

# Domination and fractional domination in digraphs

Ararat Harutyunyan<sup>a</sup>, Tien-Nam Le<sup>b</sup>,  
Alantha Newman<sup>c</sup>, and Stéphan Thomassé<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse  
Université Toulouse III  
31062 Toulouse Cedex 09, France

<sup>b</sup>Laboratoire d'Informatique du Parallélisme  
UMR 5668 ENS Lyon - CNRS - UCBL - INRIA  
Université de Lyon, France

<sup>c</sup>Laboratoire G-SCOP  
CNRS, Université Grenoble-Alpes  
Grenoble, France

## Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the relation between the (fractional) domination number of a digraph  $G$  and the independence number of its underlying graph, denoted by  $\alpha(G)$ . More precisely, we prove that every digraph  $G$  has fractional domination number at most  $2\alpha(G)$ , and every directed triangle-free digraph  $G$  has domination number at most  $\alpha(G) \cdot \alpha(G)!$ . The first bound is sharp.

## 1 Introduction

Every digraph in this paper is simple, loopless and finite, where a digraph  $G$  is *simple* if for every two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  of  $G$ , there is at most one arc with endpoints  $\{u, v\}$ . Given a digraph  $G$ , we denote by  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$  the vertex set and arc set of  $G$ , respectively. The *independence number*  $\alpha(G)$  of a digraph  $G$  is the independence number of the underlying (undirected) graph of  $G$ . A digraph with independence number 1 is called a *tournament*.

Given a digraph  $G = (V, E)$ , we say that a vertex of  $G$  *dominates* itself and all of its out-neighbors. A set of vertices  $S \subseteq V$  is called a *dominating set* if every vertex  $v \in V$  is either an element of  $S$  or is an out-neighbor of some element of  $S$ . The *domination number*  $\gamma(G)$  is the cardinality of a minimum (by cardinality) dominating set of  $G$ . Domination in tournaments has been well-studied [1], [5], [11], while little is known for domination in general digraphs. Recently, it was proved [4], [6], [7] that

domination number is closely related to the acyclic chromatic number when the digraph is a tournament or a dense digraph. The topic of domination in undirected graphs (where  $S \subseteq V$  is a *dominating set* if every vertex  $v \in V$  is either an element of  $S$  or is a neighbor of some element of  $S$ ) has also been studied extensively, see for example the monograph [8], but is not in the scope of this paper.

Suppose we are given a digraph  $G = (V, E)$ , a subset  $S$  of  $V$ , and a function  $g : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that  $g(v) = 1$  if  $v \in S$  and  $g(v) = 0$  otherwise. Then  $S$  is a dominating set of  $G$  if and only if  $\sum_{x \in N^-(v) \cup \{v\}} g(x) \geq 1$  for every  $v \in V$ , where  $N^-(v)$  is the set of in-neighbors of  $v$ . Thus, a natural linear relaxation of domination in digraphs arises as follows. A *fractional dominating function* of  $G$  is a function  $g : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $\sum_{x \in N^-(v) \cup \{v\}} g(x) \geq 1$  for every  $v \in V$ . The *fractional domination number*  $\gamma^*(G)$  is the smallest value of  $\sum_{v \in V} g(v)$  over all fractional dominating functions  $g$  of  $G$ . The fractional domination number in tournament was the main tool to prove the long standing Erdős-Sands-Sauer-Woodrow conjecture in [2].

In this paper, we will show that that for any digraph, its fractional domination number is at most twice its independence number, and this bound is sharp.

**Theorem 1.1.** *For every digraph  $G$ , we have  $\gamma^*(G) \leq 2\alpha(G)$ .*

In contrast to the fractional domination number, the domination number of a digraph can be very large. Indeed, it was shown in [10] that almost surely a random tournament has domination number on the order of  $\log n$ , much larger than its independence number of 1. However, for general digraphs, the domination number can be bounded as a function of its independence number when  $\alpha(G)$  is sufficiently large.

**Theorem 1.2.** *For any digraph  $G = (V, E)$ , if  $\alpha(G) \geq \log n$ , then  $\gamma(G) \leq (\alpha(G))^2$ .*

Moreover, if  $G$  is a directed-triangle-free digraph, then its domination number can be expressed as a function of its independence number. Let  $C_3$  be the directed triangle graph.

**Theorem 1.3.** *For any  $C_3$ -free digraph  $G$  where  $\alpha = \alpha(G)$ , the domination number of  $G$  is at most  $\alpha \cdot \alpha!$ , and we can find such a dominating set in time polynomial in the size of  $G$ .*

For every integer  $\alpha$ , let  $f(\alpha)$  be the minimum number such that every  $C_3$ -free digraph  $G$  with independence number  $\alpha$  has domination number at most  $f(\alpha)$ . We will show that  $f(\alpha) \leq \alpha \cdot \alpha!$ . This gives  $f(2) \leq 4$ ,  $f(3) \leq 18$ , etc. For small cases, we can provide better bounds, for example,  $f(2) = 3$  (Theorem 3.5), and  $3 \leq f(3) \leq 8$ .

Given that the upper bound for the fractional domination number is linear in  $\alpha$ , and our proof of Theorem 1.3 is probably not tight, it is reasonable to expect a better upper bound on the domination number of a  $C_3$ -free digraph in terms of  $\alpha$ . We believe that a polynomial bound does exist.

**Conjecture 1.4.** *There is a polynomial  $P$  such that For any  $C_3$ -free digraph  $G$  where  $\alpha = \alpha(G)$ , the domination number of  $G$  is at most  $P(\alpha)$ .*

## 1.1 Notation

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a digraph; for every  $v \in V$ , we denote by  $N_G^+(v), N^-(v)$  the set of out-neighbors and in-neighbors of  $v$ , respectively. Let  $N_G^+[v] = N_G^+(v) \cup \{v\}$  and  $N_G^-[v] = N_G^-(v) \cup \{v\}$ . Given a subset  $S$  of  $V$ , we write  $N_G^+(S) = \bigcup_{v \in S} N_G^+(v)$ , and similarly for  $N_G^-(S), N_G^+[S]$ , and  $N_G^-[S]$ . Given two vertices  $u, v$ , if  $uv, vu \notin E$ , we say that  $u$  and  $v$  are *independent*. We denote by  $N_G^o(v)$  the set of vertices that are independent with  $v$ , i.e.,  $N_G^o(v) = V \setminus (N_G^+[v] \cup N_G^-[v])$ . When it is clear from the context, we may omit the subscript  $G$ . Given a subset  $X$  of  $V$ , we denote by  $G[X]$  the induced subgraph of  $G$  on  $X$ . Finally, we sometimes use  $n$  to denote  $|V(G)|$ .

## 2 Fractional domination in digraphs

In this section, we present two different proofs of Theorem 1.1: the first is by duality of linear programming, while the second is by induction. Given a digraph  $G = (V, E)$  and a function  $g$  on  $V$ , we write  $g(X) := \sum_{v \in X} g(v)$  for short. We first present some preliminary results.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Given a digraph  $G = (V, E)$  and a function  $p : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , there is a vertex  $v \in V$  such that  $p(N^-(v)) \leq p(N^+(v))$*

*Proof.* Suppose that the lemma is false. Then there is a function  $p$  such that  $p(N^-(v)) > p(N^+(v))$  for every  $v$ , i.e.,  $\sum_{x \in N^-(v)} p(x) > \sum_{y \in N^+(v)} p(y)$  for every  $v$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in V} p(v) \left( \sum_{x \in N^-(v)} p(x) \right) &> \sum_{v \in V} p(v) \left( \sum_{y \in N^+(v)} p(y) \right) \\ \implies \sum_{xv \in E} p(v)p(x) &> \sum_{vy \in E} p(v)p(y), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. □

**Lemma 2.2.** *Given a digraph  $G = (V, E)$  and a function  $p : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$ , there is a stable set  $S \subseteq V$  such that  $p(N^+[S]) \geq p(V)/2$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the lemma by induction on  $|V|$ . The lemma clearly holds for  $|V| = 1$ . For  $|V| > 1$ , fix some function  $p : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$  and apply Lemma 2.1 on  $G$  to obtain a vertex  $v$  such that  $p(N^-(v)) \leq p(N^+(v))$ . If  $N^o(v) = \emptyset$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} 2p(N^+[v]) &\geq 2p(N^+(v)) + p(v) \\ &\geq p(N^+(v)) + p(N^-(v)) + p(v) \\ &= p(V), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma.

If  $N^o(v) \neq \emptyset$ , we apply induction on  $G[N^o(v)]$  to obtain a stable set  $S'$  such that  $p(N_{G[N^o(v)]}^+[S']) \geq p(N^o(v))/2$ . Let  $S = S' \cup \{v\}$ . We have the following remarks.

- $N_{G[N^o(v)]}^+[S'] = N^+[S'] \cap N^o(v)$ , and
- $N^+[v]$  and  $N^+[S'] \cap N^o(v)$  are disjoint.

Thus, for the stable set  $S$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
p(N^+[S]) &\geq p(N^+[v]) + p(N^+[S'] \cap N^o(v)) \\
&= p(v) + p(N^+(v)) + p(N_{G[N^o(v)]}^+[S']) \\
&\geq p(v) + (p(N^+(v)) + p(N^-(v)))/2 + p(N^o(v))/2 \\
&\geq p(V)/2.
\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma.  $\square$

Finally, we mention a trivial observation regarding the independence number of a digraph.

**Observation 2.3.** *If  $G$  is a digraph with independence number  $\alpha$  and  $v$  is an arbitrary vertex in  $G$ , then  $G[N^o(v)]$  has independence number at most  $\alpha - 1$ .*

Now we present the first proof of Theorem 1.1. We will use the following linear program. Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the set of all maximal stable sets in  $G$ , and let  $A$  be the matrix with  $|V|$  rows and  $|\mathcal{S}|$  columns, where for every  $v \in V, S \in \mathcal{S}$ ,

$$A(v, S) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } v \in N^+[S], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Let us consider the following linear program

$$(P) \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{Minimize} & \mathbf{1}^T z \\ \text{Subject to} & Az \geq \mathbf{1} \text{ and } z \geq \mathbf{0}, \end{array}$$

and its dual

$$(D) \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{Maximize} & \mathbf{1}^T w \\ \text{Subject to} & A^T w \leq \mathbf{1} \text{ and } w \geq \mathbf{0}. \end{array}$$

**Lemma 2.4.** *The value of an optimal solution for (P) is at most 2.*

*Proof.* We prove that an optimal solution to (P) is at most 2, by proving that the optimal solution to (D) is at most 2. Then we apply the Strong Duality Theorem (see [3], Theorem 17.2 for example) to complete the proof.

Suppose for a contradiction that the optimal solution of (D) is greater than 2. Then there is a function  $w$  such that  $\mathbf{1}^T w > 2$  and  $A^T w \leq \mathbf{1}$ . Then for every  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $\sum_{v \in V} A(v, S)w(v) \leq 1$ , and so by (1),

$$w(N^+[S]) = \sum_{v \in N^+[S]} w(v) \leq 1.$$

However, by Lemma 2.2, there is  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  such that  $w(N^+[S]) \geq w(V)/2 = (\mathbf{1}^T w)/2 > 1$ . This proves the lemma.  $\square$

We now restate Theorem 1.1.

**Theorem 2.5.** *For any digraph  $G = (V, E)$ , we can construct a fractional dominating function  $g : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $g(V) \leq 2\alpha(G)$ .*

*First proof.* Invoking Lemma 2.4, there is a  $z$  such that  $Az \geq \mathbf{1}$  and  $\mathbf{1}^T z \leq 2$ . Note that  $z$  is a vector of length  $|\mathcal{S}|$  and  $w$  is a vector of length  $|V|$ . Let  $g(v) := \sum_{S:v \in S} z(S)$  for every  $v \in V$ . Let  $\alpha = \alpha(G)$ .

By Lemma 2.4 Note that for every  $S \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $|S| \leq \alpha$  since  $S$  is stable. We have

$$g(V) = \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{S:v \in S} z(S) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{v \in S} z(S) = \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} |S|z(S) \leq \alpha \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} z(S) = \alpha(\mathbf{1}^T z) \leq 2\alpha.$$

Fix  $v$ , since  $Az \geq \mathbf{1}$ , we have  $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} A(v, S)z(S) \geq 1$ . In other words,

$$\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}: v \in N^+[S]} z(S) \geq 1.$$

Besides,

$$g(N^-[v]) = \sum_{x:v \in N^+[x]} g(x) = \sum_{x:v \in N^+[x]} \sum_{S:x \in S} z(S) \geq \sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}: v \in N^+[S]} z(S).$$

Thus,  $g(N^-[v]) \geq 1$  for every  $v \in V$ , i.e.  $g(v)$  is a fractional dominating function of  $G$ . This proves the theorem.  $\square$

In the second proof of Theorem 2.5, we will use the following consequence of Farkas' Lemma (we refer the reader to [9] for the proof of Lemma 2.6).

**Lemma 2.6.** *Given a digraph  $G = (V, E)$ , there exists a function  $p : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $p(V) = 1$  and  $p(N^-(v)) \geq p(N^+(v))$  for every vertex  $v$ .*

*Second proof.* We prove by induction on  $\alpha(G)$ . If  $\alpha(G) = 1$ , then  $G$  is a tournament. Let  $p$  be a function satisfying Lemma 2.6. Let  $g(v) = 2p(v)$  for every  $v \in V$ . Then  $g(V) = 2$  and for every  $v$ , we have

$$g(N^-[v]) = 2p(N^-[v]) \geq 2p(v) + p(N^-(v)) + p(N^+(v)) \geq p(V) = 1.$$

Thus,  $g$  is a fractional domination function of  $G$ . We conclude that  $\gamma^*(G) \leq g(V) = 2 = 2\alpha(G)$  for the case  $\alpha(G) = 1$ .

If  $\alpha(G) > 1$ , let  $p$  be a function satisfying Lemma 2.6. By Observation 2.3, we have  $\alpha(G[N^o(v)]) \leq \alpha(G) - 1$  for every  $v \in V$ , and so  $\gamma^*(G[N^o(v)]) \leq 2(\alpha(G) - 1)$  by induction. In the rest of the proof, we write  $G_v := G[N^o(v)]$  for short. For each vertex  $v$ , let  $g_v$  be a minimum fractional dominating function of  $G_v$ . Set  $g(x) = 2p(x) + \sum_{y \in N^o(x)} g_y(x)p(y)$

for every vertex  $x$ . We show that  $g$  is a fractional dominating function of  $G$ . Note that  $x \in N^o(y)$  if and only if  $y \in N^o(x)$ , and for every  $v, y$  with  $v \in G_y$ ,

$$\sum_{x \in N_{G_y}^-[v]} g_y(x) = g_y(N_{G_y}^-[v]) \geq 1$$

since  $g_y$  is a fractional dominating function of  $G_y$ . Fix  $v$ , we have (we omit the subscript  $G$  if applicable)

$$\begin{aligned} g(N^-[v]) &= \sum_{x \in N^-[v]} g(x) = \sum_{x \in N^-[v]} \left( 2p(x) + \sum_{y \in N^o(x)} g_y(x)p(y) \right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{x \in N^-[v]} p(x) + \sum_{x \in N^-[v]} \sum_{y \in N^o(x)} g_y(x)p(y) \\ &= 2p(N^-[v]) + \sum_{y \in V} p(y) \sum_{x \in N^-[v] \cap N^o(y)} g_y(x) \\ &\geq 2p(N^-[v]) + \sum_{y \in N^o(v)} p(y) \sum_{x \in N^-[v] \cap N^o(y)} g_y(x) \\ &= 2p(N^-[v]) + \sum_{y \in N^o(v)} p(y) \sum_{x \in N_{G_y}^-[v]} g_y(x) \\ &\geq 2p(N^-[v]) + \sum_{y \in N^o(v)} p(y) \cdot 1 \\ &= 2p(N^-[v]) + p(N^o(v)) \\ &\geq 2p(v) + p(N^-(v)) + p(N^+(v)) + p(N^o(v)) \\ &\geq p(V), \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that  $g$  is a fractional dominating function of  $G$ .

Note that  $g_v$  is a minimum fractional dominating function of  $G_v$ , and so  $g_v(N^o(v)) = \gamma^*(G_v) \leq 2\alpha(G_v) \leq 2(\alpha(G) - 1)$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} g(V) &= \sum_{v \in V} g(v) = 2 \sum_{v \in V} p(v) + \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{y \in N^o(v)} g_y(v)p(y) \\ &= 2 + \sum_{y \in V} p(y) \sum_{v \in N^o(y)} g_y(v) \\ &\leq 2 + \sum_{y \in V} p(y)(2\alpha(G) - 2) \\ &= 2\alpha(G). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\gamma^*(G) \leq \sum_{v \in V} g(v) \leq 2\alpha(G)$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

We can show that the bound in Theorem 2.5 is sharp.

**Proposition 2.7.** *Given an arbitrarily small positive real number  $\varepsilon$ , for any positive integer  $k$ , there exists a digraph  $G$  such that  $\alpha(G) = k$  and  $\gamma^*(G) > 2k - \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $r = \lceil 1/\varepsilon \rceil + 1$ . For  $k = 1$ , let  $G$  be an Eulerian tournament with  $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_{2r-1}\}$  and  $N^+(v_i) = \{v_j : 1 \leq j - i \pmod{2r-1} \leq r-1\}$ . Let  $g$  be a minimum fractional dominating function of  $G$ . Suppose that  $g(v_r) = \min_i g(v_i)$ . Note that  $\sum_i g(v_i) = \gamma^*(G) \leq 2$ , and  $r$  is chosen sufficiently large so that  $g(v_r) < 2/(2r-1) < \varepsilon$ . We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^*(G) &= \sum_i g(v_i), \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} g(v_i) + \sum_{r \leq i \leq 2r-1} g(v_i) - g(v_r) \\ &= \sum_{v_i \in N^-[v_r]} g(v_i) + \sum_{v_i \in N^-[v_{2r-1}]} g(v_i) - g(v_r) \\ &> 2 - \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

For  $k > 1$ , let  $r = \lceil k/\varepsilon \rceil + 1$ . Let  $G$  be a disjoint union of  $k$  tournaments  $G_1, \dots, G_k$ , each is constructed as in the case  $k = 1$ . Since tournaments are disjoint,  $\gamma^*(G) = \sum_i \gamma^*(G_i) \geq k(2 - \varepsilon/k) = 2k - \varepsilon$ .  $\square$

We can also show that almost surely a random tournament has a fractional domination number close to the upper bound of 2. First, we need the following proposition.

**Proposition 2.8.** *Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a digraph of maximum out-degree  $d$ , then  $\gamma^*(G) \geq n/(d+1)$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that the statement was false, then there is a function  $g : V \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that  $g(V) < n/(d+1)$  and  $g(N^-[x]) \geq 1$  for every  $x$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} n &\leq \sum_{x \in V} g(N^-[x]) = g(V) + \sum_{x \in V} g(N^-(x)) \\ &= g(V) + \sum_{ux \in E} g(u) \\ &= g(V) + \sum_{u \in V} g(u) |N^+(u)| \\ &\leq g(V) + d \cdot g(V) \\ &= (d+1)g(V) < n, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction  $\square$

We also need Chernoff's inequality (see for example [12]).

**Proposition 2.9** (Chernoff's Inequality). *Let  $X$  be a binomial random variable consisting of  $n$  Bernoulli trials, each with probability of success  $p$ . Then, for all  $0 < \epsilon < 1$ ,*

$$\Pr[|X - np| > \epsilon np] \leq 2e^{-\epsilon^2 np/3}.$$

**Proposition 2.10.** *For any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}[\gamma^*(T_n) > 2 - \epsilon] = 1 - o(1)$ , i.e.  $\gamma^*(T_n) > 2 - \epsilon$  almost surely.*

*Proof.* By Chernoff's bound, the probability that a given vertex has out-degree more than  $n/2 + 10\sqrt{n \log n}$  is  $O(n^{-C})$  for some constant  $C > 1$ . Thus, the probability that there is a vertex with out-degree more than  $n/2 + 10\sqrt{n \log n}$  is, by the union bound, at most  $n \cdot O(n^{-C}) = o(1)$ . Thus, almost surely all the vertices of  $T_n$  have out-degree at most  $n/2 + 10\sqrt{n \log n}$ . It follows that almost surely  $\gamma^*(T_n) \geq \frac{n}{n/2 + 10\sqrt{n \log n}}$ .  $\square$

Lemma 2.2 was key in proving a bound on the fractional domination number, i.e. the first proof of Theorem 2.5. We conclude this section with another application of Lemma 2.2. It is well known that a tournament has a dominating set of size at most  $\log n$  [11]. Analogously, we can show that a digraph  $G = (V, E)$  has a dominating set of size at most  $\alpha(G) \cdot \log n$ . For  $S \subseteq V$ , let  $\chi(S)$  denote the chromatic number of the underlying (undirected) graph of digraph  $G[S]$ .

**Theorem 2.11.** *For every digraph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $n = |V|$ , there is a dominating set  $D \subseteq V$  such that  $\chi(D) \leq \log n$ .*

*Proof.* We can assign each vertex a value  $p(v) = 1$  and apply Lemma 2.2 to find a stable set  $S$  such that  $p(N^+[S]) \geq p(V)/2$ . We add the stable set  $S$  to the dominating set and recurse on the induced subgraph  $G[V \setminus N^+[S]]$ . Performing this routine  $\log n$  times results in the bound.  $\square$

Since each stable set  $S$  has cardinality at most  $\alpha(G)$ , Theorem 2.11 implies the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.12.** *For every digraph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $n = |V|$ , there is a dominating set of size at most  $\alpha(G) \cdot \log n$ .*

Finally, we note that Theorem 1.2 is an immediate consequence of Corollary 2.12.

### 3 Domination in $C_3$ -free digraphs

A subset  $X$  of  $V(G)$  is *acyclic* if the subgraph (i.e. sub-digraph) of  $G$  induced by  $X$  contains no directed cycle. We first have some observations regarding dominating sets in general digraphs.

**Proposition 3.1.** *A digraph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices has an acyclic dominating set, and this set can be found in time polynomial in the size of  $G$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $n$ . The statement clearly holds for  $n = 1$ . For  $n > 1$ , pick an arbitrary vertex  $v$ . Then  $V(G) \setminus \{v\} = N^o(v) \cup N^-(v) \cup N^+(v)$ . Applying induction to the subgraph,  $G[N^o(v) \cup N^-(v)]$ , we obtain an acyclic dominating set  $S'$ . Then  $S := S' \cup \{v\}$  is a dominating set of  $G$ . Note that  $S' \subseteq N^o(v) \cup N^-(v)$ , so  $N^+(v) \cap S' = \emptyset$ . Hence  $S$  is an acyclic set since  $S'$  is an acyclic set. The running time for this procedure is polynomial in the size of  $G$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.2.** *An acyclic digraph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices has a dominating set that is also a stable set and this dominating set can be found in time polynomial in the size of  $G$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $n$  to show that every acyclic digraph  $G$  has a dominating set  $S$  that is stable. The statement clearly holds for  $n = 1$ . For  $n > 1$ , since  $G$  is acyclic, there is a vertex  $v$  with no in-neighbors. Then  $V(G) \setminus \{v\} = N^+(v) \cup N^o(v)$ . Applying induction to  $G[N^o(v)]$ , we obtain a stable dominating set  $S'$  of  $G[N^o(v)]$ . Clearly  $S := S' \cup \{v\}$  is a dominating set of  $G$ . Note that  $S' \subseteq N^o(v)$ , and so  $S$  is stable.  $\square$

We will show a slightly stronger result than Theorem 1.3.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $h$  be the function on the set of positive integers such that  $h(1) = 1$  and  $h(k) = k \cdot (h(k-1) + 1)$  for every  $k > 1$ . For any  $C_3$ -free digraph  $G$  where  $\alpha = \alpha(G)$ , the domination number of  $G$  is at most  $h(\alpha)$ , and we can find such a dominating set in time polynomial in the size of  $G$ .*

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on  $\alpha$ . If  $\alpha = 1$ , then  $G$  is a  $C_3$ -free tournament, and so  $G$  is acyclic. Then there is a vertex that dominates  $V$ . So  $h(1) = 1$ .

If  $\alpha > 1$ , we first apply Proposition 3.1 to find an acyclic dominating set  $A$  of  $G$ . Then we apply Proposition 3.2 to find a dominating set  $S \subseteq A$  of  $A$ . Note that  $|S| \leq \alpha$  since  $S$  is stable. Let  $Y$  denote the set of vertices in  $V(G) \setminus A$  that are not dominated by any vertex in  $S$ .

We observe that each vertex  $y \in Y$  belongs to  $N^o(s)$  for some  $s \in S$ . Suppose this were not the case. Then a vertex  $y \in Y$  has arcs to all  $s \in S$ . Since  $A$  dominates  $V$ , there is some  $a \in A \setminus S$  such that  $ay \in E(G)$ . Since  $S$  dominates  $A$ , there is  $s \in S$  such that  $sa \in E(G)$ . This yields the triangle  $ysa$ , which is a contradiction to  $G$  being  $C_3$ -free. Hence, for every  $y \in Y$ , there is  $s \in S$  such that  $ys \notin E(G)$ . By the definition of  $Y$ , it follows that  $sy \notin E(G)$ . We conclude that  $s$  and  $y$  are independent and therefore  $y \in N^o(s)$ .

We partition  $Y$  into  $|S|$  subsets, where for each  $s \in S$ ,  $Y_s$  is a subset of  $N^o(s)$ . Hence, by Observation 2.3,  $G[Y_s]$  has independence number at most  $\alpha - 1$ . By the induction hypothesis, there is a set  $D_s$  of size at most  $h(\alpha - 1)$  dominating  $Y_s$ . Let  $D = S \cup (\bigcup_{s \in S} D_s)$ . Then  $|D| \leq |S| + |S| \cdot h(\alpha - 1) \leq h(\alpha)$ .

Observe that  $Y = \bigcup_{s \in S} Y_s$  is dominated by  $\bigcup_{s \in S} D_s$ , and  $V \setminus Y$  is dominated by  $S$  by definition of  $Y$ . Thus,  $D$  is a dominating set of  $G$ , which proves the theorem.  $\square$

Note that Theorem 3.3 immediately implies Theorem 1.3 since  $1 \cdot 1! = 1$  and  $k \cdot k! \geq h(k)$  for every  $k \geq 2$ .

Recall that  $f(\alpha)$  is defined to be the minimum number such that every  $C_3$ -free digraph  $G$  with independence number  $\alpha$  has domination number at most  $f(\alpha)$ . We next show that  $f(2) = 3$ . The proof for  $3 \leq f(3) \leq 8$  is similar, but more involved. We first need the following claim.

**Claim 3.4.** *Given  $G = (V, E)$  with a dominating set  $D$  and  $s \in D$ . Let  $M$  be the set of out-neighbors of  $s$  in  $D$ . If  $|M| \geq 1$ , then  $\gamma(G) \leq |D| - |M| + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $Z$  be the set of vertices in  $V \setminus D$  such that every  $z \in Z$  is dominated by at least one vertex in  $M$  but is not dominated by any vertex in  $D \setminus M$ . Suppose that  $zs \in E$  for some  $z \in Z$ . Since  $M$  dominates  $Z$ , there is some  $a \in M$  such that  $az \in E(G)$ . This yields the triangle  $saz$ , which is a contradiction to  $G$  being  $C_3$ -free. Combining with the fact that  $s$  does not dominate  $z$ , we have  $z \in N^o(s)$  for every  $z \in Z$ , and so  $Z \subseteq N^o(s)$ . Hence, by Observation 2.3, there is  $z \in Z$  dominating  $Z$ . Then  $B = (D \setminus M) \cup \{z\}$  is a dominating set of  $V$  of size  $|D| - |M| + 1$ . Then  $\gamma(G) \leq |B| = |D| - |M| + 1$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.5.**  $f(2) = 3$ .

*Proof.* Observe that  $\alpha(C_5) = 2$  while  $\gamma(C_5) = 3$ , where  $C_5$  is the directed cycle of 5 vertices, so  $f(2) \geq 3$ .

Now suppose the theorem is false with  $G = (V, E)$  being a counterexample, i.e.,  $\gamma(G) > 3$ . Let  $A$  be an acyclic dominating set of  $G$  and  $S$  be a stable set dominating  $A$ . Following the proof of Theorem 3.3, we obtain a dominating set  $D$  of  $G$ . We now analyze the structure of  $D$ . If  $|S| = 1$ , then  $|D| \leq |S| + |S| \cdot h(2-1) \leq 2$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $|S| = 2$ , say  $S = \{s_1, s_2\}$ . Since  $|D| \geq \gamma(G) > 3$  and  $|D| \leq |S| + |S| \cdot h(2-1)$ , we conclude that  $|D| = 4$ .

Note that  $D$  is formed by  $S$  and  $D_{s_1}, D_{s_2}$ , and  $|D_{s_1}|, |D_{s_2}| \leq 1$ . Thus, we can suppose  $D = \{s_1, s_2, y_1, y_2\}$  with  $\{y_1\} = D_{s_2} \subseteq N^o(s_2)$  and  $\{y_2\} = D_{s_1} \subseteq N^o(s_1)$ . Recall that every vertex of  $Y$  is not dominated by any vertex of  $S$ , and so  $s_1 y_1, s_2 y_2 \notin E$ . If  $y_1 s_1 \notin E$ , then  $y_1, s_1, s_2$  are independent, a contradiction to the fact that  $\alpha(G) = 2$ . Thus,  $y_1 s_1 \in E$ , and similarly,  $y_2 s_2 \in E$ .

If  $y_1 y_2 \in E$ , then  $y_2$  has two out-neighbors in  $D$ . By Claim 3.4,  $\gamma(G) \leq |D| - 2 + 1 \leq 3$ , a contradiction. Then  $y_1 y_2 \notin E$ , and similarly,  $y_2 y_1 \notin E$ .

Let  $M$  be the set of out neighbors of  $y_1$  in  $D$  (we proved that  $M = \{s_1\}$ ), and let  $Z$  be the set of vertices in  $V \setminus D$  such that every  $z \in Z$  is dominated by  $M$  but not dominated by any vertex in  $D \setminus M$ . Then by the same argument of the proof of Claim 3.4, we find  $z \in Z$  such that  $z, y_1$  are independent and  $B = (D \setminus M) \cup \{z\} = \{y_1, y_2, s_2, z\}$  is a dominating set of  $D$ .

Note that  $y_2 z, s_2 z \notin E$  by definition of  $Z$ . If  $z y_2 \notin E$ , then  $y_1, y_2, z$  are independent vertices, contradicting  $\alpha(G) = 2$ . If  $z s_2 \notin E$ , then  $y_1, s_2, z$  are independent vertices,

contradicting  $\alpha(G) = 2$ . Thus,  $zy_2, zs_2 \in E$ . Then  $z$  has two out-neighbors in  $B$ . Then by Claim 3.4,  $\gamma(G) \leq |B| - 2 + 1 \leq 3$ , a contradiction. This proves the theorem.  $\square$

## References

- [1] N. Alon, G. Brightwell, H.A. Kierstead, A.V. Kostochka and P. Winkler, Dominating sets in  $k$ -majority tournaments, *J. Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B*, **96**, (2006), 374–387.
- [2] N. Bousquet, W. Lochet, and S. Thomassé, A proof of the Erdős-Sands-Sauer-Woodrow conjecture, *preprint*.
- [3] E. Chong and S. Žak, *An introduction to optimization*, Fourth edition, John Wiley and Sons, 2013.
- [4] M. Chudnovsky, R. Kim, C.-H. Liu, P. Seymour, and S. Thomassé, Domination in tournaments, *preprint*.
- [5] A. Gyárfás and D. Pálvölgyi, Domination in transitive colorings of tournaments, *J. Combinatorial Theory, Ser. B*, **107**, (2014), 1–11.
- [6] A. Harutyunyan, T.-N. Le, A. Newman, and S. Thomassé, Coloring dense digraphs, *preprint*.
- [7] A. Harutyunyan, T.-N. Le, S. Thomassé, and H. Wu, Coloring tournaments: from local to global, *preprint*.
- [8] T. W. Haynes, S. Hedetniemi, P. Slater, *Fundamentals of domination in graphs*, CRC Press, 1998.
- [9] A. Lagoutte, Quasi-P versus P, *Master Thesis, ENS de Lyon* (2012).
- [10] C. Lee, The domination number of a tournament, *Kangweon-Kyungki Math. Jour.* **9** (1), (2001), 21–28.
- [11] N. Megiddo and U. Vishkin, On finding a minimum dominating set in a tournament, *Theoretical Computer Science* **61**, (1988), 307–316.
- [12] M. Molloy and B. Reed. *Graph Colouring and the Probabilistic Method*. Springer, 2002.