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#### 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 $\operatorname{IR}(G)$ is the largest cardinality of an irredundant set of $G$; an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set is an irredundant set of cardinality $\operatorname{IR}(G)$.

The IR-graph of $G$ has the $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-sets as vertex set, and sets $D$ and $D^{\prime}$ are adjacent if and only if $D^{\prime}$ can be obtained from $D$ by exchanging a single vertex of $D$ for an adjacent vertex in $D^{\prime}$. 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 $S(2 n, 2 n)$, i.e., trees obtained by joining the central vertices of two disjoint stars $K_{1,2 n}$.
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## 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

[^0]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 $S(2 n, 2 n)$, i.e., trees obtained by joining the central vertices of two disjoint stars $K_{1,2 n}$. 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 $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right) \cong S(2 n, 2 n)$. 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 $v^{\prime}$ that is dominated by $v$ (i.e., $v^{\prime}=v$ or $v^{\prime} \sim v$ ) but by no vertex in $D-\{v\}$. The set of $D$-private neighbours of $v$ is called the private neighbourhood of $v$ with respect to $D$ and denoted by $\operatorname{PN}(v, D)$.

The concept of irredundance was introduced by Cockayne, Hedetniemi and Miller [4] in 1978. A set $D \subseteq V$ is irredundant if $\operatorname{PN}(v, D) \neq \varnothing$ for each $v \in D$. The upper irredundance number $\operatorname{IR}(G)$ is the largest cardinality of an irredundant set of $G$. An IR-set of $G$, or an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set, is an irredundant set of cardinality $\operatorname{IR}(G)$. Let $D$ be an irredundant set of $G$. For $v \in D$, it is possible that $v \in \operatorname{PN}(v, D)$; this happens if and only if $v$ is isolated in the subgraph $G[D]$ induced by $D$. If $u \in \operatorname{PN}(v, D)$ 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 $\operatorname{EPN}(v, D)$. 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 $\operatorname{EPN}(v, D) \neq \varnothing$.

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

$G^{\prime}$

$S(2,2)$

Figure 1: The graph $G^{\prime}=G\left[\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}\right]$ and the double star $S(2,2)$ induced by the $\operatorname{IR}\left(G^{\prime}\right)$-sets, as described in Lemma 5
$D^{\prime}$ are adjacent in $G(\mathrm{IR})$. When $D \stackrel{u v}{\sim} D^{\prime}$, we say that $v$ is swapped into and $u$ is swapped out of the $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-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 $G($ IR $) \cong H$. Figure 1 shows a graph $G^{\prime}$ and and its IR-graph $G^{\prime}(\operatorname{IR}) \cong S(2,2)$; the six $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-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 $X^{\mathrm{EPN}}$ and $X^{\text {iso }}$ (one of which may be empty), where each vertex in $X^{\text {iso }}$ is isolated in $G[X]$ and each vertex in $X^{\text {EPN }}$ 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 $X^{\mathrm{EPN}}$ or $X^{\text {iso }}$.) For each $y \in X^{\mathrm{EPN}}$, let $y^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}(y, X)$ and define $Y^{\prime}=\left\{y^{\prime}: y \in X^{\mathrm{EPN}}\right\}$. Let $X^{\prime}=\left(X-X^{\mathrm{EPN}}\right) \cup\left\{Y^{\prime}\right\}$; note that $|X|=\left|X^{\prime}\right|$. We call $X^{\prime}$ a flip-set of $X$, or to be more precise, the flip-set of $X$ using $Y^{\prime}$.

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 $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set, then so is any flip-set of $X$. In particular, if $X^{\prime}$ is the flip-set of $X$ using $Y^{\prime}$, and $y^{\prime} \in Y^{\prime}$ belongs to $\operatorname{EPN}(y, X)$, then $y \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(y^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$.

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 $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-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 $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set that contains $k \geq 3$ vertices of positive degree in $G[X]$, or with $X$-external private neighbours, then $\operatorname{diam}(H) \geq k$.

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 $\operatorname{diam}(H)=3$. Suppose $X=\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ is an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-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 $x_{i}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{i}, X\right)$ and let $X^{\prime}$ be the flip-set of $X$ using $\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}$. Note that $d_{H}\left(X, X^{\prime}\right)=3$ and assume without loss of generality that $P:\left(X=X_{0}, X_{1}, X_{2}, X_{3}=X^{\prime}\right)$, where

$$
X_{1}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\} \quad \text { and } \quad X_{2}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}
$$

is an $X-X^{\prime}$ geodesic in $H$. Then
(i) $G\left[\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}\right]$ is the graph $G^{\prime}$ shown in Figure [1; in particular, the sets $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$ are independent,
(ii) the set $U=\left\{x_{1}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ is an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set such that $x_{3} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{1}, U\right), x_{3}^{\prime} \in$ $\operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{1}^{\prime}, U\right)$ and $x_{2}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{2}, U\right)$,
(iii) denoting the flip-set $\left\{x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}, x_{3}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ of $U$ using $\left\{x_{3}, x_{3}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}\right\}$ by $U^{\prime}$, the graph induced by $\left\{X, X_{1}, X_{2}, X^{\prime}, U, U^{\prime}\right\}$ is $S(2,2)$, with edges as shown in Figure 1 .

We need a few more definitions based on Lemma 5. Observe that $C=\left(x_{1}, x_{3}, x_{3}^{\prime}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{1}\right)$ is an induced 4 -cycle in $G$, with $x_{1}, x_{3} \in X$ and $x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime} \in X^{\prime}$. Significantly, $x_{1}^{\prime}$ and $x_{3}$ have degree 2 in $G\left[\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}\right]$, while $x_{1}$ and $x_{3}^{\prime}$ have degree 3 . The set $U$ is obtained from $X$ by replacing (not swapping) $x_{3}$ with the vertex $x_{1}^{\prime}$ that is nonadjacent to it in $C$; imagine a token on $x_{3}$ skipping to $x_{1}^{\prime}$. We say that $U$ is the skip-set of $X$ replacing $x_{3}$ with $x_{1}^{\prime}$, or simply $U$ is a skip-set of $X$ when the vertices involved are obvious. (Thus $X$ is the skip-set of $U$ replacing $x_{1}^{\prime}$ with $x_{3}$.) The set $U^{\prime}$ is not only a flip-set of $U$, but also the skip-set of $X^{\prime}$ replacing $x_{1}^{\prime}$ with $x_{3}$. We call the set $\mathcal{X}=\left\{X, X^{\prime}, U, U^{\prime}\right\}$ of these four related $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-sets, which are leaves of $H$, a 4 -cluster.

## 4 Construction of a graph $G_{n}$ such that $G_{n}(\mathrm{IR}) \cong S(2 n, 2 n)$

In this section we construct a class of graphs $G_{n}$, where $n \geq 1$, such that $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)=2 n+1$ and $G_{n}(\mathrm{IR})$ is the double star $S(2 n, 2 n)$.

### 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 $A=\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right\}, B=\left\{b_{1}, \ldots, b_{n}\right\}, C=\left\{c_{1}, \ldots, c_{n}\right\}$ and $D=\left\{d_{1}, \ldots, d_{n}\right\}$. 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 $G_{3}(\mathrm{IR}) \cong S(6,6)$
the double star $S(n, n)$. Let $M=\left\{a_{i} b_{i}: i=1, \ldots, n\right\}$ 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 $i=1, \ldots, n$, let $S_{i}=\left\{a_{i}, b_{i}, c_{i}, d_{i}\right\}$ and add edges such that the subgraph induced by each $S_{i}$ is the 4 -cycle $\left(a_{i}, c_{i}, b_{i}, d_{i}, a_{i}\right)$.

### 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 $2 n+1, \operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right) \geq 2 n+1$. We show that $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)=2 n+1$. Let $X$ be any irredundant set of $G_{n}$. We prove that $|X| \leq 2 n+1$ by proving the following two statements:
(a) $\left|S_{i} \cap X\right| \leq 2$ for each $i$;
(b) if $\{u, v\} \subseteq X$, then $|X| \leq 2 n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Proof of (a). Note that if, without loss of generality, $\left\{a_{i}, b_{i}, c_{i}\right\} \subseteq X$ or $\left\{a_{i}, c_{i}, d_{i}\right\} \subseteq X$, then $\operatorname{PN}\left(c_{i}, X\right)=\varnothing$, a contradiction.
Proof of (b). Assume that $\{u, v\} \subseteq X$. Note that $\operatorname{PN}(u,\{u, v\})=A$ and $\operatorname{PN}(v,\{u, v\})=B$. Hence, if $n=1$, then $X \cap S_{1}=\varnothing$ and $X=\{u, v\}$. Assume that $n \geq 2$. Suppose $a_{i} \in X$. Then $\operatorname{PN}\left(a_{i}, X\right) \subseteq\left\{c_{i}, d_{i}\right\}$. Moreover, $\operatorname{PN}(v, X)=\left\{b_{i}\right\}$. This implies that $\left\{b_{i}, c_{i}, d_{i}\right\} \cap X=\varnothing$. Since $G_{n}[A \cup B] \cong K_{n, n}-M$, any vertex $a_{j}$, where $j \neq i$, is adjacent to $b_{i}$. Therefore, the private neighbourhood property of $v$ implies that $A \cap X=\left\{a_{i}\right\}$. Similarly, if $b_{j} \in X$, then $\operatorname{PN}(u, X)=\left\{a_{j}\right\},\left\{a_{j}, c_{j}, d_{j}\right\} \cap X=\varnothing$ and $B \cap X=\left\{b_{j}\right\}$.

If $\left\{a_{i}, b_{j}\right\} \subseteq X$ for some $i$ and $j$ (where, as shown above, $i \neq j$ ), then possibly $\left\{c_{k}, d_{k}\right\} \cap X \neq$ $\varnothing$ for some (or all) $k \notin\{i, j\}$. Necessarily, $|X| \leq 4+2(n-2)=2 n$. On the other hand, if $|X \cap(A \cup B)|=1$, say $X \cap(A \cup B)=\left\{a_{i}\right\}$, then $X \cap\left\{c_{j}, d_{j}\right\}=\varnothing$ for at least one $j \neq i$ to ensure that $\operatorname{PN}(u, X) \neq \varnothing$. Therefore $|X| \leq 3+2(n-2)=2 n-1$.

Suppose $X \cap(A \cup B)=\varnothing$. Then $\left\{c_{i}, d_{i}\right\} \cap X=\varnothing$ for at least one $i$ to ensure that $\operatorname{PN}(u, X)$ and $\operatorname{PN}(v, X)$ are nonempty. Again we have that $|X| \leq 2+2(n-1)=2 n$. This establishes (b).

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

### 4.3 The $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)$-sets

By (a) and (b) and the fact that $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)=2 n+1$, any $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)$-set contains exactly one of $u$ and $v$, and exactly two vertices from each $S_{i}$. We show that the $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)$-sets are precisely the sets

1. $X=C \cup D \cup\{u\}$
2. $X_{i}=\left(X-\left\{c_{i}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$
3. $X_{i}^{\prime}=\left(X-\left\{d_{i}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$
4. $Y=C \cup D \cup\{v\}$
5. $Y_{i}=\left(Y-\left\{c_{i}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{b_{i}\right\}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$
6. $Y_{i}^{\prime}=\left(Y-\left\{d_{i}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{b_{i}\right\}$ for $i=1, \ldots, n$.

Let $Z$ be any $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)$-set and assume first that $u \in Z$. We show that $Z \cap B=\varnothing$. Suppose $b_{i} \in Z$. Since $\left|Z \cap S_{i}\right|=2, a_{i} \in Z$ or, without loss of generality, $c_{i} \in Z$.

- Suppose $\left\{a_{i}, b_{i}\right\} \subseteq Z$. Note that $N_{G_{n}}(u)=A \cup\{v\}$. Since $u \sim a_{i}, u$ is not isolated in $G_{n}[Z]$, hence $u \notin \operatorname{PN}(u, Z)$. Since $a_{i} \in Z$ and $b_{i}$ is adjacent to $v$ and to each $a_{j}, j \neq i$, $(A \cup\{v\}) \cap \operatorname{PN}(u, Z)=\varnothing$. But then $\operatorname{PN}(u, Z)=\varnothing$, which is impossible.
- Suppose $\left\{b_{i}, c_{i}\right\} \subseteq Z$. Then $c_{i}$ is not isolated in $G_{n}[Z]$, hence $c_{i} \notin \operatorname{PN}\left(c_{i}, Z\right)$. But $b_{i} \in Z$ and $u \sim a_{i}$, hence $\left\{a_{i}, b_{i}\right\} \cap \operatorname{PN}\left(c_{i}, Z\right)=\varnothing$. Therefore $\operatorname{PN}\left(c_{i}, Z\right)=\varnothing$, which is impossible.

We conclude that $b_{i} \notin Z$ and therefore $Z \cap B=\varnothing$. 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 $\left|Z \cap S_{i}\right|=2$, we further assume without loss of generality that $c_{i} \in Z$. Since $a_{i} \sim c_{i},\left\{a_{i}, c_{i}\right\} \cap \operatorname{PN}\left(c_{i}, Z\right)=\varnothing$, and since $a_{j} \sim b_{i}, b_{i} \notin \operatorname{PN}\left(c_{i}, Z\right)$. Again we see that $\operatorname{PN}\left(c_{i}, Z\right)=\varnothing$, a contradiction.

We have therefore established that $S_{i} \cap Z=\left\{c_{i}, d_{i}\right\}$ for all except possibly one value of $i$. Consider the set $X_{i}=\left(C-\left\{c_{i}\right\}\right) \cup D \cup\left\{a_{i}, u\right\}$. For each $j \neq i, c_{j} \in \operatorname{PN}\left(c_{j}, X_{i}\right)$ and $d_{j} \in$ $\operatorname{PN}\left(d_{j}, X_{i}\right)$. Since $X_{i} \cap A=\left\{a_{i}\right\}$, no vertex in $X_{i}-\left\{d_{i}\right\}$ is adjacent to $b_{i}$, hence $b_{i} \in \operatorname{PN}\left(d_{i}, X_{i}\right)$. Finally, $v \in \operatorname{PN}\left(u, X_{i}\right)$. Therefore $X_{i}$ is irredundant. Since $\left|X_{i}\right|=2 n+1$, we have shown that $X_{i}$ is an $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)$-set for each $i$. Similarly, $X_{i}^{\prime}$ is an $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)$-set for each $i$. Therefore, the sets $X, X_{i}$ and $X_{i}^{\prime}$ are precisely the $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)$-sets containing $u$. By symmetry, $Y, Y_{i}$ and $Y_{i}^{\prime}$ are precisely the $\operatorname{IR}\left(G_{n}\right)$-sets containing $v$. Note that $\left\{X_{i}, X_{i}^{\prime}, Y_{i}, Y_{i}^{\prime}\right\}$ is a 4-cluster for each $i$.


Figure 3: The graph $G_{3}(\mathrm{IR})$, where $G_{3}$ is the graph in Figure 2, $X=$ $\left\{u, c_{1}, c_{2}, c_{3}, d_{1}, d_{2}, d_{3}\right\}, Y=\left\{v, c_{1}, c_{2}, c_{3}, d_{1}, d_{2}, d_{3}\right\}, X_{i}=\left(X-\left\{c_{i}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{a_{i}\right\}, X_{i}^{\prime}=\left(X-\left\{d_{i}\right\}\right) \cup$ $\left\{a_{i}\right\}, Y_{i}=\left(Y-\left\{c_{i}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{b_{i}\right\}$, and $Y_{i}^{\prime}=\left(Y-\left\{d_{i}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{b_{i}\right\}$

### 4.4 The graph $G_{n}$ (IR)

Denote the IR-graph $G_{n}(\mathrm{IR})$ by $H$. Figure 3 shows $H$ for the case $n=3$. Since $u \sim_{G_{n}} v$, we see that $X \stackrel{u v}{\sim}_{H} Y$. Since $c_{i} \sim_{G_{n}} a_{i}$ and $d_{i} \sim_{G_{n}} a_{i}$, it follows that $X_{i} \stackrel{c_{i} a_{i}}{\sim}{ }_{H} X$ and $X i \stackrel{d_{i} a_{i}}{\sim}{ }_{H} X$ for each $i$. Similarly, $Y_{i} \stackrel{c_{i} b_{i}}{\sim}{ }_{H} Y$ and $Y_{i}^{\prime} \stackrel{d_{i} b_{i}}{\sim}{ }_{H} Y$ for each $i$. This shows that the double star $S(2 n, 2 n)$ is a spanning subgraph of $H$. It remains to show that the vertices $X_{i}, X_{i}^{\prime}, Y_{i}$ and $Y_{i}^{\prime}$ are leaves of $H$.

- When $i \neq j$, note that $\left\{a_{i}, c_{j}\right\} \subseteq X_{i}-X_{j}$. Therefore $\left|X_{i}-X_{j}\right| \geq 2$, hence $X_{i} \nsim_{H} X_{j}$. Similarly, $X_{i}^{\prime} \propto_{H} X_{j}^{\prime}, Y_{i} \propto_{H} Y_{j}$ and $Y_{i}^{\prime} \propto_{H} Y_{j}^{\prime}$.
- For each $i$, since $c_{i} \nsim d_{i}$, it follows that $X_{i} \not \varkappa_{H} X_{i}^{\prime}$. Similarly, $Y_{i} \nsim H Y_{i}^{\prime}$.
- Consider $X_{i}$ and $X_{j}^{\prime}$ for $i \neq j$. Since $\left\{a_{i}, d_{j}\right\} \subseteq X_{i}-X_{j}^{\prime}$, we know that $\left|X_{i}-X_{j}^{\prime}\right| \geq 2$ and thus $X_{i} \nsim_{H} X_{j}^{\prime}$. Similarly, $Y_{i} \nsim_{H} Y_{j}^{\prime}$.

It follows that the sets

$$
\mathcal{X}=\left\{X_{i}: i=1, \ldots, n\right\} \cup\left\{X_{i}^{\prime}: i=1, \ldots, n\right\}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{Y}=\left\{Y_{i}: i=1, \ldots, n\right\} \cup\left\{Y_{i}^{\prime}: i=1, \ldots, n\right\}
$$

are independent in $G_{n}$.

- For any $U \in \mathcal{X}$ and any $W \in \mathcal{Y},\left\{a_{i}, u\right\} \subseteq U-W$ and $\left\{a_{i}, u\right\} \subseteq U-Y$. Hence no vertex in $\mathcal{X}$ is adjacent, in $G_{n}($ IR $)$, to $Y$ or to any $W \in \mathcal{Y}$.
- Finally, no vertex $W \in \mathcal{Y}$ is adjacent to $X$, because $\left\{b_{i}, v\right\} \subseteq W-X$.

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

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

Having shown in Section 4 that $S(2 n, 2 n)$ is an IR-tree for each $n \geq 1$, 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 $\left(v_{0}, v_{1}, v_{2}, v_{3}\right)$. For any vertex $u$ of $T, d\left(u, v_{1}\right) \leq 2$ and $d\left(u, v_{2}\right) \leq 2$. Moreover, if $d\left(u, v_{1}\right)=2$, 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 $\operatorname{diam}(T)=3$ 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 $\downarrow$. We consider three cases in the proof of Claim 4 the end of the proof of each case is indicated by an open diamond $\diamond$.

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

Proof. Suppose $T$ with $\operatorname{diam}(T)=3$ 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 $X=\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ with exactly three vertices, say $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}$, of positive degree in $G[X]$. Let $x_{i}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{i}, X\right)$ for $i=1,2,3$ and let $X^{\prime}$ be the flip-set of $X$ using $\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}$. Since $\left|X-X^{\prime}\right|=3$, we know that $d_{T}\left(X, X^{\prime}\right) \geq 3$, and since $\operatorname{diam}(T)=3$ by assumption, $d_{T}\left(X, X^{\prime}\right)=3$. Let $P:\left(X=X_{0}, X_{1}, X_{2}, X_{3}=X^{\prime}\right)$ be an $X$ - $X^{\prime}$ geodesic in $T$. Assume, as in the statement of Lemma 5, that

$$
X_{1}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}, X_{2}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\} \text { and } X_{3}=X^{\prime}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}
$$

Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z & =\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\} \\
U & =\left\{x_{1}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}, U^{\prime}=\left\{x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}, x_{3}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}, \text { and } \\
\mathcal{X} & =\left\{X, X^{\prime}, U, U^{\prime}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

By Lemma 5, $G[Z]$ is the graph $G^{\prime}$ shown in Figure 1 , the sets $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$ are independent,

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{3} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{1}, U\right), x_{3}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{1}^{\prime}, U\right) \text { and } x_{2}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{2}, U\right), \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$U^{\prime}$ is the flip-set of $U$ using $\left\{x_{3}, x_{3}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}\right\}$, and $\mathcal{X}$ is a 4 -cluster. Also by Lemma 5 ,

$$
T\left[\left\{X, X_{1}, X_{2}, X^{\prime}, U, U^{\prime}\right\}\right] \cong S(2,2)
$$

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

Claim 1 The vertex $x_{2} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{2}^{\prime}, X_{2}\right)$ and $x_{2}^{\prime}$ is the only vertex with an $X_{2}$-external private neighbour.

Proof of Claim 1. Since $X_{1}$ is independent, $x_{1}^{\prime} \nsim x_{2} \nsim x_{3}$. Since $x_{i}$ is isolated in $G[X]$ for $i=4, \ldots, r, x_{2} \nsim x_{i}$ for $i=4, \ldots, r$. Finally, since $x_{2}^{\prime} \sim x_{2}$, it follows that $x_{2} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{2}^{\prime}, X_{2}\right)$. 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, $\operatorname{diam}(T)=3$ 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 $A^{\prime} \notin\left\{X_{1}, X^{\prime}, U^{\prime}\right\}$ be any $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set such that $X_{2} \sim_{T} A^{\prime}$; say $X_{2} \stackrel{y y^{\prime}}{\sim} A^{\prime}$ for vertices $y \in X_{2}$ and $y^{\prime} \in V(G)-X_{2}$ adjacent to $y$. We aim to show that $A^{\prime}$ belongs to a 4-cluster disjoint from $\mathcal{X}$. Since $X_{2}$ is independent and $y \sim y^{\prime}$, we know that

$$
\begin{equation*}
y \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(y^{\prime}, A^{\prime}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We further investigate the neighbourhoods of $y$ and $y^{\prime}$ in Claims 2-5.
Claim 2 The vertex $y^{\prime}$ is adjacent to exactly two vertices of $A^{\prime}$.

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

Since $A^{\prime} \notin\left\{X_{1}, X^{\prime}, U^{\prime}\right\}$ is an arbitrary $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set adjacent to $X_{2}$ (and since $X^{\prime}$ and $U^{\prime}$ 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 $X-X^{\prime}$ geodesic, all $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-sets are adjacent to either $X_{1}$ or $X_{2}$. We therefore deduce that

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{1} \text { and } X_{2} \text { are the only independent } \operatorname{IR}(G) \text {-sets. } \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $u, v \in N\left(y^{\prime}\right) \cap A^{\prime}$ with $A^{\prime}$-external private neighbours $u^{\prime}$ and $v^{\prime}$, respectively. By (22), $y \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(y^{\prime}, A^{\prime}\right)$. Denote the flip-set of $A^{\prime}$ using $\left\{y, u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\}$ by $A$.

Claim 3 The vertex $y^{\prime}$ 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 $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}^{\prime}$. Recall that, by (1), $x_{i}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{i}, X\right)$ 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 $x_{1}^{\prime}$ 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 $x_{2}^{\prime}$. The only neighbours of $x_{3}^{\prime}$ in $X_{2}$ are $x_{3}$ and, by Lemma 5, $x_{1}^{\prime}$ and $x_{2}^{\prime}$ (see Figure (1). Hence $y \in\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}\right\}$. But by Lemma 55 the sets $X_{1}, X_{2}$ and the 4 -cluster $\left\{X, X^{\prime}, U, U^{\prime}\right\}$ are the only $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-sets that can be obtained in this way. We conclude that $y \in X_{2}$ is swapped for $y^{\prime} \in V(G)-X-Z$.

Claim 4 The vertex $y=x_{j}$ for some $j \geq 4$.

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 $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}^{\prime}$. Now suppose that $y \in\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}\right\}$ and $y$ is swapped for $y^{\prime} \notin Z$. We consider three cases, depending on $y$. In each case we examine the possibilities for the external $A^{\prime}$-private neighbours $u^{\prime}$ and $v^{\prime}$ of the neighbours $u$ and $v$, respectively, of $y^{\prime}$ in $A^{\prime}$. We show that each choice where $\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \cap Z \neq \varnothing$ leads to a contradiction. We are then left with a flip-set $A$ of $A^{\prime}$ containing the vertices $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \neq x_{i}, x_{i}^{\prime}$ for $i=1,2,3$, which implies that $d_{T}\left(X_{i}, A\right) \geq 2$ for $i=1,2$, contrary to Observation 6.

Case 1: $y=x_{2}^{\prime}$, that is, $A^{\prime}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, y^{\prime}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$. We show that $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \neq x_{i}, x_{i}^{\prime}$ for $i=1,2,3$. Since $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}$ are external $A^{\prime}$-private neighbours and $x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{3} \in A^{\prime}$, we know that $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \neq x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{3}$. Since $y^{\prime} \sim x_{2}^{\prime}=y$, no neighbour of $y^{\prime}$ has $x_{2}^{\prime}$ as $A^{\prime}$-private neighbour, hence $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \neq x_{2}^{\prime}$. Also, since $x_{2} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{2}^{\prime}, X_{2}\right)$, we either have $N\left[x_{2}\right] \cap A^{\prime}=\varnothing$ or $N\left[x_{2}\right] \cap A^{\prime}=\left\{y^{\prime}\right\}$; in either case, $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \neq x_{2}$. Because $x_{1}^{\prime} \sim x_{3}^{\prime} \sim x_{3}$, we know that $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \neq x_{3}^{\prime}$. Finally, since $x_{1}^{\prime} \sim x_{1} \sim x_{3}$, we have $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \neq x_{1}$. Therefore the flip-set $A$ of $A^{\prime}$ contains the vertices $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \notin Z$, which implies that $\min \left\{d_{T}\left(A, X_{1}\right), d_{T}\left(A, X_{2}\right)\right\} \geq 2$ and leads to a contradiction to Observation 6 , $\diamond$

Case 2: $y=x_{1}^{\prime}$, that is, $A^{\prime}=\left\{y^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$. We consider the possibilities for the neighbours $u, v$ of $y^{\prime}$ in $A^{\prime}$ and their respective external $A^{\prime}$-private neighbours $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}$. If $y^{\prime} \sim x_{3}^{\prime}$ (see the black and blue edges in Figure (4), then $A^{\prime} \stackrel{y^{\prime} x_{3}^{\prime}}{\sim} U^{\prime}$, so that the graph $H$ in Figure 4 is a subgraph of the tree $T$, which is impossible.

Hence we may assume that $y^{\prime} \nsim x_{3}^{\prime}$.
Clearly, $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \neq x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3} \in A^{\prime}$ because $u^{\prime}$ and $v^{\prime}$ are external $A^{\prime}$-private neighbours.
We next show that $y^{\prime} \sim x_{2}^{\prime}$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $y^{\prime} \nsim x_{2}^{\prime}$, that is, $u, v \in\left\{x_{3}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$. We may then assume that $v \neq x_{3}$. By the private neighbour properties of $X$, this implies that $v^{\prime} \neq x_{i}, x_{i}^{\prime}$ for $i=1,2,3$, since none of these vertices is adjacent to a vertex in $\left\{x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$. If we also have that $u \neq x_{3}$, the same holds for $u^{\prime}$, i.e., $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \notin Z$, and we are done, hence assume $u=x_{3}$. Since $x_{2}^{\prime} \sim x_{3}^{\prime}$, we have that $x_{3}^{\prime} \notin \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{3}, A^{\prime}\right) \cup \operatorname{EPN}\left(y^{\prime}, A^{\prime}\right)$. Therefore $u^{\prime} \neq x_{3}^{\prime}$. Since $x_{2} \sim x_{2}^{\prime}$, we know that $u^{\prime} \neq x_{2}$. Suppose $u^{\prime}=x_{1}$. Then $A=\left\{x_{1}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, v^{\prime}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}-\{v\}$. However, now $x_{1}, v^{\prime} \in A-\left(X_{1} \cup X_{2}\right)$, so that $\min \left\{d_{T}\left(A, X_{1}\right), d_{T}\left(A, X_{2}\right)\right\} \geq 2$, contrary to Observation 6. We obtain a similar contradiction if $u^{\prime} \notin Z$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Therefore we may assume that } y^{\prime} \sim x_{2}^{\prime} \text {; say } x_{2}^{\prime}=v \text {. } \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because $x_{2}^{\prime} \sim x_{3}^{\prime} \sim x_{3}$, we know that $x_{3}^{\prime} \notin\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\}$. We still need to consider $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$. Observe that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { if } x_{2} \in\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \text {, then } x_{2}=v^{\prime} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$
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Figure 4: The graph $G^{\prime \prime}=G\left[Z \cup\left\{y^{\prime}\right\}\right]$ and the graph $H$ formed by its IR-sets, as described in Case 2 of the proof of Claim 4
because $x_{2} \sim x_{2}^{\prime}=v$ by (5). Since $x_{2}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{2}, X\right), x_{1} \nsim x_{2}^{\prime}=v$ and so $x_{1} \neq v^{\prime}$. The investigation of whether $x_{1}=u^{\prime}$ depends on whether $u=x_{3}$ or $u=x_{j}$ for $j \geq 4$.

Case 2.1: $u=x_{3}$. Consider $A=\left\{y, u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}, x_{4}, . ., x_{r}\right\}$.
Suppose that $u^{\prime}=x_{1}$ and $v^{\prime}=x_{2}$. Then

$$
x_{1}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(y^{\prime}, A^{\prime}\right), \quad x_{2} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{2}^{\prime}, A^{\prime}\right) \text { and } x_{1} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{3}, A^{\prime}\right)
$$

At this point the graph $G\left[Z \cup\left\{y^{\prime}\right\}\right]$ is the graph formed by the black and red edges of the graph $G^{\prime \prime}$ in Figure 4 , where the vertices in $A^{\prime}-\left\{x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ and their private neighbours are shown by solid squares and open circles, respectively. By Claim2 (5) and the assumption of Case 2.1, $y^{\prime}$ is adjacent to exactly two vertices in $A^{\prime}$, namely $x_{2}^{\prime}$ and $x_{3}$; we deduce that $y^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{3}, X\right)$. Since, by (4), $y^{\prime} \nsim x_{3}^{\prime}$, it now follows that the set $Q_{2}=\left(X-\left\{x_{1}, x_{3}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{y^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}=\left\{y^{\prime}, x_{2}, x_{3}^{\prime}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ is independent and therefore an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set, contradicting (3).

Suppose $v^{\prime}=x_{2}$ but $x_{1} \notin \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{3}, A^{\prime}\right)$, i.e., $x_{1} \neq u^{\prime}$. Then $u^{\prime} \in V(G)-(X \cup Z)$. (See the black edges of $G^{*}$ in Figure 5.) Consider the set $Q_{3}=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ and note that $x_{1} x_{3}$ is the only edge of $G\left[Q_{3}\right]$. Moreover, $x_{1}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{1}, Q_{3}\right)$ and (with only the edges in black) $u^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{3}, Q_{3}\right)$. But by Lemma 2, $Q_{3}$ is not an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set. The only possibility is that $u^{\prime}$ is adjacent to some other vertex of $Q_{3}$. Since $x_{2}^{\prime} \in A^{\prime}$ and $u^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{3}, A^{\prime}\right)$, it follows that $u^{\prime} \nsim x_{2}^{\prime}$, and we conclude that $u^{\prime} \sim x_{1}$. (See the black and blue edges of $G^{*}$ in Figure 55.) But now $A=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, u^{\prime}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ belongs to the triangle $A \stackrel{u^{\prime} x_{3}}{\sim} X_{T}{ }_{1} \stackrel{x_{3} x_{1}}{\sim}{ }_{T} U \stackrel{x_{1} u^{\prime}}{\sim}{ }_{T} A$ in $T$, which is impossible.

Finally, suppose $v^{\prime} \neq x_{2}$. If $u^{\prime}=x_{1}$, then $A=\left\{x_{1}, x_{1}^{\prime}, v^{\prime}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$, where $v^{\prime} \neq x_{i}, x_{i}^{\prime}$ for $i=1,2,3$. Hence $\left\{x_{1}, v^{\prime}\right\} \subseteq A-\left(X_{1} \cup X_{2}\right)$ and we get a contradiction to Observation 6. We obtain a similar contradiction if $u^{\prime} \neq x_{1}$, because then $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \neq x_{i}, x_{i}^{\prime}$ for $i=1,2,3$ and $\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \subseteq A-\left(X_{1} \cup X_{2}\right)$. This concludes the proof of Case $2.1\left(u=x_{3}\right)$.

To recapitulate, we may assume, by (4) and (5), that $y^{\prime} \nsim x_{3}^{\prime}$ and $y^{\prime} \sim x_{2}^{\prime}=v$. We have shown that $\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \cap\left\{x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}=\varnothing$, and if $x_{2} \in\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\}$, then $x_{2}=v^{\prime}$ - see (6).

Case 2.2: $u \in\left\{x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$; say $u=x_{4}$. By the properties of $X, u^{\prime} \notin X \cup Z$; say $u^{\prime}=x_{4}^{\prime}$. Moreover, since $x_{1} \nsim x_{2}^{\prime}$, we have that $x_{1} \neq v^{\prime}$. Assume therefore that $x_{2}=v^{\prime}$, otherwise


Figure 5: The graph $G^{*}=G\left[Z \cup\left\{u^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right\}\right]$ and the graph $H$ formed by its IR-sets, as described in Case 2.1 of the proof of Theorem 7 .
$\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \cap Z=\varnothing$ and we are done. Now $A=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}^{\prime}, x_{5}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ and $y^{\prime} \nsim x_{2}=v^{\prime}$. If $x_{1} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{3}, A^{\prime}\right)$, then, by Theorem 1 applied to the flip-set of $A^{\prime}$ using $\left\{x_{1}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, x_{4}^{\prime}\right\}$, this set is an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set that differs from $A^{\prime}$ in four elements. But this is impossible because $\operatorname{diam}(T)=3$. Hence $x_{1} \notin \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{3}, A^{\prime}\right)$ and the only possibility is that $x_{1} \sim y^{\prime}$. Moreover, by Lemma $5(i)$ applied to $A^{\prime}$ and $A$, and because $x_{1}^{\prime} \nsim x_{2}$, we see that $x_{1}^{\prime} \sim x_{4}^{\prime} \sim x_{2}$. Consider the set $Q_{5}=\left\{x_{1}, y^{\prime}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ and note that $G\left[Q_{5}\right]$ contains the path $\left(x_{3}, x_{1}, y^{\prime}, x_{4}\right)$. Hence, by Lemma 4. $Q_{5}$ is not an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set. But $x_{2} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{1}, Q_{5}\right), x_{2}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(y^{\prime}, Q_{5}\right), x_{3}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{3}, Q_{5}\right)$ and, unless $x_{1} \sim x_{4}^{\prime}$, we also have that $x_{4}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{4}, Q_{5}\right)$; all vertices $x_{i}$ with $i \geq 5$ are isolated in $G\left[Q_{5}\right]$. Therefore $x_{1} \sim x_{4}^{\prime}$. Finally, consider the set $Q_{6}=\left\{x_{4}^{\prime}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$, and note that $x_{1}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{4}^{\prime}, Q_{6}\right), x_{2}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{2}, Q_{6}\right)$ and $y^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{4}, Q_{6}\right)$, while $x_{i}$, for $i=3$ or $i \geq 5$, is isolated in $G\left[Q_{6}\right]$. Hence $Q_{6}$ is an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set. However, $Q_{6} \stackrel{x_{4}^{\prime} x_{1}}{\sim}{ }_{T} X$, from which it follows that $T$ either has diameter at least 4 (if $Q_{6}$ is nonadjacent to all other $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-sets), or a cycle (otherwise). This concludes the proof of Case $2.2\left(u=x_{j}, j \geq 4\right)$ and also of Case $2 . \diamond$
Case 3: $y=x_{3}$, i.e., $A^{\prime}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, y^{\prime}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ and $x_{3} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(y^{\prime}, A^{\prime}\right)$. Similar to Case 2, if $y^{\prime} \sim x_{3}^{\prime}$, then $X_{2} \stackrel{x_{3} y^{\prime}}{\sim} A^{\prime} \stackrel{y^{\prime} x_{3}^{\prime}}{\sim} X^{\prime} \stackrel{x_{3}^{\prime} x_{3}}{\sim} X_{2}$, thus forming a cycle. Hence $y^{\prime} \nsim x_{3}^{\prime}$. Recall that if the external $A^{\prime}$-private neighbours $u^{\prime}$ and $v^{\prime}$ of $u$ and $v$, respectively, satisfy $\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \cap Z=\varnothing$, then $d_{T}\left(X_{i}, A\right) \geq 2$ for $i=1,2$, contrary to Observation 6. The possibilities for $u^{\prime}$ and $v^{\prime}$ among $x_{i}, x_{i}^{\prime}, i=1,2,3$, are $x_{1}, x_{2}$ and $x_{3}^{\prime}$. However, $x_{3}^{\prime}$ is adjacent to both $x_{1}^{\prime}$ and $x_{2}^{\prime}$, so we only need to consider $x_{1}$ and $x_{2}$. Note that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { if (say) } u^{\prime}=x_{1} \text {, then } u=x_{1}^{\prime} \text { since } x_{1} \sim x_{1}^{\prime} \text {; similarly, if } v^{\prime}=x_{2} \text {, then } v=x_{2}^{\prime} \text {. } \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose $u^{\prime}=x_{1}$ and $v^{\prime}=x_{2}$. Then $u=x_{1}^{\prime}$ and $v=x_{2}^{\prime}$, hence, by Claim 2 and the elements in $X$ and $A^{\prime}, x_{3}$ is the only neighbour of $y^{\prime}$ in $X$, i.e., $\left\{y^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\} \subseteq \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{3}, X\right)$. But then, since $y^{\prime} \nsim x_{3}^{\prime},\left(X-\left\{x_{2}, x_{3}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{y^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}$ is an independent set of $G$ of cardinality $\operatorname{IR}(G)$, hence an independent $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set different from both $X_{1}$ and $X_{2}$, contrary to (3).

Suppose $u=x_{1}^{\prime}$ and $v^{\prime} \neq x_{2}$, that is, $u^{\prime}$ is either $x_{1}$ or $u^{\prime} \notin Z$, and $v^{\prime} \notin Z$. Then $A=\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$, so that, by the conditions on $u^{\prime}$, the set $\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \subseteq A-\left(X_{1} \cup X_{2}\right)$. Consequently, $d_{T}\left(X_{i}, A\right) \geq 2$ for $i=1,2$, contrary to Observation 6. Similarly, if $u \neq x_{1}^{\prime}$ (so $\left.u^{\prime} \notin Z\right)$ and $v^{\prime} \notin Z$, then $d_{T}\left(X_{i}, A\right) \geq 2$ for $i=1,2$, giving the same contradiction. We examine the remaining case.



H

Figure 6: The graph $F=G\left[Z \cup\left\{x_{4}, u^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right\}\right]$ and the graph $H$ formed by some of its IR-sets, as described in Case 3 of the proof of Theorem 7.

Suppose $u \neq x_{1}^{\prime}$ and $v^{\prime}=x_{2}$. Then $v=x_{2}^{\prime}$ and $u, u^{\prime} \notin Z$. Assume without loss of generality that $u=x_{4}$. Then $A=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, x_{3}, u^{\prime}, x_{5}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$. We consider the edges of $G[A \cup Z]$ and $G\left[A^{\prime} \cup Z\right]$. Applying Lemma $5(i)$ to $A^{\prime}$ and $A$ (and noting that $x_{2} \nsim x_{3}$ and $x_{2} \nsim x_{1}^{\prime} \nsim x_{3}$ ) we find that $x_{2} \sim u^{\prime} \sim x_{3}$. Since $u^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{4}, A^{\prime}\right), u^{\prime}$ is nonadjacent to all vertices in $A^{\prime}-\left\{x_{4}\right\}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, y^{\prime}, x_{5}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$. Since each of $x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}$ has an $X^{\prime}$-external private neighbour, Lemma 4 implies that $\operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{4}, X^{\prime}\right)=\varnothing$. The only remaining possibility is that $u^{\prime} \sim x_{3}^{\prime}$. To avoid $A^{\prime}$ having four vertices with external private neighbours, $x_{1} \notin \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{1}^{\prime}, A^{\prime}\right)$, and since $x_{2}^{\prime} \nsim x_{1} \nsim x_{4}$, necessarily $y^{\prime} \sim x_{1}$.

Consider the set $Q_{7}=\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{2}^{\prime}, y^{\prime}, x_{5}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$. Since $x_{1} \sim x_{2} \sim x_{2}^{\prime}=v \sim y^{\prime}, x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{2}^{\prime}, y^{\prime}$ all have positive degree in $G\left[Q_{7}\right]$. Hence $Q_{7}$ is not an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set (by Lemma[4). However, if $x_{1} \nsim u^{\prime}$, then $x_{1}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{1}, Q_{7}\right), u^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{2}, Q_{7}\right), x_{3}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{2}^{\prime}, Q_{7}\right)$ and $x_{4} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(y^{\prime}, Q_{7}\right)$. Thus $x_{1} \sim u^{\prime}$. The subgraph $F=G\left[Z \cup\left\{x_{4}, u^{\prime}, y^{\prime}\right\}\right]$ is shown by the black edges in Figure 6, where the edges incident with $u^{\prime}$ and $y^{\prime}$ in the complement $\bar{F}$ are shown in colour (light grey in monotone). Recall that $U=\left\{x_{1}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ and consider the set $M=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, x_{4}, u^{\prime}, x_{4}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$. The vertices $x_{2}, x_{4}$ and $u^{\prime}$ have positive degree in $G[M]$ and have $M$-external private neighbours $x_{2}^{\prime}, y^{\prime}$ and $x_{3}$, respectively, hence $M$ is an $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set. However, $M \stackrel{u^{\prime} x_{1}}{\sim}{ }_{T} U \stackrel{x_{1} x_{3}}{\sim}{ }_{T} X_{1} \stackrel{x_{3} u^{\prime}}{\sim}{ }_{T} M$, hence $T$ contains a cycle, which is impossible.

We conclude that $\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \cap Z=\varnothing$, which leads to a contradiction with Observation 6 as explained above. $\diamond$

Therefore, no $y \in\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}\right\}$ is swapped when obtaining $A^{\prime}$ from $X_{2}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\} ;$ it follows that $y=x_{j}$ for some $j \geq 4$.

We have shown in Claims 3 and 4 that if $A^{\prime} \notin\left\{X_{1}, X_{3}, U^{\prime}\right\}$ is any $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-set such that $X_{2} \stackrel{y y}{\prime}_{T} A^{\prime}$, then $y=x_{i}$ for $i \geq 4$, and $y^{\prime} \in V(G)-(X \cup Z)$. Assume without loss of generality that $y=x_{4}$ and denote $y^{\prime}$ by $x_{4}^{\prime}$, so that $A^{\prime}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}, x_{4}^{\prime}, x_{5} \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ and $x_{4} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{4}^{\prime}, A^{\prime}\right)$. We determine the two neighbours of $x_{4}^{\prime}$ in $A^{\prime}$ in Claim 5.

Claim 5 The neighbours of $y^{\prime}=x_{4}^{\prime}$ in $A^{\prime}$ are $x_{2}^{\prime}$ and a vertex $x_{j} \in X$, where $j \geq 5$.

Proof of Claim 5. For the two neighbours $u$ and $v$ of $x_{4}^{\prime}$ in $A^{\prime}$, we consider the possibilities for
their external $A^{\prime}$-private neighbours $u^{\prime}$ and $v^{\prime}$, respectively. Clearly, if $\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \subseteq A-\left(X_{1} \cup X_{2}\right)$, then $d_{T}\left(X_{i}, A\right) \geq 2$ for $i=1,2$ and we obtain a contradiction to Observation 6 as before. Therefore we may assume that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \cap A \cap X_{1}\right| \geq 1 \text { or }\left|\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \cap A \cap X_{2}\right| \geq 1 . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the properties of the $X_{i}$, no vertex in $\left\{x_{5}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ is adjacent to a vertex in $X \cup Z$. Thus, if (say) $u \in\left\{x_{5}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$, then $u^{\prime} \notin X_{1} \cup X_{2}$, and the same holds for $v$ and $v^{\prime}$. Hence the inequalities (8) imply that $\left|\{u, v\} \cap\left\{x_{5}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}\right| \leq 1$ and $\left|\{u, v\} \cap\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}\right\}\right| \geq 1$. Since $x_{1}^{\prime} \sim x_{1} \sim x_{3}$ and $x_{1}^{\prime} \sim x_{3}^{\prime} \sim x_{3}$, we know that $\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \cap\left\{x_{1}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}=\varnothing$. Since we also know that $u^{\prime}, v^{\prime} \notin A^{\prime}$, the inequalities (8) now reduce to $\left\{u^{\prime}, v^{\prime}\right\} \cap\left\{x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}=\left\{x_{2}\right\}$. Necessarily, then, $x_{4}^{\prime}$ is adjacent to $x_{2}^{\prime}$ and to some vertex $x_{j} \in X$, where $j \geq 5$, as required.

Assume without loss of generality that $u^{\prime}=x_{2}$, that is, $u=x_{2}^{\prime}$, and that $v$ and $v^{\prime}$ are $x_{5}$ and $x_{5}^{\prime}$, respectively. Then $A^{\prime}=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}, x_{4}^{\prime}, x_{5}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ and $A=\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}^{\prime}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$. Let $B=\left(A-\left\{x_{4}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{x_{5}\right\}$ and $B^{\prime}=\left(A^{\prime}-\left\{x_{5}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{x_{4}\right\}$ be the skip-sets of $A$ and $A^{\prime}$, respectively. By Lemma 5, $\mathcal{A}=\left\{A, A^{\prime}, B, B^{\prime}\right\}$ is a 4-cluster. Clearly, $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{X}=\left\{X, X^{\prime}, U, U^{\prime}\right\}$ 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 $\operatorname{IR}(G)$ set $C^{\prime} \notin\left\{X_{1}, X^{\prime}, A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}, U^{\prime}\right\}$ adjacent to $X_{2}$ is obtained by swapping a vertex $x_{j} \in X_{2}$ for a vertex $x_{j}^{\prime}$, where $j \geq 6, x_{j}^{\prime} \notin\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{5}, x_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, x_{5}^{\prime}\right\}$, the only neighbours of $x_{j}^{\prime}$ in $C^{\prime}$ are $x_{2}^{\prime}$ and $x_{k}$ for some $k \geq 6, k \neq j$, and the $C^{\prime}$-external private neighbour $x_{6}^{\prime}$ of $x_{6}$ also does not belong to $\left\{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{5}, x_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, x_{5}^{\prime}\right\}$.

Proof of Claim 66. Suppose that $C^{\prime} \notin\left\{X_{1}, X^{\prime}, A^{\prime}, B^{\prime}, U^{\prime}\right\}$ and $X_{2} \stackrel{y y^{\prime}}{\sim}{ }_{T} C^{\prime}$. We first consider $C^{\prime}$ in relation to the 4 -cluster $\mathcal{X}$, repeating the arguments above.

By Claim2, $y^{\prime}$ is adjacent to exactly two vertices of $C^{\prime}$, and by Claims 3and $4, y=x_{j}$, where $j \geq 4$ and $y^{\prime} \in V(G)-\left(X \cup\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{3}^{\prime}\right\}\right)$. Say $y^{\prime}=x_{j}^{\prime}$. By Claim [5, the neighbours of $x_{j}^{\prime}$ in $C^{\prime}$ are $x_{2}^{\prime}$ and a vertex $x_{k} \in X$, where $k \geq 4$ and $k \neq j$. Note that $G\left[\left\{x_{2}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{4}, x_{4}^{\prime}, x_{5}, x_{5}^{\prime}\right\}\right] \cong G[Z]$ under an isomorphism that fixes $x_{2}$ and $x_{2}^{\prime}$. Repeating the proof above for the 4 -cluster $\mathcal{A}$, Claims 3 and 4 give that $x_{j} \in\left\{x_{1}, x_{1}^{\prime}, x_{3}, x_{3}^{\prime}, x_{6}, \ldots, x_{r}\right\}$ and $x_{j}^{\prime} \in V(G)-\left(X \cup\left\{x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{4}^{\prime}, x_{5}^{\prime}\right\}\right)$. The two conditions on $x_{j}$ show that $j \geq 6$, while those on $x_{j}^{\prime}$ show that $x_{j}^{\prime} \in V(G)-\left(X \cup\left\{x_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, x_{5}^{\prime}\right\}\right)$. Hence assume $j=6$, i.e., $y=x_{6}$ and $y^{\prime}=x_{6}^{\prime}$. Now Claim 5 applied to $\left\{x_{2}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{4}, x_{4}^{\prime}, x_{5}, x_{5}^{\prime}, x_{6}, x_{6}^{\prime}\right\}$ asserts that the neighbours of $x_{6}^{\prime}$ in $C^{\prime}$ are $x_{2}^{\prime}$ and a vertex in $C^{\prime}$ different from $x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{4}, x_{5}$. Consolidating the two conditions obtained from Claim 55, the neighbours of $x_{6}^{\prime}$ in $C^{\prime}$ are $x_{2}^{\prime}$ and $x_{k}$, where $k \geq 7$; say $k=7$. Let $x_{7}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{EPN}\left(x_{7}, C^{\prime}\right)$. As above, $G\left[\left\{x_{2}, x_{2}^{\prime}, x_{6}, x_{6}^{\prime}, x_{7}, x_{7}^{\prime}\right\}\right] \cong G[Z]$ under an isomorphism that fixes $x_{2}$ and $x_{2}^{\prime}$. Thus $\left(x_{6}, x_{6}^{\prime}, x_{7}, x_{7}^{\prime}, x_{6}\right)$ is a 4 -cycle in $G$ in which $x_{6}$ and $x_{7}$ are nonadjacent vertices of degree 2, and the skip-set $D^{\prime}=\left(C^{\prime}-\left\{x_{7}\right\}\right) \cup\left\{x_{6}\right\}$ and the flip-sets $C$ and $D$ of $C^{\prime}$ and $D^{\prime}$ obtained by using the obvious private neighbours are all $\operatorname{IR}(G)$-sets which form a 4-cluster.

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 $n \geq 3$.
(ii) The cycle $C_{n}$ is not an IR-graph for each $n \geq 5$.

Problem 1 [15] Prove or disprove: Complete graphs and $K_{m} \square K_{n}$, where $m, n \geq 2$, 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 $\operatorname{IR}(G)=2$.
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