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Abstract

For every pair of vertices $u$ and $v$ with $d(u, v) = n$, $W^G_{unv}$ denotes the set of all vertices of $G$ that are closer to $u$ than to $v$. A graph $G$ is said to be quasi-($\lambda, n$)-distance-balanced if $|W^G_{unv}| = \lambda \pm 1|W^G_{vun}|$, for some positive rational number $\lambda > 1$. In this paper, we study some properties of these graphs and present a formula to construct such graphs for arbitrarily diameter $d$. For $n = 1$, this class of graphs contains the quasi-\(\lambda\)-DB graphs recently introduced by Abedi et al. [Quasi-\(\lambda\)-distance-balanced graphs, Discrete Appl. Math. 227 (2017) 21–28]. Moreover, we will take a look at the problems arisen by Abedi et al. Some problems and a conjecture are involved.
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1. Introduction

It is well-known that in graph theory, the distance-balanced graphs are considered as one of the important class of graphs (see [2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12] and the references therein). The significance of these graphs is evident from their applications in various areas, especially theoretical computer science (more precisely, balance in communication networks), and molecular analysis in chemical studies. One of the motivations of distance-balanced property is its application in partitioning the network topology into two equal pieces of nodes, the halves may have a very different structure, in particular their metric properties can be very different. If we have an option to design a network in advance (say, in the situation when two parties are competing in a common market with an objective to minimize the cost of transport between all its nodes, it seems fair to design a network in such a way that neither of the involved parties has an advantage to the other). In another word, structuring the distance-balanced graphs brings us the fairness in distribution of benefits.

Let $G$ be a finite, undirected and connected graph with diameter $d$, and let $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ indicate the vertex set and the edge set of $G$, respectively. For $a, b \in V(G)$, let $d_G(a, b)$ (or simply $d(a, b)$) stand for the minimal path-length distance between $a$ and $b$. For any pair of vertices $a, b$ of $G$ with $d(a, b) = n$, we denote

$$W^G_{anb} = \{ x \in V(G) \mid d(x, a) < d(x, b) \},$$

and

$$W^G_{a \pm b} = \{ x \in V(G) \mid d(x, a) = d(x, b) \}.$$
In 2017, Abedi et al. \cite{II} presented a class of graphs, so-called \textit{quasi-λ-distance-balanced} (DB) graphs, in which either $|W_{ab}^G| = \lambda |W_{ba}^G|$ or $|W_{ba}^G| = \lambda |W_{ab}^G|$, for some positive rational number $\lambda > 1$. Here, $W_{ab}^G = W_{ab}^{G\lambda}$.

The study of quasi-λ-DB graphs is only beginning \cite{II, 7}. Inspired by the notion of quasi-λ-DB graph together with the $n$-distance-balanced property introduced by Faghani, Pourhadi and Kharazi \cite{5} we present a new class of graphs as follows.

**Definition 1.1.** A graph $G$ is called \textit{quasi-$(\lambda, n)$-distance-balanced} (for short, quasi-$(\lambda, n)$-DB) if for each $a, b \in V(G)$ with $d(a, b) = n$ we have either $|W_{ab}^G| = \lambda |W_{ba}^G|$ or $|W_{ba}^G| = \lambda |W_{ab}^G|$, for some positive rational number $\lambda > 1$.

For $n = \lambda = 1$ the graph $G$ is simply called \textit{distance-balanced}, which was initially introduced by Jerebic et al. \cite{10} and for $n = 1$, $G$ is called quasi-λ-distance-balanced graph defined by Abedi et al. \cite{1}.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we investigate the quasi-λ-distance-balanced graphs and reveal some related facts, and then we focus the problems recently arisen in Abedi et al. \cite{1}.

In Section 3, we introduce a new class of graphs which generalizes the quasi-λ-distance-balanced graphs and then present some results and a method to structure concerning with these graphs. Furthermore, some problems and a conjecture for the further studies are included.

2. Some facts of quasi-λ-distance-balanced graphs

In 2017, Abedi et al. \cite{II} introduced the notion of quasi-λ-distance-balanced graph which is the special case of quasi-$(\lambda, n)$-distance-balanced graph by setting $n = 1$. Since all examples of quasi-λ-DB graphs known to the authors are bipartite graphs, they arose the following natural question:

**Problem 2.1 (II).** \textit{Does there exist a non-bipartite quasi-λ-DB graph?}

In the following, we give the negative response for the above problem.

**Theorem 2.2.** \textit{If $G$ is a connected quasi-λ-distance-balanced graph, then $G$ is bipartite.}

**Proof.** Inspired by the proof of \cite{II} Theorem 1.3, let $G$ be a quasi-λ-DB graph with $d = \text{diam}(G)$, and the vertex set $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{2l+1}\}$ form an odd circle with length $2l + 1$ such that $v_i v_{i+1} \in E(G)$ and

\[
A_{ij} = \left\{ v \in V(G) \mid d(v, v_{i+k}) = m_{jk}, \ m_{jk} = \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}, k = 0, 1, \ldots, 2l \right\}, \quad 2 \leq j \leq r
\]

such that

\[
W_{v_i v_{i+j}}^G = \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^{r} A_{ij} \right) \cup \{v_i, v_{i+2l}\} \quad W_{v_{i+j} v_{i}}^G = \left( \bigcup_{j=1}^{r} A_{(i+j)j} \right) \cup \{v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}\}
\]

where the calculations in indexes $i$ are performed modulo $2l + 1$ and some $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Taking $|A_{ij}| = a_{ij}$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, 2l$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, r$ and following the hypothesis there exist $e_i \in \{\pm 1\}$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, 2l$, such that

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{0j} + 2 = \lambda^{e_0} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{1j} + 2 \right),
\]

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{1j} + 2 = \lambda^{e_1} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{2j} + 2 \right),
\]

\[
\vdots
\]

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{(2l-1)j} + 2 = \lambda^{e_{2l-1}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{(2l)j} + 2 \right),
\]

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{(2l)j} + 2 = \lambda^{e_{2l}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{0j} + 2 \right).
\]
Now, multiplying all \((2l + 1)\) equations above implies that \(\lambda \Sigma_{i=0}^{2l} c_i = 1\), that is, \(\Sigma_{i=0}^{2l} c_i = 0\). On the other hand,

\[ e_i \in \{\pm 1\} \implies 1 \leq |\Sigma_{i=0}^{2l} c_i| \]

which is a contradiction and hence \(G\) has no odd circle. This completes the proof.

**Remark 2.3.** A bipartite graph has unbalanced parity if the two vertex sets are not the same size. To describe more, such a graph cannot be Hamiltonian, because a Hamilton circuit must alternate between the two vertex sets.

**Remark 2.4.** From Theorem 1.5 in [7] if \(G\) is a connected quasi-\(\lambda\)-distance-balanced graph with \(\delta(G) > 1\) then it is 2-connected and only stars are the quasi-\(\lambda\)-distance-balanced graphs with bridge. Moreover, stars are the only connected quasi-\(\lambda\)-distance-balanced graphs with \(\delta(G) = 1\).

2.1. Local operations

In this section we consider local operations on graphs and establish that they typically demolish the quasi-\(\lambda\)-distance-balanced property.

**Theorem 2.5.** If \(G\) is a connected quasi-\(\lambda\)-distance-balanced graph with \(\delta(G) > 1\), then for any adjacent edges \(e_1, e_2 \in E(G)\) either \(G - e_1\) or \(G - e_2\) is not quasi-\(\lambda\)-distance-balanced graph.

**Proof.** Let \(e_1 = ab, e_2 = ac\) be adjacent edges in \(G\), without loss of generality and using Remark 2.4 let \(c\) belong to \(P_1\) as the shortest path connecting \(a\) to \(b\) in \(H_1 = G - e_1\). Suppose that \(x \in W_{ca}^G\). Following the fact that \(e_1\) does not lie on any shortest \((x, c)\)-path in \(G\) we get \(d_{H_1}(x, c) = d_{G}(x, c)\). This implies that

\[ d_{H_1}(x, a) > d_{G}(x, a) > d_{G}(x, c) = d_{H_1}(x, c) \]

which shows that \(x \in W_{ca}^{H_1}\), that is, \(W_{ca}^{H_1} \subseteq W_{ca}^{G}\). On the other hand, \(b \in W_{ac}^{G} \cup a W_{c}^{G} = W_{ac}^{G}\) and \(b \in W_{ca}^{H_2}\) which yields

\[ |W_{ca}^{H_1}| \geq |W_{ca}^{G}| + 1. \tag{2.1} \]

Since \(G\) is a quasi-\(\lambda\)-distance-balanced graph we consider the following cases:

**Case 1.** If \(|W_{ca}^{G}| = \lambda|W_{ca}^{G}|\) then using (2.1) we obtain

\[ |W_{ca}^{H_1}| \geq |W_{ca}^{G}| + 1 = \lambda|W_{ac}^{G}| + 1 \geq \lambda|W_{ac}^{H_1}| + 1 > \lambda|W_{ac}^{H_1}|. \]

Hence, \(|W_{ca}^{H_1}| \neq \lambda|W_{ac}^{H_1}|\). Furthermore, if \(|W_{ac}^{H_1}| = \lambda|W_{ca}^{H_1}|\) then we have

\[ |W_{ca}^{H_1}| \geq |W_{ca}^{G}| + 1 = \lambda|W_{ac}^{G}| + 1 \geq \lambda|W_{ac}^{H_1}| + 1 = \lambda^2|W_{ac}^{H_1}| + 1 \]

which is a contradiction. Therefore, \(H_1\) is not quasi-\(\lambda\)-distance-balanced.

**Case 2.** Now suppose that \(|W_{ac}^{G}| = \lambda|W_{ca}^{G}|\). Obviously, \(|W_{ac}^{H_1}| \neq \lambda|W_{ca}^{H_1}|\) since

\[ \lambda|W_{ac}^{H_1}| \geq \lambda|W_{ca}^{G}| + \lambda = |W_{ac}^{G}| + 1 \geq |W_{ac}^{H_1}| + 1 > |W_{ac}^{H_1}|. \]

For this case if \(H_1\) is not quasi-\(\lambda\)-distance-balanced, then the proof is complete, otherwise, let us consider \(|W_{ca}^{H_1}| = \lambda|W_{ac}^{H_1}|\).

**Case 2.1.** If \(|W_{ca}^{G}| = \lambda|W_{ca}^{G}|\), then by the same reasoning for the edge \(e_2\) and considering a path \(P_2\) for \(H_2 = G - e_2\) we arrive at some equalities similar to the ones above. That is,

\[ |W_{ab}^{G}| = \lambda|W_{ba}^{G}|, \quad |W_{ba}^{H_2}| = \lambda|W_{ab}^{H_2}| \]

which is a contradiction since it would imply that $|W_{ab}^G| = |W_{ba}^G| = \frac{|V(G)|}{\lambda+1}$.

**Case 2.2.** Now suppose that $|W_{ab}^G| = \lambda|W_{ba}^G|$, then considering the edge $e_3 = bd \in E(G)$ for $a \neq d$ and a path $P_3$ for $H_3 = G - e_3$ we similarly derive that

$$|W_{ba}^G| = \lambda|W_{ab}^G|, \quad |W_{ab}^{H_3}| = \lambda|W_{ba}^{H_3}|$$

which shows that $G$ is DB-graph and this is a contradiction.

This completes the proof.

Let us denote the complete graph and the cycle of order $n$ by $K_n$ and $C_n$, respectively. The complement or inverse of a graph $G$ is a graph $\overline{G}$ on the same vertices such that two vertices of $\overline{G}$ are adjacent if and only if they are not adjacent in $G$.

**Corollary 2.6.** Let graph $G$ with $\delta(G) > 1$ be given. Suppose that $G + e_i$ are quasi-$\lambda$-DB graphs for $i = 1, 2$ and $e_1, e_2$ are two adjacent edges of $G$. Then $G + e_1 + e_2$ is not quasi-$\lambda$-DB.

**Proof.** Set $H := G + e_1 + e_2$. Suppose that $H$ is a quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced graph. Then by Theorem 2.5, either $H_1 := H - e_1$ or $H_2 := H - e_2$, is not quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced, which contradicts the hypothesis.

The join $G + H$ of graphs $G$ and $H$ with disjoint vertex sets $V_1$ and $V_2$ and edge sets $E_1$ and $E_2$ is the graph union $G \cup H$ together with all the edges joining $V_1$ and $V_2$. Since quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced graphs are triangle free it is obvious that $G \cup H$ has no such property for any nontrivial graphs $G$ and $H$. Hence, $G \cup H$ is quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced if and only if $G$ and $H$ are empty graphs, that is, $G \cup H = K_{m,n}$ where $m,n$ are the order of $G$ and $H$, and $m \neq n$.

For a vertex $u$ of $G$ the total distance $D_G(u)$ of $u$ is $D_G(u) = \Sigma_{v \in V(G)} d_G(u, v)$. Whenever $G$ will be clear from the context we will write $d(u, v)$ and $D(u)$ instead of $d_G(u, v)$ and $D_G(u)$, respectively.

**Proposition 2.7.** Suppose that $G$ is a quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced graph, then for any $u, v \in V(G)$ with $d(u, v) = 2$ we have $D(u) + D(v)$ is even.

**Proof.** Suppose that $u, v, w \in V(G)$ with $d(u, v) = 2$ and $d(u, w) = d(w, v) = 1$.

**Theorem 2.8 ([2]).** Let $G$ be a connected graph. Then $G$ is distance-balanced if and only if $|\{D(u) : u \in V(G)\}| = 1$, that is, $G$ is transmission-regular.

Since any quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced graph is bipartite, it seems we have only two values for $|W_{ab}^G|$. Using this together with the structure of known such graphs that we suspect the following is true.

**Conjecture 2.9.** If $G$ is quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced graph then

$$|\{\deg(u) : u \in V(G)\}| = |\{D(u) : u \in V(G)\}| = 2.$$

### 2.2. Quasi-$\lambda$-DB and some graph products

The corona product $G \circ H$ is obtained by taking one copy of $G$ and $|V(G)|$ copies of $H$; and by joining each vertex of the $i$-th copy of $H$ to the $i$th vertex of $G$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |V(G)|$.

**Theorem 2.10.** The corona product of two arbitrary, nontrivial graphs $G$ and $H$ is quasi-$\lambda$-DB if and only if $G$ and $H$ are empty graphs. Moreover, $\lambda = |V(H)|$. 
Proof. Suppose that $G$ and $H$ are arbitrary, nontrivial and connected graphs, and let $H_i$ be the $i$-th copy of $H$, where $i = 1, 2, \ldots, |V(G)|$. Assume that $G \circ H$ is quasi-$\lambda$-DB and $uv \in E(G \circ H)$ such that $u \in V(G)$ and $v \in V(H_i)$. Hence, we get

$$|W_{uv}^{G \circ H}| = \lambda |W_{uv}^G| = \lambda = |V(G)|(|V(H)| + 1) - \deg_{G \circ H}(v).$$

which implies that $H$ must be regular. On the other hand if $uv \in E(H_i)$ then

$$|W_{uv}^{G \circ H}| = |W_{uv}^H| < \lambda, \quad |W_{uv}^{G \circ H}| = |W_{uv}^G| < \lambda$$

which is a contradiction unless $H$ is an empty graph. Now suppose that $uv \in E(G)$ then

$$|W_{uv}^{G \circ H}| = |W_{uv}^G| + |V(H)| < \lambda, \quad |W_{uv}^{G \circ H}| = |W_{uv}^G| + |V(H)| < \lambda$$

which contradicts that $G \circ H$ is a quasi-$\lambda$-DB graph, hence $G$ is an empty graph. That is, $G \circ H$ is disconnected and formed by $|V(G)|$ disjoint stars $S_k$ where $k = |V(H)|$. The converse is obvious and so the consequence follows.

Very recently, a problem concerning with characterizing the quasi-$\lambda$-DB direct products has been arisen by Abedi et al. [1]. Throughout this section, we present some facts regarding with quasi-$\lambda$-DB direct products which can be helpful in further investigations. Recall that two vertices $(u_1, u_2), (v_1, v_2) \in V(G) \times V(H)$ are adjacent in $G \times H$ when $u_1v_1 \in E(G)$ and $u_2v_2 \in E(H)$.

Remark 2.11. The graphs $G, H$ have a triangle, and more general, have an odd cycle with same type if and only if the direct product $G \times H$ has. Therefore, for this case $G \times H$ cannot be quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced.

Remark 2.12. If $G \times H$ is connected then $G$ or $H$ is not quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced. Therefore, there is no connected quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced graph $G \times H$ while both $G$ and $H$ are quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced. In other words, if $G$ and $H$ are quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced, then $G \times H$ is disconnected. Moreover, a sufficient condition for the connectedness of $G \times H$ is that $|E(G)| + |E(H)|$ must be even (see also [2]).

In the following we define a new concept related to regularity in graphs to present a result concerning with quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced property of $G \times H$. First, suppose that $\Deg(G)$ denotes the set of all distinct degrees observed in $G$.

Definition 2.13. A graph $G$ is said to be $(k_1, k_2)$-regular if $\Deg(G) = \{k_1, k_2\}$ and no adjacent vertices have the same degree.

Remark 2.14. According to Conjecture 2.9 we conjecture that any quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced graph is $(k_1, k_2)$-regular for some $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$.

Denoted by $D_{i,j}^G(x, y)$ we mean

$$D_{i,j}^G(x, y) = \{u \in V(G) \mid d(u, x) = i, d(u, y) = j\}.$$

The consequence of the following result maybe useful for the future studies.

Proposition 2.15. Suppose $G, H$ are $(r_1, \tau_1)$-regular and $(r_2, \tau_2)$-regular graphs, respectively, where $r_1 > \tau_1$ and $r_2 > \tau_2$ with $r_1 + r_2 = \tau_1 + \tau_2$ and $\diam(G) = \diam(H) = 3$. Also, let $G, H$ be quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced such that

$$\lambda = \frac{n_G + n_H}{2(r_1 + r_2)} > 1, \quad n_G := |V(G)| > n_H := |V(H)|.$$

Then there is no $\lambda^* > 1$ in which the graph $G \times H$ is quasi-$\lambda^*$-distance-balanced.
Proof. Following the Definition \[2.13\] and hypotheses, assume that
\[ \deg_G(x) = r_1, \quad \deg_G(y) = r_1, \quad \deg_H(a) = r_2, \quad \deg_H(b) = r_2. \]

Then, without loss of generality, we get
\[ |W^G_{xy}| = r_1 + |D^G_{2,3}(x, y)|, \quad |W^G_{yx}| = r_1 + |D^G_{2,3}(y, x)|, \quad |W^H_{ab}| = r_2 + |D^H_{2,3}(a, b)|, \quad |W^H_{ba}| = r_2 + |D^H_{2,3}(b, a)|, \]
for any edges \( xy \in E(G) \) and \( ab \in E(H) \).

We know that for every pair of vertices \( (r, s), (t, w) \in V(G \times H) \) we have that \( d_{G \times H}((r, s), (t, w)) = i \) if and only if either \( d_G(r, t) = i \) and \( i - d_H(s, w) \) is a nonnegative even number or \( d_H(s, w) = i \) and \( i - d_G(r, t) \) is a nonnegative even number (see also \([2, \text{Lemma 1.1}]\)). Now, consider the case
\[ |W^G_{xy}| = \lambda|W^G_{yx}| = \frac{n_G}{\lambda + 1}, \quad |W^H_{ab}| = \lambda|W^H_{ba}| = \frac{n_H}{\lambda + 1} \]
regarding the assumption that \( G, H \) are quasi-\( \lambda \)-distance-balanced and so bipartite.

For any arbitrary fixed edges \( xy \in E(G) \) and \( ab \in E(H) \), let \( (u, v) \in W^G \times H(x, a)(y, b) \) then
\[ d_{G \times H}((u, v), (x, a)) < d_{G \times H}((u, v), (y, b)). \]

We know that for every pair of vertices \( (r, s), (t, w) \in V(G \times H) \) we have that \( d_{G \times H}((r, s), (t, w)) = i \) if and only if either \( d_G(r, t) = i \) and \( i - d_H(s, w) \) is a nonnegative even number or \( d_H(s, w) = i \) and \( i - d_G(r, t) \) is a nonnegative even number (see also \([2, \text{Lemma 1.1}]\)). Now, since \( \text{diam}(G) = \text{diam}(H) = 3 \) we have
\[ d_{G \times H}((u, v), (x, a)) \in \{1, 2\}, \quad d_{G \times H}((u, v), (y, b)) \in \{2, 3\}. \]

If \( d_{G \times H}((u, v), (y, b)) = 3 \) then
\[ d_G(u, y) = 3, \quad d_H(v, b) \in \{1, 3\} \quad \text{or} \quad d_H(v, b) = 3, \quad d_G(u, y) \in \{1, 3\}. \]

On the other hand, \( d_{G \times H}((u, v), (x, a)) \in \{1, 2\} \) implies that
\[ ux \in E(G), \quad va \in E(H) \quad \text{or} \quad u = x, \quad d_H(v, a) = 2 \quad \text{or} \quad v = a, \quad d_G(u, x) = 2. \]

Eqs. \((2.4)\) and \((2.5)\) imply the following cases:
\[ (u = x, \quad d_H(v, a) = 2), \quad (d_H(v, b) = 3, \quad d_G(u, y) \in \{1, 3\}) \implies (u, v) \in \{x\} \times D^H_{2,3}(a, b) \]
or
\[ (v = a, \quad d_G(u, x) = 2), \quad (d_G(u, y) = 3, \quad d_H(v, b) \in \{1, 3\}) \implies (u, v) \in D^G_{2,3}(x, y) \times \{a\}. \]

That is,
\[ W^G \times H_{(x, a)(y, b)} \subset \left( \{x\} \times D^H_{2,3}(a, b) \right) \cup \left( D^G_{2,3}(x, y) \times \{a\} \right). \]

One can easily show that the converse of \((2.6)\) is also true, thus
\[ W^G \times H_{(x, a)(y, b)} = \left( \{x\} \times D^H_{2,3}(a, b) \right) \cup \left( D^G_{2,3}(x, y) \times \{a\} \right), \]
\[ W^G \times H_{(y, b)(x, a)} = \left( \{y\} \times D^H_{2,3}(a, b) \right) \cup \left( D^G_{2,3}(x, y) \times \{b\} \right). \]
Then using (2.2) and (2.13) we get
\[ \left| W_{x,a}^{G \times H} (y,b) \right| = \left| D_{2,3}^H (a, b) \right| + \left| D_{2,3}^G (x, y) \right|, \quad \left| W_{(y,b)(x,a)}^{G \times H} \right| = \left| D_{3,2}^H (a, b) \right| + \left| D_{3,2}^G (x, y) \right|. \tag{2.8} \]

This together with (2.2) and (2.8) imply that
\[ \left| W_{x,a}^{G \times H} (y,b) \right| = \left( \frac{n_G}{\lambda + 1} - r_1 \right) + \left( \frac{n_H}{\lambda + 1} - r_2 \right), \quad \left| W_{(y,b)(x,a)}^{G \times H} \right| = \left( \frac{n_G}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - \overline{r}_1 \right) + \left( \frac{n_H}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - \overline{r}_2 \right) \]
which shows that
\[ \left| W_{x,a}^{G \times H} (y,b) \right| = \lambda_1 \left| W_{(y,b)(x,a)}^{G \times H} \right| \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda_1 = \frac{\lambda(n_G + n_H) - (r_1 + r_2)\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{(n_G + n_H) - (\overline{r}_1 + \overline{r}_2)\lambda(\lambda + 1)} > 1. \tag{2.9} \]

Now, consider the second case
\[ |W_{y,z}^G| = \lambda |W_{xy}^G| = \frac{n_G}{\lambda + 1}, \quad |W_{ab}^H| = \lambda |W_{ba}^H| = \frac{n_H}{\lambda + 1}. \tag{2.10} \]

Considering this together with (2.2) and (2.8) we obtain
\[ \left| W_{x,a}^{G \times H} (y,b) \right| = \left( \frac{n_G}{\lambda + 1} - r_1 \right) + \left( \frac{n_H}{\lambda + 1} - r_2 \right), \quad \left| W_{(y,b)(x,a)}^{G \times H} \right| = \left( \frac{n_G}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - \overline{r}_1 \right) + \left( \frac{n_H}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - \overline{r}_2 \right) \]
which means that
\[ \left| W_{x,a}^{G \times H} (y,b) \right| = \lambda_2 \left| W_{(y,b)(x,a)}^{G \times H} \right| \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{(\lambda n_G + n_H) - (r_1 + r_2)\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{(n_G + n_H) - (r_1 + r_2)\lambda(\lambda + 1)} > 1. \tag{2.11} \]

For the third case, suppose that
\[ |W_{xy}^G| = \lambda |W_{y,z}^G| = \frac{n_G}{\lambda + 1}, \quad |W_{ab}^H| = \lambda |W_{ba}^H| = \frac{n_H}{\lambda + 1}. \tag{2.12} \]

Then using (2.2) and (2.8) we get
\[ \left| W_{x,a}^{G \times H} (y,b) \right| = \left( \frac{n_G}{\lambda + 1} - r_1 \right) + \left( \frac{n_H}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - \overline{r}_2 \right), \quad \left| W_{(y,b)(x,a)}^{G \times H} \right| = \left( \frac{n_G}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - \overline{r}_1 \right) + \left( \frac{n_H}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - \overline{r}_2 \right) \]
Therefore,
\[ \left| W_{x,a}^{G \times H} (y,b) \right| = \lambda_2 \left| W_{(y,b)(x,a)}^{G \times H} \right| \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda_2 = \frac{(\lambda n_G + n_H) - (r_1 + r_2)\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{(n_G + n_H) - (r_1 + r_2)\lambda(\lambda + 1)} > 1. \tag{2.13} \]

For the last case let us take
\[ |W_{y,z}^G| = \lambda |W_{y,z}^G| = \frac{n_G}{\lambda + 1}, \quad |W_{ab}^H| = \lambda |W_{ba}^H| = \frac{n_H}{\lambda + 1}. \tag{2.14} \]

Then using (2.2) and (2.13) we get
\[ \left| W_{x,a}^{G \times H} (y,b) \right| = \left( \frac{n_G}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - r_1 \right) + \left( \frac{n_H}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - r_2 \right), \quad \left| W_{(y,b)(x,a)}^{G \times H} \right| = \left( \frac{n_G}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - \overline{r}_1 \right) + \left( \frac{n_H}{\lambda(\lambda + 1)} - \overline{r}_2 \right). \]
which implies that
\[
\left| W^{G \times H}_{(y,b)(x,a)} \right| = \lambda_1 \left| W^{G \times H}_{(x,a)(y,b)} \right|.
\] (2.15)

Moving forward, one can see that \( \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 \), since
\[
\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 \iff \frac{\lambda(n_G + n_H) - (r_1 + r_2)\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{\lambda_2(n_G + n_H) - (r_1 + r_2)\lambda(\lambda + 1)} = \frac{\lambda n_G + n_H - (r_1 + r_2)\lambda(\lambda + 1)}{\lambda_2(n_G + n_H) - (r_1 + r_2)\lambda(\lambda + 1)}.
\]

Hence, \( G \times H \) can not be quasi-\( \lambda^* \)-distance-balanced graph if \( \lambda^* = \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = -1 \) which contradicts, and the proof is complete.

The recent result is valuable because of the following remark.

\[ \text{Remark 2.16.} \text{ Following Conjecture 2.9 and Remark 2.14, it seems } G \times H \text{ cannot be a quasi-}\lambda^*\text{-distance-balanced graph for any } \lambda^* > 1 \text{ whenever } G, H \text{ are quasi-}\lambda\text{-distance-balanced graphs with diameter 3.} \]

2.3. A method to construct quasi-\( \lambda \)-distance-balanced graphs

In the following we first improve the method presented by Abedi et al. [1] to obtain the quasi-\( \lambda \)-distance-balanced graphs and then using a new technique we generate the quasi-\( \lambda \)-distance-balanced graphs with arbitrary diameter.

Given the simple graphs \( G_1, G_2 \), by the symbol \( G_1 \ast G_2 \) we mean
\[
V(G_1 \ast G_2) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2), \quad E(G_1 \ast G_2) = \{ab \mid a \in V(G_1), b \in V(G_2)\} \cup E(G_1) \cup E(G_2).
\]

Moreover, notation \( G_1 \ast G_2 \ast \cdots \ast G_k \) stands for the graph \((G_1 \ast G_2 \ast \cdots \ast G_k) \cup (G_1 \ast G_k)\) which looks like a cycle (see Figure 4).

\[ \text{Definition 2.17.} \text{ Let } G \text{ be a non-empty } (t_1, t_2)\text{-biregular bipartite graph of order } (n_1 + n_2) \text{ with bipartition sets } B \text{ and } C \text{ with sizes } n_1 \text{ and } n_2, \text{ and degree sets } \{t_1\} \text{ and } \{t_2\}, \text{ respectively. Let } m \text{ and } k \text{ be non-zero integers with } 1 \leq n_1 + m \leq n_2 + k. \text{ Let } A \text{ and } D \text{ be sets of size } m \text{ and } k, \text{ respectively. Graph } H(m, G, k) \text{ is defined as the graph with vertex set } V(H) = A \cup B \cup C \cup D, \text{ and edge set } E(H) = E(A \ast B) \cup E(G) \cup E(C \ast D) \text{ (see Figure 1).} \]

For the case \( t = t_1 = t_2 \) and \( n = n_1 = n_2 \), graph \( Ala(m, G, k) \) in [1] Definition 3.1] is obtained.

Figure 1: \((3,4)\)-regular bipartite graph \( G = B \cup C \) and the sets \( A, D \) in the structure of \( H(m, G, k) \).
Proof. In view of the proof of \[1, Proposition 3.2\], for any adjacent vertices \(u \) and \(v\) in \(V(G)\), \(W_m \cup W^n_H = V(H)\) since \(H\) is bipartite, suppose that \(a \in A\) and \(b \in B\) are taken arbitrarily, then it is easily seen that

\[
|W_H^{ab}| = 1 + (n_1 - 1) + (n_2 - t_1) + 0 = n_1 + n_2 - t_1,
\]

\[
|W_H^{ba}| = 1 + (m - 1) + t_1 + k = m + k + t_1.
\]

Moving forward, letting \(b \in B, c \in C\) and \(d \in D\) with \(bc \in E(G)\), we get

\[
|W_H^{bc}| = m + (1 + n_1 - t_2) + (t_1 - 1) + 0 = m + n_1 + t_1 - t_2,
\]

\[
|W_H^{cb}| = k + (1 + n_2 - t_1) + (t_2 - 1) + 0 = k + n_2 + t_2 - t_1,
\]

\[
|W_H^{cd}| = 1 + (k - 1) + n_2 + m = k + m + t_2,
\]

\[
|W_H^{dc}| = 1 + (n_2 - 1) + (n_1 - t_2) + 0 = n_1 + n_2 - t_2.
\]

Hence, if \(H(m, G, k)\) is a quasi-\(\lambda\)-DB graph then

\[
\frac{n_1 + n_2 - t_1}{k + m + t_1}, \quad \frac{n_1 + n_2 - t_2}{k + m + t_2}, \quad \frac{m + n_1 + t_1 - t_2}{k + n_2 + t_2 - t_1} \in \{\lambda, \lambda^{-1}\},
\]

whic occurs only if \(t_1 = n_2 - m\) and \(t_2 = n_1 - k\), and then following \((2.16)\) one can see that \(\lambda\) would take the form \(\lambda = \frac{n_2 + k}{n_2 + m}\). For the converse, considering the discussion above, the desired conclusion follows. Furthermore, \(H(m, G, k)\) is DB if and only if each fraction in \((2.16)\) is identically equal to 1, that is, it must be \(t_1 = t_2 = n_1 - k = n_2 - m\). Therefore, the proof is complete.

In the following, Figure 2 shows a quasi-\(\frac{2}{3}\)-DB graph \(H(3, G, 2) = 3K_1 \ast G \ast 2K_1\) where \(G\) is a \((3, 2)\)-biregular bipartite graph. And this is because of the fact that \(t_1 = n_2 - m = 3\) and \(t_2 = n_1 - k = 2\). Moreover, \(|W_H^{ab}| \in \{7, 8\}\) for any edge \(ab \in E(H)\).

Remark 2.19. In view of the assumptions of Proposition 2.18 notice that for the case \(t_1 = t_2\) one can simply derive that \(n_1 = n_2\) and then \(k = m\).
In Figures 3-4, using the empty graphs $mK_1$ and $nK_1$, and the operation $\ast$ we present a new class of quasi-$\lambda$-distance-balanced graphs with diameter 2. Here, for any $x \in V(nK_1)$ and $y \in V(mK_1)$ we see that

$$|W_{xy}^{G_1}| = \lambda |W_{yx}^{G_1}|, \quad \lambda = \frac{2m}{n} \quad \text{(if } 2m > n),$$

$$|W_{xy}^{G_2}| = \lambda |W_{yx}^{G_2}|, \quad \lambda = \frac{m}{n} \quad \text{(if } m > n),$$

$$|W_{xy}^{G_3}| = \lambda |W_{yx}^{G_3}|, \quad \lambda = \frac{n}{2m} \quad \text{(if } 2m < n),$$

$$|W_{xy}^{G_4}| = \lambda |W_{yx}^{G_4}|, \quad \lambda = \frac{n}{m} \quad \text{(if } m < n).$$

Figure 3: Graph $G_1 = mK_1 \ast nK_1 \ast mK_1, n \neq 2m$, is a quasi-$\lambda$-DB graph with diameter 2.

Figure 4: Graph $G_2 = mK_1 \ast nK_1 \ast mK_1 \ast nK_1, n \neq m$, is a quasi-$\lambda$-DB graph with diameter 2.

In the following figure, graph $G_3 = mK_1 \ast nK_1 \ast mK_1 \ast \cdots \ast mK_1 \ast nK_1, n \neq m$, is a quasi-$\lambda$-DB graph with diameter $d$ and $\lambda = \frac{m}{n}$ if $m > n$. 
In Figure 6, we exemplify the method illustrated above for

$$G_4 = K_1 * 2K_1 * K_1 * 2K_1 * K_1 * 2K_1 * K_1 * 2K_1,$$

$$G_5 = 2K_1 * 3K_1 * 2K_1 * 3K_1 * 2K_1 * 3K_1$$

as quasi-$\frac{7}{3}$-DB and quasi-$\frac{8}{7}$-DB graphs, respectively.

Remark 2.20. Considering the two methods above we see that the structured graphs are biregular bipartite. The quasi-$\frac{m+n+k}{n_1+m}$-DB graph $H(m, G, k)$ in Proposition 2.18 is an $(n_1, n_2)$-biregular bipartite. Further, the quasi-$\frac{m}{n}$-DB graph $\underbrace{mK_1 * nK_1 * mK_1 * \cdots * mK_1 * nK_1}_{2d\text{-times}}$, with diameter $d$, $m > n$, is a $(2m, 2n)$-biregular bipartite.

Problem 2.21. For $m \neq n$, is there any $(m, n)$-biregular bipartite graph with no quasi-$\lambda$-DB property?
We know that any connected edge-transitive graph which is not DB, is a quasi-\(\lambda\)-DB graph (see [1]) but how about the converse:

**Problem 2.22.** Is there any quasi-\(\lambda\)-DB graph without edge-transitivity?

If the answer of Problem 2.22 is negative then by the fact that every edge-transitive graph (disallowing graphs with isolated vertices) that is not also vertex-transitive must be biregular, we find that quasi-\(\lambda\)-DB graphs are exactly the biregular bipartite graphs which also solves the Problem 2.21. We also note that quasi-\(\lambda\)-DB graphs are not vertex-transitive, since any graph with vertex-transitivity must be distance-balanced.

### 3. Quasi-(\(\lambda, n\))-distance-balanced graphs

Throughout this section, we define a new class of graphs which is considered as a generalization of quasi-\(\lambda\)-DB graphs. For \(a, b \in V(G)\) with \(d(a, b) = n\), let \(W_{a,b}^G\) and \(W_{\frac{a}{n}b}^G\) be the sets of vertices as given in the first section. Then \(G\) is called quasi-(\(\lambda, n\))-distance-balanced graph, in which either \(|W_{a,b}^G| = \lambda|W_{\frac{a}{n}b}^G|\) or \(|W_{\frac{a}{n}b}^G| = \lambda|W_{a,b}^G|\), for some positive rational number \(\lambda > 1\).

In the following using the graph operation \(*\) and the complete graphs we present a class of quasi-(\(\lambda, n\))-distance-balanced graphs for any \(n\).

![Quasi-(\(\lambda, n\))-DB graph](image)

Figure 7: Quasi-(\(\frac{n}{m}, 2\))-DB graph \(K_n * K_d * K_m\) with \(n > m\).

In Figure 8, the graphs \(K_n, K_d\) and \(K_m\) with \(n > m\), are joint together and has a common edge created by the black nodes. This graph can be also represented by \(G = K_{n-2} * K_2 * K_{d-4} * K_2 * K_{m-2}\). Moreover, for any \(x \in K_n\) and \(y \in K_m\) with \(d(x, y) = 3\) we get \(|W_{x,y}^{G_{\frac{3}{2}}}| = n\) and \(|W_{y,x}^{G_{\frac{3}{2}}}| = m\).

![Quasi-(\(\frac{n}{m}, 3\))-DB graph](image)

Figure 8: Quasi-(\(\frac{n}{m}, 3\))-DB graph \(K_{n-2} * K_2 * K_{d-4} * K_2 * K_{m-2}\) with \(n > m\).

Figure 9 shows another quasi-(\(\frac{n}{m}, 3\))-DB graph which is a cycle-shaped graph.
In Figure 10, for any $x \in K_n$ and $y \in K_m$ with $d(x, y) = 4$ we have

$$|W_G^x y| = 2m + n - 8, \quad |W_G^y x| = 2n + m - 8,$$

where

$$G = K_{m-4} \ast K_2 \ast K_{n-4} \ast K_2 \ast K_{m-4} \ast K_2 \ast K_{n-4} \ast K_2 \ast K_{m-4} \ast K_2 \ast K_{n-4} \ast K_2, \quad n > m.$$
In Figure 12, using four local groups of subgraphs $K_p$ including $k-1$ graphs $K_p$ connected by the operation $\ast$ together with $K_n$ and $K_m$ we have a quasi-$\left(\lambda, 2k+1\right)$-DB graph $G$ for

$$\lambda = \frac{2(k-1)n + m - 4(k-1)}{2(k-1)m + n - 4(k-1)}.$$
It means that $|W_{uv}^G| = 1$ or $|W_{vw}^G| = 1$, that is, $u$ or $v$ is pendant vertex but not both. (Note that if $\deg(u) = \deg(v) = 1$ then they both have the same root, that is, they are adjacent to a unique vertex in $G$ and it contradicts to the fact that $G$ is quasi-$\lambda$-DB.) This also shows that it only remains a graph with diameter 1 if we remove the pendant vertices of $G$. Therefore, $G$ is a complete graph with some pendant vertices with no same root (see Figure 13).

![Figure 13: Graph $G$ formed by a complete graph with some pendant vertices attached.](image)
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