

# Global defensive $k$ -alliances in graphs

J. A. Rodríguez-Velázquez<sup>1</sup> and J. M. Sigarreta<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Computer Engineering and Mathematics*

Rovira i Virgili University of Tarragona

Av. Països Catalans 26, 43007 Tarragona, Spain

e-mail:juanalberto.rodriguez@urv.cat

<sup>2</sup>*Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Carlos III de Madrid,*  
Avda. de la Universidad 30, 28911 Leganés (Madrid) Spain.

e-mail:josemaria.sigarreta@uc3m.es

## Abstract

Let  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  be a simple graph. For a nonempty set  $X \subseteq V$ , and a vertex  $v \in V$ ,  $\delta_X(v)$  denotes the number of neighbors  $v$  has in  $X$ . A nonempty set  $S \subseteq V$  is a *defensive  $k$ -alliance* in  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  if  $\delta_S(v) \geq \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + k$ ,  $\forall v \in S$ . A defensive  $k$ -alliance  $S$  is called *global* if it forms a dominating set. The *global defensive  $k$ -alliance number* of  $\Gamma$ , denoted by  $\gamma_k^a(\Gamma)$ , is the minimum cardinality of a defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ . We study the mathematical properties of  $\gamma_k^a(\Gamma)$ .

*Keywords:* Defensive alliances, alliances in graphs, domination.

*AMS Subject Classification numbers:* 05C69; 05A20

## 1 Introduction

The mathematical properties of alliances in graphs were first studied by P. Kristiansen, S. M. Hedetniemi and S. T. Hedetniemi [7]. They proposed different types of alliances: namely, defensive alliances [5, 6, 7, 15], offensive alliances [3, 8, 9] and dual alliances or powerful alliances [1]. A generalization

of these alliances called  $k$ -alliances was presented by K. H. Shafique and R. D. Dutton [11, 12].

In this paper, we study the mathematical properties of defensive  $k$ -alliances. We begin by stating the terminology used. Throughout this article,  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  denotes a simple graph of order  $|V| = n$  and size  $|E| = m$ . We denote two adjacent vertices  $u$  and  $v$  by  $u \sim v$ . For a nonempty set  $X \subseteq V$ , and a vertex  $v \in V$ ,  $N_X(v)$  denotes the set of neighbors  $v$  has in  $X$ :  $N_X(v) := \{u \in X : u \sim v\}$ , and the degree of  $v$  in  $X$  will be denoted by  $\delta_X(v) = |N_X(v)|$ . We denote the degree of a vertex  $v_i \in V$  by  $\delta(v_i)$  (or by  $\delta_i$  for short) and the degree sequence of  $\Gamma$  by  $\delta_1 \geq \delta_2 \geq \dots \geq \delta_n$ . The subgraph induced by  $S \subset V$  will be denoted by  $\langle S \rangle$  and the complement of the set  $S$  in  $V$  will be denoted by  $\bar{S}$ .

A nonempty set  $S \subseteq V$  is a *defensive  $k$ -alliance* in  $\Gamma = (V, E)$ ,  $k \in \{-\delta_1, \dots, \delta_1\}$ , if for every  $v \in S$ ,

$$\delta_S(v) \geq \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + k. \quad (1)$$

A vertex  $v \in S$  is said to be  *$k$ -satisfied* by the set  $S$  if (1) holds. Notice that (1) is equivalent to

$$\delta(v) \geq 2\delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + k. \quad (2)$$

A defensive  $(-1)$ -alliance is a *defensive alliance* and a defensive 0-alliance is a *strong defensive alliance* as defined in [7]. A defensive 0-alliance is also known as a *cohesive set* [14].

Defensive alliances are the mathematical model of web communities. Adopting the definition of Web community proposed recently by Flake, Lawrence, and Giles [4], “a Web community is a set of web pages having more hyperlinks (in either direction) to members of the set than to non-members”.

The *defensive  $k$ -alliance number* of  $\Gamma$ , denoted by  $a_k(\Gamma)$ , is defined as the minimum cardinality of a defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ . Notice that

$$a_{k+1}(\Gamma) \geq a_k(\Gamma). \quad (3)$$

The defensive  $(-1)$ -alliance number of  $\Gamma$  is known as the *alliance number* of  $\Gamma$  and the defensive 0-alliance number is known as the *strong alliance number*, [7, 5, 6]. For instance, in the case of the 3-cube graph,  $\Gamma = Q_3$ , every set composed by two adjacent vertices is a defensive alliance of minimum cardinality and every set composed by four vertices whose induced subgraph is isomorphic to the cycle  $C_4$  is a strong defensive alliance of minimum cardinality. Thus,  $a_{-1}(Q_3) = 2$  and  $a_0(Q_3) = 4$ .

For some graphs, there are some values of  $k \in \{-\delta_1, \dots, \delta_1\}$ , such that defensive  $k$ -alliances do not exist. For instance, for  $k \geq 2$  in the case of the star graph  $S_n$ , defensive  $k$ -alliances do not exist. By (2) we conclude that, in any graph, there are defensive  $k$ -alliances for  $k \in \{-\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n\}$ . For instance, a defensive  $(\delta_n)$ -alliance in  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  is  $V$ . Moreover, if  $v \in V$  is a vertex of minimum degree,  $\delta(v) = \delta_n$ , then  $S = \{v\}$  is a defensive  $k$ -alliance for every  $k \leq -\delta_n$ . Therefore,  $a_k(\Gamma) = 1$ , for  $k \leq -\delta_n$ . For the study of the mathematical properties of  $a_k(\Gamma)$ ,  $k \in \{\delta_n, \dots, \delta_1\}$ , we cite [10].

A set  $S \subset V$  is a *dominating set* in  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  if for every vertex  $u \in \bar{S}$ ,  $\delta_S(u) > 0$  (every vertex in  $\bar{S}$  is adjacent to at least one vertex in  $S$ ). The *domination number* of  $\Gamma$ , denoted by  $\gamma(\Gamma)$ , is the minimum cardinality of a dominating set in  $\Gamma$ .

A defensive  $k$ -alliance  $S$  is called *global* if it forms a dominating set. The *global defensive  $k$ -alliance number* of  $\Gamma$ , denoted by  $\gamma_k^a(\Gamma)$ , is the minimum cardinality of a defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ . Clearly,

$$\gamma_{k+1}^a(\Gamma) \geq \gamma_k^a(\Gamma) \geq \gamma(\Gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_k^a(\Gamma) \geq a_k(\Gamma). \quad (4)$$

The global defensive  $(-1)$ -alliance number of  $\Gamma$  is known as the *global alliance number* of  $\Gamma$  and the global defensive 0-alliance number is known as the *global strong alliance number* [6]. For instance, in the case of the 3-cube graph,  $\Gamma = Q_3$ , every set composed by four vertices whose induced subgraph is isomorphic to the cycle  $C_4$  is a global (strong) defensive alliance of minimum cardinality. Thus,  $\gamma_{-1}^a(Q_3) = \gamma_0^a(Q_3) = 4$ .

For some graphs, there are some values of  $k \in \{-\delta_1, \dots, \delta_1\}$ , such that global defensive  $k$ -alliances do not exist. For instance, for  $k = \delta_1$  in the case of nonregular graphs, defensive  $k$ -alliances do not exist. Therefore, the bounds showed in this paper on  $\gamma_k^a(\Gamma)$ , for  $k \leq \delta_1$ , are obtained by supposing that the graph  $\Gamma$  contains defensive  $k$ -alliances. Notice that for any graph  $\Gamma$ , every dominating set is a global defensive  $(-\delta_1)$ -alliance. Hence,  $\gamma_{-\delta_1}^a(\Gamma) = \gamma(\Gamma)$ . Moreover, for any  $\delta_1$ -regular graph of order  $n$ ,  $\gamma_{\delta_1-1}^a(\Gamma) = \gamma_{\delta_1}^a(\Gamma) = n$ .

## 2 Global defensive k-alliance number

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $S$  be a global defensive  $k$ -alliance of minimum cardinality in  $\Gamma$ . If  $W \subset S$  is a dominating set in  $\Gamma$ , then for every  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $0 \leq r \leq \gamma_k^a(\Gamma) - |W|$ ,*

$$\gamma_{k-2r}^a(\Gamma) + r \leq \gamma_k^a(\Gamma).$$

*Proof.* We can take  $X \subset S$  such that  $|X| = r$ . Hence, for every  $v \in Y = S - X$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_Y(v) &= \delta_S(v) - \delta_X(v) \\ &\geq \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + k - \delta_X(v) \\ &= \delta_{\bar{Y}}(v) + k - 2\delta_X(v) \\ &\geq \delta_{\bar{Y}}(v) + k - 2r.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $Y$  is a defensive  $(k - 2r)$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ . Moreover, as  $W \subset Y$ ,  $Y$  is a dominating set and, as a consequence,  $\gamma_{k-2r}^a(\Gamma) \leq \gamma_k^a(\Gamma) - r$ .  $\square$

Notice that if every vertex of  $\Gamma$  has even degree and  $k$  is odd,  $k = 2l - 1$ , then every defensive  $(2l - 1)$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$  is a defensive  $(2l)$ -alliance. Hence, in such a case,  $a_{2l-1}(\Gamma) = a_{2l}(\Gamma)$  and  $\gamma_{2l-1}^a(\Gamma) = \gamma_{2l}^a(\Gamma)$ . Analogously, if every vertex of  $\Gamma$  has odd degree and  $k$  is even,  $k = 2l$ , then every defensive  $(2l)$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$  is a defensive  $(2l + 1)$ -alliance. Hence, in such a case,  $a_{2l}(\Gamma) = a_{2l+1}(\Gamma)$  and  $\gamma_{2l}^a(\Gamma) = \gamma_{2l+1}^a(\Gamma)$ . For instance, for the complete graph of order  $n$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}n &= \gamma_{n-1}^a(K_n) = \gamma_{n-2}^a(K_n) \\ &\geq \gamma_{n-3}^a(K_n) = \gamma_{n-4}^a(K_n) = n - 1 \\ &\dots \\ &\geq \gamma_{2-n}^a(K_n) = \gamma_{3-n}^a(K_n) = 2 \\ &\geq \gamma_{1-n}^a(K_n) = 1.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for every  $k \in \{1 - n, \dots, n - 1\}$ , and for every  $r \in \{0, \dots, \frac{k+n-1}{2}\}$ ,

$$\gamma_{k-2r}^a(K_n) + r = \gamma_k^a(K_n). \quad (5)$$

Moreover, notice that for every  $k \in \{1 - n, \dots, n - 1\}$ ,  $\gamma_k^a(K_n) = \left\lceil \frac{n + k + 1}{2} \right\rceil$ .

It was shown in [6] that

$$\frac{\sqrt{4n+1}-1}{2} \leq \gamma_{-1}^a(\Gamma) \leq n - \left\lceil \frac{\delta_n}{2} \right\rceil \quad (6)$$

and

$$\sqrt{n} \leq \gamma_0^a(\Gamma) \leq n - \left\lfloor \frac{\delta_n}{2} \right\rfloor. \quad (7)$$

Here we generalize the previous results to defensive  $k$ -alliances.

**Theorem 2.** For any graph  $\Gamma$ ,  $\frac{\sqrt{4n+k^2}+k}{2} \leq \gamma_k^a(\Gamma) \leq n - \left\lfloor \frac{\delta_n - k}{2} \right\rfloor$ .

*Proof.* If  $\delta_n \leq k$ , then  $\gamma_k^a(\Gamma) \leq n \leq n - \left\lfloor \frac{\delta_n - k}{2} \right\rfloor$ . Otherwise, consider  $u \in V$  such that  $\delta(u) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{\delta_n + \delta_1}{2} \right\rfloor$ . Let  $X \subset V$  be the set of neighbors  $u$  has in  $\Gamma$ ,  $X = \{w \in V : w \sim u\}$ . Let  $Y \subset X$  be a vertex set such that  $|Y| = \left\lfloor \frac{\delta_n - k}{2} \right\rfloor$ . In such a case, the set  $V - Y$  is a global defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ . That is,  $V - Y$  is a dominating set and for every  $v \in V - Y$  we have  $\frac{\delta(v) - k}{2} \geq \left\lfloor \frac{\delta_n - k}{2} \right\rfloor \geq \delta_Y(v)$ . Therefore,  $\gamma_k^a(\Gamma) \leq n - \left\lfloor \frac{\delta_n - k}{2} \right\rfloor$ .

On the other hand, let  $S \subseteq V$  be a dominating set in  $\Gamma$ . Then,

$$n - |S| \leq \sum_{v \in S} \delta_{\bar{S}}(v). \quad (8)$$

Moreover, if  $S$  is a defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ ,

$$k|S| + \sum_{v \in S} \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) \leq \sum_{v \in S} \delta_S(v) \leq |S|(|S| - 1). \quad (9)$$

Hence, solving

$$0 \leq |S|^2 - k|S| - n \quad (10)$$

we deduce the lower bound.  $\square$

The upper bound is attained, for instance, for the complete graph  $\Gamma = K_n$  for every  $k \in \{1 - n, \dots, n - 1\}$ . The lower bound is attained, for instance, for the 3-cube graph  $\Gamma = Q_3$ , in the following cases:  $2 \leq \gamma_{-3}^a(Q_3)$  and  $4 \leq \gamma_1(Q_3) = \gamma_0(Q_3)$ .

It was shown in [6] that for any bipartite graph  $\Gamma$  of order  $n$  and maximum degree  $\delta_1$ ,

$$\gamma_{-1}^a(\Gamma) \geq \left\lceil \frac{2n}{\delta_1 + 3} \right\rceil \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_0^a(\Gamma) \geq \left\lceil \frac{2n}{\delta_1 + 2} \right\rceil.$$

Here we generalize the previous bounds to defensive  $k$ -alliances. Moreover, we show that the result is not restrictive to the case of bipartite graphs.

**Theorem 3.** For any graph  $\Gamma$ ,  $\gamma_k^a(\Gamma) \geq \left\lceil \frac{n}{\left\lfloor \frac{\delta_1 - k}{2} \right\rfloor + 1} \right\rceil$ .

*Proof.* If  $S$  denotes a defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ , then  $\delta_1 \geq \delta(v) \geq 2\delta_{\bar{S}}(v) + k$ ,  $\forall v \in S$ . Therefore,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{\delta_1 - k}{2} \right\rfloor \geq \delta_{\bar{S}}(v), \quad \forall v \in S. \quad (11)$$

The result follows by (8) and (11).  $\square$

The above bound is tight. For instance, for the Petersen graph the bound is attained for every  $k$ :  $3 \leq \gamma_{-3}^a(\Gamma)$ ,  $4 \leq \gamma_{-2}^a(\Gamma) = \gamma_{-1}^a(\Gamma)$ ,  $5 \leq \gamma_0(\Gamma) = \gamma_1(\Gamma)$  and  $10 \leq \gamma_2(\Gamma) = \gamma_3(\Gamma)$ . For the 3-cube graph  $\Gamma = Q_3$ , the above theorem leads to the following exact values of  $\gamma_k^a(Q_3)$ :  $2 \leq \gamma_{-3}^a(Q_3)$ ,  $4 \leq \gamma_0(Q_3) = \gamma_1(Q_3)$  and  $8 \leq \gamma_2(Q_3) = \gamma_3(Q_3)$ .

Hereafter, we denote by  $\mathcal{L}(\Gamma) = (V_l, E_l)$  the line graph of a simple graph  $\Gamma$ . The degree of the vertex  $e = \{u, v\} \in V_l$  is  $\delta(e) = \delta(u) + \delta(v) - 2$ . If the degree sequence of  $\Gamma$  is  $\delta_1 \geq \delta_2 \geq \dots \geq \delta_n$ , then the maximum degree of  $\mathcal{L}(\Gamma)$ , denoted by  $\Delta_l$ , is bounded by  $\Delta_l \leq \delta_1 + \delta_2 - 2$ .

**Corollary 4.** *For any graph  $\Gamma$  of size  $m$  and maximum degrees  $\delta_1 \geq \delta_2$ ,*

$$\gamma_k^a(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma)) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{m}{\left\lfloor \frac{\delta_1 + \delta_2 - 2 - k}{2} \right\rfloor + 1} \right\rfloor.$$

The above bound is attained for  $k \in \{-3, -2, -1, 2, 3\}$  in the case of the complete bipartite graph  $\Gamma = K_{1,4}$ . Notice that  $\mathcal{L}(K_{1,4}) = K_4$  and  $\gamma_{-3}^a(K_4) = 1$ ,  $\gamma_{-2}^a(K_4) = \gamma_{-1}^a(K_4) = 2$ ,  $\gamma_2^a(K_4) = \gamma_3^a(K_4) = 4$ .

## 2.1 Defensive alliances in cubic graphs

In the case of cubic graphs<sup>1</sup>  $\gamma(\Gamma) = \gamma_{-3}^a(\Gamma) \leq \gamma_{-2}^a(\Gamma) = \gamma_{-1}^a(\Gamma) \leq \gamma_0^a(\Gamma) = \gamma_1^a(\Gamma) \leq \gamma_2^a(\Gamma) = \gamma_3^a(\Gamma) = n$ . So, in this case we only study,  $\gamma_{-1}^a(\Gamma)$  and  $\gamma_0^a(\Gamma)$ .

**Theorem 5.** *For any cubic graph  $\Gamma$ ,  $\gamma_{-1}^a(\Gamma) \leq 2\gamma(\Gamma)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $S$  be a dominating set of minimum cardinality in  $\Gamma$ . Let  $X \subseteq S$  be the set composed by all  $v_i \in S$  such that  $\delta_S(v_i) = 0$ . For each  $v_i \in X$  we take a vertex  $u_i \in \bar{S}$  such that  $u_i \sim v_i$ . Let  $Y \in \bar{S}$  defined as  $Y = \cup_{v_i \in X} \{u_i\}$ . Then we have  $|Y| \leq \gamma(\Gamma)$  and the set  $S \cup Y$  is a global defensive (-1)-alliance in  $\Gamma$ .  $\square$

---

<sup>1</sup>A cubic graph is a 3-regular graph.

The above bound is tight. For instance, in the case of the 3-cube graph we have  $\gamma_{-1}^a(Q_3) = 2\gamma(Q_3) = 4$ .

A set  $S \subset V$  is a total dominating set if every vertex in  $V$  has a neighbor in  $S$ . The total domination number  $\gamma_t(\Gamma)$  is the minimum cardinality of a total dominating set in  $\Gamma$ . Notice that if  $\Gamma$  is a cubic graph, then

$$\gamma_{-1}^a(\Gamma) = \gamma_t(\Gamma). \quad (12)$$

It was shown in [2] that if  $\Gamma$  is a connected graph of order  $n \geq 3$ , then

$$\gamma_t(\Gamma) \leq \frac{2n}{3}. \quad (13)$$

Moreover, by Theorem 3 we have

$$\frac{n}{3} \leq \gamma_{-1}^a(\Gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{n}{2} \leq \gamma_0^a(\Gamma). \quad (14)$$

### 3 Defensive $k$ -alliances in planar graphs

It is well-known that the size of a planar graph  $\Gamma$  of order  $n \geq 3$  is bounded by  $m \leq 3(n-2)$ . Moreover, in the case of triangle-free graphs  $m \leq 2(n-2)$ . This inequalities allow us to obtain tight bounds for the studied parameters.

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $\Gamma = (V, E)$  be a graph of order  $n$ . Let  $S$  be a global defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$  such that the subgraph  $\langle S \rangle$  is planar.*

- (i) *If  $n > 2(2-k)$ , then  $|S| \geq \lceil \frac{n+12}{7-k} \rceil$ .*
- (ii) *If  $n > 2(2-k)$  and  $\langle S \rangle$  is a triangle-free graph, then  $|S| \geq \lceil \frac{n+8}{5-k} \rceil$ .*

*Proof.*

- (i) If  $|S| \leq 2$ , for every  $v \in S$  we have  $\delta_{\bar{S}}(v) \leq 1-k$ . Thus,  $n \leq 2(2-k)$ . Therefore,  $n > 2(2-k) \Rightarrow |S| > 2$ .

As  $\langle S \rangle$  is planar and  $|S| > 2$ , the size of  $\langle S \rangle$  is bounded by

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in S} \delta_S(v) \leq 3(|S| - 2). \quad (15)$$

If  $S$  is a global defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ ,

$$k|S| + (n - |S|) \leq k|S| + \sum_{v \in S} \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) \leq \sum_{v \in S} \delta_S(v). \quad (16)$$

By (15) and (16) the result follows.

(ii) If  $\langle S \rangle$  is a triangle-free graph, then

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in S} \delta_S(v) \leq 2(|S| - 2). \quad (17)$$

The result follows by (16) and (17). □

**Corollary 7.** *For any planar graph  $\Gamma$  of order  $n$ .*

(a) *If  $n > 2(2 - k)$ , then  $\gamma_k^a(\Gamma) \geq \lceil \frac{n+12}{7-k} \rceil$ .*

(b) *If  $n > 2(2 - k)$  and  $\Gamma$  is a triangle-free graph, then  $\gamma_k^a(\Gamma) \geq \lceil \frac{n+8}{5-k} \rceil$ .*

The above bounds are tight. In the case of the right hand side graph of Figure 1, the set  $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$  is a global defensive  $k$ -alliance for  $k = -2$ ,  $k = -1$  and  $k = 0$ , and Corollary 7-(a) leads to  $\gamma_k^a(\Gamma) \geq 3$ . Moreover, if  $\Gamma = Q_3$ , the 3-cube graph, Corollary 7-(b) leads to the following exact values of  $\gamma_k^a(Q_3)$ :  $2 \leq \gamma_{-3}^a(Q_3)$ ,  $4 \leq \gamma_0^a(Q_3) = \gamma_1^a(Q_3)$  and  $8 \leq \gamma_3^a(Q_3)$ .

**Theorem 8.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a graph of order  $n$ . Let  $S$  be a global defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$  such that the subgraph  $\langle S \rangle$  is planar connected with  $f$  faces. Then,*

$$|S| \geq \left\lceil \frac{n - 2f + 4}{3 - k} \right\rceil.$$

*Proof.* By Euler's formula,  $\sum_{v \in S} \delta_S(v) = 2(|S| + f - 2)$ , and (16) we deduce the result. □

In the case of the right hand side graph of Figure 1, the set  $S = \{1, 2, 3\}$  is a global defensive  $k$ -alliance for  $k = -1$ ,  $k = 0$  and  $k = 2$ . Moreover,  $\langle S \rangle$  has two faces. In such a case, Theorem 8 leads to  $|S| \geq 3$ .

**Theorem 9.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be a graph of order  $n$ . Let  $S$  be a global defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$  such that  $|S| > 2$ . If  $\langle S \rangle$  is  $p$ -connected and planar, then*

$$|S| \geq \left\lceil \frac{(k + p - 6) + \sqrt{(k + p - 6)^2 + 4(12 + n)}}{2} \right\rceil.$$



Moreover, if  $\langle S \rangle$  is a triangle-free graph, then

$$|S| \geq \left\lceil \frac{(k+p-4) + \sqrt{(k+p-4)^2 + 4(8+n)}}{2} \right\rceil.$$

*Proof.* Since  $S$  is a defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ ,

$$\sum_{v \in S} \delta_{\bar{S}}(v) \leq |S|^2 - (k+1)|S|. \quad (18)$$

Moreover, as the defensive  $k$ -alliance  $S$  is global, by (8) and (18) we have


$$n - |S| \leq |S|^2 - (k+1)|S|. \quad (19)$$

As  $\langle S \rangle$  is  $p$ -connected and planar, its size is bounded by

$$\frac{|S|p}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in S} \delta_S(v) \leq 3(|S| - 2). \quad (20)$$

Hence, by (19) and (20) we deduce the first bound. The second bound is obtained as before by using the fact that if  $\langle S \rangle$  is a triangle-free graph and it is  $p$ -connected, then its size is bounded by  $\frac{|S|p}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in S} \delta_S(v) \leq 2(|S| - 2)$ .  $\square$

Figure 1:



The above bounds are tight. For instance, in the case of the octahedron graph we take the set  $S$  composed by three vertices whose induced subgraph  $\langle S \rangle$  is isomorphic to a cycle. In such a case,  $\langle S \rangle$  is 2-connected,  $S$  is a global

defensive  $k$ -alliance for  $k \in \{-2, -1, 0\}$ , and Theorem 9 leads to  $|S| \geq 3$ . The second bound is attained, for instance, for the left hand side graph of Figure 1. In such a case, the subgraph induced by the set  $S = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  is planar, 2-connected and  $S$  is a global defensive  $k$ -alliance for  $k = -1$  and  $k = 0$ .

### 3.1 Defensive $k$ -alliances in trees

In this section we study global defensive  $k$ -alliances in trees but we impose a condition on the number of connected components of the subgraphs induced by the alliances.

**Theorem 10.** *Let  $T$  be a tree of order  $n$ . Let  $S$  be a global defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $T$  such that the subgraph  $\langle S \rangle$  has  $c$  connected components. Then,*


$$|S| \geq \left\lceil \frac{n + 2c}{3 - k} \right\rceil.$$

*Proof.* As the subgraph  $\langle S \rangle$  is a forest with  $c$  connected components,

$$\sum_{v \in S} \delta_S(v) = 2(|S| - c). \quad (21)$$

The bound of  $|S|$  follows from (16) and (21).  $\square$

Figure 2:



The above bound is attained, for instance, for the left hand side graph of Figure 2, where  $S = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  is a global defensive  $(-1)$ -alliance and  $\langle S \rangle$

has two connected components. Moreover, the bound is attained in the case of the right hand side graph of Figure 2, where  $S = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  is a global defensive 0-alliance and  $\langle S \rangle$  has two connected components.

**Corollary 11.** *For any tree  $T$  of order  $n$ ,  $\gamma_k^a(T) \geq \left\lceil \frac{n+2}{3-k} \right\rceil$ .*

The above bound is attained for  $k \in \{-4, -3, -2, 0, 1\}$  in the case of  $\Gamma = K_{1,4}$ . As a particular case of above theorem we obtain the bounds obtained in [6]:

$$\gamma_{-1}^a(T) \geq \left\lceil \frac{n+2}{4} \right\rceil \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_0^a(T) \geq \left\lceil \frac{n+2}{3} \right\rceil.$$

## 4 Global connected defensive $k$ -alliances

It is clear that a defensive  $k$ -alliance of minimum cardinality must induce a connected subgraph. But we can have a global defensive  $k$ -alliance of minimum cardinality with nonconnected induced subgraph. We say that a defensive  $k$ -alliance  $S$  is connected if  $\langle S \rangle$  is connected. We denote by  $\gamma_k^{ca}(\Gamma)$  the minimum cardinality of a global connected defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ . Obviously,  $\gamma_k^{ca}(\Gamma) \geq \gamma_k^a(\Gamma)$ . For instance, for the left hand side graph of Figure 2 we have  $\gamma_{-1}^{ca}(\Gamma) = 5 > 4 = \gamma_{-1}^a(\Gamma)$  and for the right hand side graph of Figure 2 we have  $\gamma_0^{ca}(\Gamma) = 6 > 5 = \gamma_0^a(\Gamma)$ .

**Theorem 12.** *For any connected graph  $\Gamma$  of diameter  $D(\Gamma)$ ,*

$$(i) \quad \gamma_k^{ca}(\Gamma) \geq \left\lceil \frac{\sqrt{4(D(\Gamma)+n-1)+(1-k)^2}+(k-1)}{2} \right\rceil.$$

$$(ii) \quad \gamma_k^{ca}(\Gamma) \geq \left\lceil \frac{n+D(\Gamma)-1}{\left\lfloor \frac{\Delta-k}{2} \right\rfloor + 2} \right\rceil.$$

*Proof.* If  $S$  is a dominating set in  $\Gamma$  such that  $\langle S \rangle$  is connected, then  $D(\Gamma) \leq D(\langle S \rangle) + 2$ . Hence,

$$D(\Gamma) \leq |S| + 1. \tag{22}$$

Moreover, if  $S$  is a global defensive  $k$ -alliance in  $\Gamma$ , then  $|S|$  satisfies (10). The first result follows by (10) and (22).

As a consequence of (8), (11) and (22) we obtain the second result.  $\square$

Both bounds in Theorem 12 are tight. For instance, both bounds are attained for  $k \in \{-2, -1, 0\}$  for the right hand side graph of Figure 1. In such a case, both bounds lead to  $\gamma_k^{ca}(\Gamma) \geq 3$ . Moreover, both bounds lead to the exact values of  $\gamma_k^{ca}(K_{3,3})$  in the following cases:  $2 \leq \gamma_{-3}^{ca}(K_{3,3}) = \gamma_{-2}^{ca}(K_{3,3}) = \gamma_{-1}^{ca}(K_{3,3})$ . Furthermore, notice that bound (ii) leads to the exact values of  $\gamma_k^{ca}(Q_3)$  in the cases  $4 \leq \gamma_0^{ca}(Q_3) = \gamma_1^{ca}(Q_3)$ , while bound (i) only gives  $3 \leq \gamma_0^{ca}(Q_3)$  and  $3 \leq \gamma_1^{ca}(Q_3)$ .

By Theorem 12, and taking into a count that  $D(\Gamma) - 1 \leq D(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma))$ , we obtain the following result on the global connected  $k$ -alliance number of the line graph of  $\Gamma$  in terms of some parameters of  $\Gamma$ .

**Corollary 13.** *For any connected graph  $\Gamma$  of size  $m$ , diameter  $D(\Gamma)$ , and maximum degrees  $\delta_1 \geq \delta_2$ ,*

$$(i) \quad \gamma_k^{ca}(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma)) \geq \left\lceil \frac{\sqrt{4(D(\Gamma)+m-2)+(1-k)^2}-(1-k)}{2} \right\rceil.$$

$$(ii) \quad \gamma_k^{ca}(\mathcal{L}(\Gamma)) \geq \left\lceil \frac{2(m+D(\Gamma)-2)}{\delta_1+\delta_2-k+1} \right\rceil.$$

## References

- [1] R. Brigham; R. Dutton and S. Hedetniemi, A sharp lower bound on the powerful alliance number of  $C_m \times C_n$ . *Congr. Numer.* **167** (2004), 57-63.
- [2] E. J. Cockayne, R. Dawes and S. T. Hedetniemi, Total domination in graphs, *Networks* **10** (1980), 211-215.
- [3] O. Favaron, G. Fricke, W. Goddard, S. Hedetniemi, S. T. Hedetniemi, P. Kristiansen, R. C. Laskar, R. D. Skaggs, Offensive alliances in graphs. *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory* **24 (2)** (2004) 263-275.
- [4] G. W. Flake, S. Lawrence, and C. L. Giles, Efficient Identification of Web Communities. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (KDD-2000), (2000), 150-160.
- [5] G. H. Fricke, L. M. Lawson, T. W. Haynes, S. M. Hedetniemi and S. T. Hedetniemi, A Note on Defensive Alliances in Graphs. *Bull. Inst. Combin. Appl.* **38** (2003), 37-41.

- [6] T. W. Haynes, S. T. Hedetniemi and M. A. Henning, Global defensive alliances in graphs. *Electron. J. Combin.* **10** (2003) 139-146.
- [7] P. Kristiansen, S. M. Hedetniemi and S. T. Hedetniemi, Alliances in graphs. *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **48** (2004) 157-177.
- [8] J. A. Rodríguez and J. M. Sigarreta, Offensive alliances in cubic graphs. *International mathematical forum* **1 (36)** (2006) 1773-1782.
- [9] J. A. Rodríguez-Velázquez and J. M. Sigarreta, Global offensive alliances in graphs. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics* **25** (2006) 157-164.
- [10] J. A. Rodríguez-Velázquez, I. González-Yero and J. M. Sigarreta, Defensive  $k$ -alliances in graphs. Submitted.
- [11] K. H. Shafique and R. D. Dutton, Maximum alliance-free and minimum alliance-cover sets. *Congr. Numer.* **162** (2003) 139-146.
- [12] K. H. Shafique and R. Dutton, A tight bound on the cardinalities of maximum alliance-free and minimum alliance-cover sets. *J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput.* **56** (2006), 139-145.
- [13] K. H. Shafique, Partitioning a Graph in Alliances and its Application to Data Clustering. Ph. D. Thesis, 2004.
- [14] K. H. Shafique and R. D. Dutton, On satisfactory partitioning of graphs. *Congress Numeratum* **154** (2002) 183-194.
- [15] J. M. Sigarreta and J. A. Rodríguez, On defensive alliance and line graphs. *Applied Mathematics Letters* **19 (12)** (2006) 1345-1350.