

Complexity of the game connected domination problem

Vesna Iršič

vesna.irsic@fmf.uni-lj.si

April 16, 2024

Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Institute of Mathematics, Physics and Mechanics, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Abstract

The connected domination game is a variation of the domination game where the played vertices must form a connected subgraph at all stages of the game. In this paper we prove that deciding whether the game connected domination number is smaller than a given integer is PSPACE-complete using log-space reductions for both Dominator- and Staller-start connected domination game.

Keywords: connected domination game, complexity, PSPACE-complete

AMS Subj. Class. (2020): 05C57, 05C69, 68Q17

1 Introduction

The *connected domination game* was introduced in 2019 by Borowiecki, Fiedorowicz, and Sidorowicz [1], and has been studied afterwards in [7, 8, 11]. The game is played on a graph G by two players: Dominator and Staller. They alternately select vertices of the graph. A move is legal if the selected vertex dominates at least one vertex which is not already dominated by previously played vertices, and if the set of vertices selected so far induces a connected subgraph of G . More precisely, choosing the vertex v_i in the i th move is legal if for the vertices v_1, \dots, v_{i-1} chosen so far we have $N[v_i] \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{i-1} N[v_j] \neq \emptyset$, and the vertices v_1, \dots, v_i induce a connected subgraph of G . Thus we only consider the connected domination game played on connected graphs. The game ends when there are no legal moves, so when the set of played vertices is a connected dominating set of G . The goal of Dominator is to finish the game with minimum number of moves, while the aim of Staller is to maximize the number of moves.

If both players play optimally, the number of moves on a graph G is the *game connected domination number* $\gamma_{\text{cg}}(G)$ if Dominator starts the game on G (D-game). If Staller starts the game (S-game), the number of moves is the *Staller-start game connected domination number*

$\gamma'_{\text{cg}}(G)$. Note that the terminology “connected game domination number” is also used in the literature, but we try to make it consistent with the terminology of other domination games (as in [5]). The moves in the D-game are denoted by $d_1, s_1, d_2, s_2, \dots$, where d_i are Dominator’s moves and s_i are Staller’s moves, while the moves in the S-game are denoted by s'_1, d'_1, \dots . For brevity, we sometimes refer to Dominator as he/him, and to Staller as she/her.

The relation between the Dominator- and Staller-start game connected domination number has been investigated in [1, 11] and differs drastically from the analogous result for the (total) domination game. If G is a connected graph, then

$$\gamma_{\text{cg}}(G) - 1 \leq \gamma'_{\text{cg}}(G) \leq 2\gamma_{\text{cg}}(G)$$

and the bounds are tight. Recall that on the other hand, the difference between the Dominator- and Staller-start game (total) domination number is at most 1 [6, 10, 12].

The connected domination game is a variation of the classical domination game which was introduced by Brešar, Klavžar and Rall in [6]. For a survey of existing results (and the variations of the game) we refer the reader to [5]. The famous $\frac{3}{5}$ - and $\frac{3}{4}$ -conjectures have recently been resolved [15, 18], and progress towards solving the $\frac{1}{2}$ -conjecture has been made [16]. The domination game is known to be difficult from the algorithmic point of view; the decision version of the game is PSPACE-complete using log-space reductions [3, 13]. The game total domination problem is also PSPACE-complete using log-space reductions [4]. The connected variation of the coloring game has also been studied [2, 9, 14].

In this paper we prove that the connected domination game is of the same complexity. In Section 2, we recall known results that are needed in the rest of the paper. The proof that the game connected domination problem is log-complete in PSPACE is given in Section 3, while an analogous result for the Staller-start game is presented in Section 4.

2 Preliminaries

For an integer n , let $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let G be a graph. A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a *connected dominating set* of G if every vertex in $V(G) \setminus S$ has a neighbor in S and the subgraph of G induced on S is connected. The smallest size of a connected dominating set is the *connected domination number* $\gamma_c(G)$ of G . Each connected dominating set of G of size $\gamma_c(G)$ is called a γ_c -*set* of G . We also recall the following result.

Theorem 2.1 ([1, Theorem 1]). *If G is a connected graph, then $\gamma_c(G) \leq \gamma_{\text{cg}}(G) \leq 2\gamma_c(G) - 1$.*

A decision problem is *PSPACE-complete* if it can be solved using working space of polynomial size with respect to the input length, and every other problem solvable in polynomial space can be reduced to it in polynomial time. If a problem is PSPACE-complete using log-space reductions, we say that it is *log-complete in PSPACE*.

We consider the following decision problems.

GAME CONNECTED DOMINATION PROBLEM

Input: A graph G and an integer m .

Question: Is $\gamma_{\text{cg}}(G) \leq m$?

STALLER-START GAME CONNECTED DOMINATION PROBLEM

Input: A graph G and an integer m .

Question: Is $\gamma'_{\text{cg}}(G) \leq m$?

POS-CNF PROBLEM

Input: A positive CNF formula \mathcal{F} with k variables and n clauses.

Question: Does Player 1 win on \mathcal{F} ?

The POS-CNF PROBLEM is known to be log-complete in PSPACE [17]. In the POS-CNF game, we are given a formula \mathcal{F} with k variables that is a conjunction of n disjunctive clauses in which only positive variables appear. Two players alternate turns, Player 1 setting a previously unset variable TRUE, and Player 2 setting one FALSE. When all k variables are set, Player 1 wins if the formula \mathcal{F} is TRUE, otherwise Player 2 wins.

Recall the properties of the following graph from [8, 11]. Let H_n , $n \geq 2$, be a graph with vertices $V(G_n) = \{u_0, \dots, u_{n+1}\} \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\} \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}\}$ and edges $u_i u_{i+1}$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $u_i x_i$, $x_i y_i$, $y_i u_{i+1}$, and $u_{i+1} x_i$ for $i \in [n-1]$. For example, see Figure 1.




Figure 1: The graph H_6 .

Lemma 2.2 ([8]). *If $n \geq 2$, then $\gamma_{\text{cg}}(H_n) = n$ and $\gamma'_{\text{cg}}(H_n) = 2n$.*

Dominator's strategy for the D-game on H_n is to play $d_1 = u_n$ which makes all the remaining moves unique and the game finishes in n moves. As in [8], we call this strategy FAST. Note that exactly vertices u_n, \dots, u_1 are played during the game.

Staller's strategy in the S-game is to start on u_0 and to play vertices x_1, \dots, x_{n-1} whenever she can. She is able to force $n-1$ additional moves on $V(H_n) \setminus \{u_0, \dots, u_{n+1}\}$. Thus, apart from the vertices u_1, \dots, u_n , exactly n additional moves are played (counting the move u_0 as well). We call this strategy of Staller SLOW.

Observe that since $\gamma_c(H_n) = n$, there are always at least n moves played on H_n (even if players do not alternate taking moves). It also follows from the above that n moves are played on H_n (again, even if players do not alternate taking moves) if and only if exactly vertices u_1, \dots, u_n are played.

3 Complexity of the Dominator-start game

In this section we provide a reduction from the POS-CNF PROBLEM to the GAME CONNECTED DOMINATION PROBLEM. The construction needed is described in Section 3.1, while the properties of the reduction and the final results are presented in Section 3.2. Note that the complexities of the domination and total domination games are also determined using a reduction from the POS-CNF PROBLEM, but the constructions used are different for each game; see [3, 4].

3.1 Construction

Let the graph B be as in Figure 2. When we refer to a copy B_i of the graph B , its vertices are labeled w_i for every $w \in \{a, e, b, d, h, k, f^1, g^1, f^2, g^2\}$.




Figure 2: The graph B .

Lemma 3.1. *If B is the graph defined above, then $\gamma_c(B) = 3$. The same holds even if vertices a and b are predominated.*

Given a formula \mathcal{F} with k variables and n disjunctive clauses, we built a graph $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ in the following way. For each variable X_i , $i \in [k]$, we add to the graph a copy B_i of the graph B (called a gadget). For each clause C_j , $j \in [n]$, we add to the graph a vertex c_j and make c_j adjacent to a_i if and only if the variable X_i appears in the clause C_j . We also add to the graph a disjoint copy of the graph H_3 and make u_0 adjacent to vertices a_i and b_i for all $i \in [k]$. For example, see Figure 3.

Lemma 3.2. *If \mathcal{F} is a formula with k variables and n disjunctive clauses, and $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the graph defined above, then $\gamma_c(G_{\mathcal{F}}) = 4 + 3k$ and every γ_c -set of $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ contains vertices $\{u_0, u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ and exactly three vertices from each gadget B_i , $i \in [k]$.*

Proof. Let $D = \{u_1, u_1, u_2, u_3\} \cup \bigcup_{i=1}^k \{a_i, e_i, b_i\}$. Clearly, $|D| = 4 + 3k$ and D is a connected dominating set of $G_{\mathcal{F}}$, so $\gamma_c(G_{\mathcal{F}}) \leq 4 + 3k$.

It follows from Lemma 3.1 that three vertices are needed to dominate each gadget B_i (even if a_i and b_i are already dominated). It follows from Lemma 2.2 that three vertices are




Figure 3: The graph $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ obtained from the formula $\mathcal{F} = (X_1 \vee X_3) \wedge (X_2 \vee X_3 \vee X_5) \wedge (X_4 \vee X_5)$.

needed to dominated H_3 and that the unique γ_c -set of H_3 of size 3 is $\{u_1, u_2, u_3\}$. But since the connected dominating set of $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ must be connected, such $3 + 3k$ vertices cannot form a connected dominating set. Thus $\gamma_c(G_{\mathcal{F}}) = 4 + 3k$ and every γ_c -set of $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ contains vertices $\{u_0, u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ and exactly three vertices from each gadget B_i , $i \in [k]$. \square

The following simple observations about the connected domination game on $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ that easily follow from Lemma 3.2 will also be useful:

- At least four moves must be played in the copy of H_3 in $G_{\mathcal{F}}$, including the vertex u_0 .
- At least three moves must be played in each gadget B_i .

3.2 Proof of the PSPACE-completeness

We consider two auxiliary lemmas that are needed for the main result.

Lemma 3.3. *If Player 1 has a winning strategy for the POS-CNF game played on \mathcal{F} , then $\gamma_{cg}(G_{\mathcal{F}}) = 4 + 3k$.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.2 and Theorem 2.1 that $\gamma_{\text{cg}}(G_{\mathcal{F}}) \geq 4 + 3k$. Thus we only need to describe Dominator's strategy that ensures that the game ends in at most $4 + 3k$ moves.

Dominator starts the game by playing $d_1 = u_3$. Thus he forces the strategy FAST to be played on H_3 , so the moves $s_1 = u_2$, $d_2 = u_1$ and $s_2 = u_0$ are forced. Observe that no vertex c_j can be a legal move in the rest of the game (to be legal, one of its neighbors, say a_i , must be played; but then c_j is dominated already and so are all vertices in $N(c_j)$).

Dominator's next move is to play $d_3 = a_i$ if setting X_i to TRUE is the optimal first move of Player 1 in the game on \mathcal{F} . For the rest of the game, Dominator will imagine a game is being played on \mathcal{F} , specifying certain moves of Staller and himself as moves in the POS-CNF game. He follows the rules listed below:

- (1) If possible, he plays in the same gadget B_i as Staller just played.
- (2) If this is not possible, but not all gadgets have been played on yet, Dominator selects an appropriate gadget B_i and plays the vertex a_i there.
- (3) Otherwise, Dominator plays on a gadget B_i that has already been played on in the previous moves, but the last move there was also made by him.

A more detailed description of Dominator's strategy in each of these cases is given below:

- (1) If possible, he plays in the same gadget B_i as Staller just played. More precisely, if Staller is the first to play on some B_i , then Dominator replies by playing e_i . If Staller is not the first to play on some B_i , but B_i is still not entirely dominated, then this is only possible if Dominator played the first move on this B_i , so by (2), he played a_i before. If Staller now plays e_i , he replies on b_i , and if she plays b_i , he selects e_i (no other move in B_i is a legal move for Staller at this stage of the game).

Notice that with this strategy, Dominator ensures that no more than three moves are played on each B_i .

- (2) If Staller plays the last possible move on some gadget B_i , then Dominator imagines that Player 2 set X_i to FALSE in the POS-CNF game. Note that by (1) this only happens if Staller also played the first vertex of B_i . In this case, Dominator clearly cannot follow the first rule. Thus, he plays on a previously unplayed gadget. He considers Player 1's optimal strategy in the POS-CNF game, and plays a_i such that Player 1's strategy is to set X_i to TRUE.

Notice that with this strategy, Dominator ensures that for all indices $i \in I$ that Player 1 sets to TRUE in his winning strategy in the POS-CNF game on \mathcal{F} , the vertices a_i , $i \in I$, are played. This results in the fact that by the end of the POS-CNF game, all vertices c_1, \dots, c_n will be dominated in $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ (since Player 1 wins on \mathcal{F}).

- (3) Otherwise, so if the game is not over yet, Dominator cannot play in the same gadget as Staller (because she played the last move there), but also all gadgets have been played on already, then this means that the imaginary POS-CNF game has ended already, with

the win of Player 1. By (2), this also means that the vertices c_1, \dots, c_n are all dominated. The only vertices left undominated then belong to gadgets where Dominator played a_i . Thus Dominator's strategy is to play e_i (if possible), or b_i if this will be the last move on B_i . Again, this strategy ensures that at most three moves are played on each gadget B_i .

It follows from the above that the game ends in at most $4 + 3k$ moves. \square

Lemma 3.4. *If Player 2 has a winning strategy for the POS-CNF game played on \mathcal{F} , then $\gamma_{\text{cg}}(G_{\mathcal{F}}) \geq 5 + 3k$.*

Proof. We describe Staller's strategy that ensures that at least $5 + 3k$ moves are played during the game.

If Dominator's first move in the game on $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ is on a vertex different from u_3 , since every γ_c -set of $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ contains only vertices $\{u_0, u_1, u_2, u_3\}$ from H_3 , then either his first move already means that an additional move will be made in the game (resulting in at least $5 + 3k$ moves overall), or Staller is able to use her strategy SLOW in H_3 and force at least one additional move (again resulting in at least $5 + 3k$ moves overall). Thus in the rest of the proof we assume that $d_1 = u_3$.

Again, the next few moves are forced: $s_1 = u_2$, $d_2 = u_1$ and $s_2 = u_0$. Observe again that no vertex c_j can be a legal move in the rest of the game.

For the rest of the game, Staller will imagine a game is being played on \mathcal{F} , specifying certain moves of Dominator and herself as moves in the POS-CNF game. Staller's strategy consists of two phases:

Phase 1 For every $i \in [k]$, at most three moves have been played on gadget B_i .

Staller follows the following rules which are described in more detail below.

- (1) If possible, Staller plays in the same gadget B_i as Dominator just played.
- (2) If this is not possible, but not all gadgets have been played on yet, Staller selects an appropriate gadget B_i and plays the vertex b_i there.
- (3) Otherwise, Staller plays on a gadget B_i that has already been played on in the previous moves, but the last move there was also made by her.

Phase 2 At least four moves have been played on some gadget B_i .

Staller plays any legal move until the game ends.

Notice that since by Lemma 3.2 every γ_c -set of $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ of size $4 + 3k$ contains exactly three vertices from each gadget B_i , as soon as Staller's strategy enters Phase 2, at least $5 + 3k$ moves in the game on $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ are ensured.

A more detailed description of Staller's strategy in Phase 1 is given below:

- (1) If possible, Staller plays on the same gadget B_i as Dominator just played. More precisely, if Dominator's move was the first on the gadget, then he played a_i or b_i , and in either case, she selects e_i . Thus exactly one more move is needed to entirely dominate B_i (see Figure 4).




Figure 4: Staller's strategy in (1) if Dominator played first on B_i . Dominated vertices are colored black.

If Dominator's move was not the first move on B_i , then Staller made the first move on B_i by playing b_i (by (2)). If Dominator plays e_i , Staller replies on h_i . If he plays a_i , she selects f_i^1 . And if he plays f_i^ℓ for some $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$, then she plays $f_i^{3-\ell}$ (see Figure 5).




Figure 5: Staller's strategy in (1) if Dominator played second on B_i . Dominated vertices are colored black.

Notice that if Dominator makes the first move on B_i , then exactly three moves will be played on that B_i . But if Staller makes the first move on B_i , then either three moves are played on it and a_i is not one of them, or at least four moves will be played on B_i (which results in the game entering Phase 2 once this happens).

- (2) If Dominator played the last possible move on some B_i , and there is still some unplayed gadget, then Staller's strategy is as follows.

First, observe that if Staller was the first player to play on B_i , then by (1) and the fact that we are in Phase 1, we can conclude that Staller was also the last player to play on B_i . Thus by assumption that Dominator played the last possible move on B_i , we can conclude that Dominator was also the first player to play on B_i . Staller now sets the corresponding X_i to TRUE as the move of Player 1 in the imagined POS-CNF game. Her next move is to play b_j in the gadget B_j such that Player 2's optimal move in the POS-CNF game is to set X_j to FALSE.

Note that this means that while we are in Phase 1, a variable X_i is set to TRUE if and only if Dominator played a_i and exactly three moves were played on B_i , while a variable X_j is set to FALSE if and only if Staller played b_j , a_j has not been played and at most three moves were played on B_j .

- (3) Otherwise, so if the game is not over yet, we are still in Phase 1, Staller cannot play in the same gadget as Dominator just did, and all gadgets have been played on already, then Staller's strategy is to play any legal move.

Note however that this case means that POS-CNF game has ended already. Since Player 2 won and at most three moves were played on each gadget, some vertex among c_1, \dots, c_n is not dominated yet, so another move on one of the gadgets will be needed to finish the game.

It follows from the above that the game ends after at least $5 + 3k$ moves. \square

Theorem 3.5. *The GAME CONNECTED DOMINATION PROBLEM is PSPACE-complete.*

Proof. It is easy to see that the GAME CONNECTED DOMINATION PROBLEM is in PSPACE. (For example, use the fact that $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{PSPACE}$.)

To prove that the problem is PSPACE-complete, we use a reduction from the POS-CNF PROBLEM. Given a POS-CNF formula \mathcal{F} , the graph $G_{\mathcal{F}}$ is obtained as described in Section 3.1. Combining Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 implies that $\gamma_{\text{cg}}(G_{\mathcal{F}}) \leq 4 + 3k$ if and only if Player 1 wins the POS-CNF game on \mathcal{F} . Since POS-CNF problem is known to be PSPACE-complete and the described reduction from POS-CNF PROBLEM to GAME CONNECTED DOMINATION PROBLEM can be computed with a polynomial size working space, the desired result follows. \square

Since the reduction in Theorem 3.5 can be computed with a logarithmic size working space, and since POS-CNF PROBLEM is known to be log-complete in PSPACE [17], we obtain an even stronger result.

Corollary 3.6. *The GAME CONNECTED DOMINATION PROBLEM is log-complete in PSPACE.*

4 Complexity of the Staller-start game

In this section we consider the Staller-start connected domination game. The main idea of the proof of the PSPACE-completeness of the STALLER-START GAME CONNECTED DOMINATION PROBLEM is similar as in the Dominator-start game. However, the graph H_3 in the construction has to be replaced with a slightly different graph.

Given a formula \mathcal{F} with k variables and n disjunctive clauses, we built a graph $G'_{\mathcal{F}}$ in the following way. For each variable X_i , $i \in [k]$, we add to the graph a copy B_i of the graph B (called a gadget). For each clause C_j , $j \in [n]$, we add to the graph a vertex c_j and make c_j adjacent to a_i if and only if the variable X_i appears in the clause C_j . We also add to the graph a disjoint copy of the graph H_6 and make u_7 adjacent to vertices a_i and b_i for all $i \in [k]$. For example, see Figure 6.

Lemma 4.1. *If Player 1 has a winning strategy for the POS-CNF game played on \mathcal{F} , then $\gamma'_{\text{cg}}(G'_{\mathcal{F}}) \leq 13 + 3k$.*




Figure 6: The graph $G'_\mathcal{F}$ obtained from the formula $\mathcal{F} = (X_1 \vee X_3) \wedge (X_2 \vee X_3 \vee X_5) \wedge (X_4 \vee X_5)$.

Proof. Dominator's strategy consists of two phases. Phase 1 is the first phase of the game and Dominator's goal is to reach Phase 2 with as few moves as possible. Phase 2 starts with the first move of Dominator after the vertex u_7 has been played (so either with the move d'_i if $s'_i = u_7$ or with the move d'_{i+1} if $d'_i = u_7$). In Phase 2, Dominator follows the same strategy as in Lemma 3.3 (after Staller played u_0 in $G_\mathcal{F}$). If during this strategy, some vertex is not a legal move (because it was played before), Dominator considers the imagined POS-CNF game as if the move was played in the current step, but plays an arbitrary legal move in $G'_\mathcal{F}$. By the Connected Game Continuation Principle from [8] this is not a loss for Dominator. However, we may need to take these additional moves into account at the final count of moves. For this sake, let

$$A = \begin{cases} \{s'_1, d'_1, \dots, s'_{i-1}, d'_{i-1}\} \cap (V(G'_\mathcal{F}) \setminus V(H_6)); & s'_i = u_7, \\ (\{s'_1, d'_1, \dots, s'_{i-1}, d'_{i-1}\} \cup \{s'_i, s'_{i+1}\}) \cap (V(G'_\mathcal{F}) \setminus V(H_6)); & d'_i = u_7, \end{cases}$$

denote the set of possibly additional moves in $V(G'_\mathcal{F}) \setminus V(H_6)$ made during the game. If $s'_1 \in V(H_6)$, then $|A| \leq 1$. If $s'_1 \in V(G) \setminus V(H_6)$, then since every vertex $x \in V(G) \setminus V(H_6)$

is at distance at most 3 from u_7 , Dominator can ensure that $|A| \leq 6$ by playing the vertices on the shortest path between s'_1 and u_7 .

To finalize the proof, consider the following cases.

Case 1. $s'_1 = u_0$.

Dominator's strategy is to play only vertices from $\{u_1, \dots, u_7\}$, thus at most 13 moves are played on H_6 . If indeed 13 moves are played on H_6 , then Staller plays u_7 and $A = \emptyset$. However, if Dominator is forced to play u_7 , then at most 12 moves were made on H_6 . In Phase 2, Dominator can ensure at most $3k$ moves are played on $G \setminus H_6$ since Player 1 has a winning strategy in the POS-CNF game on \mathcal{F} . Altogether, either at most $13 + 3k$ moves are played, or at most $12 + 3k + |A| \leq 13 + 3k$ moves are made in the game.

Case 2. $s'_1 \in V(H_6) \setminus \{u_0\}$.

Dominator's strategy is to play only vertices from $\{u_1, \dots, u_7\}$, thus at most 12 moves are played on H_6 . Combining Dominator's strategy from Phase 2 and the fact that $|A| \leq 1$, we conclude that at most $13 + 3k$ moves were played in the game.

Case 3. $s'_1 \in V(G'_{\mathcal{F}}) \setminus V(H_6)$.

Dominator's strategy is to ensure that u_7 is played as soon as possible. Additionally, he utilizes the strategy FAST on H_6 . More precisely, whenever Staller plays a vertex in H_6 , Dominator replies by playing a vertex in H_6 as well. Since the remaining moves in H_6 can be paired $((u_6, u_5), (u_4, u_3), (u_2, u_1))$ the development of the game on H_6 is independent of Dominator's strategy in $G'_{\mathcal{F}} \setminus H_6$, and exactly seven moves are played on H_6 . Combining this with Dominator's strategy from Phase 2 and the fact that $|A| \leq 6$ yields that the number of moves in the game is at most $13 + 3k$.

This concludes the proof of Lemma 4.1. □

We remark that a more detailed analysis of the game might yield that the graph H_6 in $G'_{\mathcal{F}}$ could be replaced with some H_i , $i \leq 5$, but feel that a simpler proof better illustrates the general idea.

Lemma 4.2. *If Player 2 has a winning strategy for the POS-CNF game played on \mathcal{F} , then $\gamma'_{\text{cg}}(G'_{\mathcal{F}}) \geq 14 + 3k$.*

Proof. It suffices to provide a strategy for Staller that ensures that at least $14 + 3k$ moves are played on $G'_{\mathcal{F}}$. Staller's strategy is to start the game by playing u_0 and using her strategy SLOW on H_6 . This ensures that 13 moves are played on H_6 and that Staller plays u_7 . Now, using the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.4 (after Staller played u_0) we can see that since Player 2 wins the POS-CNF game on \mathcal{F} , Staller can force at least $3k + 1$ moves on $G'_{\mathcal{F}} \setminus H_6$. Thus the game lasts at least $14 + 3k$ moves. □

Using analogous arguments as for the Dominator-start game, we obtain the following.

Theorem 4.3. *The STALLER-START GAME CONNECTED DOMINATION PROBLEM is PSPACE-complete. Moreover, the problem is log-complete in PSPACE.*

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank B. Brešar, Cs. Bujtás, S. Cabello, S. Klavžar and M. Konvalinka for pointing out the problem studied in this paper, and acknowledge the financial support from the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency (ARIS) under the grants Z1-50003, P1-0297, J1-2452 and N1-0285, and from the European Union (ERC, KARST, 101071836).

References

- [1] M. Borowiecki, A. Fiedorowicz, and E. Sidorowicz. *Connected domination game*. Appl. Anal. Discrete Math. 13 (2019), 261–289.
- [2] P. Bradshaw. *A note on the connected game coloring number*. Discrete Appl. Math. 333 (2023), 13–19.
- [3] B. Brešar, P. Dorbec, S. Klavžar, G. Košmrlj, and G. Renault. *Complexity of the game domination problem*. Theoret. Comput. Sci. 648 (2016), 1–7.
- [4] B. Brešar and M. A. Henning. *The game total domination problem is log-complete in PSPACE*. Inform. Process. Lett. 126 (2017), 12–17.
- [5] B. Brešar, M. A. Henning, S. Klavžar, and D. F. Rall. *Domination Games Played on Graphs*. Springer International Publishing, 2021.
- [6] B. Brešar, S. Klavžar, and D. F. Rall. *Domination game and an imagination strategy*. SIAM J. Discrete Math. 24 (2010), 979–991.
- [7] C. Bujtás, P. Dokyeesun, V. Iršič, and S. Klavžar. *Connected domination game played on Cartesian products*. Open Math. 17 (2019), 1269–1280.
- [8] C. Bujtás, V. Iršič, and S. Klavžar. *Predominating a vertex in the connected domination game*. Graphs Combin. 38 (2022), Page No. 77, 21.
- [9] C. Charpentier, H. Hocquard, É. Sopena, and X. Zhu. *A connected version of the graph coloring game*. Discrete Appl. Math. 283 (2020), 744–750.
- [10] M. A. Henning, S. Klavžar, and D. F. Rall. *Total version of the domination game*. Graphs Combin. 31 (2015), 1453–1462.
- [11] V. Iršič. *Connected domination game: predomination, staller-start game, and lexicographic products*. Appl. Anal. Discrete Math. 16 (2022), 66–82.
- [12] W. B. Kinnersley, D. B. West, and R. Zamani. *Extremal problems for game domination number*. SIAM J. Discrete Math. 27 (2013), 2090–2107.
- [13] S. Klavžar, G. Košmrlj, and S. Schmidt. *On the computational complexity of the domination game*. Iran. J. Math. Sci. Inform. 10 (2015), 115–122, 134.
- [14] C. V. G. C. Lima, T. Marcilon, N. Martins, and R. Sampaio. *The connected greedy coloring game*. Theoret. Comput. Sci. 940 (2023), 1–13.

- [15] J. Portier and L. Versteegen. *A proof of the $3/4$ conjecture for the total domination game*. arXiv:2211.16432 [math.CO]. Dec. 2022.
- [16] J. Portier and L. Versteegen. *Progress towards the $1/2$ -Conjecture for the domination game*. Discrete Appl. Math. 351 (2024), 36–43.
- [17] T. J. Schaefer. *On the complexity of some two-person perfect-information games*. J. Comput. System Sci. 16 (1978), 185–225.
- [18] L. Versteegen. *A proof of the $3/5$ -conjecture in the domination game*. arXiv:2212.04527 [math.CO]. Feb. 2023.