

## ROMAN DOMINATION DOT-CRITICAL TREES

NADER JAFARI RAD

Department of Mathematics  
Shahrood University of Technology,  
Shahrood, Iran.

e-mail: *n.jafarirad@shahroodut.ac.ir*

and

LUTZ VOLKMANN

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

e-mail: *volkm@math2.rwth-aachen.de*

Communicated by: S. Arumugam

Received 27 August 2010; accepted 10 May 2011

---

### Abstract

A Roman dominating function on a graph  $G$  is a function  $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  satisfying the condition that every vertex  $u$  for which  $f(u) = 0$  is adjacent to at least one vertex  $v$  for which  $f(v) = 2$ . The weight of a Roman dominating function is the value  $f(V(G)) = \sum_{u \in V(G)} f(u)$ . The Roman domination number  $\gamma_R(G)$  of  $G$  is the minimum weight of a Roman dominating function on  $G$ . In this paper, we study trees for which contracting any edge decreases the Roman domination number.

---

**Keywords:** Domination, roman domination, tree, critical.

**2010 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 05C69.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $G = (V(G), E(G))$  be a simple graph of order  $n$ . We denote the *open neighborhood* of a vertex  $v$  of  $G$  by  $N_G(v)$ , or just  $N(v)$ , and its *closed neighborhood* by  $N_G[v] = N[v]$ . For a vertex set  $S \subseteq V(G)$ ,  $N(S) = \cup_{v \in S} N(v)$  and  $N[S] = \cup_{v \in S} N[v]$ . The *degree*  $deg(x)$  of a vertex  $x$  denotes the number of neighbors of  $x$  in  $G$ , and  $\Delta(G)$  is the *maximum degree* of  $G$ . If  $S$  is a subset of  $V(G)$ , then we denote by  $G[S]$  the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $S$ . For notation and graph theory terminology in general we follow [3].

For a graph  $G$ , let  $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  be a function, and let  $(V_0; V_1; V_2)$  be the ordered partition of  $V(G)$  induced by  $f$ , where  $V_i = \{v \in V(G) : f(v) = i\}$  for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ . There is a 1 – 1 correspondence between the functions  $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  and the ordered partition  $(V_0; V_1; V_2)$  of  $V(G)$ . So we will write  $f = (V_0; V_1; V_2)$ .

A function  $f : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  is a *Roman dominating function* if every vertex  $u$  for which  $f(u) = 0$  is adjacent to at least one vertex  $v$  for which  $f(v) = 2$ . The weight of a Roman dominating function is the value  $f(V(G)) = \sum_{u \in V(G)} f(u)$ . The *Roman domination number* of a graph  $G$ , denoted by  $\gamma_R(G)$ , is the minimum weight of a Roman dominating function on  $G$ . A function  $f = (V_0; V_1; V_2)$  is called a  $\gamma_R$ -function (or  $\gamma_R(G)$ -function when we want to refer  $f$  to  $G$ ), if it is a Roman dominating function and  $f(V(G)) = \gamma_R(G)$ , [1, 5, 6].

Roman domination vertex critical graphs are studied in [2]. A graph  $G$  is *Roman domination vertex critical*, or just  $\gamma_R$ -vertex critical, if removing any vertex of  $G$  decreases the Roman domination number. We say a vertex  $v$  is a *Roman domination critical vertex*, or just a  $\gamma_R$ -critical vertex, if  $\gamma_R(G - v) < \gamma_R(G)$ . Thus a graph  $G$  is  $\gamma_R$ -vertex critical if every vertex of  $G$  is  $\gamma_R$ -critical.

For a pair of adjacent vertices  $x, y$  in a graph  $G$ , we denote by  $G.(xy)$  the graph obtained by contracting the edge  $xy$ . So,  $G.(xy)$  may be viewed as the graph obtained from  $G$  by deleting the vertices  $x$  and  $y$  and appending a new vertex, labeled by  $(xy)$ , that is adjacent to all the vertices of  $G - x - y$  that were originally adjacent to either  $x$  or  $y$ . We call a graph  $G$  *Roman domination dot critical*, or just  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical, if  $\gamma_R(G.(xy)) < \gamma_R(G)$  for any two adjacent vertices  $x, y$ . If  $G$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical and  $\gamma_R(G) = k$ , then we call  $G$  a  $k$ - $\gamma_R$ -dot critical graph. In [4] it was shown that if  $e = xy$  is an edge of a graph  $G$ , then  $\gamma_R(G) - 2 \leq \gamma_R(G.(xy)) \leq \gamma_R(G)$ .

We have proved [4] that any  $\gamma_R$ -vertex critical graph is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical. In [2] it was shown that the complete graph  $K_2$  is the only  $\gamma_R$ -vertex critical tree. In this paper we mainly study  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical trees, and we will demonstrate that there exist a lot of  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical trees. Throughout this paper for an edge  $e = uv$  of a graph  $G$  with  $\deg(u) = 1$  and  $\deg(v) > 1$ , we call  $e$  a pendant edge,  $u$  a pendant vertex, and  $v$  a support vertex.

## 2. Some general results

We start with some classes of  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical graphs. The proof is straightforward and is therefore omitted.

**Proposition 2.1.** (1) *The path  $P_n$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if  $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .*  
 (2) *The cycle  $C_n$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if  $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .*  
 (3) *The complete bipartite graph  $K_{m,n}$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if  $m = n = 1$  or  $\min\{m, n\} \geq 2$ .*

Now we present some extremal  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical trees. Let  $H$  be a tree obtained from a path  $P_4$  by adding a pendant edge to each support vertex of  $P_4$ . Let  $H_1$  be a tree obtained from a path  $P_6 = v_1v_2v_3v_4v_5v_6$  by adding a pendant edge to  $v_3$ . Also let  $H_2$  be a tree obtained from  $K_{1,3}$  by subdividing each edge. In the following we characterize all  $k$ - $\gamma_R$ -dot critical trees for  $k = 3, 4, 5$ . The proof for this result is also straightforward and is therefore omitted.

**Lemma 2.2.**

1. A tree  $T$  is 3- $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if  $T = P_4$ .
2. A tree  $T$  is 4- $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if  $T \in \{P_5, H\}$ .
3. A tree  $T$  is 5- $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if  $T \in \{P_7, H_1, H_2\}$ .

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$  be the vertex set of a graph  $H$  without isolated vertices. If  $G$  is a graph formed from  $H$  by attaching exactly two leaves  $v_i$  and  $w_i$  and joining them to  $u_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , then  $G$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.*

*Proof.* Obviously, the function  $f = (V_0; V_1; V_2) = (V(G) - V(H), \emptyset, V(H))$  is a  $\gamma_R$ -function of  $G$  and therefore we obtain  $\gamma_R(G) = 2n$ . Now let  $e = xy$  be an edge of  $G$ . If  $x = u_i$  and  $y = v_i$  or  $y = w_i$ , then  $\gamma_R(G.(xy)) = 2n - 1$ , since  $H$  has no isolated vertices. If  $x = u_i$  and  $y = u_j$  for  $i \neq j$ , then  $\gamma_R(G.(xy)) = 2n - 2$ , and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.4.** *If a support vertex of a graph  $G$  is adjacent to at least three leaves, then  $G$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.*

*Proof.* Let  $u$  be a support vertex of  $G$  which is adjacent to at least three leaves, and let  $f = (V_0; V_1; V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -function of  $G$ . This leads to  $u \in V_2$ . Now let  $v$  be a leaf adjacent to  $u$ . Since the vertex  $uv$  of  $G.(uv)$  is adjacent to at least two leaves, for any  $\gamma_R$ -function  $g$  of  $G.(uv)$ , we have  $g((uv)) = 2$  (or 0 with leaves 1, if  $uv$  is adjacent to exactly two leaves). Consequently,  $G$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.  $\square$

By Proposition 2.4, each support vertex in a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree is adjacent to at most two leaves. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the class of all trees with the property that each support vertex has degree 3 and is adjacent to exactly two leaves. In order to characterize  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical trees in  $\mathcal{F}$  we need the following lemmas.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $x$  be a support vertex of degree 3 in a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree and let  $x$  be adjacent to two leaves. If  $y$  is the vertex adjacent to  $x$  with  $\deg(y) > 1$ , then  $\deg(y) \geq 3$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $x \in V(T)$  be a support vertex with two leaves  $z_1, z_2$  adjacent to  $x$ . Let  $y$  be the vertex adjacent to  $x$  with  $\deg(y) > 1$ . Suppose to the contrary, that  $\deg(y) = 2$ . Let  $y_1 \neq x$  be adjacent to  $y$ . Let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -function for  $T.(xz_1)$ . If  $f((xz_1)) \neq 0$ , then  $g_1 : V(T) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  defined by  $g_1(x) = 2$ ,  $g_1(z_1) = g_1(z_2) = 0$ , and  $g_1(u) = f(u)$  if  $u \notin \{x, z_1, z_2\}$  is a RDF for  $T$ . Thus  $\gamma_R(T) \leq \gamma_R(T.(xz_1))$ , a contradiction to the hypothesis that  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical. So  $f((xz_1)) = 0$ . But then either  $f(y) = 2$  or  $f(z_2) = 2$ . Suppose that  $f(y) = 2$  (the proof for  $f(z_2) = 2$  is similar). Now  $g_2 : V(T) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  defined by  $g_2(x) = 2$ ,  $g_2(y_1) = \max\{1, f(y_1)\}$ , and  $g_2(u) = 0$  if  $u \in N(x)$ , and  $g_2(u) = f(u)$  if  $u \notin N[x] \cup \{y_1\}$ , is a RDF for  $T$ . Thus  $\gamma_R(T) \leq \gamma_R(T.(xz_1))$ , a contradiction. This implies that  $\deg(y) \geq 3$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $x$  be a vertex of degree greater than one in a tree  $T$  such that each vertex of  $N(x)$  except at most one is a support vertex adjacent to two leaves. Then  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.*

*Proof.* Let  $x$  be a vertex in a tree  $T$  and  $k = \deg(x)$ . Let  $N(x) = \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$ , where  $y_i$  is a support vertex adjacent to two leaves for  $2 \leq i \leq k$ . Let  $z_i, z'_i$  be the two leaves adjacent to  $y_i$ . Suppose to the contrary, that  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical. Then  $\gamma_R(T.(y_2z_2)) < \gamma_R(T)$ . Let  $f$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -function for  $T.(y_2z_2)$ . Since  $\gamma_R(T.(y_2z_2)) < \gamma_R(T)$ , it is a simple matter to see that  $f((y_2z_2)) = 0$ ,  $f(z'_2) = 1$  and  $f(x) = 2$ . Now we define  $g : V(T) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  by  $g(x) = g(z_i) = g(z'_i) = 0$  for  $2 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $g(y_i) = 2$  for  $2 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $g(y_1) = \max\{1, f(y_1)\}$ , and  $g(u) = f(u)$  if  $u \notin N[x] \cup \{z_i, z'_i : 2 \leq i \leq k\}$ . Then  $g$  is a RDF for  $T$ , a contradiction  $\square$

**Theorem 2.7.** *A tree  $T \in \mathcal{F}$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if  $T$  is isomorphic to the tree  $H$  in Lemma 2.2.*

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary, that  $T \in \mathcal{F} - H$  is a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree. Let  $P = v_1v_2 \dots v_k$  be a longest path in  $T$ . Since  $T \neq H$ , we deduce that  $k \geq 5$ . Thus  $v_2$  is a support vertex which is adjacent to two leaves. By Lemma 2.5,  $\deg(v_3) \geq 3$ . But then each vertex of  $N(v_3) \setminus \{v_4\}$  is a support vertex adjacent to two leaves. According to Lemma 2.6,  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical, a contradiction.  $\square$

Next we investigate some special trees.

**Theorem 2.8.** *Let  $T$  be a tree consisting of a path  $P = v_1v_2 \dots v_n$  such that  $v_j$  is adjacent to a leaf  $u_j$  for  $j \in \{2, 3, \dots, n-1\}$ . Then  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if*

- (1)  $n = 3t$  with  $t \geq 2$  and  $j = 3i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq t-1$  or  $j = 3i-2$  for  $2 \leq i \leq t$ .
- (2)  $n = 3t+1$  with  $t \geq 2$  and  $j = 3i+1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq t-1$ .

*Proof.* First let  $n = 3t$  with  $t \geq 1$ . If  $t \geq 2$  and  $j = 3i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq t-1$ , then it is a simple matter to obtain  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+1$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) = 2t$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ , and thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical. For reason of symmetry,  $T$  is also  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical in the case that  $j = 3i-2$  for  $2 \leq i \leq t$ . However, if  $j = 3i-1$ , then  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(v_1v_2)) = 2t$ , and thus  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Second let  $n = 3t+1$  with  $t \geq 1$ . If  $j = 3i+1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq t-1$ , then  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+2$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) = 2t+1$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ , and thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical. However, if  $j = 3i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq t$ , then  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+1$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(uv_{3i})) = 2t+1$ , and thus  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical. For reason of symmetry,  $T$  is also not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical in the case that  $j = 3i-1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq t$ .

Third let  $n = 3t+2$  with  $t \geq 1$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(uv_j)) = 2t$ , and thus  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.9.** *Let  $T$  be a tree consisting of a path  $P = v_1v_2 \dots v_n$  such that  $v_j$  is adjacent to a leaf  $u$  and  $v_{j+1}$  is adjacent to a leaf  $w$ , where  $2 \leq j \leq n-2$ . Then  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if*

- (1)  $j \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$  and  $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .
- (2)  $j \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  and  $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .
- (3)  $j \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  and  $n \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ .

*Proof.* Assume in the following, without loss of generality, that  $j-1 \leq n-(j+2)+1 = n-(j+1)$ .

(1) First let  $n = 3t$  with  $t \geq 2$ . It is easy to verify that  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+1$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(v_{3t-1}v_{3t})) = 2t+1$ , and thus  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Second let  $n = 3t+1$  with  $t \geq 1$ . We observe that  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+2$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) \leq 2t+1$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ , and thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Third let  $n = 3t+2$  with  $t \geq 1$ . We observe that  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+3$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) \leq 2t+2$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ , and thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

(2) First let  $n = 3t$  with  $t \geq 2$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+2$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) \leq 2t+1$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ , and thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Second let  $n = 3t+1$  with  $t \geq 2$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+2$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(v_{3t}v_{3t+1})) = 2t+2$ , and thus  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Third let  $n = 3t+2$  with  $t \geq 2$ . We observe that  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+3$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) \leq 2t+2$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ , and thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

(3) First let  $n = 3t$  with  $t \geq 3$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+1$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(v_{3t-1}v_{3t})) = 2t+1$ , and thus  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Second let  $n = 3t+1$  with  $t \geq 3$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+2$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(v_1v_2)) = 2t+2$ , and thus  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Third let  $n = 3t+2$  with  $t \geq 2$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 2t+3$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) \leq 2t+2$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ , and thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $P = v_1v_2 \dots v_n$  be a path. Then the corona  $T = P \circ K_1$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if  $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $u_i$  be a leaf of  $T$  adjacent to  $v_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

First let  $n = 3t$  with  $t \geq 1$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 4t$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(u_2v_2)) = 4t$ , and thus  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Second let  $n = 3t+1$  with  $t \geq 0$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 4t+2$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) = 4t+1$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ . Thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Third let  $n = 3t+2$  with  $t \geq 0$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 4t+3$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) = 4t+2$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ . Thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical, and the proof is complete.  $\square$

**Theorem 2.11.** *Let  $P = v_1v_2 \dots v_n$  be a path, and let  $T' = P \circ K_1$  such that  $u_i$  is a leaf of  $T'$  adjacent to  $v_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Then the tree  $T$  consisting of  $T'$  and a further vertex  $w$  adjacent to  $u_n$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical if and only if  $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ .*

*Proof.* First let  $n = 3t$  with  $t \geq 1$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 4t + 1$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) = 4t$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ . Thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Second let  $n = 3t + 1$  with  $t \geq 0$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 4t + 2$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(u_nv_n)) = 4t + 2$ , and thus  $T$  is not  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.

Third let  $n = 3t + 2$  with  $t \geq 0$ . Then  $\gamma_R(T) = 4t + 4$  and  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) = 4t + 3$  for every edge  $xy$  of  $T$ . Thus  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical, and the proof is complete.  $\square$

### 3. Construction

In this section we give some ways of constructing  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical trees. We begin with the following trivial observation.

**Observation 3.1.** (1) *Let  $x$  be a vertex of degree at least three in a tree  $T$  such that at least three vertices of  $N(x)$  are support vertices adjacent to exactly one leaf. Then for each  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ ,  $f(x) = 2$ .*

(2) *Let  $x$  be a support vertex in a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree and let  $x$  be adjacent to exactly two leaves. If  $y$  is adjacent to  $x$  and not adjacent to any leaf, then for any  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$  for  $T$ ,  $f(y) \neq 1$ .*

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $T$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $x$  be a vertex such that for each  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ ,  $f(x) = 2$ . Let  $y$  be a vertex adjacent to  $x$ . Then for each  $\gamma_R$ -function  $g$  of  $T.(xy)$ ,  $g((xy)) = 2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $x$  be a vertex such that for any  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ ,  $f(x) = 2$ . Let  $y$  be a vertex adjacent to  $x$ . Assume to the contrary, that there is a  $\gamma_R$ -function  $g = (V_0; V_1; V_2)$  for  $T.(xy)$  such that  $g((xy)) \neq 2$ . If  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) = \gamma_R(T) - 2$ , then  $g_1 = (V_0 \setminus \{(xy)\}; (V_1 \setminus \{(xy)\}) \cup \{x, y\}; V_2)$  is a RDF for  $T$ , a contradiction. So suppose that  $\gamma_R(T.(xy)) = \gamma_R(T) - 1$ . If  $g(xy) = 1$ , then  $g_2 = (V_0; (V_1 \setminus \{(xy)\}) \cup \{x, y\}; V_2)$  is a RDF for  $T$ , a contradiction. It remains to suppose that  $g(xy) = 0$ . Let  $z \in V_2 \cap N_{T.(xy)}((xy))$ , and without loss of generality assume that  $z \in N_T(x)$ . In this case  $g_3 = ((V_0 \setminus \{(xy)\}) \cup \{x\}; V_1 \cup \{y\}; V_2)$  is a RDF for  $T$ , a contradiction  $\square$

Now we consider the following operations. Let  $T$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $x \in V(T)$ .

$\mathcal{O}_1$ : If for each  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ ,  $f(x) = 2$ , attach a path  $yzw$  and join  $z$  to  $x$ .

$\mathcal{O}_2$ : If for each  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ ,  $f(x) = 2$ , attach a path  $v_1v_2 \dots v_{3j+2}$  for some non-negative integer  $j$ , and join  $v_1$  to  $x$ .

$\mathcal{O}_3$ : If for each  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ ,  $f(x) = 1$ , attach a path  $v_1v_2 \dots v_m$  for some positive integer  $m \not\equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , and join  $v_1$  to  $x$ .

$\mathcal{O}_4$ : If for each  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ ,  $f(x) = 0$ , attach a path  $v_1v_2 \dots v_m$  for some positive integer  $m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , and join  $v_1$  to  $x$ .

**Proposition 3.3.** *Let  $T$  be a  $k$ - $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by operation  $\mathcal{O}_1$ . Then  $T'$  is  $(k+2)$ - $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.*

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a  $k$ - $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $x$  be a vertex of  $T$  such that for each  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ ,  $f(x) = 2$ . Let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by operation  $\mathcal{O}_1$ . So  $T'$  is obtained from  $T$  by attaching a path  $yzw$  and joining  $z$  to  $x$ . Let  $f = (V_0; V_1; V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -function for  $T$ . We observe that  $f_1 = (V_0 \cup \{z\}; V_1 \cup \{y, w\}, V_2)$  is a RDF for  $T'$ . So  $\gamma_R(T') \leq \gamma_R(T) + 2$ . We show that  $\gamma_R(T') = \gamma_R(T) + 2$ . Suppose to the contrary that  $\gamma_R(T') \neq \gamma_R(T) + 2$ . Let  $g$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -function for  $T'$ . It is obvious that  $g(y) + g(z) + g(w) \geq 2$ . If  $\gamma_R(T') \leq \gamma_R(T)$ , then  $g_1 : V(T) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$  defined by  $g_1(x) = \max\{1, g(x)\}$  and  $g_1(u) = g(u)$  if  $u \neq x$ , is a RDF for  $T$  with weight less than  $\gamma_R(T)$ , a contradiction. So suppose that  $\gamma_R(T') = \gamma_R(T) + 1$ . If  $g(z) = 0$ , then  $g|_{V(T)}$  is a RDF for  $T$ , while if  $g(z) = 2$   $g_1$  described above, is a RDF for  $T$ , both of which is a contradiction. Thus  $\gamma_R(T') = \gamma_R(T) + 2$ .

Next we show that  $T'$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical. Let  $e = uv \in E(T')$ . If  $e \in E(T)$ , then  $\gamma_R(T.(uv)) \leq \gamma_R(T) - 1$ . Using  $\gamma_R(T') = \gamma_R(T) + 2$ , we deduce that

$$\gamma_R(T'.(uv)) \leq \gamma_R(T) - 1 + 2 = \gamma_R(T) + 1 < \gamma_R(T').$$

It remains to assume that  $e \in E(T') \setminus E(T)$ . Let  $h = (V_0; V_1; V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -function for  $T$ . If  $e = xz$ , then  $h_1 = (V_0 \cup \{y, w\}; V_1; (V_2 \setminus \{x\}) \cup \{(xz)\})$  is a RDF for  $T'.(xz)$  and hence  $\gamma_R(T'.(xz)) \leq \gamma_R(T) < \gamma_R(T')$ . So suppose that  $e = yz$ . This time  $h_2 = (V_0 \cup \{(yz)\}; V_1 \cup \{w\}; V_2)$  is a RDF for  $T'.(yz)$  and so again  $\gamma_R(T'.(yz)) \leq \gamma_R(T) + 1 < \gamma_R(T')$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $T$  be a  $k$ - $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by operation  $\mathcal{O}_2$ . Then  $T'$  is  $(k+2j+1)$ - $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.*

*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a  $k$ - $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $x$  be a vertex of  $T$  such that for each  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ ,  $f(x) = 2$ . Let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by operation  $\mathcal{O}_2$ . So  $T'$  is obtained from  $T$  by attaching a path  $P_{3j+2} = v_1v_2 \dots v_{3j+2}$  for an integer  $j \geq 0$ , and joining  $v_1$  to  $x$ .

We know that  $\gamma_R(P_{3j+2}) = 2j+2$ . It is straightforward to verify that  $\gamma_R(T') = \gamma_R(T) + 2j + 1 = \gamma_R(T) + \gamma_R(P_{3j+2}) - 1$ . By Lemma 3.2, we need to show that  $\gamma_R(T'.e) < \gamma_R(T')$  for  $e \in E(P_{3j+2}) \cup \{xv_1\}$ . Without loss of generality suppose that  $e = xv_1$ . It follows that  $\gamma_R(T'.e) = \gamma_R(T) + 2j$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let  $T$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by operation  $\mathcal{O}_3$ . Then  $T'$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.*



*Proof.* Let  $T$  be a  $k$ - $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $x$  be a vertex of  $T$  such that for any  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ ,  $f(x) = 1$ . Let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by operation  $\mathcal{O}_3$ . So  $T'$  is obtained from  $T$  by attaching a path  $v_1v_2 \dots v_m$  for an integer  $m$  and joining  $v_1$  to  $x$ . First assume that  $m = 3j + 1$  for some integer  $j \geq 0$ . Let  $f = (V_0; V_1; V_2)$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -function for  $T$ . Since  $\gamma_R(P_{3j+1}) = 2j + 1$ , it is a simple matter to see that  $\gamma_R(T') = \gamma_R(T) + 2j + 1 = \gamma_R(T) + \gamma_R(P_{3j+1})$ . But both  $T$  and  $P_{3j+1}$  are  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical. So it is sufficient to show that  $\gamma_R(T'.(xv_1)) < \gamma_R(T')$ . Now we observe that  $\gamma_R(T'.(xv_1)) \leq \gamma_R(T) + \gamma_R(P_{3j}) = \gamma_R(T) + 2j < \gamma_R(T')$ . The proof for  $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$  is similar.  $\square$

Similarly, the following can be verified.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $T$  be a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree, and let  $T'$  be obtained from  $T$  by operation  $\mathcal{O}_4$ . Then  $T'$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.*

Now an induction on the number of operations leads us to the following result.

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $T'$  be a tree obtained from a  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree  $T$  by successive operations  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_m$ , where  $\mathcal{D}_i \in \{\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \mathcal{O}_3, \mathcal{O}_4\}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Then  $T$  is  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical.*

Let  $n \geq 3$  be a positive integer, and let  $T$  be a tree obtained from  $K_{1,n}$  by subdividing each edge of  $K_{1,n}$ . If  $x$  is the central vertex of  $T$ , then by Observation 3.1 (1), for each  $\gamma_R$ -function  $f$ , we observe that  $f(x) = 2$ ,  $f(u) = 0$  if  $u \in N(x)$  and  $f(u) = 1$  if  $u \notin N[x]$ . Thus we can apply each operation  $\mathcal{O}_i$  on  $T$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , to produce a further  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical tree.

**Problem 3.8.** *Characterize all  $\gamma_R$ -dot critical trees.*

## References

- [1] E. J. Cockayne, P. M. Dreyer Jr., S. M. Hedetniemi, and S. T. Hedetniemi, *On Roman domination in graphs*, *Discrete Math.*, **278** (2004), 11-22.
- [2] A. Hansberg, N. Jafari Rad, and L. Volkmann, Vertex and edge critical Roman domination in graphs, *Utilitas Math.*, (To appear)
- [3] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi, and P. J. Slater, *Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998.
- [4] N. Jafari Rad and L. Volkmann, *Roman domination dot-critical graphs*, Submitted for publication.



- [5] C. S. ReVelle, K. E. Rosing, Defendens imperium romanum: a classical problem in military strategy, *Amer Math. Monthly*, **107** (2000), 585-594.
- [6] I. Stewart, Defend the Roman Empire!, *Sci. Amer.*, **281** (6) (1999), 136-139.