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Abstract

Koh and Tay proved a fundamental classification of $G$ vertex-multiplications into three classes $\mathcal{C}_0$, $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$. In this paper, we prove that vertex-multiplications of cartesian products of graphs $G \times H$ lie in $\mathcal{C}_0$ ($\mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1$ resp.) if $G^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0$ ($\mathcal{C}_1$ resp.), $d(G) \geq 2$ and $d(G \times H) \geq 4$. We also focus on cartesian products involving trees, paths and cycles and show that most of them lie in $\mathcal{C}_0$.

1. Introduction

Let $G$ be a graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$. In this paper, we consider only graphs with no loops nor parallel edges. For any vertices $v, x \in V(G)$, the distance from $v$ to $x$, $d_G(v, x)$, is defined as the length of a shortest path from $v$ to $x$. For $v \in V(G)$, its eccentricity $e_G(v)$ is defined as $e_G(v) := \max\{d_G(v, x) \mid x \in V(G)\}$. A vertex $x$ is called an eccentric vertex of $v$ if $d_G(v, x) = e_G(v)$. The diameter of $G$, denoted by $d(G)$, is defined as $d(G) := \max\{e_G(v) \mid v \in V(G)\}$ while the radius of $G$, denoted by $r(G)$, is defined as $r(G) := \min\{e_G(v) \mid v \in V(G)\}$. The above notions are defined similarly for a digraph $D$. A vertex $x$ is said to be reachable from another vertex $v$ if $d_D(v, x) < \infty$. For a digraph $D$, the outset and inset of a vertex $v \in V(D)$ are defined to be $O_D(v) := \{x \in V(D) \mid v \rightarrow x\}$ and $I_D(v) := \{y \in V(D) \mid y \rightarrow v\}$ respectively. If there is no ambiguity, we shall omit the subscript for the above notations.

An orientation $D$ of a graph $G$ is a digraph obtained from $G$ by assigning a direction to every edge $e \in E(G)$. An orientation $D$ of $G$ is said to be strong if every two vertices in $V(D)$ are mutually reachable. An edge $e \in E(G)$ is a bridge if $G - e$ is disconnected. Robbins’ well-known One-way Street Theorem [11] states that a connected graph $G$ has a strong orientation if and only if $G$ is bridgeless.

Given a connected and bridgeless graph $G$, let $\mathcal{D}(G)$ be the family of strong orientations of $G$. The orientation number of $G$ is defined as

$$d(G) := \min\{d(D) \mid D \in \mathcal{D}(G)\}.$$ 

The general problem of finding the orientation number of a connected and bridgeless graph is very difficult. Moreover, Chvátal and Thomassen [2] proved that it is NP-hard to determine if a graph admits an orientation of diameter 2. Hence, it is natural to focus on special classes of graphs. The orientation number was evaluated for various classes of graphs, such as the complete graphs [1, 8, 10] and complete bipartite graphs [3, 13].

In 2000, Koh and Tay [5] introduced a new family of graphs, $G$ vertex-multiplications, and extended the results on the orientation number of complete $n$-partite graphs. Let $G$ be a given connected graph with vertex set $V(G) = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$. For any sequence of $n$ positive integers $(s_i)$, a $G$ vertex-multiplication, denoted by $G(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$, is the
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graph with vertex set $V^* = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} V_i$ and edge set $E^*$, where $V_i$'s are pairwise disjoint sets with $|V_i| = s_i$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and for any $u, v \in V^*$, $uv \in E^*$ if and only if $u \in V_i$ and $v \in V_j$ for some $i, j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ with $i \neq j$ such that $v_i v_j \in E(G)$. For instance, if $G \cong K_n$, then the graph $G(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$ is a complete $n$-partite graph with partite sizes $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n$. Also, we say $G$ is a parent graph of $G(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$.

For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, we denote the $x$-th vertex in $V_i$ by $(x, v_i)$, i.e. $V_i = \{(x, v_i) | x = 1, 2, \ldots, s_i\}$. Hence, two vertices $(x, v_i)$ and $(y, v_j)$ in $V^*$ are adjacent in $G(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$ if and only if $i \neq j$ and $v_i v_j \in E(G)$. We will loosely use the two denotations of a vertex, for example, if $v_i = j$, then $s_i = s_j$. For convenience, we write $G^{(x)}$ in place of $G(s, s, \ldots, s)$ for any positive integer $s$, and it is understood that the number of $s$'s is equal to the order of $G$, $n$. Thus, $G^{(1)}$ is simply the graph $G$ itself.

The following theorem by Koh and Tay [5] provides a fundamental classification of vertex-multiplications.

**Theorem 1.1.** (Koh and Tay [5]) Let $G$ be a connected graph of order $n \geq 3$. If $s_i \geq 2$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, then $d(G) \leq d(G(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)) \leq d(G) + 2$.

In view of Theorem 1.1, all graphs of the form $G(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$, with $s_i \geq 2$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, can be classified into three classes $\mathcal{C}_j$, where

$$\mathcal{C}_j = \{G(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) | d(G(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)) = d(G) + j\},$$

for $j = 0, 1, 2$. Henceforth, we assume $s_i \geq 2$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. The following lemma was found useful in proving Theorem 1.1.

**Lemma 1.2.** (Koh and Tay [5]) Let $s_i, t_i$ be integers such that $s_i \leq t_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. If the graph $G(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$ admits an orientation $F$ in which every vertex $v$ lies on a cycle of length not exceeding $m$, then $d(G(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n)) \leq \max\{m, d(F)\}$.

Theorem 1.1 was generalised to digraphs by Gutin et al [4]. Ng and Koh [9] examined cycle vertex-multiplications and Koh and Tay [7] investigated tree vertex-multiplications. Since trees with diameter at most 2 are parent graphs of complete bipartite graphs and are completely solved, they considered trees of diameter at least 3. They proved that trees with diameter at least 3 does not belong to the class $\mathcal{C}_2$.

**Theorem 1.3.** (Koh and Tay [7])
If $T$ is a tree of order $n$ and $d(T) = 3, 4$ or 5, then $T(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1$.

**Theorem 1.4.** (Koh and Tay [7])
If $T$ is a tree of order $n$ and $d(T) \geq 6$, then $T(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0$.

In [14], Wong and Tay proved a characterisation for vertex-multiplications of trees with diameter 5 in $\mathcal{C}_0$ and $\mathcal{C}_1$. In [15,16], they investigated vertex-multiplications of trees with diameter 4.

In this paper, we examine vertex-multiplications of cartesian products of graphs $G$ and $H$, denoted by $G \times H$, and $V(G \times H) = \{(u, x) | u \in V(G), x \in V(H)\}$ and $E(G) = \{(u, x)(v, y) | u = v$ and $xy \in E(H)$, or $uv \in E(G)$ and $x = y\}$. Since cartesian products of disconnected graphs are disconnected, we concern ourselves with only connected graphs and focus mainly on trees, paths and cycles. We shall denote a path (cycle, complete graph resp.) of order $n$ as $P_n$ ($C_n$, $K_n$ resp.) while $T_d$ represents a tree of diameter $d$.

Since the orientation number of complete bipartite graphs $K(p, q)$ has been characterised by Soltés [13] and Gutin [3] and $P_2 \times P_2 \cong K(2, 2)$, we shall exclude $P_2 \times P_2$ from our discussion. In Section 2, we consider cartesian products of graphs in the general setting.
Theorem 1.5. If \( d(G) \geq 2 \) and \( G^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0 \) \((\mathcal{C}_1 \text{ resp.})\), then \((G \times H)^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0 \) \((\mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1 \text{ resp.})\).

Corollary 1.6. If \( d(G \times H) \geq 4 \), \( d(G) \geq 2 \) and \( G^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0 \) \((\mathcal{C}_1 \text{ resp.})\), then \((G \times H)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \) \((\mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1 \text{ resp.})\).

In Section 3, we prove that the vertex-multiplications of cartesian products of two trees are mostly in \( \mathcal{C}_0 \).

Theorem 1.7. If \( \lambda \geq 2 \) and \( \mu \geq 3 \), then \((T_\lambda \times T_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \).

For trees with diameter at most 2, the same conclusion holds if both trees are paths except for \( P_3 \times P_2 \) \((P_2 \times P_2)\).

Theorem 1.8.
\[(a) \ (P_3 \times P_3)^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_1. \]
\[(b) \ (P_\lambda \times P_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \begin{cases} \mathcal{C}_0, & \text{if } \lambda \geq 4, \mu = 2, \text{ or } \lambda \geq 3, \\ \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1, & \text{if } (\lambda, \mu) = (3, 3). \end{cases} \]

We also prove an analogue on the hypercube graph \( Q_\lambda = K_2 \times K_2 \times \ldots \times K_2, \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \).

Proposition 1.9.
\[(a) \ Q_3^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0 \text{ and } Q_3(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1. \]
\[(b) \ For \ \lambda \geq 4, \ Q_\lambda(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0. \]

In Sections 4 and 5, we examine the cartesian products of a tree and a cycle, and two cycles respectively.

Theorem 1.10. If \( \lambda \geq 2 \) and \( \mu \geq 4 \) or \( \lambda = \mu = 3 \), then \((T_\lambda \times C_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \).

Theorem 1.11.
\[(a) \ For \ \lambda \geq 4, \mu \geq 3, \ (C_\lambda \times C_\mu)^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0. \]
\[(b) \ (C_\lambda \times C_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \begin{cases} \mathcal{C}_0, & \text{if } \lambda \geq 4, \\ \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1, & \text{if } (\lambda, \mu) = (4, 3) \text{ or } (3, 3). \end{cases} \]

2. General results

In defining an orientation, we use the following notations to write succinctly. For any orientation \( D \), \( \bar{D} \) denotes the orientation satisfying \( u \to v \) in \( D \iff v \to u \) in \( D \).

Definition 2.1. Suppose \( uv, vw \) and \( wx \) are edges of a graph \( G \) and \( D \) is an orientation of \( G^{(2)} \). We denote
\( (a) \ u \Rightarrow v \text{ if } \{(1, u), (2, u)\} \to \{(1, v), (2, v)\} \text{ in } D \) \((\text{see Figure 1(a)})\).
\( (b) \ u \Leftrightarrow v \text{ if } (1, u) \to (1, v) \to (2, u) \to (2, v) \to (1, u) \text{ in } D \) \((\text{see Figure 1(b)})\).
\( (c) \ u \rightarrow v \text{ if } (2, v) \to \{(1, u), (2, u)\} \to (1, v) \text{ and } w \rightarrow x \text{ if } (1, x) \to \{(1, w), (2, w)\} \to (2, x) \text{ in } D \) \((\text{see Figure 1(c)})\).
Proof of Theorem 1.5: Since $G^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0$, there exists an orientation $D$ of $G^{(2)}$ such that $d(D) = d(G)$. Define an orientation $D^*$ of $(G \times H)^{(2)}$ as follows.

\[
\langle u, x \rangle \rightarrow \langle v, x \rangle \iff u \rightarrow v \text{ in } D,
\]

for any $x \in V(H)$, i.e., each copy of $G^{(2)}$ is oriented similarly to $D$.

\[
\langle u, x \rangle \rightarrow \langle u, y \rangle \iff xy \in E(H).
\]

We claim that $d_{D^*}((p, \langle u, x \rangle), (q, \langle v, y \rangle)) \leq d(G \times H) = d(G) + d(H)$ for $p, q = 1, 2$. If $x = y$, then by (2.1), $d_{D^*}((p, \langle u, x \rangle), (q, \langle v, x \rangle)) \leq d(D) + 1 = d(G) + 1 \leq d(G) + d(H)$.

Suppose $x \neq y$. In view of (2.2), there exists a $(p, \langle u, x \rangle) - (r, \langle u, y \rangle)$ path of length $d_{D^*}((p, \langle u, x \rangle), (r, \langle u, y \rangle)) \leq d_H(x, y) \leq d(H)$ for some $r = 1, 2$. If $(q, \langle v, y \rangle) = (r, \langle u, y \rangle)$ (i.e. $q = r, u = v$), then we are done. If $(q, \langle v, y \rangle) = (3 - r, \langle u, y \rangle)$, then $d_{D^*}((p, \langle u, x \rangle), (q, \langle v, x \rangle)) \leq d_{D^*}((p, \langle u, x \rangle), (r, \langle u, y \rangle)) + 2 \leq d(H) + 2 \leq d(H) + d(G)$ by (2.2). Finally, if $u \neq v$, then $d_{D^*}((p, \langle u, x \rangle), (q, \langle v, y \rangle)) \leq d_{D^*}((p, \langle u, x \rangle), (r, \langle u, y \rangle)) + d_{D^*}((r, \langle u, y \rangle), (q, \langle v, y \rangle)) \leq d(H) + d(D) = d(H) + d(G)$.

The proof is similar if $G^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_1$. 

Proof of Corollary 1.6: Since every vertex lies in a directed $C_4$ in the orientation $D^*$ because of (2.2), it follows from Lemma 1.2 that $(G \times H)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0$. The proof is similar if $G^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_1$. 

Corollary 2.2. If $(G_1 \times G_2)^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0$ ($\mathcal{C}_1$ resp.), then

(a) for $j \geq 3$, $(\prod_{i=1}^j G_i)^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0$ ($\mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1$ resp.), and

(b) for $k \geq 4$, $(\prod_{i=1}^k G_i)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0$ ($\mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1$ resp.).

Proof: (a) Since $d(G_1 \times G_2) \geq 2$, the result follows from Theorem 1.5.

(b) Since $d(\prod_{i=1}^k G_i) \geq 4$, $d(G_1 \times G_2) \geq 2$, the result follows from Corollary 1.6. 

Corollary 2.3.

(a) If $d \geq 6$, then $(T_d \times G)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0$.

(b) If $3 \leq d \leq 5$, then $(T_d \times G)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1$.

Proof: Since $d(T_d \times G) \geq 4$ and by Corollary 1.6, (a) and (b) follow from Theorems 1.4 and 1.3 respectively.
3. Cartesian product of trees \( T_\lambda \times T_\mu \)

In this section, we shall show that Corollary 2.3(b) can be further improved in the case of \( T_\lambda \times T_\mu \). Before that, we introduce a notation for trees \( T_d \) with \( d \leq 5 \). Whenever we speak of a tree with even diameter \( d \), we denote by \( c \), the unique central vertex of \( T_d \), i.e. \( e_{T_d}(c) = r(T_d) \), and the neighbours of \( c \) by \([i] \), i.e. \( N_{T_d}(c) = \{ [i] \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_d}(c) \} \).

For each \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_d}(c) \), we further denote the neighbours of \([i] \), excluding \( c \), by \([\alpha, i] \), i.e. \( N_{T_d}([i]) = \{ [\alpha, i] \mid \alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_d}([i]) - 1 \} \).

If \( d \) is odd, we let \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \) be the two central vertices of \( T_d \), i.e. \( e_{T_d}(c_k) = r(T_d) \) for \( k = 1, 2 \). For \( k = 1, 2 \), denote the neighbours of \( c_k \), excluding \( c_{3-k} \), by \([i]_k \), i.e. \( N_{T_d}(c_k) - \{ c_{3-k} \} = \{ [i]_k \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_d}(c_k) - 1 \} \). For each \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_d}(c_k) - 1 \), we denote the neighbours of \([i]_k \), excluding \( c_k \), by \([\alpha, i]_k \), i.e. \( N_{T_d}([i]_k) - \{ c_k \} = \{ [\alpha, i]_k \mid \alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_d}([i]_k) - 1 \} \). Figures 2 and 3 illustrate the use of this notation.

![Figure 2: Labelling vertices in a \( T_4 \)](image)

![Figure 3: Labelling vertices in a \( T_5 \)](image)

With this, we prove Theorem 1.7.

**Proof of Theorem 1.7**: Let \( G := T_\lambda \times T_\mu \). By Corollary 2.3(a), it suffices to consider \( \lambda, \mu \leq 5 \). Define an orientation \( D_{(\lambda,\mu)} \) for \( G^{(2)} \) as follows.

Case 1. \( \lambda \) is even and \( \mu \) is odd, i.e. \( \lambda = 2, 4 \) and \( \mu = 3, 5 \).

\[
\langle c, c_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle [y], c_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle [y], c_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c, c_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c, c_2 \rangle \text{ for all } [y] \in N_{T_\lambda}(c). \tag{3.1}
\]

Excluding the edges defined above, for each \([i]_1 \in N_{T_\mu}(c_1) - \{ c_2 \} \), each \( \alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_\mu}([i]_1) - 1 \), each \([j]_2 \in N_{T_\mu}(c_2) - \{ c_1 \} \), and each \( \beta = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_\mu}([j]_2) - 1 \),

\[
\langle x, [\alpha, i]_1 \rangle \leadsto \langle x, [i]_1 \rangle \leadsto \langle x, c_1 \rangle, \langle x, [\beta, j]_2 \rangle \leadsto \langle x, [j]_2 \rangle \leadsto \langle x, c_2 \rangle \leadsto \langle x, c_1 \rangle, \tag{3.2}
\]

for all \( x \in V(T_\lambda) \), and
\[
\begin{align*}
\langle [\gamma, k], [\alpha, i]\rangle &\sim \langle [k], [\alpha, i]\rangle \sim \langle c, [\alpha, i]\rangle, \\
\langle [\gamma, k], [i]\rangle &\sim \langle [k], [i]\rangle \sim \langle c, [i]\rangle, \\
\langle [\gamma, k], [\beta, j]\rangle &\sim \langle [k], [\beta, j]\rangle \sim \langle c, [\beta, j]\rangle, \\
\langle [\gamma, k], [j]\rangle &\sim \langle [k], [j]\rangle \sim \langle c, [j]\rangle, \\
\langle [\gamma, k], c_i\rangle &\sim \langle [k], c_i\rangle \text{ for } t = 1, 2,
\end{align*}
\]  

(3.3)

for all \([k] \in N_T(c)\) and \(\gamma = 1, 2, \ldots, \deg_T([k]) = 1\). (See Figures 4-7.)

We claim that \(d(D(\lambda, \mu)) = \lambda + \mu\). Let \(u, v \in V(G)\) and \(P : u = u_0w_1 \ldots w_l = v\) be a shortest \(u - v\) path in \(G\). If \(d_G(u, v) \leq d(G) - 2\) and \(P\) satisfies

\[
w_i \sim w_{i+1} \text{ or } w_{i+1} \sim w_i \text{ for any } i = 0, 1, \ldots, l - 1,
\]

(3.4)

then \(d_{D(\lambda, \mu)}((p, u), (q, v)) \leq d_G(u, v) + 2 \leq d(G)\) for \(p, q = 1, 2\). Particularly, this holds for \(u = \langle [\gamma_1, k], y_1\rangle, \ v = \langle [\gamma_2, k], y_2\rangle\) with \(\gamma_1 \neq \gamma_2\) in \(T_4 \times T_\mu\). So, by symmetry of (3.1)-(3.3), we may assume \(c\) has two eccentric vertices in \(T_\lambda\), i.e. \(T_\lambda = P_3\) if \(\lambda = 2\), and \(T_\lambda = P_5\) if \(\lambda = 4\). Furthermore, by symmetry of (3.2), we may assume \(c_i\) has two eccentric vertices for \(i = 1, 2\), in \(T_\mu\).

For the pairs of \(u, v\) that do not satisfy (3.4), we claim that there exists \(P\) with length at most \(d(G)\) that satisfies either

\[
\begin{align*}
(w_i &\Rightarrow w_{i+1} \text{ for some } i = 0, 1, \ldots, l - 1 \text{ and } \\
w_{j+1} &\Rightarrow w_j \text{ for none of } j = 0, 1, \ldots, l - 1.
\end{align*}
\]

(3.5)

Then, we can conclude \(d_{D(\lambda, \mu)}((p, u), (q, v)) \leq d(G)\).

Subcase 1.1. \(\lambda = 2\) and \(\mu = 3\). (See Figure 4.)

We list these paths \(P\) while omitting symmetric scenarios. For \(i = 1, 2\), and \(j = 1, 2,\)

\[
P^1 = \langle [1], [1]\rangle \langle [1], c_1\rangle \langle [1], c_1\rangle \langle [c, [j]\rangle \langle [2], [j]\rangle.
\]

\[
P^2 = \langle [1], [1]\rangle \langle [1], c_1\rangle \langle [1], c_1\rangle \langle [c, [j]\rangle \langle [i], [j]\rangle.
\]

\[
P^3 = \langle [1], [1]\rangle \langle [1], c_1\rangle \langle [1], c_1\rangle \langle [c, [j]\rangle \langle [2], [j]\rangle.
\]

\[
P^4 = \langle [1], [2]\rangle \langle [1], c_2\rangle \langle [1], c_1\rangle \langle [1], [j]\rangle \langle [c, [j]\rangle \langle [2], [j]\rangle.
\]

\[
P^5 = \langle [1], [2]\rangle \langle [c, [j]\rangle \langle [2], [j]\rangle \langle [2], [j]\rangle.
\]

\[
P^6 = \langle [1], [1]\rangle \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [i], [j]\rangle \langle [c, [j]\rangle.
\]

\[
P^7 = \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [i], [i]\rangle \langle [c, [j]\rangle.
\]

\[
P^8 = \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [i], [i]\rangle \langle [c, [j]\rangle.
\]

\[
P^9 = \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [c, [i]\rangle \langle [i], [i]\rangle \langle [c, [j]\rangle.
\]

Subcase 1.2. \(\lambda = 2\) and \(\mu = 5\). (See Figure 5.)

Note that \(D(2, 3)\) is a subdigraph of \(D(2, 5)\). Moreover, for any \((p, u) \in V(D(2, 5)) - V(D(2, 3))\), there exists a vertex \((r, x) \in V(D(2, 3))\) such that \(u \sim x\) or \(x \sim u\). Hence, if \((p, u) \in V(D(2, 5)) - V(D(2, 3)), (q, v) \in V(D(2, 3))\), then \(\max\{d_{D(2, 5)}((p, u), (q, v)), d_{D(2, 5)}((q, v), (p, u))\} \leq 1 + d(D(2, 3)) \leq 7\) for \(p, q = 1, 2\). Similarly, if \((p, u), (q, v) \in V(D(2, 5)) - V(D(2, 3))\), then \(d_{D(2, 5)}((p, u), (q, v)) \leq 2 + d(D(2, 3)) \leq 7\) for \(p, q = 1, 2\).
Subcase 1.3. $\lambda = 4$ and $\mu = 3$. (See Figure 6.)

Note that $D_{(2,3)}$ is a subdigraph of $D_{(4,3)}$ and this subcase follows by an argument similar to Subcase 1.2.

Subcase 1.4. $\lambda = 4$ and $\mu = 5$. (See Figure 7.)

Note that $D_{(4,3)}$ is a subdigraph of $D_{(4,5)}$ and this subcase follows by an argument similar to Subcase 1.2.

Figure 4: Orientation $D_{(2,3)}$ of $(T_2 \times T_3)^{(2)}$, where $d(D) = 5$. 
Figure 5: Orientation $D_{(2,5)}$ of $(T_2 \times T_5)^{(2)}$, where $d(D) = 7$.

Figure 6: Orientation $D_{(4,3)}$ of $(T_4 \times T_3)^{(2)}$, where $d(D) = 7$. 
Case 2. \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) are both even, i.e. \( \lambda = 2,4 \) and \( \mu = 4 \).

For each \([i] \in N_{T_\lambda}(c)\), and each \(\alpha = 1,2,\ldots,\deg_{T_\lambda}([i]) - 1\) and each \([j] \in N_{T_\mu}(c)\), and each \(\beta = 1,2,\ldots,\deg_{T_\mu}([j]) - 1\),

\[\langle [i], c \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c, c \rangle \text{ and } \langle c, [j] \rangle \Rightarrow \langle [i], [j] \rangle;\]  

(3.6)

excluding the edges defined above,

\[\langle [\alpha, i], y \rangle \sim \langle [i], y \rangle \sim \langle c, y \rangle\]  

(3.7)

for all \(y \in V(T_\mu)\), and

\[\langle x, [\beta, j] \rangle \sim \langle x, [j] \rangle \sim \langle x, c \rangle\]  

(3.8)

for all \(x \in V(T_\lambda)\). (See Figures 8 and 9.)

We use the same strategy as before to prove \(d(D_{(\lambda,\mu)}) = \lambda + \mu\). Let \(u, v \in V(G)\) and \(P : u = w_0w_1 \ldots w_k = v\) be a shortest \(u - v\) path in \(G\). If \(d_G(u, v) \leq d(G) - 2\) and \(P\) satisfies (3.4), then \(d_{D_{(\lambda,\mu)}}((p, u), (q, v)) \leq d_{D}(u, v) + 2 \leq d(G)\) for \(p, q = 1, 2\). Particularly, this holds for \(u = \langle [\alpha_1, k], y_1 \rangle, v = \langle [\alpha_2, k], y_2 \rangle\) with \(\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2\). So, by symmetry of (3.6)-(3.8), we may assume \(c\) has two eccentric vertices in \(T_\lambda\), i.e. \(T_\lambda = P_3\) if \(\lambda = 2\), and \(T_\lambda = P_5\) if \(\lambda = 4\). Furthermore, by symmetry of (3.8), we may assume \(c\) has two eccentric vertices \([1, 1]\) and \([1, 2]\) in \(T_\mu\).
For the pairs of $u, v$ that do not satisfy (3.4), we claim that there exists $P$ with length at most $d(G)$ and satisfies (3.5). Hence, $d_{D_{(λ,μ)}}((p, u), (q, v)) \leq d(G)$.

Subcase 2.1. $λ = 2$ and $μ = 4$. (See Figure 8.)

We list these paths $P$ in each of the respective subcases, omitting symmetric scenarios.

For $i = 1, 2$, and $j = 2, 3$,

$$P^1 = ([1], [1, 1]) ([1], [1]) ([1], c) (c, c) (c, [j]) (c, [1, j]) ([2], [1, j]).$$

$$P^2 = ([1], [1, 1]) ([1], [1]) ([1], c) (c, c) (c, [j]) ([2], [j]).$$

$$P^3 = (c, [1, 1]) (c, [1]) (c, c) (c, [j]) ([i], [j]) ([i], [1, j]).$$

Subcase 2.2. $λ = 4$ and $μ = 4$. (See Figure 9.)

Note that $D_{(2,4)}$ is a subdigraph of $D_{(4,4)}$ and this subcase follows by an argument similar to Subcase 1.2.

Figure 8: Orientation $D_{(2,4)}$ of $(T_2 \times T_4)^{(2)}$, where $d(D) = 6$. 
Case 3. \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) are both odd, i.e. \( \lambda, \mu = 3, 5 \).

For each \( [i]_1 \in N_{T_{\mu}}(c_1) - \{c_2\} \), each \( \alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_{\mu}}([i]_1) - 1 \), each \( [j]_2 \in N_{T_{\nu}}(c_2) - \{c_1\} \), each \( \beta = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_{\nu}}([j]_2) - 1 \),

\[
\langle c_1, [i]_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_2, c_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_2, [i]_1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_1, [i]_1 \rangle,
\langle c_1, [j]_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_2, c_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_2, [j]_2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_1, [j]_2 \rangle;
\]

(3.9)

excluding the edges defined above,

\[
\langle x, [\alpha, i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle x, [i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle x, c_1 \rangle, \langle x, [\beta, j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle x, [j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle x, c_2 \rangle \sim \langle x, c_1 \rangle
\]

(3.10)

for all \( x \in V(T_\lambda) \), and

\[
\langle [\gamma, k]_1, [\alpha, i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle [k]_1, [\alpha, i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle c_1, [\alpha, i]_1 \rangle,
\langle [\gamma, k]_1, [i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle [k]_1, [i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle c_1, [i]_1 \rangle,
\langle [\gamma, k]_1, [\beta, j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle [k]_1, [\beta, j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle c_1, [\beta, j]_2 \rangle,
\langle [\gamma, k]_1, [j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle [k]_1, [j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle c_1, [j]_2 \rangle,
\langle [\theta, l]_2, [\alpha, i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle [l]_2, [\alpha, i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle c_2, [\alpha, i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle c_1, [\alpha, i]_1 \rangle,
\langle [\theta, l]_2, [i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle [l]_2, [i]_1 \rangle \sim \langle c_2, [i]_1 \rangle,
\langle [\theta, l]_2, [\beta, j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle [l]_2, [\beta, j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle c_2, [\beta, j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle c_1, [\beta, j]_2 \rangle,
\langle [\theta, l]_2, [j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle [l]_2, [j]_2 \rangle \sim \langle c_2, [j]_2 \rangle;
\]

(3.11)

for each \( [k]_1 \in N_{T_\lambda}(c_1) - \{c_2\} \), each \( \gamma = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_\lambda}([k]_1) - 1 \), each \( [l]_2 \in N_{T_\lambda}(c_2) - \{c_1\} \) and each \( \theta = 1, 2, \ldots, deg_{T_\lambda}([l]_2) - 1 \). (See Figures 10-12.)

We use the same strategy as before to prove \( d(D_{(\lambda, \mu)}) = \lambda + \mu \). Let \( u, v \in V(G) \) and \( P : u = w_0 w_1 \ldots w_k = v \) be a shortest \( u - v \) path in \( G \). If \( d_G(u, v) \leq d(G) - 2 \) and \( P \) satisfies (3.4), then \( d_{D_{(\lambda, \mu)}}((p, u), (q, v)) \leq d_G(u, v) + 2 \leq d(G) \) for \( p, q = 1, 2 \).

By symmetry of (3.9)-(3.11), we may assume for \( i = 1, 2 \), \( N_{T_\lambda}(c_i) = \{[1], [2]\} \), and \( N_{T_\lambda}([j]_i) = \{[1, j], [j]\} \) for \( j = 1, 2 \). Furthermore, by symmetry of (3.10), we may assume
the same holds for $T_\mu$. For the pairs of $u, v$ that do not satisfy (3.4), we claim that there exists $P$ with length at most $d(G)$ and satisfies (3.5). Hence, $d_{\lambda,\mu}((p, u), (q, v)) \leq d(G)$.

**Subcase 3.1. $\lambda = 3$ and $\mu = 3$.** (See Figure 10.)

We list these paths $P$ while omitting symmetric scenarios. For $j = 1, 2,$

\[ P^1 = ([1, 1], [1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^2 = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^3 = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^4 = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^5 = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^6 = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^7 = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^8 = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^9 = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{10} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{11} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{12} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{13} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{14} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{15} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{16} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{17} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{18} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{19} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{20} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{21} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{22} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ P^{23} = ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) ([1, 1], [1, 1], [1, 1]) . \]

\[ \text{Subcase 3.2. } \lambda = 3 \text{ and } \mu = 5. \text{ (See Figure 11.)} \]

Note that $D_{(3,3)}$ is a subdigraph of $D_{(3,5)}$ and this subcase follows by an argument similar to Subcase 1.2.

\[ \text{Subcase 3.3. } \lambda = 5 \text{ and } \mu = 5. \text{ (See Figure 12.)} \]

Note that $D_{(3,5)}$ is a subdigraph of $D_{(5,5)}$ and this subcase follows by an argument similar to Subcase 1.2. \]
Figure 10: Orientation $D_{(3,3)}$ of $(T_3 \times T_3)^{(2)}$, where $d(D) = 6$.

Figure 11: Orientation $D_{(3,5)}$ of $(T_3 \times T_5)^{(2)}$, where $d(D) = 8$. 
Figure 12: Orientation $D_{5,5}$ of $(T_5 \times T_5)^{(2)}$, where $d(D) = 10$. 
Next, we shall prove two lemmas for the investigation of the rectangular grid $P_\lambda \times P_\mu$. For $P_n$ ($C_n$ resp.), we shall use the natural labelling of vertices where $E(P_n) = \{(i, i + 1) \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1\}$ $(E(C_n) = E(P_n) \cup \{(n, 1)\}$ resp.).

**Lemma 3.1.** Let $G$ be a graph and $D$ be an orientation of $G^{(2)}$. If $u_0u_1u_2$ is a unique $u_0 - u_2$ path in $G$ and $d_D((p, u_0), (q, u_2)) = d_D((p, u_2), (q, u_0)) = 2$ for all $p, q = 1, 2$, then $u_0 \leftrightarrow u_1 \leftrightarrow u_2$ or $u_0 \leftrightarrow u_1 \leftrightarrow u_2$.

**Proof:** Suppose $(1, u_1) \rightarrow (1, u_2)$. Now, for $p = 1, 2$, since $d_D((1, u_2), (p, u_0)) = 2$, it follows that $(1, u_2) \rightarrow (2, u_1) \rightarrow (p, u_0)$. Since $d_D((p, u_0), (q, u_2)) = 2$ for $p, q = 1, 2$, it follows that $(p, u_0) \rightarrow (1, u_1) \rightarrow (q, u_2)$ must hold. It is now necessary from $d_D((2, u_2), (1, u_0)) = 2$ that $(2, u_2) \rightarrow (2, u_1)$. Thus, $u_0 \leftrightarrow u_1 \leftrightarrow u_2$. Similarly, an argument reversing all arcs will give $u_0 \leftrightarrow u_1 \leftrightarrow u_2$. \hfill $\Box$

**Lemma 3.2.** Let $G$ be a graph and $D$ be an orientation of $G^{(2)}$. Suppose $v_0v_1\ldots v_k$, $k \geq 2$, is a shortest $v_0 - v_k$ path in $G$ and $D$ satisfies

(a) $v_i \rightarrow v_{i+1} \leftrightarrow v_{i+2}$ for some $i$, $0 \leq i \leq k - 2$, and

(b) if $j \neq i, i+1$, then either $v_j \leftrightarrow v_{j+1}$ or $v_{j+1} \leftrightarrow v_j$.

Then, $d_D((p, v_0), (q, v_k)) = d_D((p, v_k), (q, v_0)) = k$ for $p, q = 1, 2$.

**Proof:** Assume $v_j \leftrightarrow v_{j+1}$ for all $j \neq i, i+1$; the proof is similar otherwise. Note that $(p, v_0) \rightarrow (p, v_1) \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow (p, v_i), \{(1, v_i), (2, v_i)\} \rightarrow (1, v_{i+1}) \rightarrow \{(1, v_{i+2}), (2, v_{i+2})\}$ and $(p, v_{i+2}) \rightarrow (p, v_{i+3}) \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow (p, v_k)$ for all $p = 1, 2$. Thus, for $p, q = 1, 2$, $d_D((p, v_0), (q, v_k)) = d_G(v_0, v_k) = k$. By symmetry, we have $d_D((p, v_k), (q, v_0)) = d_G(v_k, v_0) = k$ for $p, q = 1, 2$. \hfill $\Box$

**Proof of Theorem 1.8:** Let $G := P_\lambda \times P_\mu$.

Case 1. $\lambda = 3$ and $\mu = 2$.

We first prove $\bar{d}(G^{(2)}) = 4$. Suppose there exists an orientation $D$ of $G^{(2)}$ such that $d(D) = 3$. Since $d_D((p, \langle 1, 2 \rangle), (q, \langle 3, 2 \rangle)) = d_D((q, \langle 3, 2 \rangle), (p, \langle 1, 2 \rangle)) = 2$ for all $p, q = 1, 2$, we may assume from Lemma 3.1 that $\langle 1, 2 \rangle \rightarrow (2, 2) \leftrightarrow (3, 2)$. Similarly, we assume $\langle 1, 1 \rangle \rightarrow (2, 1) \leftrightarrow (3, 1)$ (the case $\langle 1, 1 \rangle \rightarrow (2, 1) \leftrightarrow (3, 1)$ is similar). Since $d_D((1, (1, 1)), (2, (2, 2))) \leq 3$, it follows that $(1, (2, 1)) \rightarrow (2, (2, 2))$. However, we have $d_D((1, (3, 2)), (1, (2, 2))) > 3$, which contradicts $d(D) \leq 3$. Hence, $\bar{d}(G^{(2)}) \geq 4$.

Define an orientation $D_{(3,2)}$ for $G^{(2)}$ as follows. (See Figure 13.)

$\langle 1, j \rangle \rightarrow (2, j) \leftrightarrow (3, j)$ for $j = 1, 2$, and $\langle i, 1 \rangle \leftrightarrow \langle i, 2 \rangle$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

It is easy to verify $d(D_{(3,2)}) = 4$. Hence, $G^{(2)} \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and we are done for (a).
the definition of $D((1,2)) = (u,v) = (1,1,1)$. Hence, it suffices to consider vertices $u,v$ of $G$ for $\lambda \geq 4$ and $\mu = 2$.

Define an orientation $D_{\lambda,2}$ for $G^{(2)}$ as follows. (See Figure 14 when $\lambda = 4$.)

$$\langle 1,2 \rangle \mapsto \langle 2,2 \rangle \mapsto \langle 3,2 \rangle, \quad \langle \lambda - 2,1 \rangle \mapsto \langle \lambda - 1,1 \rangle \mapsto \langle \lambda,1 \rangle,$$

$$\langle i,1 \rangle \mapsto \langle i,2 \rangle$$ for $i = 1,2,\ldots,\lambda$,

$$\langle j,1 \rangle \mapsto \langle j+1,1 \rangle$$ for $j = 1,2,3,\ldots,\lambda - 3$, and

$$\langle k,2 \rangle \mapsto \langle k+1,2 \rangle$$ for $k = 3,4,\ldots,\lambda - 1$.

We claim that $d(D_{\lambda,2}) = d(G)$. Let $u,v \in V(G)$, where $d_G(u,v) \leq d(G) - 2$. By the definition of $D_{\lambda,2}$, we have $d_{D_{\lambda,2}}(u,v) \leq d_G(u,v) + 2 \leq d(G)$ for $p,q = 1,2$. Hence, it suffices to consider vertices $u,v \in V(G)$, where $d_G(u,v) = d(G) - 1$ or $d_G(u,v) = d(G)$. We illustrate this for $u$ being the ‘top left’ and $v$ being the ‘bottom right’ vertices in Figure 14 and the other cases can be proved similarly. That is, for $(u,v) = ((1,2),\langle \lambda - 1,1 \rangle), ((1,2),\langle \lambda,2 \rangle), ((1,2),\langle \lambda,1 \rangle), ((2,2),\langle \lambda,1 \rangle)$, the claim follows.

Figure 13: Orientation $D_{(3,2)}$ of $(P_3 \times P_2)^{(2)}$, where $d(D_{(3,2)}) = 4$.

Figure 14: Orientation $D_{(4,2)}$ of $(P_4 \times P_2)^{(2)}$, where $d(D_{(4,2)}) = 4$. 
by invoking Lemma 3.2 on their respective shortest paths:

\[ P_1 = ⟨1, 2⟩⟨2, 2⟩ \cdots ⟨λ - 1, 2⟩⟨λ - 1, 1⟩. \]

\[ P_2 = ⟨1, 2⟩⟨2, 2⟩ \cdots ⟨λ - 1, 2⟩⟨λ, 2⟩. \]

\[ P_3 = P_2 \text{ with } ⟨λ, 1⟩. \]

\[ P_4 = ⟨2, 2⟩⟨2, 1⟩⟨3, 1⟩ \cdots ⟨λ, 1⟩. \]

Case 3. \( λ ≥ µ ≥ 3. \)

Define an orientation \( D_{(λ, µ)} \) for \( G^{(2)} \) as follows. (See Figure 15 when \( λ = µ = 3. \))

\[ \left\langle \left\lfloor \frac{λ}{2} \right\rfloor - 1, \left\lceil \frac{µ}{2} \right\rceil \right\rangle \rightarrow \left\langle \left\lfloor \frac{λ}{2} \right\rfloor, \left\lceil \frac{µ}{2} \right\rceil \right\rangle \left\langle \frac{2}{2} \right\rangle \left\langle \left\lfloor \frac{λ}{2} \right\rfloor + 1, \left\lceil \frac{µ}{2} \right\rceil \right\rangle \text{ and} \]

\[ \left\langle \left\lfloor \frac{λ}{2} \right\rfloor, \left\lceil \frac{µ}{2} \right\rceil - 1 \right\rangle \rightarrow \left\langle \left\lfloor \frac{λ}{2} \right\rfloor, \left\lceil \frac{µ}{2} \right\rceil \right\rangle \left\langle \frac{2}{2} \right\rangle \left\langle \left\lfloor \frac{λ}{2} \right\rfloor, \left\lceil \frac{µ}{2} \right\rceil + 1 \right\rangle. \]

Except for the edges defined above,

\[ ⟨i, j⟩ \leadsto ⟨i + 1, j⟩, \text{ and } ⟨i, j⟩ \leadsto ⟨i, j + 1⟩ \text{ for all } 1 ≤ i ≤ λ - 1 \text{ and } 1 ≤ j ≤ µ - 1. \]

Figure 15: Orientation \( D_{(3, 3)} \) of \((P_3 × P_3)^{(2)}\), where \( d(D_{(3, 3)}) = 4. \)

We claim that \( d(D_{(λ, µ)}) = d(G). \) Similar to Case 2, it suffices to consider \( u, v ∈ V(G) \), where \( d_G(u, v) = d(G) - 1 \) or \( d_G(u, v) = d(G) \). We illustrate this for \( u \) being the ‘top left’ and \( v \) being the ‘bottom right’ vertices in Figure 15 and the other cases can be proved similarly. That is, for \( (u, v) = (⟨1, µ⟩, ⟨λ - 1, 1⟩), (⟨1, µ⟩, ⟨λ, 2⟩), (⟨1, µ⟩, ⟨λ, 1⟩), (⟨2, µ⟩, ⟨λ, 1⟩), (⟨1, µ - 1⟩, ⟨λ, 1⟩) \), the claim follows by invoking Lemma 3.2 on their respective shortest paths:
Proposition 3.3. If $C$ is a directed graph, then there exists an orientation $1 \rightarrow 2 \in C$ with $j \in C$ for all $j \in C$ such that $j \in C$ and $j \in C$. Hence, $G^{(2)} \in C_0$ for Cases 2 and 3. To complete (b), observe that every vertex lies in a directed $C_4$ in each orientation $D_{(\lambda, \mu)}$ of all three cases and invoke Lemma 1.2. 

If $G^{(2)}$ belongs to $C_1$, a possible direction for further research is if we can increase the vertex-multiplication, $s_i$, of a particular vertex so that the resulting graph $G(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$ belongs to $C_0$. This was shown possible in [15, 16] when the parent graph $G$ is a tree of diameter 4. Propositions 3.3 and 3.4 show $P_3 \times P_2$ as a contrasting example, i.e. however large the increase in vertex-multiplication of any particular vertex in $(P_3 \times P_2)^{(2)}$, the resulting graph still lies in $C_1$.

**Proposition 3.3.** If $j \in \{\langle 2, 1 \rangle, \langle 2, 2 \rangle\}$ and $s_i = 2$ for all $i \neq j$, then $(P_3 \times P_2)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in C_1$.

**Proof:** By Theorem 1.8(b), it suffices to prove $d((P_3 \times P_2)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)) > 3$. Suppose there exists an orientation $D$ of $(P_3 \times P_2)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$ such that $d(D) = 3$. By Theorem 1.8 and symmetry, it suffices to consider $j = \langle 2, 1 \rangle$, i.e. $s_{(2,1)} \geq 3$ (see Figure 16 when $s_{(2,1)} = 4$). Since $d_d((p, \langle 1, 2 \rangle), (q, \langle 3, 2 \rangle)) = d_d((q, \langle 3, 2 \rangle), (p, \langle 1, 2 \rangle)) = 2$ for all $p, q = 1, 2$, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that $(1, 2) \rightarrow (2, 2) \leftarrow (3, 2)$.

For $i = 1, 2$, since $d_d((p, \langle i, 2 \rangle), (3-p, \langle i, 2 \rangle)) \leq 3$ for $p = 1, 2$, it follows WLOG that $(i, 1) \rightarrow (i, 2)$. By $d_d((1, \langle 1, 1 \rangle), (1, \langle 3, 1 \rangle)) \leq 3$, we may assume WLOG that $(1, \langle 1, 1 \rangle) \rightarrow (1, 2, 1) \rightarrow (1, 2, 1) \rightarrow (1, 3, 1)$. Now, it is necessary from $d_d((1, \langle 2, 1 \rangle), (1, \langle 2, 2 \rangle)) \leq 3$ that $(1, \langle 2, 1 \rangle) \rightarrow (2, \langle 2, 2 \rangle)$. However, $d_d((2, \langle 3, 2 \rangle), (1, \langle 2, 1 \rangle)) > 3$, a contradiction. 

![Figure 16: Partial orientation $D$, where $d(D) = 4$.](image-url)
Proposition 3.4. If \( s_i = 2 \) for all \( i \in \{2, 1\}, \{2, 2\} \), then \((P_3 \times P_2)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_1\). 

Proof: By Theorem 1.8(b), it suffices to prove \( d((P_3 \times P_2)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)) > 3 \). Suppose there exists an orientation \( D \) of \((P_3 \times P_2)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)\) such that \( d(D) = 3 \). By Lemma 3.1, \((1, 1) \rightarrow (2, 1) \rightarrow (3, 1)\) (see Figure 17 when \( s_{(1,1)} = s_{(1,2)} = s_{(3,1)} = s_{(3,2)} = 4\)). For \( i = 3, 4, \ldots, s_{(1,1)} \) and \( j = 3, 4, \ldots, s_{(3,1)} \), replace \((2, 1, 1)\) \((2, 3, 1)\) resp. by \((i, 1, 1)\) \((j, 3, 1)\) resp. and apply Lemma 3.1 to conclude \((p, 1, 1) \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow\) for all \( p = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{(1,1)} \) and \( q = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{(3,1)} \). Similarly, \((p, 1, 2) \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow (q, 3, 2) \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow (p, 1, 2)\) for all \( p = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{(1,2)} \) and \( q = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{(3,2)} \).

By \( d_D((1, \{2, 1\}), (1, \{1, 2\})) \leq 3 \), we must have \((1, \{2, 1\}) \rightarrow (2, \{2, 2\})\). However, \( d_D((1, \{3, 2\}), (1, \{2, 1\})) > 3 \), a contradiction. \hfill \( \Box \)

Figure 17: Partial orientation \( D \), where \( d(D) = 4 \).

Example 3.5. If \( s_i = 2 \) for all \( i \notin \{2, 1\}, \{2, 2\} \) and \( s_j = 4 \) for all \( j \in \{2, 1\}, \{2, 2\} \), then \((P_3 \times P_2)(4, 4, 2, 2, \ldots, 2) \in \mathcal{C}_0\).

Proof: Define an orientation \( D \) of \((P_3 \times P_2)(4, 4, 2, 2, \ldots, 2)\). (See Figure 18.)

\( \langle 1, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 1, 1 \rangle, \langle 3, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow (3, 1) \),
\( (p, 1, 1) \Rightarrow (q, 2, 2) \) for \( p, q = 1, 2, 3, 4 \). 
\{\( (2, 1, i), (4, 2, i) \)\} \( \rightarrow \) \( (1, 1, i) \rightarrow \{\( (1, 2, i), (3, 2, i) \)\} \rightarrow (2, 1, i) \rightarrow \{\( (2, 2, i), (4, 2, i) \)\}, \)
\{\( (1, 2, i), (4, 2, i) \)\} \( \rightarrow \) \( (1, 3, i) \rightarrow \{\( (2, 2, i), (3, 2, i) \)\} \rightarrow (2, 3, i) \rightarrow \{\( (1, 2, i), (4, 2, i) \)\} \)
for \( i = 1, 2 \). It is easy to verify that \( d(D) = 3 \). \hfill \( \Box \)
Theorem 3.6. (Sperner [12]) Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\mathcal{A}$ be an antichain of $\mathbb{N}_n := \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ (i.e. $A \nsubseteq B$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$). Then, $|\mathcal{A}| \leq \binom{n}{n/2}$ with equality holding if and only if all members in $\mathcal{A}$ have the same size, $\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil$ or $\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor$. (The two sizes coincide if $n$ is even.)

To this end, recall the classical Sperner Theorem.

Proposition 3.7. If $s_i = 2$ for all $i \notin \{(2, 1), (2, 2)\}$ and $s_{(2, 2)} > \binom{s_{(2, 1)} + 4}{\left\lceil (s_{(2, 1)} + 4)/2 \right\rceil}$, then $H := (P_3 \times P_2)(s_{(2, 2)}, s_{(2, 1)}, 2, 2, \ldots, 2) \in \mathcal{C}_1$.

Proof: Let $V_1 = \{(p, (2, 2)) | p = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{(2, 2)}\}$ and $V_2 = \{(p, (2, 1)) | p = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{(2, 1)}\}$ $\cup\{(1, 1, 2), (2, 1, 2)\} \cup \{(1, 3, 2), (2, 3, 2)\}$. Note the subgraph induced by $V_1 \cup V_2$ is a complete bipartite graph with partite sets $V_1$ and $V_2$. Since $|V_1| = s_{(2, 2)} > \binom{s_{(2, 1)} + 4}{\left\lceil (s_{(2, 1)} + 4)/2 \right\rceil}$, there exists some $1 \leq p, q \leq s_{(2, 2)}, p \neq q$ such that $O((p, (2, 2))) \subseteq O((q, (2, 2)))$ by Sperner’s Theorem. This implies that $d_D((p, (2, 2)), (q, (2, 2))) \geq 4$. Hence, by Theorem 1.8(b), $H \in \mathcal{C}_1$.

We end off the section with a result on the hypercube graph.

Proof of Proposition 1.9: We shall prove $\bar{d}(Q_3^{(2)}) = 3$. Denote the vertices of the two disjoint copies of $C_4$ in $Q_4$ by $1, 2, 3, 4$, and $5, 6, 7, 8$. Define an orientation $D$ of $Q_3^{(2)}$ as follows. (See Figure 19.)

\[
\begin{align*}
i &\sim i + 1 \sim i + 2 \sim i + 3 \text{ and } i \sim i + 3 \text{ for } i = 1, 5, \\
4 &\Rightarrow 8, 2 \Rightarrow 6, 5 \Rightarrow 1, \text{ and } 7 \Rightarrow 3.
\end{align*}
\]

It is easy to verify that $d(D) = 3$. Hence, $Q_3^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0$. Now, by Theorem 1.5, $Q_3^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0$ for $\lambda \geq 3$. Since every vertex lies in a directed $C_4$, it follows from Lemma 1.2 that $Q_3(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1$ and $Q_\lambda(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0$ for $\lambda \geq 4$.\(\square\)
4. Cartesian product of trees with cycles $T_\lambda \times C_\mu$

In this section, we consider cartesian product of trees with cycles.

**Proof of Theorem 1.10:**

Case 1. $\lambda \geq 2$ and $\mu \geq 4$.

Let $(V_1, V_2)$ be a bipartition of $V(T_\lambda)$, i.e. $V_1$ and $V_2$ are independent sets. Let $F$ be a strong orientation of $C_\mu$, say $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow \mu \rightarrow 1$, and define an orientation $D$ for $(T_\lambda \times C_\mu)^{(2)}$ as follows.

\[ \langle u, x \rangle \Rightarrow \langle u, y \rangle \iff x \rightarrow y \text{ in } F \]

for any $u \in V_1$ and any $x, y \in V(C_\mu)$, i.e. the copy $C_\mu^{(2)}$ is oriented similarly to $F$.

\[ \langle u, x \rangle \Rightarrow \langle u, y \rangle \iff y \rightarrow x \text{ in } F \]

for any $u \in V_2$ and any $x, y \in V(C_\mu)$, i.e. the copy $C_\mu^{(2)}$ is oriented similarly to $\tilde{F}$.

\[ \langle u, x \rangle \Rightarrow \langle v, x \rangle \]

for any $u, v \in V(T_\lambda)$ with $uv \in E(T_\lambda)$.

We claim that $d_D((p, \langle u, x \rangle), (q, \langle v, y \rangle)) \leq \lambda + \lfloor \frac{\mu}{2} \rfloor = d(T_\lambda) + d(C_\mu)$ for any $\langle u, x \rangle, \langle v, y \rangle \in V(T_\lambda \times C_\mu)$, and $p, q = 1, 2$. Suppose $u = v \in V_1$. Note that either $d_F(x, y) \leq \lfloor \frac{\mu}{2} \rfloor$ or $d_{\tilde{F}}(x, y) \leq \lfloor \frac{\mu}{2} \rfloor$. There is a path $P$ ($P'$ resp.) of length at most $\lfloor \frac{\mu}{2} \rfloor$ from $\{(1, \langle u, x \rangle), (2, \langle u, x \rangle)\}$ to $\{(1, \langle w, y \rangle), (2, \langle u, x \rangle)\}$ in $D$ ($\{(1, \langle w, y \rangle), (2, \langle w, x \rangle)\}$ to $\{(1, \langle u, y \rangle), (2, \langle w, y \rangle)\}$ in $D$, where $w \in V_2$ is some vertex adjacent to $u$ in $T_\lambda$ resp.). In the former case, $P$ suffices and we are done. In the latter case, we shall further assume $\langle u, x \rangle \Rightarrow \langle w, x \rangle$ for simplicity; the proof is similar otherwise. Then, $(p, \langle u, x \rangle)(p, \langle w, x \rangle),\ldots$
$P'$ and $(3 - q, (w, y))(q, (u, y))$ form a $(p, (u, x)) - (q, (v, y))$ path of length at most $2 + \left\lceil \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil \leq \lambda + \left\lceil \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil$. A similar proof follows if $u = v \in V_2$.

Suppose $u \neq v$. Let $u w_1 w_2 \ldots w_l v$ be the unique shortest $u - v$ path in $T_\lambda$. For simplicity, we shall assume $(u, x) \leadsto (w_1, x) \leadsto \ldots \leadsto (v, x)$; the proof is similar otherwise. If $x = y$, then $(p, (u, x))(p, (w_1, x)) \ldots (p, (v, x))(3 - p, (v, w_l))(3 - p, (v, x))$ guarantees a $(p, (u, x)) - (q, (v, y))$ path of length at most $\lambda + \left\lceil \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil$.

Next, suppose $x \neq y$. Furthermore, we shall assume $v \in V_1$ (and hence $w_l \in V_2$); the proof is similar if $v \in V_2$. Again, consider the cases $d_F(x, y) \leq \left\lceil \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil$ or $d_F(x, y) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3} \right\rfloor$.

There is a path $Q$ ($Q'$ resp.) of length at most $\left\lceil \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil$ from $\{(1, (v, x)), (2, (v, x))\}$ to $\{(1, (v, y)), (2, (v, y))\}$ in $D$ ($\{(1, (w_l, x)), (2, (w_l, x))\}$ to $\{(1, (w_l, y)), (2, (w_l, y))\}$ in $D$ resp.). In the former case, $(p, (u, x))(p, (w_1, x)) \ldots (p, (v, x))$ and $Q$ form a $(p, (u, x)) - (q, (v, y))$ path of length at most $\lambda + \left\lceil \frac{4}{3} \right\rceil$. In the latter case, $(p, (u, x))(p, (w_1, x)) \ldots (p, (w_l, x))$ with $Q'$ and $(q, (w_l, y))(q, (v, y))$ form a $(p, (u, x)) - (q, (v, y))$ of length at most $\lambda + \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3} \right\rfloor$. Hence, $(T_\lambda \times C_\mu)^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0$.

Case 2. $\lambda = \mu = 3$.

Define an orientation $D$ for $(T_3 \times C_3)^{(2)}$ as follows. (See Figure 20.) For all $[i]_1 \in N_T(c_1)$ and all $[j]_2 \in N_T(c_2)$,

\[
\begin{align*}
(\langle c_1, 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_1, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_1, 3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_1, 1 \rangle), & \quad (\langle c_2, 3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_2, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_2, 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_2, 3 \rangle), \\
(\langle [i]_1, y \rangle \Rightarrow \langle [i]_1, y \rangle \Rightarrow \langle [i]_2, y \rangle), & \quad \text{and} \quad (\langle c_2, y \rangle \Rightarrow \langle [j]_2, y \rangle \rangle \text{ for all } y = 1, 2, 3, \\
(\langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle \leadsto \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle \leadsto \langle [i]_3, 3 \rangle \leadsto \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle), & \quad \text{and} \quad (\langle [j]_2, 1 \rangle \leadsto \langle [j]_2, 2 \rangle \leadsto \langle [j]_2, 3 \rangle \leadsto \langle [j]_2, 1 \rangle).
\end{align*}
\]

We claim that $d(D) = 4$. In view of the symmetry of $D$, it suffices to check $D$ for $(T_3 \times C_3)^{(2)}$ where $c_i$ has two end-vertex neighbours $[1]_i, [2]_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ in $T_3$. We remark that the checking includes the distance from any vertex in the $[1]_i$-copy ($[2]_i$-copy resp.) of $C_3^{(2)}$ to any vertex in the $[2]_1$-copy ($[2]_2$-copy resp.) of $C_3^{(2)}$, though only one $[i]_1$-copy ($[j]_2$-copy resp.) is shown in Figure 20 for brevity. Hence, $(T_3 \times C_3)^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0$.

Since every vertex lies in a directed $C_4$ in $D$ of both cases, it follows from Lemma 1.2 that $(T_\lambda \times C_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0$. 

\[
(1, \langle [i]_1, 3 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 3 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 3 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 3 \rangle) \\
(2, \langle i]_1, 3 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle i]_1, 3 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 3 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 3 \rangle) \\
(1, \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle) \\
(2, \langle i]_1, 2 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle i]_1, 2 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle) \\
(1, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \\
(2, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \\
(2, \langle [i]_1, 3 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 3 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 3 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 3 \rangle) \\
(2, \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 2 \rangle) \\
(1, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \\
(2, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [i]_1, 1 \rangle) \\
(1, \langle [j]_2, 3 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [j]_2, 3 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [j]_2, 3 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [j]_2, 3 \rangle) \\
(2, \langle [j]_2, 3 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [j]_2, 3 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [j]_2, 3 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [j]_2, 3 \rangle) \\
(1, \langle [j]_2, 2 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [j]_2, 2 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [j]_2, 2 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [j]_2, 2 \rangle) \\
(2, \langle [j]_2, 2 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [j]_2, 2 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [j]_2, 2 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [j]_2, 2 \rangle) \\
(1, \langle [j]_2, 1 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [j]_2, 1 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [j]_2, 1 \rangle) \quad (1, \langle [j]_2, 1 \rangle) \\
(2, \langle [j]_2, 1 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [j]_2, 1 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [j]_2, 1 \rangle) \quad (2, \langle [j]_2, 1 \rangle)
\]
For all $i$, if $T_i$ for all $j$, if $T_j$ for all $\deg(b)$, then $\deg(\mu)$ results involving $K_\mu$, $\mu \geq 3$, in place of $C_3$. For $T_2 \times K_\mu$, we split into cases of $deg_{T_2}(c) = 2$ (i.e., $T_2 = P_3$) and $deg_{T_2}(c) > 2$.

**Proposition 4.1.** For $\mu \geq 3$,

(a) if $deg_{T_2}(c) = 2$, then $(T_2 \times K_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0$.

(b) if $deg_{T_2}(c) > 2$, then $(T_2 \times K_\mu)^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_1$ and $(T_2 \times K_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1$.

**Proof:** Define an orientation $D$ for $(T_2 \times K_\mu)^{(2)}$ as follows. (See Figure 21 when $deg_{T_2}(c) = 2$ and $\mu = 3$.)

$$
\langle [1], j \rangle \mapsto \langle c, j \rangle \leftrightarrow \langle [i], j \rangle
$$

(4.1)

for all $[i] \in N_{T_2}(c) - \{[1]\}$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \mu$.

Except $\langle v, j \rangle \sim \langle v, 1 \rangle$ for $j = 3, 4, \ldots, \mu$,

$$
\langle v, j_1 \rangle \sim \langle v, j_2 \rangle \text{ whenever } 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \mu.
$$

(4.2)

for all $v \in V(T_2)$.

(a) Suppose $deg_{T_2}(c) = 2$. We give a brief verification of $d(D) = 3$. It is easy to check that the orientation in Figure 21 has diameter 3. Next, note for all $v \in T_2$, and all $j = 4, 5, \ldots, \mu$, that $\langle v, j \rangle$ really plays the same role as $\langle v, 3 \rangle$ in view of (4.2). Hence, it remains to check that the distance of any two vertices in each copy of $K_\mu^{(2)}$ is at most 3. This follows since $u \sim v$ or $v \sim u$ for all $u, v$ in each copy of $K_\mu$. Hence, $(T_2 \times K_\mu)^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_0$. Since every vertex lies in a directed $C_3$, it follows from Lemma 1.2 that $(T_2 \times K_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0$.

![Figure 21: Orientation $D$ of $(T_2 \times K_3)^{(2)}$ when $deg_{T_2}(c) = 2$, where $d(D) = 3$.](image-url)
(b) Now, consider the case $deg_{T_2}(c) > 2$. Suppose there exists an orientation $F$ of $(T_2 \times K_\mu)^{(2)}$ with $d(F) = 3$. By Lemma 3.1, $\langle [1], 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{1} \langle c, 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{2} \langle [2], 1 \rangle$ and $\langle [1], 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{1} \langle c, 1 \rangle \xleftarrow{2} \langle [3], 1 \rangle$. However, this contradicts $\langle [3], 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{1} \langle c, 1 \rangle \xrightarrow{2} \langle [2], 1 \rangle$. Thus, $(T_2 \times K_\mu)^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_1$.

To show $(T_2 \times K_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1$, we need to verify $d(D) = 4$. In view of (a) and its symmetry among the vertices $\langle [i], j \rangle$ for $[i] \in N_{T_2}(c) - \{[1]\}$ by (4.1), it suffices to check $d_D(p, \langle [2], j \rangle), (q, \langle [3], j \rangle) \leq 4$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, \mu$, and $p, q = 1, 2$. That is, the partial orientation in Figure 22 has diameter 4, which is easy to check. Since every vertex lies in a directed $C_3$, it follows from Lemma 1.2 that $(T_2 \times K_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1$.

![Figure 22: Partial orientation of $(T_2 \times K_3)^{(2)}$ when $deg_{T_2}(c) > 2$, where $d(D) = 4$.](image)

In Proposition 4.2, we generalise the sufficient condition in Proposition 4.1(b), "$deg_{T_2}(c) > 2$", for the vertex-multiplication of $T_2 \times K_\mu$ to be in $\mathcal{C}_1$.

**Proposition 4.2.** Let $\mu \geq 3$ and $m = \min\{s_{\langle c, v \rangle} \mid v \in V(K_\mu)\}$. If $deg_{T_2}(c) > \binom{m}{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}$, then $(T_2 \times K_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_1$.

**Proof:** Let $D$ be an orientation of $(T_2 \times K_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$ with $d(D) = 3$. In view of parity, $d_D(p, \langle [i], v \rangle), (q, \langle [j], v \rangle) = 2$ for any $p = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{\langle [i], v \rangle}$, $q = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{\langle [j], v \rangle}$ and all $[i], [j] \in N_{T_2}(c)$. For any $p, \langle [i], v \rangle \in V(D)$, let $O^{(c,v)}((p, \langle [i], v \rangle)) = O((p, \langle [i], v \rangle)) \cap \{(i, \langle c, v \rangle) \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{\langle c, v \rangle}\}$.

Since $deg_D(c) > \binom{m}{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}$, there exists some $v^* \in V(K_\mu)$ such that $deg_{T_2}(c) > \binom{s_{\langle c, v^* \rangle}}{\lfloor s_{\langle c, v^* \rangle}/2 \rfloor}$. By Sperner’s Theorem, for some $p^* = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{\langle [i], v^* \rangle}$, some $q^* = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{\langle [j], v^* \rangle}$ and some $[i^*], [j^*] \in N_{T_2}(c)$ with $[i^*] \neq [j^*]$, $O^{(c,v^*)}((p^*, \langle [i^*], v^* \rangle)) \subseteq O^{(c,v^*)}((q^*, \langle [j^*], v^* \rangle))$. Hence, it follows that $d_D((p^*, \langle [i^*], v^* \rangle), (q^*, \langle [j^*], v^* \rangle)) = 2$, a contradiction. Hence, $(T_2 \times K_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \notin \mathcal{C}_0$. By Proposition 4.1(b), $(T_2 \times K_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_1$.

**Remark 4.3.** Using the same notations as Proposition 4.2, a similar proof shows that if $deg_{T_2}(c) > \binom{m}{\lfloor m/2 \rfloor}$, then $(T_2 \times K_2)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \notin \mathcal{C}_0$.  
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Proposition 4.4. For $\mu \geq 3$, $(P_2 \times K_{\mu})(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_1$.

Proof: Suppose $F$ is an orientation of $(P_2 \times K_{\mu})(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$ with $d(F) = 2$. It follows from $d_F((p, \langle u, x \rangle), (q, \langle v, x \rangle)) \leq 2$ that $(p, \langle u, x \rangle) \rightarrow (q, \langle v, x \rangle)$ for $u, v \in V(P_2)$, $x \in V(K_{\mu})$, $p = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{(u,x)}$, $q = 1, 2, \ldots, s_{(v,x)}$. Then, $d_F((q, \langle v, x \rangle), (p, \langle u, x \rangle)) > 2$, a contradiction. Hence, $(P_2 \times K_{\mu})(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \notin \mathcal{C}_0$.

Define an orientation $D$ of $(P_2 \times K_{\mu})^{(2)}$ as follows. (See Figure 23 when $\mu = 3$.)

\[
\langle 2, 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 1, 1 \rangle, \langle 1, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 2, 2 \rangle, \langle 1, i \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle 2, i \rangle \text{ for } i = 3, 4, \ldots, \mu,
\]

\[
\langle k, j \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle k, 1 \rangle \text{ for } j = 3, 4, \ldots, \mu,
\]

\[
\langle k, j_1 \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle k, j_2 \rangle \text{ whenever } 1 \leq j_1 < j_2 < \mu,
\]

for $k = 1, 2$.

It can be verified easily that $d(D) = 3$. Hence, $(P_2 \times K_{\mu})^{(2)} \in \mathcal{C}_1$. Furthermore, since every vertex lies in a directed $C_3$, it follows from Lemma 1.2 that $(P_2 \times K_{\mu})(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_1$.

Figure 23: Orientation $D$ of $(P_2 \times K_3)^{(2)}$, where $d(D) = 3$.

5. Cartesian product of two cycles $C_\lambda \times C_\mu$

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.11.

Proposition 5.1. If $\lambda \geq \mu \geq 4$, then $(C_\lambda \times C_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0$.

Proof: We shall use a similar strategy as in Theorem 1.10. Partition $V(C_\mu)$ into $V_1 = \{v \mid v \text{ is odd}\}$ and $V_2 = \{v \mid v \text{ is even}\}$. Let $F$ be a strong orientation of $C_\mu$, say $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow \mu \rightarrow 1$, and define an orientation $D$ for $(C_\lambda \times C_\mu)^{(2)}$ as follows.

\[
\langle u, x \rangle \Rightarrow \langle u, y \rangle \iff x \rightarrow y \text{ in } F
\]
for any \( u \in V_1 \), and any \( x, y \in V(H) \), i.e. the copy \( C_\mu^{(2)} \) is oriented similarly to \( F \).

\[ \langle u, x \rangle \Rightarrow \langle u, y \rangle \iff y \rightarrow x \text{ in } F \]

for any \( u \in V_2 \), and any \( x, y \in V(H) \), i.e. the copy \( C_\mu^{(2)} \) is oriented similarly to \( \tilde{F} \).

\[ \langle u, x \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle u+1, x \rangle \text{ (addition is taken modulo } \lambda \text{)} \]

for any \( u \in V(C_\lambda) \) and any \( x \in V(C_\mu) \).

We claim that \( d_F((p, \langle u, x \rangle), (q, \langle v, y \rangle)) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor = d(C_\lambda)+d(C_\mu) \) for any \( \langle u, x \rangle, \langle v, y \rangle \in V(C_\lambda \times C_\mu) \) and \( p, q = 1, 2 \). Suppose \( u = v \in V_1 \). Note that either \( d_F(x, y) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \) or \( d_F(x, y) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \). There is a path \( P \) \( (P' \text{ resp.}) \) of length at most \( \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \) from \( \{1, \langle u, x \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle u, x \rangle \rangle \} \to \{1, \langle v, y \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle v, y \rangle \rangle \} \} \in D \{1, \langle w, x \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle w, y \rangle \rangle \} \} \} \in D \{1, \langle w, y \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle w, y \rangle \rangle \} \} \} \text{ in } D, \) where \( w \in V_2 \) is some vertex adjacent to \( u \) in \( C_\lambda \) resp.). In the former case, \( P \) suffices and we are done. In the latter case, we shall further assume \( u = w+1 \) (mod \( \lambda \)) for simplicity; the proof is similar if \( u = w+1 \) (mod \( \lambda \)). Then, \( (p, \langle u, x \rangle)(p, \langle w, x \rangle) \) with \( P' \) and \( \langle 3 - q, \langle v, y \rangle \rangle \langle q, \langle v, y \rangle \rangle \) form a \( (p, \langle u, x \rangle) - (q, \langle v, y \rangle) \) path of length at most \( 2 + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \). A similar proof follows if \( u = v \in V_2 \).

Suppose \( u \neq v \). For simplicity, we shall assume \( u(u+1) \ldots (u+l) \) to be a shortest \( u-v \) path in \( C_\lambda \); the proof is similar if the shortest path is \( u(u-1) \ldots (u-l) \).

Next, suppose \( x \neq y \). Furthermore, we shall assume \( v \in V_1 \); the proof is similar if \( v \in V_2 \). Again, consider the cases \( d_F(x, y) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \) or \( d_F(x, y) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \). In the former case, there is a path \( Q \) of length at most \( \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \) from \( \{1, \langle v, y \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle v, y \rangle \rangle \} \to \{1, \langle v, y \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle v, y \rangle \rangle \} \) in \( D \). So, \( \langle p, \langle u, x \rangle \rangle \langle p, \langle u+1, x \rangle \rangle \ldots \langle p, \langle u+l, x \rangle \rangle \langle p, \langle v, y \rangle \rangle \rangle \) and \( Q \) form a \( (p, \langle u, x \rangle) - (q, \langle v, y \rangle) \) path of length at most \( \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \). In the latter case, unless \( u = \lambda \) and \( v = 1 \), there exists some \( i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, l \), such that \( u+i \in V_2 \). Moreover, there is a path \( Q' \) of length at most \( \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \) from \( \{1, \langle u+i, x \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle u+i, x \rangle \rangle \} \to \{1, \langle u+i, y \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle u+i, y \rangle \rangle \} \) in \( D \) so that \( (p, \langle u, x \rangle) \ldots (p, \langle u+i, x \rangle) \) with \( Q' \) and \( q \langle q, \langle u+i, y \rangle \rangle \) form a \( (p, \langle u, x \rangle) - (q, \langle v, y \rangle) \) path of length at most \( \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \).

Finally, if \( u = \lambda \) is odd, \( v = 1 \), and \( y - x \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 \) \( \text{mod } \mu \), then \( (p, \langle \lambda, x \rangle) \rightarrow (p, \langle 1, x \rangle) \rightarrow \{1, \langle 1, x+1 \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle 1, x+1 \rangle \rangle \} \rightarrow \{1, \langle 1, x+2 \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle 1, x+2 \rangle \rangle \} \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow \{1, \langle 1, y \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle 1, y \rangle \rangle \} \) ensures a path of length at most \( 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 \leq 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \). If \( u = \lambda \) is odd, \( v = 1 \), and \( y - x > \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 \) \( \text{mod } \mu \), then \( (p, \langle \lambda, x \rangle) \rightarrow (3 - p, \langle \lambda, x \rangle) \rightarrow \{1, \langle \lambda-1, x-1 \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle \lambda-1, x-1 \rangle \rangle \} \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow \{1, \langle 1, \lambda-1, y \rangle\}, \langle 2, \langle 1, \lambda-1, y \rangle \rangle \} \) form a \( (p, \langle \lambda, x \rangle) - (q, \langle v, y \rangle) \) path of length at most \( 3 + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor - 2 \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{d}{2} \right\rfloor \).

Since every vertex lies in a directed \( C_4 \), it follows from Lemma 1.2 that \( (C_\lambda \times C_\mu)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \).

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 5.2.** \( (C_3 \times C_3)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1 \).

**Proof:** We claim that \( d(D) = 3 \) where \( F \) is as defined in Proposition 5.1. For any \( \langle u, x \rangle, \langle v, y \rangle \in V(C_\lambda \times C_\mu) \), observe that either \( \langle u, x \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle v, y \rangle \) or \( \langle v, y \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle u, x \rangle \) and \( \langle v, x \rangle \Rightarrow \langle v, x+2 \rangle \) or \( v, x \Rightarrow \langle v, x-1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle v, x-2 \rangle \), where the addition is taken modulo 3, proves the claim. Hence, \( (C_3 \times C_3)(2) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1 \). Since every vertex lies in a directed \( C_3 \), it follows from Lemma 1.2 that \( (C_3 \times C_3)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1 \).

\[ \square \]

**Proposition 5.3.** \( (C_4 \times C_3)(2) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \) and \( (C_4 \times C_3)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1 \).
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**Proof:** Define an orientation \( D \) for \((C_4 \times C_3)^{(2)}\) as follows. (See Figure 24.)

\[
\langle 2, i \rangle \sim \langle 1, i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle 3, i \rangle \sim \langle 4, i \rangle \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, 3.
\]

\[
\langle 1, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 1, 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 4, 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 4, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 1, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 1, 3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 4, 3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 4, 2 \rangle,
\]

\[
\langle 3, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 3, 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 2, 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 2, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 3, 2 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 3, 3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 2, 3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 2, 2 \rangle,
\]

\[
\langle 1, 3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 1, 1 \rangle, \langle 4, 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 4, 3 \rangle, \langle 3, 3 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 3, 1 \rangle, \text{ and} \quad \langle 2, 1 \rangle \Rightarrow \langle 2, 3 \rangle.
\]

It is easy to check \( d(D) = 3 \). Since every vertex lies in a directed \( C_4 \), it follows from Lemma 1.2 that \((C_4 \times C_3)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1\).

![Figure 24: Orientation D of \((C_4 \times C_3)^{(2)}\), where d(D) = 3.](image)

We end with some concluding remarks. In this paper, we considered primarily vertex-multiplications of cartesian products involving trees, paths and cycles as they are some special families of graphs studied for orientations. We refer the interested reader to a good survey on orientations of graphs [6] by Koh and Tay.

Recall by Corollary 2.3(b) that \((T_2 \times T_2)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathcal{C}_0 \cup \mathcal{C}_1\). We believe its characterisation likely involve notions and techniques of Extremal Set Theory such as antichains. This is akin to Proposition 4.2 and vertex-multiplications of trees with diameter 4 (see [15, 16]). Hence, we conclude by proposing the following problem.

**Problem 5.4.** Characterise the vertex-multiplications \((T_2 \times T_2)(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)\) that belong to \( \mathcal{C}_0 \).
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