

# A Note on Edge-Domsaturation Number of a Graph

# Devadhas Nidha, Murugan Kala

Department of Mathematics, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, India Email: nidhamaths@gmail.com, karthipyi91@yahoo.co.in

Received April 27, 2012; revised May 30, 2012; accepted June 12, 2012

# ABSTRACT

The edge-domsaturation number ds'(G) of a graph G = (V, E) is the least positive integer k such that every edge of G lies in an edge dominating set of cardinality k. In this paper, we characterize unicyclic graphs G with  $ds'(G) = q - \Delta'(G) + 1$  and investigate well-edge dominated graphs. We further define  $\gamma'$ -critical,  $\gamma''$ -critical, ds''-critical, ds''-critical edges and study some of their properties.

Keywords: Edge-Dominating Set; Edge-Domination Number; *ds'*-Critical; Edge-Domsaturation Number; Well Edge Dominated Graph

# **1. Introduction**

Throughout this paper, G denotes a graph with order p and size q. By a graph we mean a finite undirected graph without loops or multiple edges. For graph theoretic terms we refer Harary [1] and in particular, for terminology related to domination theory we refer Haynes *et al.* [2].

# 1.1. Definition

Let G = (V, E) be a graph. A subset D of E is said to be an edge dominating set if every edge in E-D is adjacent to at least one edge in D. An edge dominating set D is said to be a minimal edge dominating set if no proper subset of D is an edge dominating set of G. The edge domination number  $\gamma'(G)$  of a graph G equals the minimum cardinality of an edge dominating set of G. An edge dominating set of G with cardinality  $\gamma'(G)$  is called a  $\gamma'(G)$ -set or  $\gamma'$ -set.

Acharya [3] introduced the concept of domsaturation number ds(G) of a graph. For any graph G of order p, and for any integer r such that  $\gamma(G) \leq r \leq p$ , we call the set  $DC_r(G) = \{u \in V(G)/u \in D \text{ forsome } D \in \mathfrak{A}_r(G)\}$  the r-level domination core of G. We say that G is r-level domination-saturated (or in short, "r-domsaturated") if  $DC_r(G) - V(G)$ . The domsaturation number ds(G) is then defined by  $ds(G) = \min\{r/G \text{ isr-domsaturated}\}$ . Arumugam and Kala [4] observed that for any graph G,

 $ds(G) = \gamma(G)$  or  $ds(G) = \gamma(G) + 1$  and obtained several results on ds(G). We now extend the concept of domsaturation number of a graph to edges.

# **1.2. Definition**

The least positive integer k such that every edge of G lies

in an edge dominating set of cardinality k is called the edge-domsaturation number of G and is denoted by ds'(G).

If G is a graph with edge set E and D is a  $\gamma'$ -set of G, then for any edge  $e \in E-D$ ,  $D \cup \{e\}$  is also an edge dominating set and hence  $ds'(G) = \gamma'(G)$  or  $\gamma'(G)+1$ . Thus we have the following definition.

**1.3. Definition** 

A graph G is said to be of class 1 or class 2 according as  $ds'(G) = \gamma'(G)$  or  $\gamma'(G)+1$ .

# 1.4. Definition

An edge e of G is

1)  $\gamma'$ -critical if  $\gamma'(G-e) \neq \gamma'(G)$ ;

2)  $\gamma'^+$ -critical if  $\gamma'(G-e) > \gamma'(G)$ ;

3)  $\gamma'$ -critical if  $\gamma'(G-e) < \gamma'(G)$ ;

4)  $\gamma'$ -fixed if every  $\gamma'$ -set contains *e*;

5)  $\gamma$ '-free if there exists  $\gamma$ '-sets containing *e* and also  $\gamma$ '-sets not containing *e*;

6)  $\gamma$ '-totally free if there is no  $\gamma$ '-set containing *e*.

We use the following theorem.

# 1.5. Theorem [5]

For any connected unicyclic graph G = (V, E) with cycle C,  $\gamma'(G) = q - \Delta'(G)$  if and only if one of the following holds.

1)  $C = C_3;$ 

2)  $G=C_3=(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_1)$ ,  $\deg u_1 \ge 3$ ,  $\deg u_2 = \deg u_3 = 2$ ,  $\deg(u_1, w) \le 2$  for all vertices *w* not on *C* and  $\deg w \ge 3$  for at most one vertex *w* not on *C*;

3) 
$$G = C_3 = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_1), \deg u_1 \le 3, \deg u_2 \le 3, \deg u_3 = 2$$

all the vertices not on C adjacent to  $u_1$  have degree at most 2 and all vertices whose distance from  $u_1$  is 2 are pendent vertices;

4)  $C = C_3 = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_1)$ , deg  $u_1 = 3$ , deg  $u_2 \le 3$ , deg  $u_3 \le 3$ and all vertices not on *C* are pendent vertices;

5)  $C = C_4$ ;

6)  $C = C_4$ , either exactly one vertex of C has degree at least 3 and all vertices not on C are pendent vertices.

# 2. Main Results

# 2.1. Lemma

An edge *e* of *G* is  $\gamma^r$ -critical if and only if  $\gamma'(G-e) = \gamma'(G) - 1$ 

Proof

For any edge e, we observe that  $\gamma'(G-e) = \gamma'(G)-1$ or  $\gamma'(G)$  or  $\gamma'(G)+1$ . Now, suppose e is  $\gamma'$ -critical. Then  $\gamma'(G-e) < \gamma'(G)$ . Hence  $\gamma'(G-e) = \gamma'(G)-1$ . The converse is obvious.

# 2.2. Theorem

An edge *e* is  $\gamma'$ -critical if and only if

$$N(e) \subset \bigcup_{f \in D-e} N(f) \tag{1}$$

for some  $\gamma'$ -set *D* containing *e*.

Proof

If *e* is  $\gamma'$ -critical,  $\gamma'(G-e) = \gamma'(G) - 1$  by lemma 2.1. Let *S* be a  $\gamma'$ -set of G - e. If *S* contains an edge of N(e), then *S* will be an edge dominating set of *G* and hence  $\gamma'(G) \le \gamma'(G-e)$ , a contradiction. Thus *S* does not contain any edge of N(e). Since  $\gamma'(G-e) = \gamma'(G) - 1$ ,  $D = S \cup \{e\}$  is a  $\gamma'$ -set of *G* and so Equation (1) holds. Conversely, suppose *e* is an edge such that (1) is true. Then G - e is an edge dominating set of G - e and hence  $\gamma'(G-e) = \gamma'(G) - 1$ . Thus *e* is  $\gamma'$ -critical.

#### 2.3. Theorem

Let *G* be a graph without isolated edges. An edge *e* in *G* is  $\gamma^{-}$ -critical if and only if

1) *e* is  $\gamma'$ -free, and

2) no  $\gamma'$ -set of G - e contains any edge of N(e).

#### Proof

If *e* is  $\gamma^{r}$ -critical, then  $\gamma'(G-e) = \gamma'(G)-1$  by Lemma 2.1. As in theorem 2.2, if *S* is any  $\gamma'$ -set of G - e, then *S* will not contain any edge of N(e) and  $S \cup \{f\}$  is a  $\gamma'$ -set of *G* for every  $f \in N[e]$ . This implies that *e* is  $\gamma'$ -free. Conversely, suppose (1) and (2) are true. Let *S* be a  $\gamma'$ -set of G - e. By (2) *S* does not contain any edge of N[e]. Hence *S* cannot be an edge dominating set of *G*. But, for any edge  $f \in N[e]$ ,  $S \cup \{f\}$  is an edge dominating set of *G* - *e*,  $S \cup \{f\}$  is a since *S* is a minimum edge dominating set for G - e,  $S \cup \{f\}$  is also a minimum edge dominating set for *G*.

and hence  $\gamma'(G) = |S \cup \{f\}| = \gamma'(G - e) + 1$ . Thus *e* is  $\gamma'$ -critical.

# 2.4. Theorem

Let *G* be a graph and  $e \in E(G)$ . Then

1) *e* is  $\gamma'$ -fixed if and only if there exists no edge dominating set of G - e with  $\gamma'(G)$  edges which is also an edge dominating set of *G*.

2) *e* is  $\gamma'$ -totally free if and only if every  $\gamma'$ -set of *G* is a  $\gamma'$ -set of G - e.

Proof

1) Assume that *e* is  $\gamma'$ -fixed. Suppose there exists an edge dominating set *S* of *G* – *e* with  $|S| = \gamma'(G)$  which is also an edge dominating set of *G*. Then *S* is a  $\gamma'$ -set not containing *e* which is impossible as *e* is  $\gamma'$ -fixed. The converse is obvious.

2) Let *e* be  $\gamma'$ -totally free. Then *e* does not belong to any  $\gamma'$ -set of *G* and so every  $\gamma'$ -set *D* of *G* is an edge dominating set of G - e. Thus  $\gamma'(G-e) \leq \gamma'(G)$ . If  $\gamma'(G-e) \leq \gamma'(G)$ , then by theorem 2.3, *e* is  $\gamma'$ -free and so  $\gamma'(G-e) = \gamma'(G)$ , *D* is a  $\gamma'$ -set of G - e. The converse is obvious.

# 2.5. Theorem

Let G be a connected graph. If a cut edge e of G is  $\gamma'$ -fixed, then e is  $\gamma'$ -critical

Proof

Let S be a  $\gamma'$ -set of G. Let e be a cut edge that is  $\gamma'$ -fixed. Then e belongs to every  $\gamma'$ -set. Since e is a cut edge, G - e is a disconnected graph with at least two components G' and G". Let e' and e" be the neighbors of e in G' and G" respectively. Therefore  $D = (S - e) \cup \{e', e''\}$ is a minimum edge dominating set of G - e so that  $\gamma'(G - e) = \gamma'(G) + 1$ . Hence e is  $\gamma''$ -critical.

# 2.6. Theorem

An edge *e* in a graph *G* is  $\gamma^{\prime+}$ -critical if and only if

- 1) *e* is not isolated edge
- 2) *e* is  $\gamma'$ -fixed and

3) There is no edge dominating set for G - N[e] having  $\gamma'(G)$  edges which also dominates N[e].

#### Proof

If e is  $\gamma'^+$ -critical, then  $\gamma'(G-e) = \gamma'(G)+1$ , by lemma 2.1. Clearly e is not an isolated edge. If S is a  $\gamma'$ -set of G-N[e] having  $\gamma'(G)$  edges which also dominates N(e) then  $\gamma'(G-e) \le \gamma'(G)$ , a contradiction. Thus no edge dominating set of G-N[e] having  $\gamma'(G)$  edges can dominate N(e). By Theorem 2.4, e is  $\gamma'$ -fixed. The converse is obvious.

We now investigate relationships between,  $\gamma'$ -free edges,  $\gamma'$ -totally free edges and graphs which are class 1 and class 2.

# 2.7. Theorem

If G is a graph without isolated edges, then G is of class 2 if and only if G has  $\gamma'$ -totally free edges.

#### Proof

Suppose *G* has a  $\gamma'$ -totally free edge *e*. By Theorem 2.4 (2), *G* is of class 2. Conversely, suppose *G* is of class 2. Then there exists an edge *e* which is not in any  $\gamma'$ -set. Hence every  $\gamma'$ -set of *G* is also a  $\gamma'$ -set of *G* - *e* so that *e* is  $\gamma'$ -totally free.

# 2.8. Theorem

#### Proof

Let G be a connected graph. If G has a  $\gamma'$ -fixed edge, then it has a  $\gamma'$ -totally free edge.

Suppose G has a  $\gamma'$ -fixed edge e. Then e belongs to every  $\gamma'$ -set.

**Claim:** No neighbor of *e* belongs to any  $\gamma'$ -set of *G*. Suppose at least one of its neighbor say *e'* belongs to a  $\gamma'$ -set *D*. Let e = uv and *e'* be incident with *u*. Then  $D_1 = D - \{e\} \cup \{e''\}$ , where *e''* is any edge incident with *v* is an edge dominating set of G - e with  $\gamma'$ -edges which is also an edge dominating set of *G*. But by Theorem 2.6, this is a contradiction, since *e* is a  $\gamma'$ -fixed edge. Therefore no neighbor of *e* belongs to any  $\gamma'$ -set of *G*. Thus neighbors of *e* are all  $\gamma'$ -totally free in *G*.

We now investigate the class of graphs which are  $ds'^+$ ,  $ds'^-$ -critical.

# 2.9. Lemma

Let  $e \in E(G)$ . If e is  $\gamma'$ -totally free and G - e is of class 1, then ds'(G) = ds'(G - e) + 1.

Proof

Since *e* is  $\gamma'$ -totally free, by Theorem 2.4,

$$\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G - e) \tag{1}$$

Since *e* is  $\gamma$ '-totally free, by Theorem 2.3, *G* is of class 2 and so

$$ds'(G) = \gamma'(G) + 1 \tag{2}$$

Since G - e is of class 1, we have

$$ds'(G-e) = \gamma'(G-e) \tag{3}$$

From Equations (1), (2) and (3), we have

$$ds'(G) = ds'(G-e) + 1.$$

#### 2.10. Lemma

Let  $e \in E(G)$ . If e is  $\gamma'$ -totally free and G - e is of class 2, then ds'(G) = ds'(G - e).

### Proof

If *e* is  $\gamma$ '-totally free, then by Theorem 2.4,

$$\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G - e) \tag{1}$$

class 
$$ds'(G) = \gamma'(G) + 1$$

and

$$ds'(G-e) = \gamma'(G-e) + 1 \tag{3}$$

From equations (1), (2) and (3), we have

Since G and G - e are of class 2, we have

$$ds'(G) = ds'(G-e).$$

## 2.11. Lemma

Let *e* be an edge of *G*. If *e* is  $\gamma$ '-free and G - e is of class 1, then ds'(G) = ds'(G - e) or ds'(G) = ds'(G - e) + 1.

Proof

Suppose *e* is a  $\gamma'$ -free edge. In any case *G* is either of class 1 or class 2.

**Case** (1). *G* is of class 1.

Let *S* be a  $\gamma'$ -set of G - e. If *S* does not contain any neighbor of *e*, then every neighbor of *e* is  $\gamma'$ -totally free in G - e. This implies that G - e is of class 2. But this is a contradiction and so *S* must contain a neighbor of *e*. Then by theorem 2.4,  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G - e)$ . Since *G* and G - e are of class 1, we have

$$ds'(G) = \gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e) = ds'(G-e).$$

**Case (2).** *G* is of class 2.

Since G - e is of class 1, then by a similar argument, S must contain a neighbor of e. Since G is of class 2, we have  $ds'(G) = \gamma'(G) + 1 = \gamma'(G - e) + 1 = ds'(G - e) + 1$ .

#### 2.12. Lemma

Let e be an edge of G. If e is  $\gamma'$ -free and G - e is of class 2, then ds'(G) = ds'(G-e), ds'(G) = ds'(G-e)+1 or ds'(G) = ds'(G-e)-1.

Proof

**Case** (1). *G* is of class 1.

Let *S* be a  $\gamma'$ -set of G - e. We have the following cases: **Subcase (1).** *S* contains a neighbor of *e*.

Now  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e)$ . Since G is of class 1 and G-e is of class 2, we have ds'(G-e) = ds'(G)+1.

Subcase (2). *S* does not contain a neighbor of *e*.

Now  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e) + 1$ . Since G - e is of class 2 and G is of class 1, we have ds'(G) = ds'(G-e).

**Case (2).** *G* is of class 2.

By an argument similar to that in case (1), we have ds'(G) = ds'(G-e) or ds'(G) = ds'(G-e)+1.

#### 2.13. Lemma

Let *e* be an edge of *G*. If *e* is  $\gamma'$ -fixed and G - e is of class 1, then ds'(G) = ds'(G - e).

Proof

If e is  $\gamma'$ -fixed, then by Theorem 2.8, all of its neighbors are  $\gamma'$ -totally free. Then by Theorem 2.7, G is of

(2)

class 2 and hence

$$ds'(G) = \gamma'(G) + 1 \tag{1}$$

As *e* is  $\gamma'$ -fixed, by Theorem 2.4,  $\gamma'(G) \neq \gamma'(G-e)$ . If  $\gamma'(G) > \gamma'(G-e)$ , then *e* is  $\gamma'$ -critical. Then by Lemma 2.11, *e* is  $\gamma'$ -free and this is a contradiction. Therefore  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e) - 1$ . Since *G* is of class 2 and G - e is of class 1, we have ds'(G-e) = ds'(G).

#### 2.14. Lemma

Let  $e \in E(G)$ . If e is  $\gamma$ '-fixed and G - e is of class 2, then ds'(G) = ds'(G-e) - 1.

#### Proof

By an argument analogous to that in Lemma 2.13, since G - e is of class 2, we have ds'(G) = ds'(G - e) - 1.

#### 2.15. Theorem

Let G be a graph without isolated edges. An edge e in G is ds'-critical if and only if one of the following holds.

1) *e* is  $\gamma'$ -totally free and G - e is of class 1.

2) *e* is  $\gamma'$ -free, *G* is of class 2 and *G* – *e* is of class 1.

3) *e* is  $\gamma'$ -free and both *G* and *G* – *e* are of class 2.

Proof

Suppose *e* is *ds*<sup>-</sup>-critical. Then

$$ds'(G) = ds'(G-e) + 1$$
 (1)

Let S be a  $\gamma'$ -set of G. Then we have the following cases:

**Case** (1). G and G - e are of class 1.

By (1),  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e)+1$ . By theorem 2.3, *e* is  $\gamma'$ -free and no  $\gamma'$ -set of *G*-*e* contains any edge of *N*(*e*). Now every neighbor of *e* is  $\gamma'$ -totally free in *G* - *e*. Therefore *G* - *e* is of class 2, which is a contradiction.

**Case (2).** G is of class 1 and G - e is of class 2.

Then Equation (1) becomes  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e) + 2$ . But this is not possible.

**Case (3).** G is of class 2 and G - e is of class 1.

Then Equation (1) becomes  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e)$ . Then either *e* is  $\gamma'$ -free or  $\gamma'$ -totally free.

**Case (4).** G and G - e are of class 2.

In this case, Equation (1) becomes  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e) + 1$ . Then by theorem 2.3, *e* is  $\gamma'$ -free.

From Lemmas 2.9, 2.11 and 2.12, the converse is true.

#### 2.16. Theorem

Let *G* be a graph without isolated edges. An edge *e* in *G* is  $ds^{i^+}$ -critical if and only if one of the following holds.

1) *e* is  $\gamma'$ -free, *G* is of class 1 and *G* – *e* is of class 2.

2) *e* is  $\gamma'$ -fixed and G - e is of class 2.

Proof

Suppose e in G is  $ds^{+}$ -critical. Hence

$$ds'(G) = ds'(G-e) - 1 \tag{1}$$

Let S be a  $\gamma'$ -set of G. Then we have the following cases:

Copyright © 2012 SciRes.

Case (1). G and G-e are of class 1.

From equation (1)  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e) - 1$  and so G is  $\gamma'^+$ -critical. Hence by Theorem 2.6, e is  $\gamma'$ -fixed, which is a contradiction.

**Case** (2). *G* is of class 1 and G - e is of class 2.

Now equation (1) becomes  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e)$ . Then S must contain a neighbor of e. Since G is of class 1, e is  $\gamma'$ -free.

**Case (3).** G is of class 2 and G - e is of class 1.

Then Equation (1) becomes  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e) - 2$ , which is not possible.

**Case** (4). G is of class 2 and G - e is of class 2.

In this case, Equation (1) becomes  $\gamma'(G) = \gamma'(G-e) - 1$ . Then by Theorem 2.4, *e* is  $\gamma'$ -fixed.

Conversely, suppose if (1) or (2) is true. Then by case (1) of Lemma 2.12 and Lemma 2.14, the result follows.

# 3. Edge-Domsaturation Number of a Graph Theorem

#### 1 neorem

For any connected unicyclic graph G = (V, E) with cycle C,  $ds'(G) = q - \Delta'(G) + 1$  if and only if one of the following holds.

1)  $C = C_3 = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_1)$ , deg  $u_1 \ge 3$ , deg  $u_2 \ge 3$ , deg  $u_3 = 2$ , deg  $u_{u \in N[u_1] \cap (V-C)} \le 2$  and there exists

 $w \in V - C$  such that  $d(u_i, w) \leq 2, i = 1, 2$ .

2)  $C = C_3 = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_1), \text{ deg } u_1 \ge 4, \text{ deg } u_2 = 2,$ 

 $\deg u_3 = 2$ , exactly one vertex w not on C has  $\deg w \ge 2$ and remaining vertices are pendent vertices.

Proof

Suppose  $ds'(G) = q - \Delta'(G) + 1$ .

Let  $C = C_k = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k, u_1)$  be the unique cycle in G.

If  $C = C_k$ , then  $ds'(G) = \lceil q/3 \rceil < q-1$  for all  $n \ge 3$ and so  $G \ne C_k$ .

Let *S* denote the set of all pendent edges of *G* and let |S| = t.

**Claim 1:**  $t \le \Delta'(G) - 2$ . Since  $E - (S \cup \{e\})$  is an edge dominating set for any edge *e* of *C*,  $\gamma'(G) \le q - t - 1$ . For any pendent edge *f*,  $E - (S \cup \{g, e\}) \cup \{f\}$  is an edge dominating set of *G* containing *f*. Here *g* is an edge adjacent to *f* and *e* is any edge of the cycle. Hence  $ds'(G) \le q - t - 1$ , so that  $t \le \Delta'(G) - 2$ .

**Claim 2:** e = uv is an edge with degree  $\Delta'$ . Then either u or v lies on  $C_k$ .

Now let  $G \neq C_k$  and e = uv be an edge of maximum degree  $\Delta'$ . If  $e \in C_k$ , then for some edge  $e' \in C_k$ , G - e' is a tree *T* of *G* with at least  $(\Delta'(G)+1)$  pendent edges. If *X* is the set of all pendent edges of G - e, then

 $|X| \ge \Delta'(G) + 1$ . Then E(T) - X is an edge dominating set of cardinality at most  $q - \Delta'(G) - 1$ . Therefore  $ds'(G) < q - \Delta'(G) + 1$ , which is a contradiction.

**Case (1).** u or v lies on C.

**Claim 3:**  $G - C_k$  is the union of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Suppose not. Then,  $G - C_k$  contains  $P_k = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_K, k \ge 3$ . Suppose  $u = u_1$  lies on  $C_K$ . Let  $T_{u_1}$  be the maximal tree rooted at  $u_1$  not containing any edge of  $C_k$ . Clearly  $T_{u_k}$ has at least  $\Delta'(G) - 2$  pendent edges, say S. Then

 $E(G) - (S \cup \{u_1u_2, u_ku_1, u_ix_1\}), i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, k \text{ is an edge}$ dominating set of cardinality less than  $q - \Delta'(G)$ . Therefore  $ds'(G) < q - \Delta'(G) + 1$ , which is a contradiction.

In this case, G has at least  $\Delta' - 2$  pendent edges. Let W be the set of these pendent edges. Further  $ds'(C_k) = \lfloor k/3 \rfloor$ and let Y denote a  $\gamma'$ -set of  $C_k$ . Let  $Z = E(C_k) - Y$ . If k > 14, then E(G) - W - Z is an edge dominating set of cardinality less than  $q - \Delta'(G)$ . Hence  $C_k = C_3$  or  $C_4$ . Since  $t \ge \Delta'(G) - 2$ . By claim 1,  $t = \Delta'(G) - 2$ .

**Subcase (1).**  $C = C_3 = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_1)$ 

 $G - C_3$  is the union of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ . Also u or v lies on C. Let  $u = u_1$ . Therefore  $G - C_3$  contains at least one  $P_2$ . Since  $t = \Delta'(G) - 2$ , no other vertex other than u and v has degree > 3.

If  $G - C_3$  is the union of  $P_2's$  alone, then  $\{x_1x_2, u_iu_i\}$ or  $\{u_1x_1, u_iu_j\}, i \neq ji, j = 1, 2, 3$  is an edge dominating set and every edge lies in a  $\gamma'$ -set. Therefore  $ds'(G) = q - \Delta'(G)$ .

If  $G-C_3$  is the union of  $P_1's$  and  $P_2's$ , then from Theorem 1.5,  $\gamma'(G) = q - \Delta'(G)$ . But pendent edges adjacent to  $u_1$  does not lie in any  $\gamma'$ -set. Therefore  $ds'(G) = q - \Delta'(G) + 1.$ 

Subcase (2).  $C = C_4 = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_1)$ 

As in subcase (1),  $G - C_4$  also contains  $P_2$ . Then

 $E(G) - W - \{u_1u_2, u_1u_4, u_2u_3\}$  is an edge dominating set of cardinality  $\langle q - \Delta'(G) \rangle$ . Therefore

 $ds'(G) < q - \Delta'(G) + 1$ .

Case (2). *u* and *v* lies on C.

**Claim 4:**  $G - C_k$  is the union of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ .

Suppose not. Then,  $G - C_k$  contains  $P_k = x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k$ ,  $k \ge 3$ . Suppose  $e = u_1 u_2$  lies on  $C_k$ . Let

$$\begin{split} T_{u_1u_2} &= T_{u_1} \cup T_{u_2} \cup \left\{ u_1, \ u_2 \right\}. \\ \text{Clearly } T_{u_1u_2} \text{ has at least } \Delta'(G) - 2 \text{ pendent edges,} \end{split}$$
say P.

Then  $E(G) - P - \{u_i x_1, u_k u_1, u_2 u_3\}, i = 1, 2 \cdots k$  is an edge dominating set of cardinality less than  $q - \Delta'(G)$ . Therefore  $ds'(G) < q - \Delta'(G) + 1$ , which is a contradiction.

As in case (1),  $t = \Delta'(G) - 2$ . Let  $e = u_1 u_2$  be an edge of maximum degree.

**Subcase (1).**  $C = C_3 = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_1)$ 

In this case, from Theorem 1.5, (3),  $u_3u_1$  does not belong to any  $\gamma'$ -set. Therefore  $ds'(G) = q - \Delta'(G) + 1$ .

**Subcase (2).**  $C = C_4 = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_1)$ 

From Theorem 1.5, there does not exist an edge dominating set of cardinality  $q - \Delta'(G)$ .

The converse is obvious.

#### 4. Well-Edge Dominated Graph

A graph G is called well dominated if all minimal dominating sets have the same cardinality. This concept was introduced by Finbow, Hartnell and Nowakowski [6].

#### 4.1. Definition

A graph G is well-edge dominated if every minimal edge dominating set of G has the same cardinality.

#### 4.2. Lemma

If G is a well-edge dominated graph and e is an edge of G, then there exists a minimum edge dominating set containing e and a minimum edge dominating set not containing e.

#### Proof

To obtain an edge dominating set containing e, place e in the set D, delete N[e] from G and continue in this greedy fashion until there are no edges left. Then D is minimal and since G is well-edge dominated, it is minimum.

To obtain a minimum edge dominating set not containing e, we use the same greedy method except that we use a neighbor of e as our initial edge in D.

# 4.3. Theorem

If G is well-edge dominated, then G is of class 1.

Proof

From the above lemma, it is clear that every edge belongs to any one of the  $\gamma$ 'set. Therefore G is of class 1.

#### REFERENCES

- F. Harary, "Graph Theory," Addison-Wesley Publishing [1] Company, Boston, 1969.
- T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi and P. J. Slater, "Funda-[2] mentals of Domination in Graphs," Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998.
- B. D. Acharya, "The Strong Domination Number of a [3] Graph and Related Concepts," Journal of Mathematical Physics, Vol. 14, No. 5, 1980, pp. 471-475.
- [4] S. Arumugam and R. Kala, "Domsaturation Number of a Graph," Indian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 33, No. 11, 2002, pp. 1671-1676.
- S. Arumugam and S. Velammal, "Edge Domination in [5] Graphs," Taiwanese Journal of Mathematics, Vol. 2, No. 2, 1998, pp. 173-179.
- A. Finbow, B. L. Hartnell and R. Nowakowski, "Well [6] Dominated Graphs: A Collection of Covered Ones," Ars Combinatoria, Vol. 25, No. A, 1988, pp. 5-10.