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Abstract

Let $\alpha(G)$ denote the cardinality of a maximum independent set, while $\mu(G)$ be
the size of a maximum matching in the graph $G = (V, E)$. If $\alpha(G) + \mu(G) = |V|$, then $G$ is a Konig-Egervary graph. If $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \cdots \leq d_n$ is the degree sequence
of $G$, then the annihilation number $h(G)$ of $G$ is the largest integer $k$ such that
$k \sum_{i=1}^n d_i \leq |E|$ [31, 32]. A set $A \subseteq V$ satisfying $\sum_{a \in A} \deg(a) \leq |E|$ is an annihilation
set; if, in addition, $\deg(v) + \sum_{a \in A} \deg(a) > |E|$, for every vertex $v \in V(G) - A$, then
$A$ is a maximal annihilation set in $G$.

In [23] it was conjectured that the following assertions are equivalent:
(i) $\alpha(G) = h(G)$;
(ii) $G$ is a Konig-Egervary graph and every maximum independent set is a
maximal annihilating set.

In this paper, we prove that the implication "(i) $\implies$ (ii)" is correct, while for
the opposite direction we provide a series of generic counterexamples.
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Egervary graph, annihilation set, annihilation number.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper $G = (V, E)$ is a finite, undirected, loopless graph without multiple
edges, with vertex set $V = V(G)$ of cardinality $|V(G)| = n(G)$, and edge set $E = E(G)$
of size $|E(G)| = m(G)$. If $X \subseteq V(G)$, then $G[X]$ is the subgraph of $G$ induced by
$X$. By $G - v$ we mean the subgraph $G[V(G) - \{v\}]$, for $v \in V(G)$. $K_n, K_{m,n}, P_n, C_n$
denote respectively, the complete graph on $n \geq 1$ vertices, the complete bipartite graph
on $m, n \geq 1$ vertices, the path on $n \geq 1$ vertices, and the cycle on $n \geq 3$ vertices,
respectively.
The disjoint union of the graphs $G_1$, $G_2$ is the graph $G_1 \cup G_2$ having the disjoint union of $V(G_1), V(G_2)$ as a vertex set, and the disjoint union of $E(G_1), E(G_2)$ as an edge set. In particular, $nG$ denotes the disjoint union of $n > 1$ copies of the graph $G$.

A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is independent if no two vertices from $S$ are adjacent, and by $\text{Ind}(G)$ we mean the family of all the independent sets of $G$. An independent set of maximum size is a maximum independent set of $G$, and $\alpha(G) = \max\{|S| : S \in \text{Ind}(G)\}$. Let $\Omega(G)$ denote the family of all maximum independent sets.

A matching in a graph $G$ is a set of edges $M \subseteq E(G)$ such that no two edges of $M$ share a common vertex. A matching of maximum cardinality $\mu(G)$ is a maximum matching, and a perfect matching is one saturating all vertices of $G$.

It is known that $|V(G)|/2 + 1 \leq \alpha(G) + \mu(G) \leq |V(G)| \leq \alpha(G) + 2\mu(G)$ hold for every graph $G$ [6]. If $\alpha(G) + \mu(G) = |V(G)|$, then $G$ is called a König-Egerváry graph [11, 34]. For instance, each bipartite graph is a König-Egerváry graph [12, 19]. Various properties of König-Egerváry graphs can be found in [3, 4, 5, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33].

Let $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \cdots \leq d_n$ be the degree sequence of a graph $G$. Pepper [31, 32] defined the annihilation number of $G$, denoted $h(G)$, to be the largest integer $k$ such that the sum of the first $k$ terms of the degree sequence is at most half the sum of the degrees in the sequence. In other words, $h(G)$ is precisely the largest integer $k$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i \leq m(G).$$

Clearly, $h(G) = n(G)$ if and only if $m(G) = 0$, while $h(G) = n(G) - 1$ if and only if $m(G) = 1$. Moreover, for every positive integer $p$, there exists a connected graph, namely $K_{1,p}$, having $h(K_{1,p}) = p = n(K_{1,p}) - 1$.

For $A \subseteq V(G)$, let $\text{deg}(A) = \sum_{v \in A} \text{deg}(v)$. Every $A \subseteq V(G)$ satisfying $\text{deg}(A) \leq m(G)$ is an annihilating set. Clearly, every independent set is annihilating. An annihilating set $A$ is maximal if $\text{deg}(A \cup \{v\}) > m(G)$, for every vertex $v \in V(G) - A$, and it is maximum if $|A| = h(G)$ [31]. For example, if $G = K_{p,q} = (A,B,E)$ and $p > q$, then $A$ is a maximum annihilating set, while $B$ is a maximal annihilating set.

Recall that a vertex-cover of a graph $G$ is a subset of vertices $W \subseteq V(G)$ such that $W \cap \{u,v\} \neq \emptyset$ holds for every $uv \in E(G)$. Notice that a vertex cover need not to be independent.

**Lemma 1.1** Every independent vertex cover of a graph without isolated vertices is a maximal annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let $A$ be an independent vertex cover for a graph $G$. Since $A$ is independent, we get that $\text{deg}(A) = m(G)$. This ensures that $A$ is a maximal annihilating set, because $G$ has no isolated vertices. □

**Theorem 1.2** [37] For every graph $G$, $h(G) \geq \max \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{n(G)}{2} \right\rfloor, \alpha(G) \right\}$.

For instance, $h(C_7) = \alpha(C_7) = \left\lfloor \frac{n(C_7)}{2} \right\rfloor$, $h(T_2) = 3 > \alpha(T_2) = \left\lfloor \frac{n(T_2)}{2} \right\rfloor$, $h(K_{2,3}) = \alpha(K_{2,3}) > \left\lfloor \frac{n(K_{2,3})}{2} \right\rfloor$, while $h(C_6) = \left\lfloor \frac{n(C_6)}{2} \right\rfloor > \alpha(C_6)$. 

2
The annihilation number of a graph were studied in [1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 18, 31].

Theorem 1.3 [23] For a graph \( G \) with \( h(G) \geq \frac{\alpha(G)}{2} \), \( \alpha(G) = h(G) \) if and only if \( G \) is a König-Egerváry graph and every \( S \in \Omega(G) \) is a maximum annihilating set.

Actually, Larson and Pepper [23] proved a stronger result that reads as follows.

Theorem 1.4 Let \( G \) be a graph with \( h(G) \geq \frac{\alpha(G)}{2} \). Then the following are equivalent:

(i) \( \alpha(G) = h(G) \);
(ii) \( G \) is a König-Egerváry graph and every \( S \in \Omega(G) \) is a maximum annihilating set;
(iii) \( G \) is a König-Egerváry graph and some \( S \in \Omega(G) \) is a maximum annihilating set.

Along these lines, it was conjectured that the impacts of maximum and maximal annihilating sets are the same.

Conjecture 1.5 [23] Let \( G \) be a graph with \( h(G) \geq \frac{\alpha(G)}{2} \). Then the following assertions are equivalent:

(i) \( \alpha(G) = h(G) \);
(ii) \( G \) is a König-Egerváry graph and every \( S \in \Omega(G) \) is a maximal annihilating set.

In this paper we validate the "(i) \( \implies \) (ii)" part of Conjecture 1.5, while for the converse, we provide some generic counterexamples, including trees, bipartite graphs that are not trees, and non-bipartite König-Egerváry graphs. Let us notice that, if \( G \) is a König-Egerváry graph, bipartite or non-bipartite, and \( H = qK_1 \cup G \), then \( H \) inherits these properties. Moreover, the relationship between the independence numbers and annihilation numbers of \( G \) and \( H \) remains the same, because \( \alpha(H) = \alpha(G) + q \) and \( h(H) = h(G) + q \). Therefore, it is enough to construct only connected counterexamples.

Finally, we hypothesize that Conjecture 1.5 is true for connected graphs with independence number equal to three.

2 The annihilation number of a sequence

Let \( D = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n) \) be a sequence of real numbers such that \( d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \cdots \leq d_n \). The annihilation number \( h(D, \Theta) \) of \( D \) with respect to the threshold \( \Theta \) is the largest integer \( k \) such that \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} d_i \leq \Theta \). A subsequence \( A \) of \( D \) is maximum if \( |A| = h(D, \Theta) \).

For a subsequence \( A \) of \( D \), let \( \operatorname{deg}(A) = \sum_{i \in \operatorname{Dom}(A)} d_i \), where \( \operatorname{Dom}(A) \) is the set of all indexes defining \( A \). If \( \operatorname{deg}(A) \leq \Theta \), then \( A \) is an annihilating subsequence of \( D \). An annihilating subsequence \( A \) is maximal if \( \operatorname{deg}(A) + d_i > \Theta \) for every index \( i \notin \operatorname{Dom}(A) \).

Example 2.1 Let \( D = (1, 2, 3, 4, 4) \). For \( \Theta = 3 \), we get \( h(D, \Theta) = 2 \) and \( A = (1, 2) \) is a maximum subsequence of \( D \). For \( \Theta = 6 \), we get \( h(D, \Theta) = 3 \) and \( A_1 = (1, 2, 3) \) is a maximum subsequence of \( D \), while \( A_2 = (2, 4) \) is a maximal non-maximum subsequence of \( D \).
Theorem 2.2 Let \( D = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n) \) be a sequence of real numbers such that
\[
d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \cdots \leq d_n, \text{ and } h(D, \Theta) = k.
\]
Then every maximum annihilating subsequence of \( D \) is maximal as well.

**Proof.** Clearly, \( A = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_k) \) is both a maximum and a maximal subsequence of \( D \), as \( h(D, \Theta) = k \).

Let
\[
B = (d_{j_1}, d_{j_2}, \ldots, d_{j_k}), \quad j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_k
\]
be a maximum annihilating subsequence of \( D \). Suppose, to the contrary, that \( B \) is not maximal, i.e., there exists some index \( q \) such that \( d_{j_1} + d_{j_2} + \cdots + d_{j_k} + d_q \leq \Theta \).

If \( q > k \), then
\[
d_{j_1} + d_{j_2} + \cdots + d_{j_k} + d_q \geq d_1 + d_2 + \cdots + d_k + d_q > \Theta.
\]
Therefore, \( q \leq k \). In what follows, without loss of generality, we may assume that \( q \) is the smallest index possible satisfying this inequality.

Let \( C = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_{q-1}, d_q, d_{j_q}, d_{j_{q+1}}, \ldots, d_{j_k}) \). Then we have
\[
d_{j_q} + d_{j_q} + \cdots + d_{j_k} + d_q =
\]
\[
d_1 + d_2 + \cdots + d_{q-1} + d_q + d_{j_q} + d_{j_{q+1}} + \cdots + d_{j_k-1} + d_{j_k} \geq
\]
\[
d_1 + d_2 + \cdots + d_{q-1} + d_q + d_{q+1} + d_{q+2} + \cdots + d_k + d_{j_k} > \Theta,
\]
which contradicts the assumption that \( B \) is not maximal. \( \blacksquare \)

Let us suppose that \( D = (d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n) \) is a degree sequence of a graph \( G \), i.e., \( d_i = \deg(v_i), v_i \in V(G) \), and \( \Theta = m = |E(G)| \). In this case, the definition of the annihilation number of a sequence coincides with the original Pepper’s definition of the annihilation number of the graph \( G \). In what follows, we apply Theorem 2.2 to graphs.

The cycle \( C_5 \) has \( h(C_5) = \alpha(C_5) = \left\lceil \frac{n(C_5)}{2} \right\rceil \) and every of its maximum independent sets is both a maximal and a maximum annihilating set. Notice that \( C_5 \) is not a König-Egerváry graph.

\( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \)

Figure 1: Non-König-Egerváry graphs with \( h(G_1) = 3 \) and \( h(G_2) = 2 \).

Consider the graphs from Figure 1. The graph \( G_1 \) has \( h(G_1) > \alpha(G_1) \) and none of its maximum independent sets is a maximal or a maximum annihilating set. The graph \( G_2 \) has \( h(G_2) = \alpha(G_2) \) and each of its maximum independent sets is both a maximal and a maximum annihilating set. Notice that \( h(G_1) > \frac{n(G_1)}{2} \), while \( h(G_2) < \frac{n(G_2)}{2} \).
Consider now the graphs from Figure 2. The graph $G_1$ has $\alpha(G_1) = \frac{n(G_1)}{2} < h(G_1)$ and each of its maximum independent sets is neither a maximal nor a maximum annihilating set. The graph $G_2$ has $h(G_2) = \alpha(G_2) = \frac{n(G_2)}{2}$, every of its maximum independent sets is both a maximal and a maximum annihilating set, and it has a maximum independent set that is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set, namely $\{a, b\}$. The graph $G_3$ has $h(G_3) = \alpha(G_3) = n(G_3)$, every of its maximum independent sets is both a maximal and maximum annihilating set, and it has a maximum independent set that is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set, namely $\{a, b\}$. The graph $G_4$ has $h(G_4) > \alpha(G_4) > \frac{n(G_4)}{2}$ and none of its maximum independent sets is a maximal or maximum annihilating set.

Theorem 2.3 Let $G$ be a graph with $h(G) \geq \frac{n(G)}{2}$. If $\alpha(G) = h(G)$, then $G$ is a König-Egerváry graph and every maximum independent set is a maximal annihilating set.

Proof. Since $h(G) \geq \frac{n(G)}{2}$ and $\alpha(G) = h(G)$, Theorem 1.3 ensures that $G$ is a König-Egerváry graph and each maximum independent set is a maximum annihilating set. Hence, in accordance with Theorem 2.2 we infer that every maximum independent set is a maximal annihilating set as well. Thus Conjecture 1.5 is half-verified.

3 Tree counterexamples

Recall that if a graph $G$ has a unique maximum independent set, say $S$, and $V(G) - S$ is also an independent set, then $G$ is a strong unique maximum independence graph [14].

Theorem 3.1 [14] (i) A tree is a strong unique maximum independence tree (graph) if and only if the distance between any two leaves is even.

(ii) A connected graph is a strong unique maximum independence graph if and only if it is bipartite and has a spanning tree which is a strong unique maximum independence tree (graph).

Consider the trees from Figures 4 and 5.
• $T_1$ has $m(T_1) = 7$, the degree sequence $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3)$, $h(T_1) = 5 = \alpha(T_1)$, $\Omega(T_1) = \{S_1, S_2\}$, where $S_1 = \{v_1, v_2, v_7, v_8\}$, $S_1 = \{v_1, v_5, v_7, v_8\}$, and $\deg(S_1) = \deg(S_2) = 6$. Hence, every maximum independent set of $T_1$ is both a maximal and a maximum annihilating set.

• $T_2$ has $m(T_2) = 5$, the degree sequence $(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 3)$, $h(T_2) = 4 > \alpha(T_2)$, $\Omega(T_2) = \{S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5\}$, where $S_1 = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ has $\deg(S_1) = 5$, $S_2 = \{b_1, b_2, b_3\}$ has $\deg(S_2) = 5$, $S_3 = \{a_1, a_2, b_3\}$ has $\deg(S_3) = 4$, $S_4 = \{a_1, b_2, a_3\}$ has $\deg(S_4) = 4$, $S_5 = \{a_1, b_2, b_3\}$ has $\deg(S_5) = 3$. Consequently, only $S_1$ and $S_2$ are maximal annihilating sets belonging to $\Omega(T_2)$.

![Figure 4: Trees with $\alpha(T_1) = 5$ and $\alpha(T_2) = 3$.](image)

• $T_3$ has $m(T_3) = 10$, the degree sequence $(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 3, 4)$, $h(T_3) = 8 > \alpha(T_3)$, $\Omega(T_3) = \{S\}$, where $S = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7\}$ has $\deg(S) = 8$. Thus $S$ is a (unique) maximum independent set but not a maximal annihilating set.

![Figure 5: A tree with $\alpha(T_3) = 7$.](image)

**Theorem 3.2** There exist a tree of order $2k + 1, k \geq 4$ and a tree of order $2k + 4, k \geq 3$, satisfying the following conditions:

• $h(T) \geq \frac{\alpha(T)}{2}$,

• each $S \in \Omega(T)$ is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let us consider the trees from Figure 4.

The tree $T_{2k+1}, k \geq 4$, has $n(T_{2k+1}) = 2k + 1$, $m(T_{2k+1}) = 2k$, $\alpha(T_{2k+1}) = k + 1$ and the degree sequence

$$1, \ldots, 1, 2, \ldots, 2, k.$$

Consequently, we infer that $h(T_{2k+1}) = k + \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor > \max\left\{ \frac{n(T_{2k+1})}{2}, \alpha(T_{2k+1}) \right\}$. According to Theorem 3.1(i), $T_{2k+1}$ is a strong unique maximum independence tree. Hence, $\Omega(T_{2k+1}) = \{S\}$, where $S = \{a_1, \ldots, a_k, v\}$. Since $S$ is an independent vertex cover, by
Lemma 1.1 we conclude that each maximum independent set of $T_{2k+1}$ is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

The tree $T_{2k+4}, k \geq 3$, has $n(T_{2k+4}) = 2k + 4, m(T_{2k+4}) = 2k + 3, \alpha(T_{2k+1}) = k + 3$ and the degree sequence

$$1, \ldots, 1, 2, \ldots, 2, 3, k + 1.$$  

Consequently, we infer that $h(T_{2k+1}) = k + 2 + \left\lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \right\rfloor > \max \left\{ \frac{n(T_{2k+4})}{2}, \alpha(T_{2k+4}) \right\}$. According to Theorem 3.1(i), $T_{2k+4}$ is a strong unique maximum independence tree. Hence, $\Omega(T_{2k+4}) = \{S\}$, where $S = \{a_1, \ldots, a_k, v_1, v_2, v_3\}$. Since $S$ is an independent vertex cover, by Lemma 1.1 we conclude that each maximum independent set of $T_{2k+4}$ is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

4 Bipartite counterexamples that are not trees

**Lemma 4.1** The bipartite graph $G_k, k \geq 1$, from Figure 7 has $\alpha(G_k) = k + 4$ and each $S \in \Omega(G_k)$ includes either $A_0 = \{a_i : i = 1, \ldots, 4\}$ or $B_0 = \{b_i : i = 1, \ldots, 4\}$. Moreover, every $S \in \Omega(G_k)$ but one contains $x_k$, and $\deg(S) \in \{2k + 11, 2k + 12\}$.

**Proof.** Let $G_0 = G_k - \{x_1, \ldots, x_k, y_1, \ldots, y_k\} = (A_0, B_0, E_0)$. Clearly, $\alpha(G_0) = 4$ and $A_0, B_0 \in \Omega(G_0)$, because $G_0$ has a perfect matching. The spanning graph

$$L = (V(G_0), \{a_1b_1, b_1a_2, a_2b_2, b_2a_3, a_3b_3, b_3a_4, a_4b_4, b_4a_1\}) = (A_0, B_0, U)$$

of $G_0$ has exactly two maximum independent sets, namely $A_0$ and $B_0$, as $L$ is isomorphic to $C_8$. The graph $G_0$ can be obtained from $L$ by adding some edges keeping $A_0, B_0$ as independent sets. Consequently, we infer that $\Omega(G_0) = \Omega(L) = \{A_0, B_0\}$.
Since $G_k$ is bipartite and has a perfect matching, we get that $\alpha (G_k) = k + 4$ for every $k \geq 1$, and $|S \cap (\{x_i : i = 1, ..., k\} \cup \{y_i : i = 1, ..., k\})| = k$, for each $S \in \Omega (G_k)$.

Assume that there is some $S' \in \Omega (G_k)$ such that both $A_1 = S' \cap A_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $B_1 = S' \cap B_0 \neq \emptyset$. Since

$$S' = (S' \cap (\{x_i : i = 1, ..., k\} \cup \{y_i : i = 1, ..., k\})) \cup A_1 \cup B_1,$$

we get that $A_1 \cup B_1$ is an independent set in $G_0$ of size 4, different from both $A_0$ and $B_0$, thus contradicting the fact that $\Omega (G_0) = \{A_0, B_0\}$. In conclusion, every maximum independent set of $G_k$ includes either $A_0 = \{a_i : i = 1, ..., 4\}$ or $B_0 = \{b_i : i = 1, ..., 4\}$.

Let $S \in \Omega (G_k)$.

Case 1. $y_k \in S$. Then, necessarily, we get that $\{y_i : i = 1, ..., k-1\} \cup B_0 \subset S$, because $y_k a_k \in E(G_k)$. Consequently, $\deg (S) = m(G_k) = 2k + 12$.

Case 2. $y_k \notin S$. Then, necessarily, $x_k \in S$.

If $\{x_i : i = 1, ..., k-1\} \subset S$, we have two options:

- $S = \{x_i : i = 1, ..., k\} \cup A_0$, and therefore, $\deg (S) = m(G_k) = 2k + 12$.
- $S = \{x_i : i = 1, ..., k\} \cup B_0$, and therefore, $\deg (S) = m(G_k) - 1 = 2k + 11$.

Otherwise, if $y_j \in S$, then $\{y_i : i = 1, ..., j-1\} \cup B_0 \subset S$, and hence, we get that $\deg (S) = 2k + 11$. □

**Theorem 4.2** For every $k \geq 0$, there exists a connected bipartite graph $G_k$, of order $2k + 8$, satisfying the following:

- $h(G_k) > \frac{n(G_k)}{2} = \alpha (G_k)$,
- each $S \in \Omega (G_k)$ is a maximal annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let $G_0 = G_k - \{x_1, ..., x_k, y_1, ..., y_k\}$, where $G_k = (A_k, B_k, E_k), k \geq 1$, is the graph from Figure 7, while

$$A_0 = \{a_i : i = 1, 2, 3, 4\}, B_0 = \{b_i : i = 1, 2, 3, 4\},$$

$$A_k = A_0 \cup \{x_1, ..., x_k\} \text{ and } B_k = B_0 \cup \{y_1, ..., y_k\}.$$

Clearly, $\frac{n(G_k)}{2} = \alpha (G_k)$, since every $G_k$ is a bipartite graph with a perfect matching.

Case 1. $k = 0$. The bipartite graph $G_0 = (A_0, B_0, E)$ has $m(G_0) = 12$ and the degree sequence $(2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 4)$. Hence $h(G_0) = 5 > 4 = \alpha (G_0)$. In addition, $\Omega (G_0) = \{A_0, B_0\}$ and $\deg (A_0) = \deg (B_0) = m(G_0)$, i.e., each $S \in \Omega (G_0)$ is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

Case 2. $k = 1$. The bipartite graph $G_1 = (A_1, B_1, E)$ has $m(G_1) = 14$ and the degree sequence $(1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5)$. Hence $h(G_1) = 6 > 5 = \alpha (G_1)$. According to Lemma 4.1 for every $S \in \Omega (G_1)$ we have that $\deg (S) \in \{13, 14\}$, while

$$\deg (S) + \min \{\deg (v) : v \notin S\} > 14,$$

i.e., each $S \in \Omega (G_1)$ is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.
Case 3. $k = 2$. The  bipartite graph $G_2 = (A_2, B_2, E)$ has $m(G_2) = 16$ and the degree sequence $(1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5)$. Hence $h(G_2) = 8 > 6 = \alpha(G_2)$. By Lemma 4.1 for every $S \in \Omega(G_2)$ we have that $\deg(S) \in \{15, 16\}$, while

$$\deg(S) + \min\{\deg(v) : v \notin S\} > 16,$$

i.e., each $S \in \Omega(G_2)$ is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

Case 4. $k \geq 3$. The bipartite graph $G_k = (A_k, B_k, E)$ has the degree sequence

$$1, 2, \ldots, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5.$$ 

Thus $m(G_k) = 2k + 12$. It follows that the sum $1 + 2(2k + 2) + 3 = 4k + 8$ of the first $2k + 4$ degrees is greater than $m(G_k)$ for each $k \geq 3$. Hence, $h(G_k) \leq 2k + 3$.

The inequality $1 + 2x \leq m(G_k)$ leads to $x \leq \frac{2k + 11}{2}$, which gives

$$h(G_k) = 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{2k + 11}{2} \right\rfloor = k + 6 > k + 4 = \alpha(G_k).$$

Lemma 4.1 claims that for every $S \in \Omega(G_k)$ we have that $\deg(S) \in \{2k + 11, 2k + 12\}$. If $S \in \Omega(G_k)$, then $\min\{\deg(v) : v \notin S\} = 1$ if and only if $S = B_0 \cup \{y_1, ..., y_k\}$. To this end, $S$ is a vertex cover of $G_k$. Thus, by Lemma 4.1, $S$ is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

Otherwise, we get that

$$\deg(S) + \min\{\deg(v) : v \notin S\} \geq \deg(S) + 2 > m(G_k).$$

Therefore, each $S \in \Omega(G_k)$ is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set. ■

Lemma 4.3 The graph $G_k, k \geq 0$, from Figure 8 has a unique maximum independent set, namely, $A_k = \{x_k, ..., x_1, a_5, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$, where $G_0 = G_k - \{x_1, ..., x_k, y_1, ..., y_k\}$ and $A_0 = \{a_5, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$.

![Figure 8: A bipartite graph of odd order with $\alpha(G_k) = k + 5, k \geq 0$.](image)

Proof. For every $k \geq 0$, the set $\{x_jy_j : j = 1, ..., k\} \cup \{a_5b_1, a_4b_2, a_3b_3, a_2b_4\}$ is a maximum matching of $G_k$, which gives $\mu(G_k) = k + 4$. Since $|V(G_k)| = 2k + 9 = \alpha(G_k) + \mu(G_k)$ and $A_k$ is an independent set of cardinality $k + 5$, we infer that $A_k \in \Omega(G_k)$ and $\alpha(G_k) = k + 5$.

Consider the trees $T_k = (A_k, V(G_k) - A_k, U), k \geq 1$ and $T_0 = T_k - \{x_j, y_j : 1 \leq j \leq k\}$ from Figure 8. Since all the leaves of $T_k$ belong to $A_k$, it follows that the distance
between any two leaves is even. Consequently, by Theorem 3.1(i), we get that \( T_k \) is a strong unique maximum independence tree, and \( \Omega (T_k) = \{ A_k \} \). On the other hand, \( T_k \) is a spanning tree of \( G_k \), for every \( k \geq 0 \). Further, Theorem 3.1(ii) implies that \( G_k \) is a strong unique maximum independence graph and \( \Omega (G_k) = \{ A_k \} \).

**Theorem 4.4** For each \( k \geq 0 \), there exists a connected bipartite graph \( G_k \) of order \( 2k + 9 \), satisfying the following:

- \( h (G_k) > \left\lceil \frac{n(G_k)}{2} \right\rceil = \alpha (G_k) \),
- every \( S \in \Omega (G_k) \) is a maximal annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let \( G_k = (A_k, B_k, E_k), k \geq 0 \), be the bipartite graph from Figure 8, where

\[
A_0 = \{ a_i : i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 \}, \quad B_0 = \{ b_i : i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \}, \\
A_k = A_0 \cup \{ x_1, ..., x_k \} \text{ and } B_k = B_0 \cup \{ y_1, ..., y_k \}.
\]

Lemma 4.3 claims that \( A_k = \{ x_1, ..., x_k, a_1, ..., a_5 \} \) is the unique maximum independent set of \( G_k \). Hence, \( \left\lceil \frac{n(G_k)}{2} \right\rceil = \alpha (G_k) \), since \( G_k - a_1 \) is bipartite and has a perfect matching.

**Case 1.** \( k = 0 \). The bipartite graph \( G_0 = (A_0, B_0, E_0) \) has \( m (G_0) = 14 \) and the degree sequence \((2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5)\). Hence, \( h(G_0) = 6 > 5 = \alpha(G_0) \). In addition, \( \deg(A_0) = m(G_0) \), i.e., each maximum independent set of \( G_0 \) is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

**Case 2.** \( k = 1 \). The bipartite graph \( G_1 = (A_1, B_1, E_1) \) has \( m(G_1) = 16 \) and the degree sequence \((1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5)\). Hence, \( h(G_1) = 7 > 6 = \alpha(G_1) \). In addition, \( \deg(A_1) = m(G_1) \), while

\[
\deg(A_1) + \min \{ \deg(v) : v \notin A_1 \} \geq 16 + 2 > m (G_1),
\]

i.e., each maximum independent set of \( G_1 \) is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

**Case 3.** \( k = 2 \). The bipartite graph \( G_2 = (A_2, B_2, E_2) \) has \( m(G_2) = 18 \) and the degree sequence \((1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 5, 5, 5)\). Hence, \( h(G_2) = 9 > 7 = \alpha(G_2) \). In addition, \( \deg(A_2) = m(G_2) \), while

\[
\deg(A_2) + \min \{ \deg(v) : v \notin A_2 \} \geq 18 + 2 > m (G_2),
\]

i.e., each maximum independent set of \( G_2 \) is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

**Case 4.** \( k \geq 3 \). The bipartite graph \( G_k = (A_k, B_k, E_k) \) has the degree sequence

\[
1, 2, \ldots, 2, 3, 3, 5, 5, 5.
\]

Thus \( m(G_k) = 2k + 14 \). It follows that the sum \( 1 + 2(2k + 3) + 3 = 4k + 10 \) of the first \( 2k + 5 \) degrees is greater than \( m(G_k) \) for each \( k \geq 3 \). Hence, \( h(G_k) \leq 2k + 4 \).

The inequality \( 1 + 2x \leq m(G_k) \) leads to \( x \leq \frac{2k+13}{2} \), which gives

\[
h(G_k) = 1 + \left\lceil \frac{2k + 13}{2} \right\rceil = k + 7 > k + 5 = \alpha(G_k).
\]
In addition, \( \deg(A_k) = m(G_k) \), while
\[
\deg(A_k) + \min \{ \deg(v) : v \notin A_k \} = 2k + 16 > m(G_k),
\]
i.e., each maximum independent set of \( G_k \) is maximal non-maximum annihilating. ■

5 Non-bipartite König-Egerváry counterexamples

In what follows, we present a series of counterexamples to the opposite direction of Conjecture 1.5 for non-bipartite König-Egerváry graphs. All these graphs have unique maximum independent sets.

Lemma 5.1 The graph \( H_k, k \geq 0 \), from Figure 9 is a König-Egerváry graph that has a unique maximum independent set, namely, \( S_k = \{ x_k, \ldots, x_1, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1 \} \), where \( H_0 = H_k - \{ x_j, y_j : j = 1, 2, \ldots, k \} \) and \( S_0 = \{ a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1 \} \).

![Figure 9: \( H_k \) is a non-bipartite König-Egerváry graph with \( \alpha(H_k) = k + 4, k \geq 0 \).](image)

Proof. Clearly, \( S_k = \{ x_k, \ldots, x_1, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1 \} \) is an independent set and
\[
\{ x_j, y_j : j = 1, 2, \ldots, k \} \cup \{ a_4b_4, a_3b_2, a_3b_3, a_1b_1 \}
\]
is a perfect matching of \( H_k \). Hence, we get
\[
|V_k| = 2\mu(H_k) = |S_k| + \mu(H_k) \leq \alpha(H_k) + \mu(H_k) \leq |V_k|,
\]
which implies \( \alpha(H_k) + \mu(H_k) = |V_k| \), i.e., \( H_k \) is a König-Egerváry graph, and \( \alpha(H_k) = k + 4 = |S_k| \).

Let \( L_k = H_k [X_k \cup Y_k], k \geq 1 \), and \( L_0 = H_k [A \cup B] \), where
\[
X_k = \{ x_j : j = 1, \ldots, k \}, Y_k = \{ y_j : j = 1, \ldots, k \},
A = \{ a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 \} \text{ and } B = \{ b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4 \}.
\]

Since \( L_k \) has, on the one hand, \( K_{k,k} \) as a subgraph, and, on the other hand,
\[
y_ky_{k-1}, y_{k-1}y_{k-2}, \ldots, y_2y_1 \in E(L_k),
\]
it follows that \( X_k \) is the unique maximum independent set of \( L_k \).
The graph $L_0$ has $A$ as a unique independent set, because

$$C_8 + b_3b_4 = (A \cup B, \{a_1b_1, b_1b_3, a_2b_2, a_3b_3, a_4b_3, b_2b_4, a_4b_1, b_1a_1, b_3b_4\})$$

has $A$ as a unique maximum independent set, and $L_0$ can be obtained from $C_8 + b_3b_4$ by adding a number of edges.

Since $H_k$ can be obtained from the union of $L_k$ and $L_0$ by adding some edges, and $S_k = X_k \cup A$ is independent in $H_k$, it follows that $H_k$ has $S_k$ as a unique maximum independent set.

**Corollary 5.2** The graph $H_k, k \geq 0$, from Figure 10 is a König-Egerváry graph that has a unique independent set, namely, $S_k = \{x_i : i = 1, ..., k\} \cup \{a_i : i = 1, ..., 5\}$, where $H_0 = H_k - \{y_j, y_j : j = 1, 2, ..., k\}$ and $S_0 = \{a_i : i = 1, ..., 5\}$.

![Figure 10: $H_k$ is a non-bipartite König-Egerváry graph with $\alpha(G_k) = k + 5, k \geq 0.$](image)

**Proof.** According to Lemma 5.1, $H_k - a_5$ is a König-Egerváry graph with a unique maximum independent set, namely, $W_k = \{x_i : i = 1, ..., k\} \cup \{a_i : i = 1, ..., 4\}$. Since $S_k = W_k \cup \{a_5\}$ is an independent set and $\mu(H_k) = \mu(H_k - a_5) = k + 4$, it follows that $H_k$ is a König-Egerváry graph and $S_k$ is its unique maximum independent set.

The following results show that if the order of the graph is greater or equal to 8, then the converse of Theorem 2.3 is not true for non-bipartite König-Egerváry graphs.

**Theorem 5.3** For every $k \geq 0$, there exists a connected non-bipartite König-Egerváry graph $H_k = (V_k, E_k)$, of order $2k + 8$, satisfying the following:

- $h(H_k) > \frac{n(H_k)}{2} = \alpha(H_k)$,
- each $S \in \Omega(H_k)$ is a maximal annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let $H_k = (V_k, E_k), k \geq 0$, be the graph from Figure 9 (in the bottom and the top lines are written the degrees of its vertices), where $H_0 = H_k - \{x_1, ..., x_k, y_1, ..., y_k\}$. Clearly, every $H_k$ is non-bipartite.

By Lemma 5.1, each $H_k, k \geq 0$, is a König-Egerváry graph with a unique maximum independent set, namely, $S_k = \{x_k, ..., x_1, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$, where $S_0 = \{a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$.

Case 1. $k = 0$. Since $m(H_0) = 13$ and the degree sequence $(2, 2, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5)$, we infer that $h(H_0) = 5 > 4 = \alpha(H_0)$. In addition, $\deg(S_0) = m(H_0) - 1$, i.e., each maximum independent set of $H_0$ is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.
Case 2. $k \geq 1$.

Clearly, $H_k$ has $m(G_k) = k^2 + 9k + 13$ and its degree sequence is

\[
k + 2, k + 2, k + 2, k + 2, k + 3, k + 3, k + 4, \cdots, k + 4, k + 5, k + 5, k + 5, k + 6, \cdots, k + 6.
\]

Since the sum of the first $k + 6$ degrees of the sequence satisfies

\[k^2 + 10k + 16 > m(H_k),\]

we infer that the annihilation number $h(H_k) \leq k + 6$. The sum $12 + 4(x - 5) + kx$ of the first $x \geq 5$ degrees of the sequence satisfies $12 + 4(x - 5) + kx \leq m(H_k)$ for $x \leq \frac{k^2 + 9k + 21}{k + 4}$. This implies

\[h(H_k) = \left \lfloor \frac{k^2 + 9k + 21}{k + 4} \right \rfloor = k + 5 > k + 4 = \alpha(H_k),\]

i.e., $H_k$ has no maximum annihilating set belonging to $\Omega(H_k)$. Since its unique maximum independent set $S_k = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k\}$ has

\[\deg(S_k) = k^2 + 8k + 12 < m(H_k),\]

while

\[\deg(S_k) + \min \{\deg(v) : v \in V_k - S\} = (k^2 + 8k + 12) + (k + 2) > m(H_k),\]

we infer that $S_k$ is a maximal annihilating set.

**Theorem 5.4** For every $k \geq 0$, there exists a connected non-bipartite König-Egerváry graph $H_k = (V_k, E_k)$, of order $2k + 9$, satisfying the following:

- $h(H_k) > \left \lceil \frac{n(H_k)}{2} \right \rceil = \alpha(H_k),$
- each $S \in \Omega(H_k)$ is a maximal annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let $H_k = (V_k, E_k), k \geq 1$, be the graph from Figure 10 (in the bottom and the top lines are written the degrees of its vertices), and $H_0 = H_k - \{x_1, \ldots, x_k, y_1, \ldots, y_k\}$.

Corollary 5.2 claims that $H_k, k \geq 0,$ is a König-Egerváry graph with a unique maximum independent set, namely $S_k = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k, a_1, \ldots, a_5\}, k \geq 1,$ and $S_0 = \{a_1, \ldots, a_5\}$.

**Case 1.** The non-bipartite König-Egerváry graph $H_0$ has $m(H_0) = 15$ and the degree sequence $2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 6, 6$. Hence, $h(H_0) = 6 > 5 = \alpha(G_0)$. In addition, $\Omega(H_0) = \{S_0\}$, and $\deg(S_0) = 14$, i.e., each maximum independent set of $H_0$ is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

**Case 2.** $k \geq 1$.

Clearly, $H_k$ has $m(H_k) = k^2 + 10k + 15$ and its degree sequence is

\[
k + 2, k + 2, k + 2, k + 2, k + 3, k + 3, k + 4, \cdots, k + 4, k + 5, k + 5, k + 5, k + 6, \cdots, k + 6.
\]

Since the sum of the first $k + 7$ degrees of the sequence satisfies

\[k^2 + 11k + 18 > m(H_k),\]
we infer that the annihilation number $h(H_k) \leq k + 6$. The sum $14 + 4(x - 5) + kx$ of the first $x \geq 6$ degrees of the sequence satisfies $14 + 4(x - 6) + kx \leq m(H_k)$ for $x \leq \frac{k^2 + 10k + 25}{k + 4}$. This implies

$$h(H_k) = \left\lfloor \frac{k^2 + 10k + 25}{k + 4} \right\rfloor = k + 6 > k + 5 = \alpha(H_k),$$

i.e., $H_k$ has no maximum annihilating set belonging to $\Omega(H_k)$. Since its unique maximum independent set $S_k$ has $\deg(S_k) = \frac{k^2 + 9k + 14}{k + 4} < m(G_k)$, while

$$\deg(S_k) + \min\{\deg(v) : v \in V_k - S_k\} = \left(\frac{k^2 + 9k + 14}{k + 4}\right) + (k + 2) > m(G_k),$$

we infer that $S_k$ is a maximal annihilating set.

## 6 Conclusions

If $G$ is a König-Egerváry graph with $\alpha(G) \in \{1, 2\}$, then $\alpha(G) = h(G)$ and each maximum independent set is maximal annihilating, since the list of such König-Egerváry graphs reads as follows:

$$\{K_1, K_2, K_1 \cup K_1, K_1 \cup K_2, K_2 \cup K_2, P_3, P_4, C_4, K_3 + e, K_4 - e\}.$$ Consequently, Conjecture 1.5 is correct for König-Egerváry graphs with $\alpha(G) \leq 2$.

Let $G$ be a disconnected König-Egerváry graph with $\alpha(G) = 3$.

- If $\alpha(G) = h(G)$, then

$$G \in \left\{3K_1, 2K_1 \cup K_2, K_1 \cup 2K_2, 3K_2, K_1 \cup P_3, K_1 \cup P_4, K_1 \cup C_4, K_1 \cup (K_3 + e), K_1 \cup (K_4 - e), K_2 \cup P_3, K_2 \cup C_4 \right\},$$

while every $S \in \Omega(G)$ is a maximal annihilating set.

- If $\alpha(G) < h(G)$, then $G \in \{K_2 \cup P_4, K_2 \cup (K_3 + e), K_2 \cup (K_4 - e)\}$, while for every such $G$, there exists a maximum independent set, which is a not a maximal annihilating set. Moreover, for $K_2 \cup (K_3 + e)$ and $K_2 \cup (K_4 - e)$ all maximum independent sets are not maximal annihilating.

Thus Conjecture 1.5 is true for disconnected König-Egerváry graphs with $\alpha(G) = 3$. On the other hand, Theorems 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.3, 5.4 present various counterexamples to the "(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i)" part of Conjecture 1.5 for every independence number greater than three.
Conjecture 6.1 Let $G$ be a graph with $h(G) \geq \frac{n(G)}{2}$. If $G$ is a connected König-Egerváry graph with $\alpha(G) = 3$, and every $S \in \Omega(G)$ is a maximal annihilating set, then $\alpha(G) = h(G)$.
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