Irredundance Trees of Diameter 3

C.M. Mynhardt^{*}

Department of Mathematics and Statistics University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, CANADA kieka@uvic.ca

kieka@uvic.ca

A. Roux[†]

Department of Mathematical Sciences Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, SOUTH AFRICA rianaroux@sun.ac.za

October 11, 2021

Abstract

A set D of vertices of a graph G = (V, E) is irredundant if each non-isolated vertex of G[D] has a neighbour in V - D that is not adjacent to any other vertex in D. The upper irredundance number IR(G) is the largest cardinality of an irredundant set of G; an IR(G)-set is an irredundant set of cardinality IR(G).

The IR-graph of G has the IR(G)-sets as vertex set, and sets D and D' are adjacent if and only if D' can be obtained from D by exchanging a single vertex of D for an adjacent vertex in D'. An IR-tree is an IR-graph that is a tree. We characterize IR-trees of diameter 3 by showing that these graphs are precisely the double stars S(2n, 2n), i.e., trees obtained by joining the central vertices of two disjoint stars $K_{1,2n}$.

Keywords: Irredundance; Reconfiguration problem; IR-graph; IR-tree AMS Subject Classification Number 2010: 05C69

1 Introduction

Reconfiguration problems are concerned with determining conditions under which a feasible solution to a given problem can be transformed into another one via a sequence of feasible solutions in such a way that any two consecutive solutions are adjacent according to a specified adjacency relation. The solutions form the vertex set of the associated reconfiguration

^{*}Supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

[†]This work is based on research supported by the National Research Foundation of South Africa (Grant number: 121931)

graph, two vertices being adjacent if one solution can be obtained from the other in a single step. Typical questions about the reconfiguration graph concern its structure (connectedness, Hamiltonicity, diameter), realizability (which graphs can be realized as a specific type of reconfiguration graph), and algorithmic properties (finding a shortest path between two solutions).

Domination reconfiguration problems involving dominating sets of different cardinalities were introduced by Haas and Seyffarth [9] and also studied in, for example, [1, 10, 11, 16]. Two variations of domination reconfiguration problems involving only minimum-cardinality dominating sets were introduced by Lakshmanan and Vijayakumar [13] in 2010, and Fricke, Hedetniemi, Hedetniemi, and Hutson [8] in 2011, respectively, and also studied in [2, 5, 6, 7, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20]. A survey of results concerning the reconfiguration of colourings and dominating sets in graphs can be found in [14].

The study of upper irredundance graphs, or IR-graphs, was mentioned as an open problem in [17] and initiated by the current authors in [15]. There we showed that all disconnected graphs, but not all connected graphs, are realizable as IR-graphs, and that the smallest noncomplete IR-tree is the double star S(2,2) (see Figure 1). Here we characterize IR-trees of diameter 3 by showing that these graphs are precisely the *double stars* S(2n, 2n), i.e., trees obtained by joining the central vertices of two disjoint stars $K_{1,2n}$. We need a number of results from [15], which we state in Section 3 after providing some definitions in Section 2. In Section 4 we construct a class of graphs G_n , $n \geq 1$, and show that $IR(G_n) \cong S(2n, 2n)$. We show in Section 5 that these double stars are the only IR-trees of diameter 3. We close by mentioning open problems and conjectures in Section 6.

2 Definitions

We follow the notation of [3] for general concepts, and that of [12] for domination related concepts not defined here. For a graph G = (V, E) and vertices $u, v \in V$, we use the notation $u \sim v$ ($u \nsim v$, respectively) to denote that u is adjacent (nonadjacent, respectively) to v. For a set $D \subseteq V$ and a vertex $v \in D$, a *D*-private neighbour of v is a vertex v' that is dominated by v (i.e., v' = v or $v' \sim v$) but by no vertex in $D - \{v\}$. The set of *D*-private neighbours of vis called the private neighbourhood of v with respect to D and denoted by PN(v, D).

The concept of irredundance was introduced by Cockayne, Hedetniemi and Miller [4] in 1978. A set $D \subseteq V$ is *irredundant* if $PN(v, D) \neq \emptyset$ for each $v \in D$. The *upper irredundance number* IR(G) is the largest cardinality of an irredundant set of G. An IR-*set* of G, or an IR(G)-*set*, is an irredundant set of cardinality IR(G). Let D be an irredundant set of G. For $v \in D$, it is possible that $v \in PN(v, D)$; this happens if and only if v is isolated in the subgraph G[D] induced by D. If $u \in PN(v, D)$ and $u \neq v$, then $u \in V - D$; in this case u is an *external D-private neighbour of* v. The set of external D-private neighbours of v is denoted by EPN(v, D). An isolated vertex of G[D] may or may not have external D-private neighbours, but if v has positive degree in G[D], then $EPN(v, D) \neq \emptyset$.

As defined in [15], the IR-graph G(IR) of G is the graph whose vertex set consists of the IR(G)-sets, where sets D and D' are adjacent if and only if there exist vertices $u \in D$ and $v \in D' - \{u\}$ such that $uv \in E(G)$ and $D' = (D - \{u\}) \cup \{v\}$. We shorten the expression $D' = (D - \{u\}) \cup \{v\}$ to $D \stackrel{uv}{\sim} D'$, and also write $D \sim_H D'$ or $D \stackrel{uv}{\sim}_{G(IR)} D'$ to show that D and



Figure 1: The graph $G' = G[\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\}]$ and the double star S(2, 2) induced by the IR(G')-sets, as described in Lemma 5

D' are adjacent in G(IR). When $D \stackrel{uv}{\sim} D'$, we say that v is swapped into and u is swapped out of the IR(G)-set, or simply that u and v are swapped. To prove that a given graph H is an IR-graph, one needs to construct a graph G such that $G(\text{IR}) \cong H$. Figure 1 shows a graph G' and and its IR-graph $G'(\text{IR}) \cong S(2,2)$; the six IR(G)-sets are given in Lemma 5 below.

3 Previous Results

We need the following results from Mynhardt and Roux [15]. We weakly partition an IR-set X into subsets X^{EPN} and X^{iso} (one of which may be empty), where each vertex in X^{iso} is isolated in G[X] and each vertex in X^{EPN} has at least one external private neighbour. (This partition is not necessarily unique. Isolated vertices of G[X] with external private neighbours can be allocated arbitrarily to X^{EPN} or X^{iso} .) For each $y \in X^{\text{EPN}}$, let $y' \in \text{EPN}(y, X)$ and define $Y' = \{y' : y \in X^{\text{EPN}}\}$. Let $X' = (X - X^{\text{EPN}}) \cup \{Y'\}$; note that |X| = |X'|. We call X' a flip-set of X, or to be more precise, the flip-set of X using Y'.

The first result from [15] allows us to find more IR-sets by using external private neighbours in a given IR-set.

Theorem 1 [15] If X is an IR(G)-set, then so is any flip-set of X. In particular, if X' is the flip-set of X using Y', and $y' \in Y'$ belongs to EPN(y, X), then $y \in \text{EPN}(y', X')$.

The following lemmas from [15] are important tools in the study of IR-trees.

Lemma 2 [15] If the IR-graph H of G is connected and X is an IR(G)-set such that

- (i) G[X] has exactly one edge, or
- (ii) X is independent but at least two vertices have X-external private neighbours,

then H contains an induced C_4 .

Lemma 3 [15] Let G be a graph, all of whose IR-sets are independent. If the IR-graph H of G is connected and has order at least three, then H contains a triangle or an induced C_4 .

Lemma 4 [15] If the IR-graph H of G is connected and X is an IR(G)-set that contains $k \ge 3$ vertices of positive degree in G[X], or with X-external private neighbours, then diam $(H) \ge k$.

The last lemma in this section is adapted from Lemma 5.1 of [15].

Lemma 5 Let H be an IR-tree of a graph G such that diam(H) = 3. Suppose $X = \{x_1, ..., x_r\}$ is an IR(G)-set such that exactly three vertices, say x_1, x_2, x_3 , have positive degree in G[X]. For i = 1, 2, 3, let $x'_i \in \text{EPN}(x_i, X)$ and let X' be the flip-set of X using $\{x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\}$. Note that $d_H(X, X') = 3$ and assume without loss of generality that $P : (X = X_0, X_1, X_2, X_3 = X')$, where

$$X_1 = \{x'_1, x_2, ..., x_r\}$$
 and $X_2 = \{x'_1, x'_2, x_3, ..., x_r\},\$

is an X-X' geodesic in H. Then

- (i) $G[\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\}]$ is the graph G' shown in Figure 1; in particular, the sets X_1 and X_2 are independent,
- (ii) the set $U = \{x_1, x'_1, x_2, x_4, ..., x_r\}$ is an IR(G)-set such that $x_3 \in \text{EPN}(x_1, U), x'_3 \in \text{EPN}(x'_1, U)$ and $x'_2 \in \text{EPN}(x_2, U),$
- (iii) denoting the flip-set $\{x'_2, x'_3, x_3, x_4, ..., x_r\}$ of U using $\{x_3, x'_3, x'_2\}$ by U', the graph induced by $\{X, X_1, X_2, X', U, U'\}$ is S(2, 2), with edges as shown in Figure 1.

We need a few more definitions based on Lemma 5. Observe that $C = (x_1, x_3, x'_3, x'_1, x_1)$ is an induced 4-cycle in G, with $x_1, x_3 \in X$ and $x'_1, x'_3 \in X'$. Significantly, x'_1 and x_3 have degree 2 in $G[\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\}]$, while x_1 and x'_3 have degree 3. The set U is obtained from X by replacing (not swapping) x_3 with the vertex x'_1 that is nonadjacent to it in C; imagine a token on x_3 skipping to x'_1 . We say that U is the skip-set of X replacing x_3 with x'_1 , or simply U is a skip-set of X when the vertices involved are obvious. (Thus X is the skip-set of U replacing x'_1 with x_3 .) The set U' is not only a flip-set of U, but also the skip-set of X' replacing x'_1 with x_3 . We call the set $\mathcal{X} = \{X, X', U, U'\}$ of these four related IR(G)-sets, which are leaves of H, a 4-cluster.

4 Construction of a graph G_n such that $G_n(\text{IR}) \cong S(2n, 2n)$

In this section we construct a class of graphs G_n , where $n \ge 1$, such that $IR(G_n) = 2n + 1$ and $G_n(IR)$ is the double star S(2n, 2n).

4.1 Construction of G_n

See Figure 2 for the case n = 3. The vertex set of G_n consists of five disjoint subsets $\{u, v\}, A, B, C, D$, where $A = \{a_1, ..., a_n\}, B = \{b_1, ..., b_n\}, C = \{c_1, ..., c_n\}$ and $D = \{d_1, ..., d_n\}$. Join u to each vertex in $A \cup \{v\}$, and join v to each vertex in B. Hence, ignoring (for the moment) the edges between A and B, the subgraph induced by $A \cup B \cup \{u, v\}$ is isomorphic to



Figure 2: A graph G_3 such that $G_3(IR) \cong S(6, 6)$

the double star S(n,n). Let $M = \{a_i b_i : i = 1, ..., n\}$ and join the vertices in A to the vertices in B so that the subgraph induced by $A \cup B$ is isomorphic to the bipartite graph $K_{n,n} - M$ with partite sets A and B. Finally, for each i = 1, ..., n, let $S_i = \{a_i, b_i, c_i, d_i\}$ and add edges such that the subgraph induced by each S_i is the 4-cycle $(a_i, c_i, b_i, d_i, a_i)$.

4.2 The upper irredundance number of G_n

Since $C \cup D \cup \{u\}$ and $C \cup D \cup \{v\}$ are independent sets of cardinality 2n + 1, $IR(G_n) \ge 2n + 1$. We show that $IR(G_n) = 2n + 1$. Let X be any irredundant set of G_n . We prove that $|X| \le 2n + 1$ by proving the following two statements:

- (a) $|S_i \cap X| \leq 2$ for each *i*;
- (b) if $\{u, v\} \subseteq X$, then $|X| \le 2n$ for all $n \ge 1$.

Proof of (a). Note that if, without loss of generality, $\{a_i, b_i, c_i\} \subseteq X$ or $\{a_i, c_i, d_i\} \subseteq X$, then $PN(c_i, X) = \emptyset$, a contradiction.

Proof of (b). Assume that $\{u, v\} \subseteq X$. Note that $PN(u, \{u, v\}) = A$ and $PN(v, \{u, v\}) = B$. Hence, if n = 1, then $X \cap S_1 = \emptyset$ and $X = \{u, v\}$. Assume that $n \ge 2$. Suppose $a_i \in X$. Then $PN(a_i, X) \subseteq \{c_i, d_i\}$. Moreover, $PN(v, X) = \{b_i\}$. This implies that $\{b_i, c_i, d_i\} \cap X = \emptyset$. Since $G_n[A \cup B] \cong K_{n,n} - M$, any vertex a_j , where $j \ne i$, is adjacent to b_i . Therefore, the private neighbourhood property of v implies that $A \cap X = \{a_i\}$. Similarly, if $b_j \in X$, then $PN(u, X) = \{a_j\}, \{a_j, c_j, d_j\} \cap X = \emptyset$ and $B \cap X = \{b_j\}$.

If $\{a_i, b_j\} \subseteq X$ for some i and j (where, as shown above, $i \neq j$), then possibly $\{c_k, d_k\} \cap X \neq \emptyset$ for some (or all) $k \notin \{i, j\}$. Necessarily, $|X| \leq 4 + 2(n-2) = 2n$. On the other hand, if $|X \cap (A \cup B)| = 1$, say $X \cap (A \cup B) = \{a_i\}$, then $X \cap \{c_j, d_j\} = \emptyset$ for at least one $j \neq i$ to ensure that $PN(u, X) \neq \emptyset$. Therefore $|X| \leq 3 + 2(n-2) = 2n - 1$.

Suppose $X \cap (A \cup B) = \emptyset$. Then $\{c_i, d_i\} \cap X = \emptyset$ for at least one *i* to ensure that PN(u, X) and PN(v, X) are nonempty. Again we have that $|X| \leq 2 + 2(n-1) = 2n$. This establishes (b). \blacklozenge

Therefore, the cardinality of X is maximized when $|X \cap \{u, v\}| = 1$. It follows that $IR(G_n) = 2n + 1$, as asserted.

4.3 The $IR(G_n)$ -sets

By (a) and (b) and the fact that $IR(G_n) = 2n + 1$, any $IR(G_n)$ -set contains exactly one of u and v, and exactly two vertices from each S_i . We show that the $IR(G_n)$ -sets are precisely the sets

1. $X = C \cup D \cup \{u\}$ 2. $X_i = (X - \{c_i\}) \cup \{a_i\}$ for i = 1, ..., n3. $X'_i = (X - \{d_i\}) \cup \{a_i\}$ for i = 1, ..., n4. $Y = C \cup D \cup \{v\}$ 5. $Y_i = (Y - \{c_i\}) \cup \{b_i\}$ for i = 1, ..., n6. $Y'_i = (Y - \{d_i\}) \cup \{b_i\}$ for i = 1, ..., n.

Let Z be any IR(G_n)-set and assume first that $u \in Z$. We show that $Z \cap B = \emptyset$. Suppose $b_i \in Z$. Since $|Z \cap S_i| = 2$, $a_i \in Z$ or, without loss of generality, $c_i \in Z$.

- Suppose $\{a_i, b_i\} \subseteq Z$. Note that $N_{G_n}(u) = A \cup \{v\}$. Since $u \sim a_i$, u is not isolated in $G_n[Z]$, hence $u \notin PN(u, Z)$. Since $a_i \in Z$ and b_i is adjacent to v and to each a_j , $j \neq i$, $(A \cup \{v\}) \cap PN(u, Z) = \emptyset$. But then $PN(u, Z) = \emptyset$, which is impossible.
- Suppose $\{b_i, c_i\} \subseteq Z$. Then c_i is not isolated in $G_n[Z]$, hence $c_i \notin PN(c_i, Z)$. But $b_i \in Z$ and $u \sim a_i$, hence $\{a_i, b_i\} \cap PN(c_i, Z) = \emptyset$. Therefore $PN(c_i, Z) = \emptyset$, which is impossible.

We conclude that $b_i \notin Z$ and therefore $Z \cap B = \emptyset$. We show next that $|Z \cap A| \leq 1$. Suppose to the contrary that $a_i, a_j \in Z$ for $i \neq j$. Since $|Z \cap S_i| = 2$, we further assume without loss of generality that $c_i \in Z$. Since $a_i \sim c_i$, $\{a_i, c_i\} \cap PN(c_i, Z) = \emptyset$, and since $a_j \sim b_i, b_i \notin PN(c_i, Z)$. Again we see that $PN(c_i, Z) = \emptyset$, a contradiction.

We have therefore established that $S_i \cap Z = \{c_i, d_i\}$ for all except possibly one value of *i*. Consider the set $X_i = (C - \{c_i\}) \cup D \cup \{a_i, u\}$. For each $j \neq i, c_j \in PN(c_j, X_i)$ and $d_j \in PN(d_j, X_i)$. Since $X_i \cap A = \{a_i\}$, no vertex in $X_i - \{d_i\}$ is adjacent to b_i , hence $b_i \in PN(d_i, X_i)$. Finally, $v \in PN(u, X_i)$. Therefore X_i is irredundant. Since $|X_i| = 2n + 1$, we have shown that X_i is an IR(G_n)-set for each *i*. Similarly, X'_i is an IR(G_n)-set for each *i*. Therefore, the sets X, X_i and X'_i are precisely the IR(G_n)-sets containing *u*. By symmetry, Y, Y_i and Y'_i are precisely the IR(G_n)-sets containing *v*. Note that $\{X_i, X'_i, Y_i, Y'_i\}$ is a 4-cluster for each *i*.



Figure 3: The graph $G_3(\text{IR})$, where G_3 is the graph in Figure 2, $X = \{u, c_1, c_2, c_3, d_1, d_2, d_3\}, Y = \{v, c_1, c_2, c_3, d_1, d_2, d_3\}, X_i = (X - \{c_i\}) \cup \{a_i\}, X'_i = (X - \{d_i\}) \cup \{a_i\}, Y_i = (Y - \{c_i\}) \cup \{b_i\}, \text{ and } Y'_i = (Y - \{d_i\}) \cup \{b_i\}$

4.4 The graph $G_n(\text{IR})$

Denote the IR-graph $G_n(\text{IR})$ by H. Figure 3 shows H for the case n = 3. Since $u \sim_{G_n} v$, we see that $X \sim_{H} Y$. Since $c_i \sim_{G_n} a_i$ and $d_i \sim_{G_n} a_i$, it follows that $X_i \sim_{H} X$ and $X'_i \sim_{H} X$ for each i. Similarly, $Y_i \sim_{H} Y$ and $Y'_i \sim_{H} Y$ for each i. This shows that the double star S(2n, 2n) is a spanning subgraph of H. It remains to show that the vertices X_i, X'_i, Y_i and Y'_i are leaves of H.

- When $i \neq j$, note that $\{a_i, c_j\} \subseteq X_i X_j$. Therefore $|X_i X_j| \geq 2$, hence $X_i \nsim_H X_j$. Similarly, $X'_i \nsim_H X'_j$, $Y_i \nsim_H Y_j$ and $Y'_i \nsim_H Y'_j$.
- For each *i*, since $c_i \approx d_i$, it follows that $X_i \approx_H X'_i$. Similarly, $Y_i \approx_H Y'_i$.
- Consider X_i and X'_j for $i \neq j$. Since $\{a_i, d_j\} \subseteq X_i X'_j$, we know that $|X_i X'_j| \ge 2$ and thus $X_i \not\sim_H X'_j$. Similarly, $Y_i \not\sim_H Y'_j$.

It follows that the sets

$$\mathcal{X} = \{X_i : i = 1, ..., n\} \cup \{X'_i : i = 1, ..., n\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{Y_i : i = 1, ..., n\} \cup \{Y'_i : i = 1, ..., n\}$$

are independent in G_n .

- For any $U \in \mathcal{X}$ and any $W \in \mathcal{Y}$, $\{a_i, u\} \subseteq U W$ and $\{a_i, u\} \subseteq U Y$. Hence no vertex in \mathcal{X} is adjacent, in $G_n(\mathrm{IR})$, to Y or to any $W \in \mathcal{Y}$.
- Finally, no vertex $W \in \mathcal{Y}$ is adjacent to X, because $\{b_i, v\} \subseteq W X$.

This completes the proof that $H = G_n(\text{IR}) \cong S(2n, 2n)$.

5 Stars S(2k, 2k) are the only IR-trees of diameter 3

Having shown in Section 4 that S(2n, 2n) is an IR-tree for each $n \ge 1$, we now show that they are the only IR-trees of diameter 3. We begin by stating a simple observation about trees of diameter 3 for referencing.

Observation 6 Let T be a tree with diameter 3 and diametrical path (v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3) . For any vertex u of T, $d(u, v_1) \leq 2$ and $d(u, v_2) \leq 2$. Moreover, if $d(u, v_1) = 2$, then v_2 lies on the v_1 -u geodesic and $u \sim v_2$.

We are now ready to prove our main result. We use the graphs in Figure 1 throughout the proof to affirm adjacencies and nonadjacencies between their vertices. To prove the theorem we show that if a tree T with diam(T) = 3 is an IR-tree, then the leaves of T occur in disjoint 4-clusters. We state and prove several claims within the main proof; the end of the proof of a claim is signalled by a diamond \blacklozenge . We consider three cases in the proof of Claim 4; the end of the proof of each case is indicated by an open diamond \diamondsuit .

Theorem 7 The stars S(2k, 2k), $k \ge 1$, are the only IR-trees of diameter 3.

Proof. Suppose T with diam(T) = 3 is an IR-tree of a graph G. By Lemma 2, all the IRsets of G are either independent or induce a graph that has exactly three vertices of positive degree. If G has only independent IR-sets, then by Lemma 3 the IR-graph of G contains a cycle. Therefore G has an IR-set $X = \{x_1, ..., x_r\}$ with exactly three vertices, say x_1, x_2, x_3 , of positive degree in G[X]. Let $x'_i \in \text{EPN}(x_i, X)$ for i = 1, 2, 3 and let X' be the flip-set of X using $\{x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\}$. Since |X - X'| = 3, we know that $d_T(X, X') \ge 3$, and since diam(T) = 3by assumption, $d_T(X, X') = 3$. Let $P: (X = X_0, X_1, X_2, X_3 = X')$ be an X-X' geodesic in T. Assume, as in the statement of Lemma 5, that

$$X_1 = \{x'_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_r\}, X_2 = \{x'_1, x'_2, x_3, \dots, x_r\}$$
 and $X_3 = X' = \{x'_1, x'_2, x'_3, \dots, x_r\}.$

Let

$$Z = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\},\$$

$$U = \{x_1, x'_1, x_2, x_4, \dots, x_r\},\ U' = \{x'_2, x'_3, x_3, x_4, \dots, x_r\},\ \text{and}\$$

$$\mathcal{X} = \{X, X', U, U'\}.$$

By Lemma 5, G[Z] is the graph G' shown in Figure 1, the sets X_1 and X_2 are independent,

$$x_3 \in \text{EPN}(x_1, U), \ x'_3 \in \text{EPN}(x'_1, U) \text{ and } x'_2 \in \text{EPN}(x_2, U),$$
 (1)

U' is the flip-set of U using $\{x_3, x'_3, x'_2\}$, and \mathcal{X} is a 4-cluster. Also by Lemma 5,

$$T[\{X, X_1, X_2, X', U, U'\}] \cong S(2, 2),$$

with edges shown in Figure 1. For referencing we state and prove the following claim.

Claim 1 The vertex $x_2 \in \text{EPN}(x'_2, X_2)$ and x'_2 is the only vertex with an X_2 -external private neighbour.

Proof of Claim 1. Since X_1 is independent, $x'_1 \not\sim x_2 \not\sim x_3$. Since x_i is isolated in G[X] for $i = 4, ..., r, x_2 \not\sim x_i$ for i = 4, ..., r. Finally, since $x'_2 \sim x_2$, it follows that $x_2 \in \text{EPN}(x'_2, X_2)$. Since X_2 is independent, Lemma 2 implies that that no other vertex in X_2 has an X_2 -external private neighbour.

By assumption, T is a tree, diam(T) = 3 and P is a diametrical path of T. Hence any vertex of T not on P is a leaf adjacent to X_1 or X_2 . Let $A' \notin \{X_1, X', U'\}$ be any IR(G)-set such that $X_2 \sim_T A'$; say $X_2 \overset{yy'}{\sim}_T A'$ for vertices $y \in X_2$ and $y' \in V(G) - X_2$ adjacent to y. We aim to show that A' belongs to a 4-cluster disjoint from \mathcal{X} . Since X_2 is independent and $y \sim y'$, we know that

$$y \in \text{EPN}(y', A'). \tag{2}$$

We further investigate the neighbourhoods of y and y' in Claims 2-5.

Claim 2 The vertex y' is adjacent to exactly two vertices of A'.

Proof of Claim 2. First suppose that y' is an X_2 -private neighbour of y. Then, by Claim 1, $y = x'_2$ (but $y' \neq x_2$, otherwise $A' = X_1$) and $A' = \{x'_1, y', x_3, \ldots, x_r\}$. Furthermore, if $y' \nsim x_2$, then $Q_1 = \{x'_1, y', x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_r\}$ is an independent set, hence an irredundant set, with $X_1 \subsetneq Q_1$. But then $|Q_1| > \operatorname{IR} G$), which is impossible. Hence $y' \sim x_2$. However, now (X_1, X_2, A', X_1) is a cycle in the tree T. This contradiction implies that y' is not an X_2 -external private neighbour of y and therefore y' is not isolated in G[A']. In fact, since X_2 is independent, it follows from Lemma 2 that y' is adjacent to at least two vertices in $A' = (X_2 - \{y\}) \cup \{y'\}$. If y' is adjacent to more than two vertices in A', then the flip-set of A' through $N[y'] \cap A'$ is at distance at least 3 from X_2 , contradicting Observation 6. We conclude that y' is adjacent to exactly two vertices of A'. \blacklozenge

Since $A' \notin \{X_1, X', U'\}$ is an arbitrary $\operatorname{IR}(G)$ -set adjacent to X_2 (and since X' and U' are not independent), it follows that no $\operatorname{IR}(G)$ -set adjacent to X_2 , other than X_1 , is independent. By symmetry, the same statement is true for $\operatorname{IR}(G)$ -sets, other than X_2 , adjacent to X_1 . Since $\operatorname{diam}(T) = 3$ and P is an X-X' geodesic, all $\operatorname{IR}(G)$ -sets are adjacent to either X_1 or X_2 . We therefore deduce that

$$X_1$$
 and X_2 are the only independent $\operatorname{IR}(G)$ -sets. (3)

Let $u, v \in N(y') \cap A'$ with A'-external private neighbours u' and v', respectively. By (2), $y \in \text{EPN}(y', A')$. Denote the flip-set of A' using $\{y, u', v'\}$ by A.

Claim 3 The vertex y' belongs to $V(G) - (X \cup Z)$.

Proof of Claim 3. Suppose the vertex $y \in X_2$ is swapped out for one of the vertices x_1, x_2, x'_3 . Recall that, by (1), $x'_i \in \text{EPN}(x_i, X)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Since the only neighbours of x_1 in X are x_2 and x_3 , the only neighbours of x_1 in X_2 are x'_1 and x_3 . Since the only neighbour of x_2 in X is x_1 , the only neighbour of x_2 in X_2 is x'_2 . The only neighbours of x'_3 in X_2 are x_3 and, by Lemma 5, x'_1 and x'_2 (see Figure 1). Hence $y \in \{x'_1, x'_2, x_3\}$. But by Lemma 5, the sets X_1, X_2 and the 4-cluster $\{X, X', U, U'\}$ are the only IR(G)-sets that can be obtained in this way. We conclude that $y \in X_2$ is swapped for $y' \in V(G) - X - Z$.

Claim 4 The vertex $y = x_j$ for some $j \ge 4$.

Proof of Claim 4. We showed in the proof of Claim 3 that no vertex in X_2 is swapped out for one of the vertices x_1, x_2, x'_3 . Now suppose that $y \in \{x'_1, x'_2, x_3\}$ and y is swapped for $y' \notin Z$. We consider three cases, depending on y. In each case we examine the possibilities for the external A'-private neighbours u' and v' of the neighbours u and v, respectively, of y' in A'. We show that each choice where $\{u', v'\} \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ leads to a contradiction. We are then left with a flip-set A of A' containing the vertices $u', v' \neq x_i, x'_i$ for i = 1, 2, 3, which implies that $d_T(X_i, A) \geq 2$ for i = 1, 2, contrary to Observation 6.

Case 1: $y = x'_2$, that is, $A' = \{x'_1, y', x_3, \ldots, x_r\}$. We show that $u', v' \neq x_i, x'_i$ for i = 1, 2, 3. Since u', v' are external A'-private neighbours and $x'_1, x_3 \in A'$, we know that $u', v' \neq x'_1, x_3$. Since $y' \sim x'_2 = y$, no neighbour of y' has x'_2 as A'-private neighbour, hence $u', v' \neq x'_2$. Also, since $x_2 \in \text{EPN}(x'_2, X_2)$, we either have $N[x_2] \cap A' = \emptyset$ or $N[x_2] \cap A' = \{y'\}$; in either case, $u', v' \neq x_2$. Because $x'_1 \sim x'_3 \sim x_3$, we know that $u', v' \neq x'_3$. Finally, since $x'_1 \sim x_1 \sim x_3$, we have $u', v' \neq x_1$. Therefore the flip-set A of A' contains the vertices $u', v' \notin Z$, which implies that $\min\{d_T(A, X_1), d_T(A, X_2)\} \geq 2$ and leads to a contradiction to Observation 6. \Diamond

Case 2: $y = x'_1$, that is, $A' = \{y', x'_2, x_3, ..., x_r\}$. We consider the possibilities for the neighbours u, v of y' in A' and their respective external A'-private neighbours u', v'. If $y' \sim x'_3$ (see the black and blue edges in Figure 4), then $A' \overset{y'x'_3}{\sim} U'$, so that the graph H in Figure 4 is a subgraph of the tree T, which is impossible.

Hence we may assume that
$$y' \nsim x'_3$$
. (4)

Clearly, $u', v' \neq x'_2, x_3 \in A'$ because u' and v' are external A'-private neighbours.

We next show that $y' \sim x'_2$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $y' \approx x'_2$, that is, $u, v \in \{x_3, ..., x_r\}$. We may then assume that $v \neq x_3$. By the private neighbour properties of X, this implies that $v' \neq x_i, x'_i$ for i = 1, 2, 3, since none of these vertices is adjacent to a vertex in $\{x_4, ..., x_r\}$. If we also have that $u \neq x_3$, the same holds for u', i.e., $u', v' \notin Z$, and we are done, hence assume $u = x_3$. Since $x'_2 \sim x'_3$, we have that $x'_3 \notin \text{EPN}(x_3, A') \cup \text{EPN}(y', A')$. Therefore $u' \neq x'_3$. Since $x_2 \sim x'_2$, we know that $u' \neq x_2$. Suppose $u' = x_1$. Then $A = \{x_1, x'_1, x'_2, v', x_4, ..., x_r\} - \{v\}$. However, now $x_1, v' \in A - (X_1 \cup X_2)$, so that $\min\{d_T(A, X_1), d_T(A, X_2)\} \geq 2$, contrary to Observation 6. We obtain a similar contradiction if $u' \notin Z$.

Therefore we may assume that
$$y' \sim x'_2$$
; say $x'_2 = v$. (5)

Because $x'_2 \sim x'_3 \sim x_3$, we know that $x'_3 \notin \{u', v'\}$. We still need to consider x_1 and x_2 . Observe that

if
$$x_2 \in \{u', v'\}$$
, then $x_2 = v'$ (6)



Figure 4: The graph $G'' = G[Z \cup \{y'\}]$ and the graph H formed by its IR-sets, as described in Case 2 of the proof of Claim 4

because $x_2 \sim x'_2 = v$ by (5). Since $x'_2 \in \text{EPN}(x_2, X)$, $x_1 \nsim x'_2 = v$ and so $x_1 \neq v'$. The investigation of whether $x_1 = u'$ depends on whether $u = x_3$ or $u = x_j$ for $j \ge 4$.

Case 2.1: $u = x_3$. Consider $A = \{y, u', v', x_4, ..., x_r\}$. Suppose that $u' = x_1$ and $v' = x_2$. Then

$$x'_1 \in \text{EPN}(y', A'), x_2 \in \text{EPN}(x'_2, A') \text{ and } x_1 \in \text{EPN}(x_3, A').$$

At this point the graph $G[Z \cup \{y'\}]$ is the graph formed by the black and red edges of the graph G'' in Figure 4, where the vertices in $A' - \{x_4, ..., x_r\}$ and their private neighbours are shown by solid squares and open circles, respectively. By Claim 2, (5) and the assumption of Case 2.1, y' is adjacent to exactly two vertices in A', namely x'_2 and x_3 ; we deduce that $y' \in \text{EPN}(x_3, X)$. Since, by (4), $y' \nsim x'_3$, it now follows that the set $Q_2 = (X - \{x_1, x_3\}) \cup \{y', x'_3\} = \{y', x_2, x'_3, x_4, ..., x_r\}$ is independent and therefore an IR(G)-set, contradicting (3).

Suppose $v' = x_2$ but $x_1 \notin \text{EPN}(x_3, A')$, i.e., $x_1 \neq u'$. Then $u' \in V(G) - (X \cup Z)$. (See the black edges of G^* in Figure 5.) Consider the set $Q_3 = \{x_1, x'_2, x_3, ..., x_r\}$ and note that x_1x_3 is the only edge of $G[Q_3]$. Moreover, $x'_1 \in \text{EPN}(x_1, Q_3)$ and (with only the edges in black) $u' \in \text{EPN}(x_3, Q_3)$. But by Lemma 2, Q_3 is not an IR(G)-set. The only possibility is that u' is adjacent to some other vertex of Q_3 . Since $x'_2 \in A'$ and $u' \in \text{EPN}(x_3, A')$, it follows that $u' \sim x'_2$, and we conclude that $u' \sim x_1$. (See the black and blue edges of G^* in Figure 5.) But now $A = \{x'_1, x_2, u', x_4, ..., x_r\}$ belongs to the triangle $A \overset{u'x_3}{\sim}_T X_1 \overset{x_3x_1}{\sim}_T U \overset{x_1u'}{\sim}_T A$ in T, which is impossible.

Finally, suppose $v' \neq x_2$. If $u' = x_1$, then $A = \{x_1, x'_1, v', x_4, ..., x_r\}$, where $v' \neq x_i, x'_i$ for i = 1, 2, 3. Hence $\{x_1, v'\} \subseteq A - (X_1 \cup X_2)$ and we get a contradiction to Observation 6. We obtain a similar contradiction if $u' \neq x_1$, because then $u', v' \neq x_i, x'_i$ for i = 1, 2, 3 and $\{u', v'\} \subseteq A - (X_1 \cup X_2)$. This concludes the proof of Case 2.1 $(u = x_3)$.

To recapitulate, we may assume, by (4) and (5), that $y' \nsim x'_3$ and $y' \sim x'_2 = v$. We have shown that $\{u', v'\} \cap \{x'_2, x_3, x'_3\} = \emptyset$, and if $x_2 \in \{u', v'\}$, then $x_2 = v'$ – see (6).

Case 2.2: $u \in \{x_4, ..., x_r\}$; say $u = x_4$. By the properties of X, $u' \notin X \cup Z$; say $u' = x'_4$. Moreover, since $x_1 \nsim x'_2$, we have that $x_1 \neq v'$. Assume therefore that $x_2 = v'$, otherwise



Figure 5: The graph $G^* = G[Z \cup \{u', y'\}]$ and the graph H formed by its IR-sets, as described in Case 2.1 of the proof of Theorem 7.

 $\{u',v'\} \cap Z = \emptyset$ and we are done. Now $A = \{x'_1, x_2, x_3, x'_4, x_5, ..., x_r\}$ and $y' \not\sim x_2 = v'$. If $x_1 \in \text{EPN}(x_3, A')$, then, by Theorem 1 applied to the flip-set of A' using $\{x_1, x'_1, x_2, x'_4\}$, this set is an IR(G)-set that differs from A' in four elements. But this is impossible because diam(T) = 3. Hence $x_1 \notin \text{EPN}(x_3, A')$ and the only possibility is that $x_1 \sim y'$. Moreover, by Lemma 5(i) applied to A' and A, and because $x'_1 \nsim x_2$, we see that $x'_1 \sim x'_4 \sim x_2$. Consider the set $Q_5 = \{x_1, y', x_3, ..., x_r\}$ and note that $G[Q_5]$ contains the path (x_3, x_1, y', x_4) . Hence, by Lemma 4, Q_5 is not an IR(G)-set. But $x_2 \in \text{EPN}(x_1, Q_5), x'_2 \in \text{EPN}(y', Q_5), x'_3 \in \text{EPN}(x_3, Q_5)$ and, unless $x_1 \sim x'_4$, we also have that $x'_4 \in \text{EPN}(x_4, Q_5)$; all vertices x_i with $i \ge 5$ are isolated in $G[Q_5]$. Therefore $x_1 \sim x'_4$. Finally, consider the set $Q_6 = \{x'_4, x_2, ..., x_r\}$, and note that $x'_1 \in \text{EPN}(x'_4, Q_6), x'_2 \in \text{EPN}(x_2, Q_6)$ and $y' \in \text{EPN}(x_4, Q_6)$, while x_i , for i = 3 or $i \ge 5$, is isolated in $G[Q_6]$. Hence Q_6 is an IR(G)-set. However, $Q_6 \overset{x'_4x_1}{\sim} T$ X, from which it follows that T either has diameter at least 4 (if Q_6 is nonadjacent to all other IR(G)-sets), or a cycle (otherwise). This concludes the proof of Case 2.2 ($u = x_i, j \ge 4$) and also of Case 2. \Diamond

Case 3: $y = x_3$, i.e., $A' = \{x'_1, x'_2, y', x_4, \ldots, x_r\}$ and $x_3 \in \text{EPN}(y', A')$. Similar to Case 2, if $y' \sim x'_3$, then $X_2 \stackrel{x_3y'}{\sim} A' \stackrel{y'x'_3}{\sim} X_2$, thus forming a cycle. Hence $y' \nsim x'_3$. Recall that if the external A'-private neighbours u' and v' of u and v, respectively, satisfy $\{u', v'\} \cap Z = \emptyset$, then $d_T(X_i, A) \geq 2$ for i = 1, 2, contrary to Observation 6. The possibilities for u' and v' among $x_i, x'_i, i = 1, 2, 3$, are x_1, x_2 and x'_3 . However, x'_3 is adjacent to both x'_1 and x'_2 , so we only need to consider x_1 and x_2 . Note that

if (say)
$$u' = x_1$$
, then $u = x'_1$ since $x_1 \sim x'_1$; similarly, if $v' = x_2$, then $v = x'_2$. (7)

Suppose $u' = x_1$ and $v' = x_2$. Then $u = x'_1$ and $v = x'_2$, hence, by Claim 2 and the elements in X and A', x_3 is the only neighbour of y' in X, i.e., $\{y', x'_3\} \subseteq \text{EPN}(x_3, X)$. But then, since $y' \nsim x'_3$, $(X - \{x_2, x_3\}) \cup \{y', x'_3\}$ is an independent set of G of cardinality IR(G), hence an independent IR(G)-set different from both X_1 and X_2 , contrary to (3).

Suppose $u = x'_1$ and $v' \neq x_2$, that is, u' is either x_1 or $u' \notin Z$, and $v' \notin Z$. Then $A = \{u', v', x_3, ..., x_r\}$, so that, by the conditions on u', the set $\{u', v'\} \subseteq A - (X_1 \cup X_2)$. Consequently, $d_T(X_i, A) \geq 2$ for i = 1, 2, contrary to Observation 6. Similarly, if $u \neq x'_1$ (so $u' \notin Z$) and $v' \notin Z$, then $d_T(X_i, A) \geq 2$ for i = 1, 2, giving the same contradiction. We examine the remaining case.



Figure 6: The graph $F = G[Z \cup \{x_4, u', y'\}]$ and the graph H formed by some of its IR-sets, as described in Case 3 of the proof of Theorem 7.

Suppose $u \neq x'_1$ and $v' = x_2$. Then $v = x'_2$ and $u, u' \notin Z$. Assume without loss of generality that $u = x_4$. Then $A = \{x'_1, x_2, x_3, u', x_5, \ldots, x_r\}$. We consider the edges of $G[A \cup Z]$ and $G[A' \cup Z]$. Applying Lemma 5(*i*) to A' and A (and noting that $x_2 \nsim x_3$ and $x_2 \nsim x'_1 \nsim x_3$) we find that $x_2 \sim u' \sim x_3$. Since $u' \in \text{EPN}(x_4, A')$, u' is nonadjacent to all vertices in $A' - \{x_4\} = \{x'_1, x'_2, y', x_5, \ldots, x_r\}$. Since each of x'_1, x'_2, x'_3 has an X'-external private neighbour, Lemma 4 implies that $\text{EPN}(x_4, X') = \emptyset$. The only remaining possibility is that $u' \sim x'_3$. To avoid A' having four vertices with external private neighbours, $x_1 \notin \text{EPN}(x'_1, A')$, and since $x'_2 \nsim x_1 \nsim x_4$, necessarily $y' \sim x_1$.

Consider the set $Q_7 = \{x_1, x_2, x'_2, y', x_5, ..., x_r\}$. Since $x_1 \sim x_2 \sim x'_2 = v \sim y', x_1, x_2, x'_2, y'$ all have positive degree in $G[Q_7]$. Hence Q_7 is not an IR(G)-set (by Lemma 4). However, if $x_1 \approx u'$, then $x'_1 \in \text{EPN}(x_1, Q_7)$, $u' \in \text{EPN}(x_2, Q_7)$, $x'_3 \in \text{EPN}(x'_2, Q_7)$ and $x_4 \in \text{EPN}(y', Q_7)$. Thus $x_1 \sim u'$. The subgraph $F = G[Z \cup \{x_4, u', y'\}]$ is shown by the black edges in Figure 6, where the edges incident with u' and y' in the complement \overline{F} are shown in colour (light grey in monotone). Recall that $U = \{x_1, x'_1, x_2, x_4, ..., x_r\}$ and consider the set $M = \{x'_1, x_2, x_4, u', x_4, ..., x_r\}$. The vertices x_2, x_4 and u' have positive degree in G[M] and have M-external private neighbours x'_2, y' and x_3 , respectively, hence M is an IR(G)-set. However, $M \stackrel{u'x_1}{\sim}_T U \stackrel{x_1x_3}{\sim}_T X_1 \stackrel{x_3u'}{\sim}_T M$, hence T contains a cycle, which is impossible.

We conclude that $\{u', v'\} \cap Z = \emptyset$, which leads to a contradiction with Observation 6 as explained above. \Diamond

Therefore, no $y \in \{x'_1, x'_2, x_3\}$ is swapped when obtaining A' from $X_2 = \{x'_1, x'_2, x_3, \dots, x_r\}$; it follows that $y = x_j$ for some $j \ge 4$.

We have shown in Claims 3 and 4 that if $A' \notin \{X_1, X_3, U'\}$ is any IR(G)-set such that $X_2 \stackrel{yy'}{\sim}_T A'$, then $y = x_i$ for $i \ge 4$, and $y' \in V(G) - (X \cup Z)$. Assume without loss of generality that $y = x_4$ and denote y' by x'_4 , so that $A' = \{x'_1, x'_2, x_3, x'_4, x_5, \ldots, x_r\}$ and $x_4 \in \text{EPN}(x'_4, A')$. We determine the two neighbours of x'_4 in A' in Claim 5.

Claim 5 The neighbours of $y' = x'_4$ in A' are x'_2 and a vertex $x_j \in X$, where $j \ge 5$.

Proof of Claim 5. For the two neighbours u and v of x'_4 in A', we consider the possibilities for

their external A'-private neighbours u' and v', respectively. Clearly, if $\{u', v'\} \subseteq A - (X_1 \cup X_2)$, then $d_T(X_i, A) \geq 2$ for i = 1, 2 and we obtain a contradiction to Observation 6 as before. Therefore we may assume that

$$|\{u', v'\} \cap A \cap X_1| \ge 1 \text{ or } |\{u', v'\} \cap A \cap X_2| \ge 1.$$
 (8)

By the properties of the X_i , no vertex in $\{x_5, ..., x_r\}$ is adjacent to a vertex in $X \cup Z$. Thus, if (say) $u \in \{x_5, ..., x_r\}$, then $u' \notin X_1 \cup X_2$, and the same holds for v and v'. Hence the inequalities (8) imply that $|\{u, v\} \cap \{x_5, ..., x_r\}| \le 1$ and $|\{u, v\} \cap \{x'_1, x'_2, x_3\}| \ge 1$. Since $x'_1 \sim x_1 \sim x_3$ and $x'_1 \sim x'_3 \sim x_3$, we know that $\{u', v'\} \cap \{x_1, x'_3\} = \emptyset$. Since we also know that $u', v' \notin A'$, the inequalities (8) now reduce to $\{u', v'\} \cap \{x_1, x_2, x'_3\} = \{x_2\}$. Necessarily, then, x'_4 is adjacent to x'_2 and to some vertex $x_j \in X$, where $j \ge 5$, as required. \blacklozenge

Assume without loss of generality that $u' = x_2$, that is, $u = x'_2$, and that v and v' are x_5 and x'_5 , respectively. Then $A' = \{x'_1, x'_2, x_3, x'_4, x_5, ..., x_r\}$ and $A = \{x'_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x'_5, ..., x_r\}$. Let $B = (A - \{x_4\}) \cup \{x_5\}$ and $B' = (A' - \{x_5\}) \cup \{x_4\}$ be the skip-sets of A and A', respectively. By Lemma 5, $\mathcal{A} = \{A, A', B, B'\}$ is a 4-cluster. Clearly, \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{X} = \{X, X', U, U'\}$ are disjoint 4-clusters.

We complete the proof of the theorem by showing, in Claim 6, that any other leaf of T belongs to a 4-cluster disjoint from both \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{X} .

Claim 6 Any IR(G) set $C' \notin \{X_1, X', A', B', U'\}$ adjacent to X_2 is obtained by swapping a vertex $x_j \in X_2$ for a vertex x'_j , where $j \ge 6$, $x'_j \notin \{x_1, ..., x_5, x'_1, ..., x'_5\}$, the only neighbours of x'_j in C' are x'_2 and x_k for some $k \ge 6$, $k \ne j$, and the C'-external private neighbour x'_6 of x_6 also does not belong to $\{x_1, ..., x_5, x'_1, ..., x'_5\}$.

Proof of Claim 6. Suppose that $C' \notin \{X_1, X', A', B', U'\}$ and $X_2 \overset{yy'}{\sim}_T C'$. We first consider C' in relation to the 4-cluster \mathcal{X} , repeating the arguments above.

By Claim 2, y' is adjacent to exactly two vertices of C', and by Claims 3 and 4, $y = x_j$, where $j \ge 4$ and $y' \in V(G) - (X \cup \{x'_1, x'_2, x'_3\})$. Say $y' = x'_j$. By Claim 5, the neighbours of x'_j in C' are x'_2 and a vertex $x_k \in X$, where $k \ge 4$ and $k \ne j$. Note that $G[\{x_2, x'_2, x_4, x'_4, x_5, x'_5\}] \cong G[Z]$ under an isomorphism that fixes x_2 and x'_2 . Repeating the proof above for the 4-cluster \mathcal{A} , Claims 3 and 4 give that $x_j \in \{x_1, x'_1, x_3, x'_3, x_6, ..., x_r\}$ and $x'_j \in V(G) - (X \cup \{x'_2, x'_4, x'_5\})$. The two conditions on x_j show that $j \ge 6$, while those on x'_j show that $x'_j \in V(G) - (X \cup \{x'_1, ..., x'_5\})$. Hence assume j = 6, i.e., $y = x_6$ and $y' = x'_6$. Now Claim 5 applied to $\{x_2, x'_2, x_4, x'_4, x_5, x'_5, x_6, x'_6\}$ asserts that the neighbours of x'_6 in C' are x'_2 and a vertex in C' different from x'_2, x_4, x_5 . Consolidating the two conditions obtained from Claim 5, the neighbours of x'_6 in C' are x'_2 and x_k , where $k \ge 7$; say k = 7. Let $x'_7 \in \text{EPN}(x_7, C')$. As above, $G[\{x_2, x'_2, x_6, x'_6, x_7, x'_7\}] \cong G[Z]$ under an isomorphism that fixes x_2 and x'_2 . Thus $(x_6, x'_6, x_7, x'_7, x_6)$ is a 4-cycle in G in which x_6 and x_7 are nonadjacent vertices of degree 2, and the skip-set $D' = (C' - \{x_7\}) \cup \{x_6\}$ and the flip-sets C and D of C' and D' obtained by using the obvious private neighbours are all IR(G)-sets which form a 4-cluster. \blacklozenge

By repeating the arguments in the proof of Claim 6, considering all existing 4-clusters in turn in each step until all vertices in X have been used, we show that the leaves of T occur in disjoint 4-clusters, thus obtaining the desired result.

6 Open Problems

We conclude by mentioning a number of conjectures and open problems, most of which also appear in [15].

Conjecture 1 [15] (i) The path P_n is not an IR-graph for each $n \ge 3$.

(ii) The cycle C_n is not an IR-graph for each $n \ge 5$.

Problem 1 [15] Prove or disprove: Complete graphs and $K_m \square K_n$, where $m, n \ge 2$, are the only connected claw-free IR-graphs.

Problem 2 [15] Determine which double spiders are IR-trees.

Problem 3 [15] Characterize IR-graphs having diameter 2.

Problem 4 Determine which graphs are IR-graphs of a graph G such that IR(G) = 2.

Acknowledgements We acknowledge the support of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), PIN 253271.

Cette recherche a été financée par le Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en génie du Canada (CRSNG), PIN 253271.

References

- S. Alikhani, D. Fatehi and S. Klavžar, On the structure of dominating graphs, *Graphs Combin.* 33 (2017), 665–672.
- [2] A. Bień, Gamma graphs of some special classes of trees, Ann. Math. Sil. 29 (2015), 25–34.
- [3] G. Chartrand, L. Lesniak, P. Zhang, *Graphs & Digraphs* (sixth edition), Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2016.
- [4] E. J. Cockayne, S. T. Hedetniemi, D. J. Miller, Properties of hereditary hypergraphs and middle graphs, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **21** (1978), 461–468.
- [5] E. Connelly, S.T. Hedetniemi, K.R. Hutson, A note on γ -Graphs. AKCE Intr. J. Graphs Comb. 8(1) (2010), 23-31.
- [6] A. Dyck, The Realisability of γ -Graphs. Master's Thesis, Simon Fraser University, 2017.

- [7] M. Edwards, Vertex-critically and bicritically for independent domination and total domination in graphs. PhD Dissertation, University of Victoria, 2015.
- [8] G.H. Fricke, S.M. Hedetniemi, S.T. Hedetniemi, K.R. Hutson, γ-graphs of graphs. Discuss. Math. Graph Theory 31 (2011), 517-531.
- [9] R. Haas, K. Seyffarth, The k-dominating graph, Graphs Combin. **30**(3) (2014), 609–617.
- [10] R. Haas, K. Seyffarth, Reconfiguring dominating sets in some well-covered and other classes of graphs, *Discrete Math.* **340** (2017), 1802–1817.
- [11] A. Haddadan, T. Ito, A. E. Mouawad, N. Nishimura, H. Ono, A. Suzuki, Y. Tebbal, The complexity of dominating set reconfiguration, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 651 (2016), 37–49.
- [12] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi, P.J. Slater, Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998.
- [13] S. A. Lakshmanan, A. Vijayakumar, The gamma graph of a graph, AKCE Int. J. Graphs Comb. 7 (2010), 53–59.
- [14] C. M. Mynhardt, S. Nasserasr, Reconfiguration of colourings and dominating sets in graphs, in F. Chung, R. Graham, F. Hoffman,L. Hogben, Ron Mullin and Doug West (Eds.), 50 Years of Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing, Chapman and Hall/CRC Press, 2019.
- [15] C. M. Mynhardt, A. Roux, Irredundance Graphs, submitted. arXiv:1812.03382
- [16] C. M. Mynhardt, A. Roux, L. E. Teshima, Connected k-dominating graphs, Discrete Math. 342 (2019), 145-151.
- [17] C. M. Mynhardt and L. Teshima, A note on some variations of the γ-graph, J. Combin. Math. Combin. Comput. 104 (2018), 217-230.
- [18] N. Sridharan, S. Amutha, S. B. Rao, Induced subgraphs of gamma graphs, Discrete Math. Algorithms Appl. 5 (2013), no. 3, 1350012, 5 pp.
- [19] K. Subramanian, N. Sridharan, γ -graph of a graph. Bull. Kerala Math. Assoc. 5(1) (2008), 17-34.
- [20] A. Suzuki, A.E. Mouawad, N. Nishimura, Reconfiguration of dominating sets, in: Z. Cai, A. Zelikovsky, A. Bourgeois (Eds.), COCOON 2014, in: *LNCS*, vol. 8591, Springer, Heidelberg, 2014, 405–416.