by Proposition 3.

*Proof.* If  $G$  is disconnected, then the result follows from Propositions 1 and 5. Therefore we assume that  $G$  is connected. Let  $u$  be a vertex of minimum degree  $\delta(G)$ ,  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{rk}(G)$ -function and  $B = \{x \in N(u) \mid f(x) = \emptyset\}$ .

If  $f(u) = \emptyset$ , then  $\bigcup_{v \in N(u)-B} f(v) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ . Then obviously the function  $g : V(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, k\})$  defined by  $g(u) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ ,  $g(x) = \{1\}$  if  $x \in B$  and  $g(z) = f(z)$  otherwise, is a GkRDF of  $G$  with weight at most  $\gamma_{rk}(G) + \delta(G) + k - 1$  and hence  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + \delta(G) + k - 1$ .

Let  $|f(u)| \geq 1$ . Define  $g : V(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, k\})$  by  $g(u) = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ ,  $g(v) = \{1\}$  if  $v \in B$  and  $g(z) = f(z)$  for each  $z \in V(G) - (B \cup \{u\})$ . It is clear that  $g$  is a GkRDF of  $G$  with weight at most  $\gamma_{rk}(G) + \delta(G) + k - 1$  and hence  $\gamma_{grk}(G) \leq \gamma_{rk}(G) + \delta(G) + k - 1$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$



## 4. GLOBAL RAINBOW DOMINATION NUMBERS OF TREES

According to Theorem 2, for any tree  $T$  of order  $n \geq 4$  we have

$$\gamma_{gr2}(T) \leq \gamma_{r2}(T) + 2. \quad (4.1)$$

In this section we characterize all extremal trees attaining equality in (4.1). We begin with some lemmas giving some sufficient conditions for a tree to have global 2-rainbow domination number less than  $\gamma_{r2}(T) + 2$ . As a special case, Corollary 1 and Proposition 3 imply the next results.

**Corollary 5.** For any tree  $T$  with  $\text{diam}(T) \geq 7$ ,  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ .

**Corollary 6.** If  $T$  is a star of order  $n \geq 4$ , then  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T) + 2$ .

**Lemma 1.** Let  $T$  be a tree. If  $T$  has two strong support vertices, then  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) \leq \gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $u$  and  $v$  be two strong support vertices of  $T$  and let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{r2}(T)$ -function. Obviously we may assume that  $f(u) = f(v) = \{1, 2\}$ . Since  $T$  is a tree,  $u$  and  $v$  have at most one common neighbor. If  $u$  and  $v$  have no common neighbor, then clearly  $f$  is a G2RDF of  $T$  and hence  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ . If  $u$  and  $v$  has a common neighbor, say  $w$ , then the function  $g$  defined by  $g(w) = f(w) \cup \{1\}$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$  otherwise, is a G2RDF of  $T$  of weight at most  $\gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$  and the result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** Let  $T$  be a tree. If  $\text{diam}(T) = 6$ , then  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $P = v_1 v_2 \dots v_7$  be a diametral path of  $T$  and let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{r2}(T)$ -function. Root  $T$  at  $v_1$ . If  $v_2$  and  $v_6$  are strong support vertices, then  $f$  is a  $\gamma_{gr2}(T)$ -function since  $v_2$  and  $v_6$  have no common neighbor. Hence  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that  $\deg(v_2) = 2$ . By Theorem E, we may assume  $f(v_1) = \{1\}$  and  $2 \in f(v_3)$ . If  $v_6$  is a strong support vertex, then we can assume  $f(v_6) = \{1, 2\}$  and clearly  $f$  is a G2RDF of  $T$  implying that  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ . Henceforth, we assume  $\deg(v_6) = 2$ . By Theorem E, we may assume  $f(v_7) = \{1\}$  and  $2 \in f(v_5)$ . Define the function  $g$  by  $g(v) = \{1\}$  if  $v \in V(T_{v_5})$  and  $f(v) = \{2\}$ ,  $g(v) = \{2\}$  if  $v \in V(T_{v_5})$  and  $f(v) = \{1\}$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$  otherwise. Clearly,  $g$  is a G2RDF of  $T$  of weight  $\gamma_{r2}(T)$  and hence  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** Let  $T$  be a tree. If  $\text{diam}(T) = 5$ , then  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) \leq \gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $P = v_1 v_2 \dots v_6$  be a diametral path of  $T$ , and let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{r2}(T)$ -function. If  $v_2$  and  $v_5$  are strong support vertices, then  $f$  is a  $\gamma_{gr2}(T)$ -function and hence  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ . Assume, without loss of generality, that all support vertices adjacent to  $v_4$  have degree 2. By Theorem E, we may assume  $f(v_6) = \{1\}$  and  $2 \in f(v_4)$ . Then the function  $g$  defined by  $g(v_3) = f(v_3) \cup \{1\}$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$  otherwise, is a G2RDF of  $T$  of weight at most  $\gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$  that implies  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) \leq \gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$ .  $\square$



A *subdivision* of an edge  $uv$  is obtained by removing the edge  $uv$ , adding a new vertex  $w$ , and adding edges  $uw$  and  $wv$ . The *subdivision graph*  $S(G)$  is the graph obtained from  $G$  by subdividing each edge of  $G$ . The subdivision star  $S(K_{1,t})$  for  $t \geq 2$ , is called a *healthy spider*. A *wounded spider*  $S_t$  is the graph formed by subdividing at most  $t - 1$  of the edges of a star  $K_{1,t}$  for  $t \geq 2$ . The *center of a spider*, is the center of the star whose subdivision produced the spider.

**Definition 1.** For  $1 \leq i \leq 2$ , let  $\mathcal{B}_i$  be the family of trees  $T$  defined as follows and let  $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{B}_i$ .

$\mathcal{B}_1$  :  $T$  is a spider  $S_t$  for some  $t \geq 2$  with exception of stars, wounded spiders  $S_t$  ( $t \geq 3$ ) with exactly one wounded leg or wounded spiders  $S_t$  ( $t \geq 3$ ) with at least four healthy legs.

$\mathcal{B}_2$  :  $T$  is obtained from stars  $K_{1,r_1}, K_{1,r_2}, \dots, K_{1,r_j}$  where  $r_k \geq 3$  for  $1 \leq k \leq j$ , with centers  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_j$  ( $j \geq 2$ ) by adding a new vertex  $x$  and joining  $x$  to all vertices  $y_j$  and adding at most one pendant edge at  $x$ .

**Lemma 4.** Let  $T$  be a tree. If  $\text{diam}(T) = 4$ , then  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) \leq \gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$  and equality holds if and only if  $T \in \mathcal{B}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\text{diam}(T) = 4$  and let  $P = v_1v_2v_3v_4v_5$  be a diametral path of  $T$ . Let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_{r2}(T)$ -function. Consider the following cases.

**Case 1.**  $\text{deg}(v_2) = 3$ .

Suppose  $u, v_1$  are the leaves adjacent to  $v_2$ . Then we can assume that  $f(v_2) = \{1, 2\}$ . If  $\text{deg}(v_4) \geq 3$ , then we may assume  $f(v_4) = \{1, 2\}$  and if  $\text{deg}(v_4) = 2$  then by Theorem E we can assume  $f(v_5) = \{1\}$  and  $2 \in f(v_3)$ . Define  $g : V(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, 2\})$  by  $g(v_1) = \{1\}, g(u) = \{2\}, g(v_2) = \emptyset$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$  otherwise. Obviously  $g$  is a G2RDF of  $T$  of weight  $\gamma_{r2}(T)$  and hence  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ .

By Case 1, we may assume that all support vertices adjacent to  $v_3$  have degree different from 3.

**Case 2.**  $\text{deg}(v_2) > 3$ .

Then  $f(v_2) = \{1, 2\}$ . If  $\text{deg}(v_4) = 2$ , then by Theorem E we may assume  $f(v_5) = \{1\}$  and  $2 \in f(v_3)$ , and clearly  $f$  is a G2RDF of  $T$  and hence  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ . So we assume that each support vertex adjacent to  $v_3$  has degree at least 4. If  $v_3$  is a strong support vertex, then  $f(v_3) = \{1, 2\}$  and clearly  $f$  is a G2RDF of  $T$  and hence  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ . Let  $v_3$  be not a strong support vertex. Then  $T \in \mathcal{B}_2$  and  $T$  has at most two  $\gamma_{r2}(T)$ -functions which none of them is G2RDF of  $T$  and hence  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) \geq \gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$ . On the other hand, the function  $g$  defined by  $g(v_3) = \{1\}$  and  $g(x) = f(x)$  otherwise is a G2RDF of  $T$  of weight  $\gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$  implying that  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$ .

By Cases 1 and 2, we may assume that all support vertices adjacent to  $v_3$  have degree 2. Thus  $T$  is a spider of diameter 4. If  $T$  is a wounded spiders  $S_t$  ( $t \geq 3$ ) with exactly one wounded leg, then the function  $g$  that assigns  $\emptyset$  to all support vertices

of  $T$  with exception of the center of spider,  $\{1\}$  to the center of spider and the leaf adjacent to the center of spider, and  $\{2\}$  to the other leaves, is a G2RDF of  $T$  of weight  $\gamma_{r2}(T)$  implying that  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ . Now  $T$  is a wounded spider  $S_t$  ( $t \geq 3$ ) with at least four healthy legs. Suppose  $x$  is the center of  $T$  and  $u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4$  are leaves at distance two from  $x$ . Then the function  $g$  that assigns  $\{1, 2\}$  to  $x$ ,  $\emptyset$  to all support vertices of  $T$ ,  $\{1\}$  to  $u_1, u_2$ , and  $\{2\}$  to the other leaves, is a G2RDF of  $T$  of weight  $\gamma_{r2}(T)$  implying that  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ . Finally let  $T$  be a spider that is not a wounded spider  $S_t$  ( $t \geq 3$ ) with exactly one wounded leg or a wounded spider  $S_t$  ( $t \geq 3$ ) with at least four healthy legs, that is  $T \in \mathcal{B}_1$ . It is easy to see that in this case  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$  and the proof is complete.  $\square$

For  $p, q \geq 1$ , a double star  $DS(p, q)$  is a tree with exactly two vertices that are not leaves, with one adjacent to  $p$  leaves and the other to  $q$  leaves.

**Lemma 5.** Let  $T$  be a tree. If  $\text{diam}(T) = 3$ , then  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) \leq \gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$  and equality holds if and only if  $T = DS(p, q)$  with  $q \geq p = 1$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\text{diam}(T) = 3$ . Then  $T$  is a double star  $DS(p, q)$  with  $q \geq p \geq 1$ . Let  $u, v$  be the vertices of  $T$  of degree  $p$  and  $q$ , respectively. If  $p \geq 2$ , then  $u, v$  are strong support vertices with no common neighbor and it follows from the proof of Lemma 1 that  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T)$ . Henceforth, assume  $p = 1$ . If  $q = 1$ , then  $T = P_4$  and clearly  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$ . Let  $q \geq 2$  and  $u'$  be the leaf adjacent to  $u$ . Then  $T$  has exactly two  $\gamma_{r2}(T)$ -functions  $f_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) defined by  $f_i(v) = \{1, 2\}$ ,  $f_i(u') = \{i\}$  and  $f_i(x) = \emptyset$  otherwise. Obviously, none of  $f_1$  or  $f_2$  is not a G2RDF of  $T$  and also the function  $g$  defined by  $g(u) = \{1\}$  and  $g(x) = f_1(x)$  for  $x \in V(T) - \{u\}$  is a G2RDF of  $T$  that yields  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) \geq \gamma_{r2}(T) + 1$ .  $\square$

The next theorem is an immediate consequence of (4.1), Corollaries 5, 6 and Lemmas 2, 3, 4, 5.

**Theorem 3.** Let  $T$  be a tree of order  $n \geq 4$ . Then  $\gamma_{gr2}(T) = \gamma_{r2}(T) + 2$  if and only if  $T$  is the star  $K_{1,t}$  for some  $t \geq 3$ .

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank anonymous referees for their remarks and suggestions that helped improve the manuscript.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] J. Amjadi, A. Bahremandpour, S. M. Sheikholeslami, and L. Volkmann, "The rainbow domination number of a digraph," *Kragujevac J. Math.*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 257–268, 2013.
- [2] J. Amjadi, N. Mohammadi, S. M. Sheikholeslami, and L. Volkmann, "The  $k$ -rainbow bondage number of a digraph," *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 261–270, 2015, doi: [10.7151/dmgt.1797](https://doi.org/10.7151/dmgt.1797).
- [3] S. Arumugam, K. Karuppasamy, and I. S. Hamid, "Fractional global domination in graphs," *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 33–44, 2010, doi: [10.7151/dmgt.1474](https://doi.org/10.7151/dmgt.1474).

- [4] M. Atapour, S. Norouzian, and S. M. Sheikholeslami, "Global minus domination in graphs," *Trans. Comb.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 35–44, 2014.
- [5] M. Atapour, S. M. Sheikholeslami, and L. Volkmann, "Global Roman domination in trees," *Graphs Combin.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 813–825, 2015, doi: [0.1007/s00373-014-1415-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00373-014-1415-3).
- [6] B. Brešar and T. K. Šumenjak, "On the 2-rainbow domination in graphs," *Discrete Appl. Math.*, vol. 155, no. 17, pp. 2394–2400, 2007, doi: [10.1016/j.dam.2007.07.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2007.07.018).
- [7] R. C. Brigham and R. D. Dutton, "Factor domination in graphs," *Discrete Math.*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 127–136, 1990, doi: [10.1016/0012-365X\(90\)90355-L](https://doi.org/10.1016/0012-365X(90)90355-L).
- [8] G. J. Chang, J. Wu, and X. Zhu, "Rainbow domination on trees," *Discrete Appl. Math.*, vol. 158, no. 1, pp. 8–12, 2010, doi: [10.1016/j.dam.2009.08.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2009.08.010).
- [9] N. Dehgard, S. M. Sheikholeslami, and L. Volkmann, "The rainbow domination subdivision numbers of graphs," *Mat. Vesnik*, vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 102–114, 2015.
- [10] D. Delic and C. Wang, "The global connected domination in graphs," *Ars Combin.*, vol. 114, pp. 105–110, 2014.
- [11] M. Falahat, S. M. Sheikholeslami, and L. Volkmann, "New bounds on the rainbow domination subdivision number," *Filomat*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 615–622, 2014, doi: [0.2298/FIL1403615F](https://doi.org/0.2298/FIL1403615F).
- [12] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater, *Fundamentals of domination in graphs*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1998.
- [13] V. R. Kulli and B. Janakiram, "The total global domination number of a graph," *India J. Pure Appl. Math.*, vol. 27, pp. 537–542, 1996.
- [14] D. Meierling, S. M. Sheikholeslami, and L. Volkmann, "Nordhaus–Gaddum bounds on the  $k$ -rainbow domatic number of a graph," *Applied Math. Lett.*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 1758–1761, 2011, doi: [10.1016/j.aml.2011.04.046](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aml.2011.04.046).
- [15] E. Sampathkumar, "The global domination number of a graph," *J. Math. Phys. Sci.*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 377–385, 1989.
- [16] S. M. Sheikholeslami and L. Volkmann, "The  $k$ -rainbow domatic number of a graph," *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 129–140, 2012, doi: [10.7151/dmgt.1591](https://doi.org/10.7151/dmgt.1591).
- [17] S. M. Sheikholeslami and L. Volkmann, "The  $k$ -rainbow domination and domatic numbers of digraphs," *Kyungpook Math. J.*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 69–81, 2016.
- [18] C. Tong, X. Lin, Y. Yang, and M. Luo, "2-rainbow domination of generalized Petersen graphs  $P(n, 2)$ ," *Discrete Appl. Math.*, vol. 157, no. 8, pp. 1932–1937, 2009, doi: [10.1016/j.dam.2009.01.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2009.01.020).
- [19] D. B. West, *Introduction to graph theory*. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, 2001.
- [20] V. Zverovich and A. Poghosyan, "On Roman, global and restrained domination in graphs," *Graphs Combin.*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 755–768, 2011, doi: [10.1007/s00373-010-0992-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00373-010-0992-z).

#### *Authors' addresses*

##### **J. Amjadi**

Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Department of Mathematics, Tabriz, I.R. Iran

*E-mail address:* j-amjadi@azaruniv.edu

##### **S.M. Sheikholeslami**

Azarbaijan Shahid Madani University, Department of Mathematics, Tabriz, I.R. Iran

*E-mail address:* s.m.sheikholeslami@azaruniv.edu

##### **L. Volkmann**

RWTH Aachen University, Lehrstuhl II für Mathematik, 52056, Aachen, Germany

*E-mail address:* volkm@math2.rwth-aachen.de