

# On an Annihilation Number Conjecture

Vadim E. Levit

Department of Computer Science  
Ariel University, Israel  
levitv@ariel.ac.il

Eugen Mandrescu

Department of Computer Science  
Holon Institute of Technology, Israel  
eugen\_m@hit.ac.il

## Abstract

Let  $\alpha(G)$  denote the cardinality of a maximum independent set, while  $\mu(G)$  be the size of a maximum matching in the graph  $G = (V, E)$ . If  $\alpha(G) + \mu(G) = |V|$ , then  $G$  is a *König-Egerváry graph*. If  $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_n$  is the degree sequence of  $G$ , then the *annihilation number*  $h(G)$  of  $G$  is the largest integer  $k$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i \leq |E|$  [31, 32]. A set  $A \subseteq V$  satisfying  $\sum_{a \in A} \deg(a) \leq |E|$  is an *annihilation set*; if, in addition,  $\deg(v) + \sum_{a \in A} \deg(a) > |E|$ , for every vertex  $v \in V(G) - A$ , then  $A$  is a *maximal annihilation set* in  $G$ .

In [23] it was conjectured that the following assertions are equivalent:

(i)  $\alpha(G) = h(G)$ ;

(ii)  $G$  is a König-Egerváry graph and every maximum independent set is a maximal annihilating set.

In this paper, we prove that the implication "(i)  $\implies$  (ii)" is correct, while for the opposite direction we provide a series of generic counterexamples.

**Keywords:** maximum independent set, matching, tree, bipartite graph, König-Egerváry graph, annihilation set, annihilation number.

## 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper  $G = (V, E)$  is a finite, undirected, loopless graph without multiple edges, with vertex set  $V = V(G)$  of cardinality  $|V(G)| = n(G)$ , and edge set  $E = E(G)$  of size  $|E(G)| = m(G)$ . If  $X \subset V(G)$ , then  $G[X]$  is the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $X$ . By  $G - v$  we mean the subgraph  $G[V(G) - \{v\}]$ , for  $v \in V(G)$ .  $K_n, K_{m,n}, P_n, C_n$  denote respectively, the complete graph on  $n \geq 1$  vertices, the complete bipartite graph on  $m, n \geq 1$  vertices, the path on  $n \geq 1$  vertices, and the cycle on  $n \geq 3$  vertices, respectively.

The *disjoint union* of the graphs  $G_1, G_2$  is the graph  $G_1 \cup G_2$  having the disjoint union of  $V(G_1), V(G_2)$  as a vertex set, and the disjoint union of  $E(G_1), E(G_2)$  as an edge set. In particular,  $nG$  denotes the disjoint union of  $n > 1$  copies of the graph  $G$ .

A set  $S \subseteq V(G)$  is *independent* if no two vertices from  $S$  are adjacent, and by  $\text{Ind}(G)$  we mean the family of all the independent sets of  $G$ . An independent set of maximum size is a *maximum independent set* of  $G$ , and  $\alpha(G) = \max\{|S| : S \in \text{Ind}(G)\}$ . Let  $\Omega(G)$  denote the family of all maximum independent sets.

A *matching* in a graph  $G$  is a set of edges  $M \subseteq E(G)$  such that no two edges of  $M$  share a common vertex. A matching of maximum cardinality  $\mu(G)$  is a *maximum matching*, and a *perfect matching* is one saturating all vertices of  $G$ .

It is known that  $\lfloor |V(G)|/2 \rfloor + 1 \leq \alpha(G) + \mu(G) \leq |V(G)| \leq \alpha(G) + 2\mu(G)$  hold for every graph  $G$  [6]. If  $\alpha(G) + \mu(G) = |V(G)|$ , then  $G$  is called a König-Egerváry graph [10, 34]. For instance, each bipartite graph is a König-Egerváry graph [12, 19]. Various properties of König-Egerváry graphs can be found in [3, 4, 5, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33].

Let  $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_n$  be the degree sequence of a graph  $G$ . Pepper [31, 32] defined the annihilation number of  $G$ , denoted  $h(G)$ , to be the largest integer  $k$  such that the sum of the first  $k$  terms of the degree sequence is at most half the sum of the degrees in the sequence. In other words,  $h(G)$  is precisely the largest integer  $k$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^k d_i \leq m(G).$$

Clearly,  $h(G) = n(G)$  if and only if  $m(G) = 0$ , while  $h(G) = n(G) - 1$  if and only if  $m(G) = 1$ . Moreover, for every positive integer  $p$ , there exists a connected graph, namely  $K_{1,p}$ , having  $h(K_{1,p}) = p = n(K_{1,p}) - 1$ .

For  $A \subseteq V(G)$ , let  $\deg(A) = \sum_{v \in A} \deg(v)$ . Every  $A \subseteq V(G)$  satisfying  $\deg(A) \leq m(G)$  is an *annihilating set*. Clearly, every independent set is annihilating. An annihilating set  $A$  is *maximal* if  $\deg(A \cup \{v\}) > m(G)$ , for every vertex  $v \in V(G) - A$ , and it is *maximum* if  $|A| = h(G)$  [31]. For example, if  $G = K_{p,q} = (A, B, E)$  and  $p > q$ , then  $A$  is a maximum annihilating set, while  $B$  is a maximal annihilating set.

Recall that a *vertex-cover* of a graph  $G$  is a subset of vertices  $W \subseteq V(G)$  such that  $W \cap \{u, v\} \neq \emptyset$  holds for every  $uv \in E(G)$ . Notice that a vertex cover need not to be independent.

**Lemma 1.1** *Every independent vertex cover of a graph without isolated vertices is a maximal annihilating set.*

**Proof.** Let  $A$  be an independent vertex cover for a graph  $G$ . Since  $A$  is independent, we get that  $\deg(A) = m(G)$ . This ensures that  $A$  is a maximal annihilating set, because  $G$  has no isolated vertices. ■

**Theorem 1.2** [31] *For every graph  $G$ ,  $h(G) \geq \max\left\{\left\lfloor \frac{n(G)}{2} \right\rfloor, \alpha(G)\right\}$ .*

$$\text{For instance, } h(C_7) = \alpha(C_7) = \left\lfloor \frac{n(C_7)}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad h(\overline{P_5}) = 3 > \alpha(\overline{P_5}) = \left\lfloor \frac{n(\overline{P_5})}{2} \right\rfloor,$$

$$h(K_{2,3}) = \alpha(K_{2,3}) > \left\lfloor \frac{n(K_{2,3})}{2} \right\rfloor, \quad \text{while } h(\overline{C_6}) = \left\lfloor \frac{n(\overline{C_6})}{2} \right\rfloor > \alpha(\overline{C_6}).$$

The relation between the annihilation number and various parameters of a graph were studied in [1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 18, 31].

**Theorem 1.3** [23] *For a graph  $G$  with  $h(G) \geq \frac{n(G)}{2}$ ,  $\alpha(G) = h(G)$  if and only if  $G$  is a König-Egerváry graph and every  $S \in \Omega(G)$  is a maximum annihilating set.*

Actually, Larson and Pepper [23] proved a stronger result that reads as follows.

**Theorem 1.4** *Let  $G$  be a graph with  $h(G) \geq \frac{n(G)}{2}$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\alpha(G) = h(G)$ ;
- (ii)  $G$  is a König-Egerváry graph and every  $S \in \Omega(G)$  is a maximum annihilating set;
- (iii)  $G$  is a König-Egerváry graph and some  $S \in \Omega(G)$  is a maximum annihilating set.

Along these lines, it was conjectured that the impacts of maximum and maximal annihilating sets are the same.

**Conjecture 1.5** [23] *Let  $G$  be a graph with  $h(G) \geq \frac{n(G)}{2}$ . Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\alpha(G) = h(G)$ ;
- (ii)  $G$  is a König-Egerváry graph and every  $S \in \Omega(G)$  is a maximal annihilating set.

In this paper we validate the "(i)  $\implies$  (ii)" part of Conjecture 1.5, while for the converse, we provide some generic counterexamples, including trees, bipartite graphs that are not trees, and non-bipartite König-Egerváry graphs. Let us notice that, if  $G$  is a König-Egerváry graph, bipartite or non-bipartite, and  $H = qK_1 \cup G$ , then  $H$  inherits these properties. Moreover, the relationship between the independence numbers and annihilation numbers of  $G$  and  $H$  remains the same, because  $\alpha(H) = \alpha(G) + q$  and  $h(H) = h(G) + q$ . Therefore, it is enough to construct only connected counterexamples.

Finally, we hypothesize that Conjecture 1.5 is true for connected graphs with independence number equal to three.

## 2 The annihilation number of a sequence

Let  $D = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$  be a sequence of real numbers such that  $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_n$ . The *annihilation number*  $h(D, \Theta)$  of  $D$  with respect to the threshold  $\Theta$  is the largest integer  $k$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^k d_i \leq \Theta$ . A subsequence  $A$  of  $D$  is *maximum* if  $|A| = h(D, \Theta)$ .

For a subsequence  $A$  of  $D$ , let  $\deg(A) = \sum_{i \in \text{Dom}(A)} d_i$ , where  $\text{Dom}(A)$  is the set of all indexes defining  $A$ . If  $\deg(A) \leq \Theta$ , then  $A$  is an *annihilating subsequence* of  $D$ . An annihilating subsequence  $A$  is *maximal* if  $\deg(A) + d_i > \Theta$  for every index  $i \notin \text{Dom}(A)$ .

**Example 2.1** *Let  $D = (1, 2, 3, 4, 4)$ . For  $\Theta = 3$ , we get  $h(D, \Theta) = 2$  and  $A = (1, 2)$  is a maximum subsequence of  $D$ . For  $\Theta = 6$ , we get  $h(D, \Theta) = 3$  and  $A_1 = (1, 2, 3)$  is a maximum subsequence of  $D$ , while  $A_2 = (2, 4)$  is a maximal non-maximum subsequence of  $D$ .*

**Theorem 2.2** Let  $D = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$  be a sequence of real numbers such that

$$d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_n, \text{ and } h(D, \Theta) = k.$$

Then every maximum annihilating subsequence of  $D$  is maximal as well.

**Proof.** Clearly,  $A = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k)$  is both a maximum and a maximal subsequence of  $D$ , as  $h(D, \Theta) = k$ .

Let

$$B = (d_{j_1}, d_{j_2}, \dots, d_{j_k}), j_1 < j_2 < \dots < j_k$$

be a maximum annihilating subsequence of  $D$ . Suppose, to the contrary, that  $B$  is not maximal, i.e., there exists some index  $q$  such that  $d_{j_1} + d_{j_2} + \dots + d_{j_k} + d_q \leq \Theta$ .

If  $q > k$ , then

$$d_{j_1} + d_{j_2} + \dots + d_{j_k} + d_q \geq d_1 + d_2 + \dots + d_k + d_q > \Theta.$$

Therefore,  $q \leq k$ . In what follows, without loss of generality, we may assume that  $q$  is the smallest index possible satisfying this inequality  $d_{j_1} + d_{j_2} + \dots + d_{j_k} + d_q \leq \Theta$ . Hence, we infer that

$$d_1 = d_{j_1}, d_2 = d_{j_2}, \dots, d_{q-1} = d_{j_{q-1}}, \text{ and } q + 1 \leq j_q.$$

Let  $C = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_{q-1}, d_q, d_{j_q}, d_{j_{q+1}}, \dots, d_{j_{k-1}})$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{j_1} + d_{j_2} + \dots + d_{j_k} + d_q = \\ & d_1 + d_2 + \dots + d_{q-1} + \mathbf{d}_q + d_{j_q} + d_{j_{q+1}} + \dots + d_{j_{k-1}} + d_{j_k} \geq \\ & d_1 + d_2 + \dots + d_{q-1} + \mathbf{d}_q + d_{q+1} + d_{q+2} + \dots + d_k + d_{j_k} > \Theta, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts the assumption that  $B$  is not maximal. ■

Let us suppose that  $D = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$  is a degree sequence of a graph  $G$ , i.e.,  $d_i = \deg(v_i), v_i \in V(G)$ , and  $\Theta = m = |E(G)|$ . In this case, the definition of the annihilation number of a sequence coincides with the original Pepper's definition of the annihilation number of the graph  $G$ . In what follows, we apply Theorem 2.2 to graphs.

The cycle  $C_5$  has  $h(C_5) = \alpha(C_5) = \lfloor \frac{n(C_5)}{2} \rfloor$  and every of its maximum independent sets is both a maximal and a maximum annihilating set. Notice that  $C_5$  is not a König-Egerváry graph.



Figure 1: Non-König-Egerváry graphs with  $h(G_1) = 3$  and  $h(G_2) = 2$ .

Consider the graphs from Figure 1. The graph  $G_1$  has  $h(G_1) > \alpha(G_1)$  and none of its maximum independent sets is a maximal or a maximum annihilating set. The graph  $G_2$  has  $h(G_2) = \alpha(G_2)$  and each of its maximum independent sets is both a maximal and a maximum annihilating set. Notice that  $h(G_1) > \frac{n(G_1)}{2}$ , while  $h(G_2) < \frac{n(G_2)}{2}$ .

Consider now the graphs from Figure 2. The graph  $G_1$  has  $\alpha(G_1) = \frac{n(G_1)}{2} < h(G_1)$  and each of its maximum independent sets is neither a maximal nor a maximum annihilating set. The graph  $G_2$  has  $h(G_2) = \alpha(G_2) = \frac{n(G_2)}{2}$ , every of its maximum independent sets is both a maximal and a maximum annihilating set, and it has a maximal independent set that is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set, namely  $\{a, b\}$ . The graph  $G_3$  has  $h(G_3) = \alpha(G_3) > \frac{n(G_3)}{2}$  and every of its maximum independent sets is both a maximal and maximum annihilating set. The graph  $G_4$  has  $h(G_4) > \alpha(G_4) > \frac{n(G_4)}{2}$  and none of its maximum independent sets is a maximal or maximum annihilating set.




Figure 2: König-Egerváry graphs with  $h(G_1) = h(G_3) = 4$ ,  $h(G_2) = 3$ ,  $h(G_4) = 6$ .

**Theorem 2.3** *Let  $G$  be a graph with  $h(G) \geq \frac{n(G)}{2}$ . If  $\alpha(G) = h(G)$ , then  $G$  is a König-Egerváry graph and every maximum independent set is a maximal annihilating set.*

**Proof.** Since  $h(G) \geq \frac{n(G)}{2}$  and  $\alpha(G) = h(G)$ , Theorem 1.3 ensures that  $G$  is a König-Egerváry graph and each maximum independent set is a maximum annihilating set. Hence, in accordance with Theorem 2.2, we infer that every maximum independent set is a maximal annihilating set as well. ■

Thus Conjecture 1.5 is half-verified.

### 3 Tree counterexamples

Recall that if a graph  $G$  has a unique maximum independent set, say  $S$ , and  $V(G) - S$  is also an independent set, then  $G$  is a *strong unique maximum independence graph* [14].

**Theorem 3.1** [14] (i) *A tree is a strong unique maximum independence tree (graph) if and only if the distance between any two leaves is even.*

(ii) *A connected graph is a strong unique maximum independence graph if and only if it is bipartite and has a spanning tree which is a strong unique maximum independence tree (graph).*




Figure 3: Strong unique maximum independence trees  $T_k, k \geq 1$ .

Consider the trees from Figures 4 and 5.

- $T_1$  has  $m(T_1) = 7$ , the degree sequence  $(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3)$ ,  $h(T_1) = 5 = \alpha(T_1)$ ,  $\Omega(T_1) = \{S_1, S_2\}$ , where  $S_1 = \{v_1, v_2, v_4, v_7, v_8\}$ ,  $S_2 = \{v_1, v_2, v_5, v_7, v_8\}$ , and  $\deg(S_1) = \deg(S_2) = 6$ . Hence, every maximum independent set of  $T_1$  is both a maximal and a maximum annihilating set.
- $T_2$  has  $m(T_2) = 5$ , the degree sequence  $(1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 3)$ ,  $h(T_2) = 4 > \alpha(T_2)$ ,  $\Omega(T_2) = \{S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5\}$ , where  $S_1 = \{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$  has  $\deg(S_1) = 5$ ,  $S_2 = \{b_1, b_2, b_3\}$  has  $\deg(S_2) = 5$ ,  $S_3 = \{a_1, a_2, b_3\}$  has  $\deg(S_3) = 4$ ,  $S_4 = \{a_1, b_2, a_3\}$  has  $\deg(S_4) = 4$ ,  $S_5 = \{a_1, b_2, b_3\}$  has  $\deg(S_5) = 3$ . Consequently, only  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  are maximal annihilating sets belonging to  $\Omega(T_2)$ .




Figure 4: Trees with  $\alpha(T_1) = 5$  and  $\alpha(T_2) = 3$ .

- $T_3$  has  $m(T_3) = 10$ , the degree sequence  $(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4)$ ,  $h(T_3) = 8 > \alpha(T_3)$ ,  $\Omega(T_3) = \{S\}$ , where  $S = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6, x_7\}$  has  $\deg(S) = 8$ . Thus  $S$  is a (unique) maximum independent set but not a maximal annihilating set.




Figure 5: A tree with  $\alpha(T_3) = 7$ .

**Theorem 3.2** *There exist a tree of order  $2k+1$ ,  $k \geq 4$  and a tree of order  $2k+4$ ,  $k \geq 3$ , satisfying the following conditions:*

- $h(T) \geq \frac{n(T)}{2}$ ,
- each  $S \in \Omega(T)$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let us consider the trees from Figure 6.

The tree  $T_{2k+1}$ ,  $k \geq 4$ , has  $n(T_{2k+1}) = 2k+1$ ,  $m(T_{2k+1}) = 2k$ ,  $\alpha(T_{2k+1}) = k+1$  and the degree sequence

$$\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_k, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_k, k.$$

Consequently, we infer that  $h(T_{2k+1}) = k + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor > \max \left\{ \frac{n(T_{2k+1})}{2}, \alpha(T_{2k+1}) \right\}$ . According to Theorem 3.1(i),  $T_{2k+1}$  is a strong unique maximum independence tree. Hence,  $\Omega(T_{2k+1}) = \{S\}$ , where  $S = \{a_1, \dots, a_k, v\}$ . Since  $S$  is an independent vertex cover, by




Figure 6: Odd and even tree counterexamples.

Lemma 1.1, we conclude that each maximum independent set of  $T_{2k+1}$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

The tree  $T_{2k+4}$ ,  $k \geq 3$ , has  $n(T_{2k+4}) = 2k + 4$ ,  $m(T_{2k+4}) = 2k + 3$ ,  $\alpha(T_{2k+4}) = k + 3$  and the degree sequence

$$\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{k+2}, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_k, 3, k+1.$$

Consequently, we infer that  $h(T_{2k+4}) = k + 2 + \lfloor \frac{k+1}{2} \rfloor > \max \left\{ \frac{n(T_{2k+4})}{2}, \alpha(T_{2k+4}) \right\}$ .

According to Theorem 3.1(i),  $T_{2k+4}$  is a strong unique maximum independence tree. Hence,  $\Omega(T_{2k+4}) = \{S\}$ , where  $S = \{a_1, \dots, a_k, v_1, v_2, v_3\}$ . Since  $S$  is an independent vertex cover, by Lemma 1.1, we conclude that each maximum independent set of  $T_{2k+4}$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set. ■

## 4 Bipartite counterexamples that are not trees

**Lemma 4.1** *The bipartite graph  $G_k$ ,  $k \geq 1$ , from Figure 7 has  $\alpha(G_k) = k + 4$  and each  $S \in \Omega(G_k)$  includes either  $A_0 = \{a_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$  or  $B_0 = \{b_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$ . Moreover, every  $S \in \Omega(G_k)$  but one contains  $x_k$ , and  $\deg(S) \in \{2k + 11, 2k + 12\}$ .*




Figure 7: A bipartite graph with  $\alpha(G_k) = k + 4$ ,  $k \geq 0$ .

**Proof.** Let  $G_0 = G_k - \{x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k\} = (A_0, B_0, E_0)$ . Clearly,  $\alpha(G_0) = 4$  and  $A_0, B_0 \in \Omega(G_0)$ , because  $G_0$  has a perfect matching. The spanning graph

$$L = (V(G_0), \{a_1b_4, b_4a_2, a_2b_3, b_3a_3, a_3b_2, b_2a_4, a_4b_1, b_1a_1\}) = (A_0, B_0, U)$$

of  $G_0$  has exactly two maximum independent sets, namely  $A_0$  and  $B_0$ , as  $L$  is isomorphic to  $C_8$ . The graph  $G_0$  can be obtained from  $L$  by adding some edges keeping  $A_0, B_0$  as independent sets. Consequently, we infer that  $\Omega(G_0) = \Omega(L) = \{A_0, B_0\}$ .

Since  $G_k$  is bipartite and has a perfect matching, we get that  $\alpha(G_k) = k+4$  for every  $k \geq 1$ , and  $|S \cap (\{x_i : i = 1, \dots, k\} \cup \{y_i : i = 1, \dots, k\})| = k$ , for each  $S \in \Omega(G_k)$ .

Assume that there is some  $S' \in \Omega(G_k)$  such that both  $A_1 = S' \cap A_0 \neq \emptyset$  and  $B_1 = S' \cap B_0 \neq \emptyset$ . Since

$$S' = (S' \cap (\{x_i : i = 1, \dots, k\} \cup \{y_i : i = 1, \dots, k\})) \cup A_1 \cup B_1,$$

we get that  $A_1 \cup B_1$  is an independent set in  $G_0$  of size 4, different from both  $A_0$  and  $B_0$ , thus contradicting the fact that  $\Omega(G_0) = \{A_0, B_0\}$ . In conclusion, every maximum independent set of  $G_k$  includes either  $A_0 = \{a_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$  or  $B_0 = \{b_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$ .

Let  $S \in \Omega(G_k)$ .

*Case 1.*  $y_k \in S$ . Then, necessarily, we get that  $\{y_i : i = 1, \dots, k-1\} \cup B_0 \subset S$ , because  $y_1 a_4 \in E(G_k)$ . Consequently,  $\deg(S) = m(G_k) = 2k + 12$ .

*Case 2.*  $y_k \notin S$ . Then, necessarily,  $x_k \in S$ .

If  $\{x_i : i = 1, \dots, k-1\} \subset S$ , we have two options:

- $S = \{x_i : i = 1, \dots, k\} \cup A_0$ , and therefore,  $\deg(S) = m(G_k) = 2k + 12$ .
- $S = \{x_i : i = 1, \dots, k\} \cup B_0$ , and therefore,  $\deg(S) = m(G_k) - 1 = 2k + 11$ .

Otherwise, if  $y_j \in S$ , then  $\{y_i : i = 1, \dots, j-1\} \cup B_0 \subset S$ , and hence, we get that  $\deg(S) = 2k + 11$ . ■

**Theorem 4.2** *For every  $k \geq 0$ , there exists a connected bipartite graph  $G_k$ , of order  $2k + 8$ , satisfying the following:*

- $h(G_k) > \frac{n(G_k)}{2} = \alpha(G_k)$ ,
- each  $S \in \Omega(G_k)$  is a maximal annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let  $G_0 = G_k - \{x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ , where  $G_k = (A_k, B_k, E_k)$ ,  $k \geq 1$ , is the graph from Figure 7, while

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \{a_i : i = 1, 2, 3, 4\}, B_0 = \{b_i : i = 1, 2, 3, 4\}, \\ A_k &= A_0 \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \text{ and } B_k = B_0 \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_k\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,  $\frac{n(G_k)}{2} = \alpha(G_k)$ , since every  $G_k$  is a bipartite graph with a perfect matching.

*Case 1.*  $k = 0$ . The bipartite graph  $G_0 = (A_0, B_0, E)$  has  $m(G_0) = 12$  and the degree sequence  $(2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 4)$ . Hence  $h(G_0) = 5 > 4 = \alpha(G_0)$ . In addition,  $\Omega(G_0) = \{A_0, B_0\}$  and  $\deg(A_0) = \deg(B_0) = m(G_0)$ , i.e., each  $S \in \Omega(G_0)$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

*Case 2.*  $k = 1$ . The bipartite graph  $G_1 = (A_1, B_1, E)$  has  $m(G_1) = 14$  and the degree sequence  $(1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5)$ . Hence  $h(G_1) = 6 > 5 = \alpha(G_1)$ . According to Lemma 4.1, for every  $S \in \Omega(G_1)$  we have that  $\deg(S) \in \{13, 14\}$ , while

$$\deg(S) + \min \{\deg(v) : v \notin S\} > 14,$$

i.e., each  $S \in \Omega(G_1)$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.



*Case 3.*  $k = 2$ . The bipartite graph  $G_2 = (A_2, B_2, E)$  has  $m(G_2) = 16$  and the degree sequence  $(1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5)$ . Hence  $h(G_2) = 8 > 6 = \alpha(G_2)$ . By Lemma 4.1, for every  $S \in \Omega(G_2)$  we have that  $\deg(S) \in \{15, 16\}$ , while

$$\deg(S) + \min\{\deg(v) : v \notin S\} > 16,$$

i.e., each  $S \in \Omega(G_2)$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

*Case 4.*  $k \geq 3$ . The bipartite graph  $G_k = (A_k, B_k, E)$  has the degree sequence

$$1, \underbrace{2, \dots, 2}_{2k+2}, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5.$$

Thus  $m(G_k) = 2k + 12$ . It follows that the sum  $1 + 2(2k + 2) + 3 = 4k + 8$  of the first  $2k + 4$  degrees is greater than  $m(G_k)$  for each  $k \geq 3$ . Hence,  $h(G_k) \leq 2k + 3$ .

The inequality  $1 + 2x \leq m(G_k)$  leads to  $x \leq \frac{2k+11}{2}$ , which gives

$$h(G_k) = 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{2k+11}{2} \right\rfloor = k + 6 > k + 4 = \alpha(G_k).$$

Lemma 4.1 claims that for every  $S \in \Omega(G_k)$  we have that  $\deg(S) \in \{2k + 11, 2k + 12\}$ .

If  $S \in \Omega(G_k)$ , then  $\min\{\deg(v) : v \notin S\} = 1$  if and only if  $S = B_0 \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ . To this end,  $S$  is a vertex cover of  $G_k$ . Thus, by Lemma 1.1,  $S$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

Otherwise, we get that

$$\deg(S) + \min\{\deg(v) : v \notin S\} \geq \deg(S) + 2 > m(G_k).$$

Therefore, each  $S \in \Omega(G_k)$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set. ■

**Lemma 4.3** *The graph  $G_k, k \geq 0$ , from Figure 8 has a unique maximum independent set, namely,  $A_k = \{x_k, \dots, x_1, a_5, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$ , where  $G_0 = G_k - \{x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k\}$  and  $A_0 = \{a_5, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$ .*




Figure 8: A bipartite graph of odd order with  $\alpha(G_k) = k + 5, k \geq 0$ .

**Proof.** For every  $k \geq 0$ , the set  $\{x_j y_j : j = 1, \dots, k\} \cup \{a_5 b_4, a_4 b_2, a_3 b_3, a_2 b_1\}$  is a maximum matching of  $G_k$ , which gives  $\mu(G_k) = k + 4$ . Since  $|V(G_k)| = 2k + 9 = \alpha(G_k) + \mu(G_k)$  and  $A_k$  is an independent set of cardinality  $k + 5$ , we infer that  $A_k \in \Omega(G_k)$  and  $\alpha(G_k) = k + 5$ .

Consider the trees  $T_k = (A_k, V(G_k) - A_k, U), k \geq 1$  and  $T_0 = T_k - \{x_j, y_j : 1 \leq j \leq k\}$  from Figure 3. Since all the leaves of  $T_k$  belong to  $A_k$ , it follows that the distance

between any two leaves is even. Consequently, by Theorem 3.1(i), we get that  $T_k$  is a strong unique maximum independence tree, and  $\Omega(T_k) = \{A_k\}$ . On the other hand,  $T_k$  is a spanning tree of  $G_k$ , for every  $k \geq 0$ . Further, Theorem 3.1(ii) implies that  $G_k$  is a strong unique maximum independence graph and  $\Omega(G_k) = \{A_k\}$ . ■

**Theorem 4.4** *For each  $k \geq 0$ , there exists a connected bipartite graph  $G_k$  of order  $2k + 9$ , satisfying the following:*

- $h(G_k) > \left\lceil \frac{n(G_k)}{2} \right\rceil = \alpha(G_k)$ ,
- every  $S \in \Omega(G_k)$  is a maximal annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let  $G_k = (A_k, B_k, E_k)$ ,  $k \geq 0$ , be the bipartite graph from Figure 8, where

$$A_0 = \{a_i : i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}, B_0 = \{b_i : i = 1, 2, 3, 4\},$$

$$A_k = A_0 \cup \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \text{ and } B_k = B_0 \cup \{y_1, \dots, y_k\}.$$

Lemma 4.3 claims that  $A_k = \{x_1, \dots, x_k, a_1, \dots, a_5\}$  is the unique maximum independent set of  $G_k$ . Hence,  $\left\lceil \frac{n(G_k)}{2} \right\rceil = \alpha(G_k)$ , since  $G_k - a_1$  is bipartite and has a perfect matching.

*Case 1.*  $k = 0$ . The bipartite graph  $G_0 = (A_0, B_0, E_0)$  has  $m(G_0) = 14$  and the degree sequence  $(2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 5, 5)$ . Hence,  $h(G_0) = 6 > 5 = \alpha(G_0)$ . In addition,  $\deg(A_0) = m(G_0)$ , i.e., each maximum independent set of  $G_0$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

*Case 2.*  $k = 1$ . The bipartite graph  $G_1 = (A_1, B_1, E_1)$  has  $m(G_1) = 16$  and the degree sequence  $(1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 5, 5)$ . Hence,  $h(G_1) = 7 > 6 = \alpha(G_1)$ . In addition,  $\deg(A_1) = m(G_1)$ , while

$$\deg(A_1) + \min\{\deg(v) : v \notin A_1\} \geq 16 + 2 > m(G_1),$$

i.e., each maximum independent set of  $G_1$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

*Case 3.*  $k = 2$ . The bipartite graph  $G_2 = (A_2, B_2, E_2)$  has  $m(G_2) = 18$  and the degree sequence  $(1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 5, 5, 5)$ . Hence,  $h(G_2) = 9 > 7 = \alpha(G_2)$ . In addition,  $\deg(A_2) = m(G_2)$ , while

$$\deg(A_2) + \min\{\deg(v) : v \notin A_2\} \geq 18 + 2 > m(G_2),$$

i.e., each maximum independent set of  $G_2$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

*Case 4.*  $k \geq 3$ . The bipartite graph  $G_k = (A_k, B_k, E_k)$  has the degree sequence

$$1, 2, \underbrace{\dots}_{2k+3}, 2, 3, 3, 5, 5, 5.$$

Thus  $m(G_k) = 2k + 14$ . It follows that the sum  $1 + 2(2k + 3) + 3 = 4k + 10$  of the first  $2k + 5$  degrees is greater than  $m(G_k)$  for each  $k \geq 3$ . Hence,  $h(G_k) \leq 2k + 4$ .

The inequality  $1 + 2x \leq m(G_k)$  leads to  $x \leq \frac{2k+13}{2}$ , which gives

$$h(G_k) = 1 + \left\lceil \frac{2k+13}{2} \right\rceil = k + 7 > k + 5 = \alpha(G_k).$$

In addition,  $\deg(A_k) = m(G_k)$ , while

$$\deg(A_k) + \min \{\deg(v) : v \notin A_k\} = 2k + 16 > m(G_k),$$

i.e., each maximum independent set of  $G_k$  is maximal non-maximum annihilating. ■

## 5 Non-bipartite König-Egerváry counterexamples

In what follows, we present a series of counterexamples to the opposite direction of Conjecture 1.5 for non-bipartite König-Egerváry graphs. All these graphs have unique maximum independent sets.

**Lemma 5.1** *The graph  $H_k, k \geq 0$ , from Figure 9 is a König-Egerváry graph that has a unique maximum independent set, namely,  $S_k = \{x_k, \dots, x_1, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$ , where  $H_0 = H_k - \{x_j, y_j : j = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and  $S_0 = \{a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$ .*




Figure 9:  $H_k$  is a non-bipartite König-Egerváry graph with  $\alpha(H_k) = k + 4, k \geq 0$ .

**Proof.** Clearly,  $S_k = \{x_k, \dots, x_1, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$  is an independent set and

$$\{x_j y_j : j = 1, 2, \dots, k\} \cup \{a_4 b_4, a_3 b_2, a_3 b_3, a_1 b_1\}$$

is a perfect matching of  $H_k$ . Hence, we get

$$|V_k| = 2\mu(H_k) = |S_k| + \mu(H_k) \leq \alpha(H_k) + \mu(H_k) \leq |V_k|,$$

which implies  $\alpha(H_k) + \mu(H_k) = |V_k|$ , i.e.,  $H_k$  is a König-Egerváry graph, and  $\alpha(H_k) = k + 4 = |S_k|$ .

Let  $L_k = H_k[X_k \cup Y_k], k \geq 1$ , and  $L_0 = H_k[A \cup B]$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} X_k &= \{x_j : j = 1, \dots, k\}, Y_k = \{y_j : j = 1, \dots, k\}, \\ A &= \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4\} \text{ and } B = \{b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $L_k$  has, on the one hand,  $K_{k,k}$  as a subgraph, and, on the other hand,

$$y_k y_{k-1}, y_{k-1} y_{k-2}, \dots, y_2 y_1 \in E(L_k),$$

it follows that  $X_k$  is the unique maximum independent set of  $L_k$ .

The graph  $L_0$  has  $A$  as a unique independent set, because

$$C_8 + b_3b_4 = (A \cup B, \{a_1b_4, b_4a_2, a_2b_3, b_3a_3, a_3b_2, b_2a_4, a_4b_1, b_1a_1, b_3b_4\})$$

has  $A$  as a unique maximum independent set, and  $L_0$  can be obtained from  $C_8 + b_3b_4$  by adding a number of edges.

Since  $H_k$  can be obtained from the union of  $L_k$  and  $L_0$  by adding some edges, and  $S_k = X_k \cup A$  is independent in  $H_k$ , it follows that  $H_k$  has  $S_k$  as a unique maximum independent set. ■

**Corollary 5.2** *The graph  $H_k, k \geq 0$ , from Figure 10 is a König-Egerváry graph that has a unique independent set, namely,  $S_k = \{x_i : i = 1, \dots, k\} \cup \{a_i : i = 1, \dots, 5\}$ , where  $H_0 = H_k - \{x_j, y_j : j = 1, 2, \dots, k\}$  and  $S_0 = \{a_i : i = 1, \dots, 5\}$ .*




Figure 10:  $H_k$  is a non-bipartite König-Egerváry graph with  $\alpha(G_k) = k + 5, k \geq 0$ .

**Proof.** According to Lemma 5.1,  $H_k - a_5$  is a König-Egerváry graph with a unique maximum independent set, namely,  $W_k = \{x_i : i = 1, \dots, k\} \cup \{a_i : i = 1, \dots, 4\}$ . Since  $S_k = W_k \cup \{a_5\}$  is an independent set and  $\mu(H_k) = \mu(H_k - a_5) = k + 4$ , it follows that  $H_k$  is a König-Egerváry graph and  $S_k$  is its unique maximum independent set. ■

The following results show that if the order of the graph is greater or equal to 8, then the converse of Theorem 2.3 is not true for non-bipartite König-Egerváry graphs.

**Theorem 5.3** *For every  $k \geq 0$ , there exists a connected non-bipartite König-Egerváry graph  $H_k = (V_k, E_k)$ , of order  $2k + 8$ , satisfying the following:*

- $h(H_k) > \frac{n(H_k)}{2} = \alpha(H_k)$ ,
- each  $S \in \Omega(H_k)$  is a maximal annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let  $H_k = (V_k, E_k), k \geq 0$ , be the graph from Figure 9 (in the bottom and the top lines are written the degrees of its vertices), where  $H_0 = H_k - \{x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ . Clearly, every  $H_k$  is non-bipartite.

By Lemma 5.1, each  $H_k, k \geq 0$ , is a König-Egerváry graph with a unique maximum independent set, namely,  $S_k = \{x_k, \dots, x_1, a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$ , where  $S_0 = \{a_4, a_3, a_2, a_1\}$ .

*Case 1.  $k = 0$ .* Since  $m(H_0) = 13$  and the degree sequence  $(2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 5, 5)$ , we infer that  $h(H_0) = 5 > 4 = \alpha(H_0)$ . In addition,  $\deg(S_0) = m(H_0) - 1$ , i.e., each maximum independent set of  $H_0$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

Case 2.  $k \geq 1$ .

Clearly,  $H_k$  has  $m(G_k) = k^2 + 9k + 13$  and its degree sequence is

$$k + 2, k + 2, k + 2, k + 3, k + 3, \underbrace{k + 4, \dots, k + 4}_{k+1}, k + 5, k + 5, \underbrace{k + 6, \dots, k + 6}_k.$$

Since the sum of the first  $k + 6$  degrees of the sequence satisfies

$$k^2 + 10k + 16 > m(H_k),$$

we infer that the annihilation number  $h(H_k) \leq k + 6$ . The sum  $12 + 4(x - 5) + kx$  of the first  $x \geq 5$  degrees of the sequence satisfies  $12 + 4(x - 5) + kx \leq m(H_k)$  for  $x \leq \frac{k^2 + 9k + 21}{k + 4}$ . This implies

$$h(H_k) = \left\lfloor \frac{k^2 + 9k + 21}{k + 4} \right\rfloor = k + 5 > k + 4 = \alpha(H_k),$$

i.e.,  $H_k$  has no maximum annihilating set belonging to  $\Omega(H_k)$ . Since its unique maximum independent set  $S_k = \{a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$  has

$$\deg(S_k) = k^2 + 8k + 12 < m(H_k), \text{ while}$$

$$\deg(S_k) + \min\{\deg(v) : v \in V_k - S\} = (k^2 + 8k + 12) + (k + 2) > m(H_k),$$

we infer that  $S_k$  is a maximal annihilating set. ■

**Theorem 5.4** *For every  $k \geq 0$ , there exists a connected non-bipartite König-Egerváry graph  $H_k = (V_k, E_k)$ , of order  $2k + 9$ , satisfying the following:*

- $h(H_k) > \left\lfloor \frac{n(H_k)}{2} \right\rfloor = \alpha(H_k)$ ,
- each  $S \in \Omega(H_k)$  is a maximal annihilating set.

**Proof.** Let  $H_k = (V_k, E_k)$ ,  $k \geq 1$ , be the graph from Figure 10 (in the bottom and the top lines are written the degrees of its vertices), and  $H_0 = H_k - \{x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ .

Corollary 5.2 claims that  $H_k$ ,  $k \geq 0$ , is a König-Egerváry graph with a unique maximum independent set, namely  $S_k = \{x_1, \dots, x_k, a_1, \dots, a_5\}$ ,  $k \geq 1$ , and  $S_0 = \{a_1, \dots, a_5\}$ .

Case 1. The non-bipartite König-Egerváry graph  $H_0$  has  $m(H_0) = 15$  and the degree sequence  $(2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 4, 6, 6)$ . Hence,  $h(H_0) = 6 > 5 = \alpha(H_0)$ . In addition,  $\Omega(H_0) = \{S_0\}$ , and  $\deg(S_0) = 14$ , i.e., each maximum independent set of  $H_0$  is a maximal non-maximum annihilating set.

Case 2.  $k \geq 1$ .

Clearly,  $H_k$  has  $m(H_k) = k^2 + 10k + 15$  and its degree sequence is

$$k + 2, k + 2, k + 2, k + 2, k + 3, k + 3, \underbrace{k + 4, \dots, k + 4}_{k+1}, k + 5, k + 5, \underbrace{k + 6, \dots, k + 6}_k.$$

Since the sum of the first  $k + 7$  degrees of the sequence satisfies

$$k^2 + 11k + 18 > m(H_k),$$

we infer that the annihilation number  $h(H_k) \leq k + 6$ . The sum  $14 + 4(x - 5) + kx$  of the first  $x \geq 6$  degrees of the sequence satisfies  $14 + 4(x - 6) + kx \leq m(H_k)$  for  $x \leq \frac{k^2 + 10k + 25}{k + 4}$ . This implies

$$h(H_k) = \left\lfloor \frac{k^2 + 10k + 25}{k + 4} \right\rfloor = k + 6 > k + 5 = \alpha(H_k),$$

i.e.,  $H_k$  has no maximum annihilating set belonging to  $\Omega(H_k)$ . Since its unique maximum independent set  $S_k$  has

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(S_k) &= k^2 + 9k + 14 < m(G_k), \text{ while} \\ \deg(S_k) + \min\{\deg(v) : v \in V_k - S_k\} &= (k^2 + 9k + 14) + (k + 2) > m(G_k), \end{aligned}$$

we infer that  $S_k$  is a maximal annihilating set. ■

## 6 Conclusions

If  $G$  is a König-Egerváry graph with  $\alpha(G) \in \{1, 2\}$ , then  $\alpha(G) = h(G)$  and each maximum independent set is maximal annihilating, since the list of such König-Egerváry graphs reads as follows:

$$\{K_1, K_2, K_1 \cup K_1, K_1 \cup K_2, K_2 \cup K_2, P_3, P_4, C_4, K_3 + e, K_4 - e\}.$$

Consequently, Conjecture 1.5 is correct for König-Egerváry graphs with  $\alpha(G) \leq 2$ .



Figure 11:  $G_1 = K_3 + e$  and  $G_2 = K_4 - e$ .

Let  $G$  be a disconnected König-Egerváry graph with  $\alpha(G) = 3$ .

- If  $\alpha(G) = h(G)$ , then

$$G \in \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 3K_1, 2K_1 \cup K_2, K_1 \cup 2K_2, 3K_2, K_1 \cup P_3, K_1 \cup P_4, \\ K_1 \cup C_4, K_1 \cup (K_3 + e), K_1 \cup (K_4 - e), K_2 \cup P_3, K_2 \cup C_4 \end{array} \right\},$$

while every  $S \in \Omega(G)$  is a maximal annihilating set.

- If  $\alpha(G) < h(G)$ , then  $G \in \{K_2 \cup P_4, K_2 \cup (K_3 + e), K_2 \cup (K_4 - e)\}$ , while for every such  $G$ , there exists a maximum independent set, which is not a maximal annihilating set. Moreover, for  $K_2 \cup (K_3 + e)$  and  $K_2 \cup (K_4 - e)$  all maximum independent sets are not maximal annihilating.

Thus Conjecture 1.5 is true for disconnected König-Egerváry graphs with  $\alpha(G) = 3$ .

On the other hand, Theorems 3.2, 4.2, 4.4, 5.3, 5.4 present various counterexamples to the ”(ii)  $\implies$  (i)“ part of Conjecture 1.5 for every independence number greater than three.

**Conjecture 6.1** *Let  $G$  be a graph with  $h(G) \geq \frac{n(G)}{2}$ . If  $G$  is a connected König-Egerváry graph with  $\alpha(G) = 3$ , and every  $S \in \Omega(G)$  is a maximal annihilating set, then  $\alpha(G) = h(G)$ .*

## References

- [1] J. Amjadi, *An upper bound on the double domination number of trees*, Kragujevac Journal of Mathematics **39** (2015) 133–139.
- [2] H. Aram, R. Khoelilar, S. M. Sheikholeslami, L. Volkmann, *Relating the annihilation number and the Roman domination number*, Acta Mathematica Universitatis Comenianae **87** (2018) 1–13.
- [3] I. Beckenbach, R. Borndörfer, *Hall’s and König’s theorem in graphs and hypergraphs*, Discrete Mathematics **341** (2018) 2753–2761.
- [4] A. Bhattacharya, A. Mondal, T. S. Murthy, *Problems on matchings and independent sets of a graph*, Discrete Mathematics **341** (2018) 1561–1572.
- [5] F. Bonomo, M. C. Dourado, G. Durán, L. Faria, L. N. Grippo, M. D. Safe, *Forbidden subgraphs and the König-Egerváry property*, Discrete Applied Mathematics Volume **161** (2013) 2380–2388.
- [6] E. Boros, M. C. Golumbic, V. E. Levit, *On the number of vertices belonging to all maximum stable sets of a graph*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **124** (2002) 17–25.
- [7] N. Dehgard, S. Norouzian, S. M. Sheikholeslami, *Bounding the domination number of a tree in terms of its annihilation number*, Transactions on Combinatorics **2** (2013) 9–16.
- [8] N. Dehgard, A. Khodkar, S. M. Sheikholeslami, *Bounding the rainbow domination number of a tree in terms of its annihilation number*, Transactions on Combinatorics **2** (2013) 21–32.
- [9] N. Dehgard, A. Khodkar, S. M. Sheikholeslami, *Bounding the paired-domination number of a tree in terms of its annihilation number*, Filomat **28** (2014) 523–529.
- [10] R. W. Deming, *Independence numbers of graphs - an extension of the König-Egerváry theorem*, Discrete Mathematics **27** (1979) 23–33.
- [11] W. J. Desormeaux, T. W. Haynes, M. A. Henning, *Relating the annihilation number and the total domination number of a tree*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **161** (2013) 349–354.
- [12] E. Egerváry, *On combinatorial properties of matrices*, Matematikai Lapok **38** (1931) 16–28.
- [13] M. Gentner, M. A. Henning, D. Rautenbach, *Smallest domination number and largest independence number of graphs and forests with given degree sequence*, Journal of Graph Theory **88** (2018) 131–145.

- [14] G. Hopkins, W. Staton, *Graphs with unique maximum independent sets*, Discrete Mathematics **57** (1985) 245–251.
- [15] A. Jarden, V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Two more characterizations of König-Egerváry graphs*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **231** (2017) 175–180.
- [16] A. Jarden, V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Critical and maximum independent sets of a graph*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **247** (2018) 127–134.
- [17] A. Jarden, V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Monotonic properties of collections of maximum independent sets of a graph*, Order (2018). Available online at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11083-018-9461-8>.
- [18] D. A. Jaumea, G. Molina, *Maximum and minimum nullity of a tree degree sequence*, arXiv:1806.02399 [math.CO] (2018) 13 pp.
- [19] D. König, *Graphen und matrisen*, Matematikai Lapok **38** (1931) 116–119.
- [20] E. Korach, T. Nguyen, B. Peis, *Subgraph characterization of red/blue-split graphs and König-Egerváry graphs*, in: Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM–SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, ACM Press, 2006, 842–850.
- [21] C. E. Larson, *A note on critical independent sets*, Bulletin of the Institute of Combinatorics and its Applications **51** (2007) 34–46.
- [22] C. E. Larson, *The critical independence number and an independence decomposition*, European Journal of Combinatorics **32** (2011) 294–300.
- [23] C. E. Larson, R. Pepper, *Graphs with equal independence and annihilation numbers*, The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics **18** (2011) #P180.
- [24] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Combinatorial properties of the family of maximum stable sets of a graph*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **117** (2002) 149–161.
- [25] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *On  $\alpha^+$ -stable König-Egerváry graphs*, Discrete Mathematics **263** (2003) 179–190.
- [26] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Critical independent sets and König-Egerváry graphs*, Graphs and Combinatorics **28** (2012) 243–250.
- [27] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Vertices belonging to all critical independent sets of a graph*, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics **26** (2012) 399–403.
- [28] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *On maximum matchings in König-Egerváry graphs*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **161** (2013) 1635–1638.
- [29] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *A set and collection lemma*, The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics **21** (2014) #P1.40.
- [30] V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *On König-Egerváry collections of maximum critical independent sets*, The Art of Discrete and Applied Mathematics **2** (2019) #P1.02.



- [31] R. Pepper, *Binding independence*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Houston, 2004.
- [32] R. Pepper, *On the annihilation number of a graph*, in: Recent Advances in Electrical Engineering: Proceedings of the 15th American Conference on Applied Mathematics (2009), 217–220.
- [33] T. Short, *On some conjectures concerning critical independent sets of a graph*, The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics **23** (2016), #P2.43.
- [34] F. Sterboul, *A characterization of the graphs in which the transversal number equals the matching number*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series **B 27** (1979) 228–229.