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ABSTRACT

Restrained and Other Domination Parameters in Complementary Prisms

by

Wyatt J. DesOrmeaux

In this thesis, we will study several domination parameters of a family of graphs known as complementary prisms. We will first present the basic terminology and definitions necessary to understand the topic. Then, we will examine the known results addressing the domination number and the total domination number of complementary prisms. After this, we will present our main results, namely, results on the restrained domination number of complementary prisms. Subsequently results on the $\text{distance} - k$ domination number, 2-step domination number and stratification of complementary prisms will be presented. Then, we will characterize when a complementary prism is Eulerian or bipartite, and we will obtain bounds on the chromatic number of a complementary prism. We will finish the thesis with a section on possible future problems.
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The purpose of this thesis is to study selected domination parameters of a family of graphs known as complementary prisms. In Section 1.1, we introduce the basic terminology of graph theory utilized in this paper. In Section 1.2, we introduce the definitions of each of the domination parameters discussed in this paper. In Section 1.3, we define the complementary prism of a graph and give examples.

1.1 Basic Terminology of Graph Theory

As defined in [3], a graph $G = (V(G), E(G))$ is a nonempty, finite set of elements called vertices together with a (possibly empty) set of unordered pairs of distinct vertices of $G$ called edges. The vertex set of $G$ is denoted by $V(G)$ and the edge set of $G$ is denoted by $E(G)$. In Figure 1, we have an example of a graph.

![Graph](image)

Figure 1: A Graph $G$

In this paper, we will be studying simple graphs, which are graphs for which there exists, at most, 1 edge between any two vertices, and for which the endpoints of any edge are distinct. Given any graph $G$, the order of $G$, denoted $n(G) = |V(G)|$, is the number of vertices in $G$. The size of $G$, denoted $m(G) = |E(G)|$, is the number of edges in $G$. For example, for the graph $G$ in Figure 1, the order $n(G) = 10$ and the
size $m(G) = 15$. The \textit{complement} of $G$, denoted $\overline{G}$, is a graph with $V(\overline{G}) = V(G)$ and $E(\overline{G}) = \{ab | ab \notin E(G)\}$. For example, consider the graphs $G$ and $\overline{G}$ seen in Figure 1.1.

For any vertices $v, u \in V(G)$, $u$ and $v$ are \textit{adjacent} if $uv \in E(G)$. A \textit{$u$-$v$ path} is a finite alternating sequence $\{u = v_0, e_1, v_1, e_2 \ldots e_k, v_k = v\}$ of vertices and edges such that $e_i = v_{i-1}v_i$ for $i = 1 \ldots k$ and $e_i = e_j$ if, and only if, $i = j$. Among all $u$-$v$ paths, the number of edges in a shortest length $u$-$v$ path is known as the \textit{distance} from $u$ to $v$, denoted by $\text{dist}(u, v)$. For any vertex $v \in V(G)$, the \textit{open neighborhood} of $v$ is $N(v) = \{u \in V(G) \mid uv \in E(G)\}$, and the \textit{closed neighborhood} $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$. For a set $S \subseteq V(G)$, its \textit{open neighborhood} $N(S) = \bigcup_{v \in S} N(v)$, and its \textit{closed neighborhood} $N[S] = N(S) \cup S$. The degree of a vertex $v$ is $\text{deg}_G(v) = |N(v)|$. The \textit{minimum degree} of $G$ is $\delta(G) = \min\{\text{deg}_G(v) \mid v \in V(G)\}$. The \textit{maximum degree} of $G$ is $\Delta(G) = \max\{\text{deg}_G(v) \mid v \in V(G)\}$. A vertex of degree zero is an \textit{isolated vertex}. A vertex of degree one is called a \textit{leaf} or an \textit{endvertex}, and its neighbor is called a \textit{support vertex}.

For any leaf vertex $v$ and support vertex $w$, the edge $vw$ is called a \textit{pendant edge}.

Given $S \subseteq V(G)$, and $v \in S$, a vertex $w \in V(G)$ is an \textit{S-private neighbor} of $v$ if $N_G(w) \cap S = \{v\}$. The \textit{S-external private neighborhood} of $v$, denoted $\text{epn}(v, S)$, is the set of all S-private neighbors of $v$ in $V(G) \setminus S$. For any $S \subseteq V(G)$, the subgraph of $G$ \textit{induced} by $S$ is denoted $\langle S \rangle$. If $S \subseteq V(G)$ and $uv \in E(G)$ for every $u, v \in S,$
then $S$ forms a *clique* of order $|S|$, and $\langle S \rangle$ is called a *complete graph* of order $|S|$. If $uv \notin E(G)$ for every $u, v \in S$, then $S$ is an independent set of order $|S|$ and $\langle S \rangle$ is called an *empty graph* of order $|S|$. For any set $S \subseteq V(G)$, and any vertex $v \in V(G)$, $\text{dist}(v, S) = \min \{d(v, u) | u \in S \}$. A graph $G$ whose vertex set $V(G)$ can be partitioned into a clique and an independent set is called a *split graph*. For any graph $G$, the *corona* of $G$, denoted $G \circ K_1$, is formed by adding for each $v \in V(G)$, a new vertex $v'$ and a pendant edge $vv'$. A set $P \subseteq V(G)$ is a *packing* if $N[u] \cap N[v] = \emptyset$ for every $u, v \in P$.

Given a graph $G$ with vertex set $V(G)$, a *proper coloring* of $G$ is a partitioning of $V(G)$ into independent sets. These sets are called *color classes*. A proper coloring of $G$ that has a minimum number of color classes is called a $\chi(G)$-*coloring* and the number of color classes in such a coloring is $\chi(G)$. For other definitions and terminology related to graph theory, the interested reader is referred to [3, 4, 9].

1.2 Domination Parameters

A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a *dominating set* (abbreviated DS) if $N[S] = V(G)$ and is a *total dominating set* (abbreviated TDS) if $N(S) = V(G)$. The minimum cardinality of any DS (respectively, TDS) of $G$ is the *domination number* $\gamma(G)$ (respectively, *total domination number* $\gamma_t(G)$). A DS of $G$ with cardinality $\gamma(G)$ is called a $\gamma(G)$-*set*, and a $\gamma_t(G)$-*set* is defined similarly. A set $S \subset V(G)$ is a *restrained dominating set* (abbreviated RDS) of $G$, if for every vertex $v \in V(G) \setminus S$, $v$ is adjacent to a vertex in $S$ and to a vertex in $V(G) \setminus S$. The *restrained domination number* $\gamma_r(G)$ is the
cardinality of a minimum RDS of $G$. A RDS of $G$ with cardinality $\gamma_r(G)$ is called a $\gamma_r(G)$-set. A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a distance-$k$ dominating set if for every $u$ in $V(G) \setminus S$, $u$ is within a distance $k$ of some vertex in $S$, that is for each $u \in V(G) \setminus S$, there exists a vertex $v \in S$ such that $\text{dist}(u, v) \leq k$. The distance $- k$ domination number, denoted $\gamma_{\leq k}(G)$, is the cardinality of a minimum distance $- k$ dominating set of $G$.

A distance $- k$ dominating set with cardinality $\gamma_{\leq k}(G)$ is called a $\gamma_{\leq k}(G)$-set. A set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a $k$-step dominating set if for every $u$ in $V(G) \setminus S$, $u$ is exactly a distance $k$ from some vertex in $S$, that is, for each $u \in V(G) \setminus S$, there exists a vertex $v \in S$ such that $\text{dist}(u, v) = k$. The $k$-step domination number, denoted $\gamma_{= k}(G)$, is the cardinality of a minimum $k$-step dominating set of $G$. A $k$-step dominating set of cardinality $\gamma_{= k}(G)$ is called a $\gamma_{= k}(G)$-set. For further information related to domination in graphs, the interested reader is referred to [5, 6].

1.3 Stratification and Domination

In Chapter 4 of this paper, we will study stratification and domination in complementary prisms. The concept of stratification and domination in graphs was introduced by Chartrand, Haynes, Henning and Zhang in [2]. A stratification of a graph $G$ is a partitioning of its vertex set. If the partition has two equivalence classes $\{V_1, V_2\}$, then $G$ is a 2-stratified graph. We restrict our attention in this paper to 2-stratified graphs, where we treat the equivalence classes $V_1$ and $V_2$ as color classes. We will color $V_1$ red and $V_2$ blue. Let $F$ be a 2-stratified graph rooted at one blue vertex, and containing at least one red vertex. Given a graph $G$, an $F$-coloring of $G$ is a red-blue coloring of the vertices of $V(G)$ done in such a manner that every blue
vertex $v \in V(G)$ is contained in a copy of $F$ rooted at $v$. The $F$-domination number, denoted $\gamma_F(G)$, is the minimum number of red vertices in an $F$-coloring of $G$. An $F$-coloring that colors $\gamma_F(G)$ vertices of $G$ red is a $\gamma_F$-coloring of $G$. The set of red vertices in a $\gamma_F$-coloring is called a $\gamma_F(G)$-set. If $G$ contains no copy of $F$ and if $G$ has order $n$, then $\gamma_F(G) = n$. In this thesis, we will examine the $F$-domination number of a complementary prism $\overline{GG}$ when $F$ is a 2-stratified $P_3$ with 1 blue rooted vertex $v$. This will give us 5 possibilities for the graph $F$.

1.4 Complementary Prisms

Complementary prisms were first introduced by Haynes, Henning, Slater and Van der Merwe in [7]. For a graph $G$, its complementary prism, denoted $\overline{GG}$, is formed from a copy of $G$ and a copy of $\overline{G}$ by adding a perfect matching between corresponding vertices. For each $v \in V(G)$, let $\overline{v}$ denote the vertex $v$ in the copy of $\overline{G}$. Formally $\overline{GG}$ is formed from $G \cup \overline{G}$ by adding the edge $v\overline{v}$ for every $v \in V(G)$. For any graph $G$, we denote its complementary prism by $\overline{GG}$. Many well known graphs can be realized as complementary prisms. For instance, the corona $K_n \circ K_1$ is the complementary prism $K_n \overline{K}_n$. Another example, is the Petersen graph, which is the complementary prism $C_5 \overline{C}_5$. See Figure 1.4.

To aid in the discussion of complementary prisms, we will use the following terminology. For a set $P \subseteq V(G)$, let $\overline{P}$ be the corresponding set of vertices in $V(\overline{G})$. For a vertex $v \in V(G)$, let $\overline{v}$ represent the corresponding vertex in $V(\overline{G})$.

In this thesis, we will explore the domination parameters defined in this introduction for complementary prisms. We will also characterize graphs for which the
complementary prism is Eulerian or bipartite and obtain bounds on the chromatic number of complementary prisms.
2 LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, we review the literature dealing with complementary prisms. In Section 2.1, we will examine the complementary product first introduced in [7] and we will see how complementary prisms are a subset of this. In Section 2.2, we will review the work on domination and total domination in complementary prisms seen in [7, 8].

2.1 The Complementary Product of Two Graphs

In [7], Haynes, Henning, Slater and Van der Merwe introduced a generalization of the Cartesian product of two graphs. Let $G_1$ and $G_2$ be graphs with $V(G_1) = \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_n\}$ and $V(G_2) = \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_p\}$. The Cartesian product of the graphs $G_1$ and $G_2$, symbolized by $G_1 \square G_2$, is the graph formed from $G_1$ and $G_2$ in the following manner.

The graph $G_1 \square G_2$ has $np$ vertices. Each of these vertices has a label taken from $V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$. In $G_1 \square G_2$, 2 vertices $(u_i, v_j)$ and $(u_r, v_s)$ are adjacent if, and only if 1 of the following conditions hold:

1. $i = r$, and $v_jv_s \in E(G_2)$.
2. $j = s$, and $u_iu_r \in E(G_1)$.

For each $i$, the induced subgraph on the vertices $(u_i, v_j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq p$ is a copy of $G_2$, and for each $j$, the induced subgraph on the vertices $(u_i, v_j)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ is a copy of $G_1$. In less formal terms, $G_1 \square G_2$ can either be viewed as the graph formed by taking each vertex of $G_1$, replacing it with a copy of $G_2$ and matching the
corresponding vertices and taking each vertex of $G_2$, replacing it with a copy of $G_1$ and matching the corresponding vertices.

In [7], the complementary product of two graphs is defined as follows: Let $R$ be a subset of $V(G)$ and $S$ be a subset of $V(H)$. The complementary product (symbolized by $G(R)\Box H(S)$) is constructed as follows. The vertex set $V(G(R)\Box H(S))$ is $\{(u_i, v_j) : 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$. And the edge $(u_i, v_j)(u_h, v_k)$ is in $E(G(R)\Box H(S))$ if one of the following conditions hold.

1. If $i = h$, $u_i \in R$, and $v_jv_k \in E(H)$, or if $i = h$, $u_i \notin R$ and $v_jv_k \notin E(H)$.

2. If $j = k$, $v_j \in S$, and $u_iu_h \in E(G)$, or if $j = k$, $v_j \notin S$, and $u_iu_h \notin E(G)$.

In other words, for each $u_i \in V(G)$, we replace $u_i$ with a copy of $H$ if $u_i$ is in $R$ and with a copy of its complement $\overline{H}$ if $u_i$ is not in $R$, and for each $v_j \in V(H)$, we replace each $v_j$ with a copy of $G$ if $v_j \in S$ and a copy of $\overline{G}$ if $v_j \notin S$.

In the case where $R = V(G)$ (respectively, $S = V(H)$), the complementary product $G(R)\Box H(S)$ is written $G\Box H(S)$ (respectively, $G(R)\Box H$). To put it more informally, $G\Box H(S)$ is the graph obtained by replacing each vertex $v \in V(H)$ with a copy
of $G$ if $v \in S$ and by a copy of $\overline{G}$ if $v \not\in S$, and replacing each $u_i$ with a copy of $H$.

In the extreme case where $R = V(G)$, and $S = V(H)$, the complementary product $G(V(G)) \square H(V(H)) = G \square H$ is simply the same as the Cartesian product $G \square H$. See Figure 4 for an illustration of $C_4(\{u_1, u_4\}) \square C_3(\{v_3\})$.

A complementary prism $G \overline{G}$ is the complementary product $G \square K_2(S)$ with $|S| = 1$.

2.2 Domination and Total Domination in Complementary Prisms

In [8], Haynes, Henning and Van der Merwe studied domination and total domination in complementary prisms, they obtained the following results.

When $G$ is a complete graph $K_n$, the graph $tK_2$, the corona $K_t \circ K_1$, a cycle $C_n$, or a path $P_n$, they obtained the exact values of $\gamma(G \overline{G})$ and $\gamma_t(G \overline{G})$.

**Proposition 1** [8]

If $G = K_n$, then $\gamma(G \overline{G}) = n$.

If $G = tK_2$, then $\gamma(G \overline{G}) = t + 1$.

If $G = K_t \circ K_1$ and $t \geq 3$, then $\gamma(G \overline{G}) = \gamma(G) = t$.

If $G = C_n$ and $n \geq 3$, then $\gamma(G \overline{G}) = \lceil (n + 4)/3 \rceil$.

If $G = P_n$ and $n \geq 2$, then $\gamma(G \overline{G}) = \lceil (n + 3)/3 \rceil$.

**Proposition 2** [8]

If $G = K_n$, then $\gamma_t(G \overline{G}) = n$.

If $G = tK_2$, then $\gamma_t(G \overline{G}) = n = 2t$.

If $G = K_t \circ K_1$ and $t \geq 3$, then $\gamma_t(G \overline{G}) = \gamma_t(G) = t$. 
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If $G \in \{C_n, P_n\}$ with order $n \geq 5$, then

$$
\gamma_t(G\overline{G}) = \begin{cases} 
\gamma_t(G), & \text{if } n \equiv 2 \pmod{4} \\
\gamma_t(G) + 2, & \text{if } G = C_n, \text{ and } n \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \\
\gamma_t(G) + 1, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
$$

They characterized graphs $G$ for which the domination number $\gamma(G\overline{G})$ and the total domination number $\gamma_t(G\overline{G})$ of a complementary prism are small.

**Proposition 3** [8] Let $G$ be a graph of order $n$. Then,$$
\gamma(G\overline{G}) = 1 \text{ if, and only if, } G = K_1.
\gamma(G\overline{G}) = 2 \text{ if, and only if, } n \geq 2 \text{ and } G \text{ has a support vertex that dominates } V(G) \text{ or } \overline{G} \text{ has a support vertex that dominates } V(\overline{G}).
$$

**Proposition 4** [8] Let $G$ be a graph of order $n \geq 2$, with $|E(G)| = |E(\overline{G})|$. Then
$$
\gamma_t(G\overline{G}) = 2 \text{ if, and only if, } G = K_2.
\gamma_t(G\overline{G}) = 3 \text{ if, and only if, } n \geq 3 \text{ and } G = K_3 \text{ or } G \text{ has a support vertex that dominates } V(G) \text{ or } \overline{G} \text{ has a support vertex that dominates } V(\overline{G})).
$$

They found upper and lower bounds on the parameters $\gamma(G\overline{G})$ and $\gamma_t(G\overline{G})$. Proposition 5 will be needed later in this work.

**Proposition 5** [8] For any graph $G$, $\max\{\gamma(G), \gamma(\overline{G})\} \leq \gamma(G\overline{G}) \leq \gamma(G) + \gamma(\overline{G})$.

**Proposition 6** [8] If $G$ and $\overline{G}$ are without isolates, then $
\max\{\gamma_t(G), \gamma_t(\overline{G})\} \leq \gamma_t(G\overline{G}) \leq \gamma_t(G) + \gamma_t(\overline{G}).$

Finally, they characterized graphs $G$ for which $\gamma(G\overline{G}) = \max\{\gamma(G), \gamma(\overline{G})\}$ and $\gamma_t(G\overline{G}) = \max\{\gamma_t(G), \gamma_t(\overline{G})\}$.
Proposition 7 [8] A graph $G$ satisfies $\gamma(G\overline{G}) = \gamma(G) \geq \gamma(\overline{G})$ if, and only if, $G$ has an isolated vertex or there exists a packing $P$ of $G$ such that $|P| \geq 2$ and $\gamma(G \setminus P) = \gamma(G) - |P|.$

Proposition 8 [8] Let $G$ be a graph such that neither $G$ nor $\overline{G}$ has an isolated vertex. Then $\gamma_t(G\overline{G}) = \gamma_t(G) \geq \gamma_t(\overline{G})$ if, and only if, $G = n/2K_2$ or there exists an open packing $P = P_1 \cup P_2$ in $G$ satisfying the following conditions:

- $|P| \geq 2$;
- $P_1 \cap P_2 = \emptyset$;
- if $P_1 \neq \emptyset$, then $P_1$ is a packing in $G$;
- if $P_1 = \emptyset$, then $|P| \geq 3$ or $G[P] = K_2$;
- $\gamma_t(G \setminus N(P_1 \setminus P_2)) = \gamma_t(G) - 2|P_1| - |P_2|.$
3 RESTRAINED DOMINATION IN COMPLEMENTARY PRISMS

In this chapter, we present some of the major results of this thesis. We will parallel the work done in [8] for domination and total domination and will obtain analogous results for the restrained domination number $\gamma_r(G\overline{G})$ of a complementary prism.

3.1 Restrained Domination Number of $G\overline{G}$ for a Specific Graph $G$

In this section, we determine the restrained domination number of the complementary prism $G\overline{G}$ for selected graphs $G$. We begin with a useful observation.

**Observation 9** Every RDS of a graph $G$ must include all of the isolated and end-vertices of $G$.

First, we find the restrained domination number of $G\overline{G}$, when $G$ is a complete graph.

**Proposition 10** If $G$ is the non-trivial complete graph $K_n$, then $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = n$.

**Proof.** Let $G = K_n$ with order $n \geq 2$. Since for every $\overline{v} \in V(\overline{G})$, $\deg_{\overline{G}}(\overline{v}) = 1$; by Observation 9 it follows that $\overline{v}$ is in every $\gamma_r(G\overline{G})$-set. Thus $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \geq n$. Since $n \geq 2$, every vertex in $V(G)$ has a neighbor in $V(G)$ and a neighbor in $V(\overline{G})$. Therefore, $V(\overline{G})$ is a RDS for $G\overline{G}$. Hence, $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \leq |V(\overline{G})| = n$ and so $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = n$. □

We now give the restrained domination number for the complementary prism of paths and cycles. We need the following observation from [8].

**Observation 11** For the path $P_n$, $\gamma(P_n) = \lceil n/3 \rceil$. 
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**Proposition 12** If \( G \in \{ C_n, P_n \} \) and \( n \geq 3 \), then

\[
\gamma_r(GG) = \begin{cases} 
\lceil (n+7)/3 \rceil, & \text{if } n \in \{4,5\} \\
\lceil (n+4)/3 \rceil, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** It is a simple exercise to verify the cases when \( n \in \{3,4,5\} \). Let \( G \in \{ C_n, P_n \} \), and assume that \( n \geq 6 \). Let \( \{u_1 \ldots u_n\} \) be the \( n \) vertices of \( G \) labeled sequentially, where if \( G = P_n \), then \( u_1 \) and \( u_n \) are the two endvertices of the path. Let \( G^* = \langle V(G) \setminus \{u_1, u_n\} \rangle \). Then \( G^* \) is a path on \( n-2 \) vertices. Let \( T \) be any \( \gamma(G^*) \)-set that does not include vertices \( u_2 \) and \( u_{n-1} \) (such a set always exists since if an endvertex is in a DS, we can replace it by its neighboring support vertex). By Observation 11, \( |T| = \lceil (n-2)/3 \rceil \). We note that the set \( T \cup \{\pi_1, \pi_n\} \) forms a RDS for \(GG\). Therefore, \( \gamma_r(GG) \leq |T| + 2 = \lceil (n-2)/3 \rceil + 2 = \lceil (n+4)/3 \rceil \). If \( G = C_n \), Proposition 1 states that \( \gamma(GG) = \lceil (n+4)/3 \rceil \). Hence, if \( G = C_n \), then \( \gamma_r(GG) \geq \gamma(GG) = \lceil (n+4)/3 \rceil \), and so \( \gamma_r(GG) = \lceil (n+4)/3 \rceil \).

If \( G = P_n \), then by Proposition 1, \( \gamma(GG) = \lceil (n+3)/3 \rceil \). If \( n \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \) or \( n \equiv 2 \pmod{3} \), then \( \gamma(GG) = \lceil (n+4)/3 \rceil \). Thus \( \gamma_r(GG) \geq \gamma(GG) = \lceil (n+4)/3 \rceil \), and so \( \gamma_r(GG) = \lceil (n+4)/3 \rceil \).

Hence, the only remaining case to consider is for \( n \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \). Let \( n = 3k \) for some integer \( k \geq 2 \). Now, by Observation 11, \( \gamma(GG) = k+1 \) hence, \( k+1 \leq \gamma_r(GG) \leq \lceil (n+4)/3 \rceil = k + 2 \). Assume (for purposes of contradiction) that \( \gamma_r(GG) = k+1 \), that is, there exists a \( \gamma(GG) \)-set \( S \) that is also a \( \gamma_r(GG) \)-set.

**Claim** \( |S \cap V(G)| \geq k \).
**Proof of Claim** Suppose not, then $k - |S \cap V(G)| = t \geq 1$. Since each vertex in $V(G)$ dominates at most three vertices of $V(G)$, it follows that at least $3t$ vertices of $V(G)$ are not dominated by $S \cap V(G)$. Moreover, each vertex in $V(G)$ dominates exactly one vertex of $V(G)$, implying that $|S \cap V(G)| \geq 3t$. Hence, $|S| = |S \cap V(G)| + |S \cap V(G)| \geq k - t + 3t = k + 2t > k + 1$, a contradiction. Thus $|S \cap V(G)| \geq k$.

(end of proof of claim)

If $S \subseteq V(G)$, then to dominate $V(G)$, $|V(G)| = |S| = k + 1$, a contradiction. Thus $|S \cap V(G)| = k$, and $|S \cap V(G)| = 1$. Let $\{v\} = V(G) \cap S$. Assume that $v$ is an endvertex of $G$. Without loss of generality let $v = u_1$. Then $S$ must equal $\{u_{2+3i} | 0 \leq i \leq (n - 3)/3\} \cup \{v_1\}$ in order to dominate $V(G)$. But then $N(u_1) \subseteq S$, so $S$ is not a RDS of $G$, a contradiction. Assume next that $v$ is not an endvertex of $G$, that is $v = u_i, 2 \leq i \leq n - 1$. In order for $S$ to dominate $v_{i-1}$ and $v_{i+1}$, it is necessary for both $u_{i-1} \in S$ and $u_{i+1} \in S$. This fails to make $S$ a DS for $G$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\gamma_r(\overline{G}) = k + 2 = [(n + 4)/3]$. □

Next, we find the restrained domination number of the corona $K_t \circ K_1$.

**Proposition 13** If $G$ is the corona $K_t \circ K_1$ then

$$
\gamma_r(\overline{G}) = \begin{cases} 
t, & \text{if } t \geq 4 \\
2, & \text{if } t = 1 \\
4, & \text{if } t \in \{2, 3\}.
\end{cases}
$$

**Proof.** Let $G = K_t \circ K_1$. If $t = 1$, then $G = K_2, G_{\overline{G}} = P_4$ and $\gamma_r(G_{\overline{G}}) = 2$. If $t = 2$, then $G = P_4$, and by Proposition 11, $\gamma_r(G_{\overline{G}}) = 4$. It is a straightforward exercise to check the case where $t = 3$. Assume $t \geq 4$, and label the vertices of $G$ as follows: let
$A = \{a_i | 1 \leq i \leq t\}$ be the set of $t$ vertices that induce the $K_t$ subgraph of $G$, and let $B = \{b_j | 1 \leq j \leq t\}$ be the endvertices in $G$ adjacent to the vertices in $A$ such that $a_ib_i \in E(G)$. Let $S = \{B \setminus \{b_1, b_2\}\} \cup \{a_1, b_2\}$. Then $S$ is a RDS of $G\overline{G}$ with $|S| = t$.

Hence, $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \leq t$. Now let $S$ be any $\gamma_r(G\overline{G})$-set. Since $S$ must dominate $G\overline{G}$, it is necessary that for each $b_i \in B$, $N_{G\overline{G}}[b_i] \cap S \neq \emptyset$. However, for each $b_i, b_j \in B$, $N_{G\overline{G}}[b_i] \cap N_{G\overline{G}}[b_j] = \emptyset$; therefore, $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = |S| \geq |B| = t$. Thus $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = t$. □

3.2 Complementary Prisms with Small Restrained Domination Number

In this section, we consider complementary prisms with small restrained domination numbers.

Proposition 15 For a graph $G$ and its complementary prism $G\overline{G}$,

(1) $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \neq 1$ for any graph $G$.

(2) $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 2$ if, and only if, $|V(G)| \in \{1, 2\}$. 


(3) \( \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 3 \) if, and only if, \( |V(G)| = 3 \).

**Proof.** (1) Assume to the contrary that \( \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 1 \) for some graph \( G \). Without loss of generality, assume that \( S \subseteq V(G) \) and \( S = \{u\} \) is a \( \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \)-set. The only vertex in \( G \) dominated by \( u \) is \( \overline{u} \). Therefore, \( |V(\overline{G})| = 1 \), and \( G = K_1 \). Hence, \( G\overline{G} = K_2 \). By Observation 9, \( \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 2 \), a contradiction.

(2) If \( |V(G)| = 1 \), then \( G\overline{G} = K_2 \) and \( \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 2 \). If \( |V(G)| = 2 \), then \( G\overline{G} = P_4 \) and \( \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 2 \). Assume that \( \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 2 \), and let \( S \) be any \( \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \)-set. If \( S \subseteq V(G) \), then in order for \( S \) to dominate \( V(\overline{G}) \), it is necessary for \( |V(\overline{G})| = |S| = 2 \). Similarly if \( S \subseteq V(\overline{G}) \), then \( |V(G)| = 2 \).

Assume that \( S \cap V(G) \neq \emptyset \) and \( S \cap V(\overline{G}) \neq \emptyset \). Let \( S = \{u, \overline{u}\} \). Vertex \( u \) must dominate \( V(G) \setminus \{v\} \) and \( \overline{u} \) must dominate \( \overline{G} \setminus \{\overline{v}\} \). If \( u = v \), then \( G = K_1 \) and \( G\overline{G} = K_2 \). Assume that \( u \neq v \). If \( u \) is adjacent to \( v \), then \( deg_G(u) = n - 1 \) and \( u \) is a leaf in \( G\overline{G} \). By Observation 9, it follows that \( \overline{u} \in S \) but this forces \( u = v \), a contradiction. If \( u \) is not adjacent to \( v \), then \( \overline{u} \) is adjacent to \( v \). This implies that \( deg_{G\overline{G}}(\overline{v}) = n - 1 \). Hence, \( v \) is a leaf in \( G\overline{G} \). By Observation 9, it follows that \( v \in S \) hence, \( u = v \), a contradiction.

(3) It is an easy observation to see that if \( |V(G)| = 3 \), then \( G \in \{K_3, K_3, P_3, P_3\} \) and by Propositions 10 and 12, \( \gamma_r(K_3K_3) = \gamma_r(P_3P_3) = 3 \).

For the converse, assume that \( \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 3 \), and let \( S \) be any \( \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \)-set. If \( S \subseteq V(G) \), then in order to dominate \( \overline{G} \), it is necessary for \( |V(\overline{G})| = 3 \). Likewise, if \( S \subseteq V(\overline{G}) \), then in order to dominate \( G \), it is necessary for \( |V(G)| = 3 \). In either case, it follows that \( |V(G)| = 3 \).
Assume that $S \cap V(G) \neq \emptyset$ and $S \cap V(\overline{G}) \neq \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, let $S = \{u, \overline{v}, \overline{w}\}$, where $u \in V(G)$, and $\overline{v}, \overline{w} \in V(\overline{G})$. If $\overline{u} \not\in \{\overline{v}, \overline{w}\}$, then $u$ dominates $G \setminus \{v, w\}$. Hence, in $\overline{G}$, the only neighbors of $\overline{u}$ are in $\{v, w\}$. This implies that $N_{\overline{G}}(\overline{u}) \subseteq S$. But $\overline{u} \in V(\overline{G}) \setminus S$, contradicting the fact that $S$ is a RDS of $\overline{G}$. If $\overline{u} \in \{\overline{v}, \overline{w}\}$, then without loss of generality, let $\overline{u} = \overline{v}$. This implies that $\overline{u}$ dominates $V(\overline{G}) \setminus \{w\}$, thus $\overline{u}$ has no neighbor in $V(\overline{G}) \setminus \{w\}$. Since $S$ is a RDS for $\overline{G}$, it follows that $w$ dominates $V(\overline{G}) \setminus \{u\}$. Hence, $N_{\overline{G}}(w) \subseteq S$, again contradicting that $S$ is a RDS of $\overline{G}$. \(\Box\)

3.3 Bounds on the Restrained Domination Number for $\overline{G}$

In contrast to the bounds seen in Proposition 5 and Proposition 6, $\gamma_r(G\overline{G})$ is not bounded below by $\max\{\gamma_r(G), \gamma_r(\overline{G})\}$. For example, let $G = K_{1,m}$ where $m \geq 4$. Then $\gamma_r(G) = m + 1$, $\gamma_r(\overline{G}) = 2$, but $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 4 < \max\{\gamma_r(G), \gamma_r(\overline{G})\}$. However, we give the following bounds for $\gamma_r(G\overline{G})$.

**Proposition 16** For any graph $G$, $\max\{\gamma(G), \gamma(\overline{G})\} \leq \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \leq \gamma_r(G) + \gamma_r(\overline{G})$ and these bounds are sharp.

**Proof.** Let $S$ be any $\gamma_r(G)$-set, and let $T$ be any $\gamma_r(\overline{G})$ set. Then $S \cup T$ is a RDS for $G\overline{G}$. Therefore, $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \leq |S \cup T| = \gamma_r(G) + \gamma_r(\overline{G})$. For sharpness of the upper bound, consider the family of split graphs formed from a clique of order $n \geq 3$, and an independent set of order $r \geq 3$ with all possible edges between the clique vertices and the independent set vertices.

By Proposition 5, $\gamma(G\overline{G}) \geq \max\{\gamma(G), \gamma(\overline{G})\}$. Since $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \geq \gamma(G\overline{G})$, it follows that $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \geq \max\{\gamma(G), \gamma(\overline{G})\}$. For sharpness, consider the $K_r \circ K_1$ (see Proposition
Next, we characterize the graphs $G$ attaining the lower bound $\gamma_r(G) = \max\{\gamma(G)\gamma(G)\}$.

**Theorem 17** Let $G$ be a graph of order $n$, and assume without loss of generality, that $\gamma(G) \leq \gamma(G)$. Then $\gamma_r(G) = \gamma(G)$ if, and only if, $G = \overline{K}_n$ or $G$ has a maximal packing $P$, such that for every $v \in P$, $\deg_G(v) \geq 1$, $2 \leq |P| \leq \gamma(G) - 2$ and $2 \leq \gamma(G \setminus P) = \gamma(G) - |P|$.

**Proof.** First, assume that $G = \overline{K}_n$. Then $\gamma(G) = n > \gamma(G) = 1$ and $\gamma_r(G) = n = \gamma(G)$.

Assume that $G \neq \overline{K}_n$, has a maximal packing satisfying the hypothesis. Let $S$ be any $\gamma(G \setminus P)$-set. Consider the set of vertices $S \cup P$.

**Claim** $S \cup P$ is an RDS of $G\overline{G}$.

**Proof of Claim:** Clearly $P$ dominates $P$ in $G\overline{G}$. Since $P$ is a packing in $G$ and $|P| \geq 2$, it follows that $P$ dominates $V(G\overline{G})$. By definition, $S$ dominates $V(G \setminus P)$ so $S \cup P$ is a DS of $G\overline{G}$. Now it is necessary to show that every vertex in $V(G\overline{G}) \setminus (S \cup P)$ has a neighbor in $V(G\overline{G}) \setminus (S \cup P)$. For every $v \in V(G \setminus (S \cup P))$, its neighbor $\overline{v} \in V(G) \setminus (S \cup P)$ is in $V(G\overline{G}) \setminus (S \cup P)$. In like manner, for every $\overline{v} \in V(G) \setminus (S \cup P)$, its neighbor $v \in V(G \setminus (S \cup P)$ is in $V(G\overline{G}) \setminus (S \cup P)$. Now, we need only to consider the vertices in $S \cup P$. Since every $v \in P$ has $\deg_G(v) \geq 1$, and $P$ is a packing, $v$ must have a neighbor in $V(G) \setminus P$. If $v$ has a neighbor in $S$, then $S \cup (P \setminus \{v\})$ is a DS of $G\overline{G}$.
$G$ and $\gamma(G) \leq |S \cup (P \setminus \{v\})| = |S| + |P| - 1 = \gamma(G \setminus P) + |P| - 1$, contradicting the hypothesis. Hence, every $v \in P$, has a neighbor in $V(G) \setminus (P \cup S) \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus (S \cup \overline{P})$.

Finally, every $v \in S$ must have a neighbor in $V(G) \setminus \overline{P} \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus (S \cup \overline{P})$ else if this is not the case, then in $G$, vertex $v$ dominates $G \setminus P$ contradicting the hypothesis that $\gamma(G \setminus P) \geq 2$. Therefore, $S \cup \overline{P}$ is an RDS for $G\overline{G}$. (end of proof of claim)

Hence, $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \leq |S \cup \overline{P}| = |S| + |\overline{P}| = |S| + |P| = \gamma(G) - |P| + |P| = \gamma(G)$. Since by Proposition 16, $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \geq \gamma(G)$, it follows that $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = \gamma(G)$.

Now, assume that for a graph $G$ of order $n$, $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = \gamma(G) \geq \gamma(G)$. Let $S$ be any $\gamma_r(G\overline{G})$-set. Let $S_1 = S \cap V(G)$ and $S_2 = S \cap V(\overline{G})$. If, without loss of generality, $S = S_1$, then $S \subseteq V(G)$. In order to dominate $\overline{G}$, it would be necessary for $|S| = \gamma(G) = n$ and this implies that $G = \overline{K_n}$. Thus, assume that $|S_1| \geq 1$ and $|S_2| \geq 1$. Since $|S_1| < |S| = \gamma(G)$, it follows that $S_1$ does not dominate $G$. Let $P$ be the set of vertices of $G$ not dominated by $S_1$. Since $S$ is a DS of $G\overline{G}$, $P$ is dominated by $\overline{P} \subseteq S_2$. Since $S_1 \cup P$ dominates $G$, it follows that $|S_1| + |P| \geq \gamma(G) = \gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = |S| = |S_1| + |S_2| \geq |S_1| + |\overline{P}| = |S_1| + |P|$, implying that $|S_2| = |\overline{P}|$. Since $\overline{P} \subseteq S_2$, it follows that $S_2 = \overline{P}$. The set $P$ is an independant set since if $u, v \in P$ are adjacent, then $S_1 \cup P \setminus \{v\}$ is a DS of $G$ with cardinality less than $\gamma(G)$, a contradiction.

The set $P$ must be a packing in $G$, since if there exists a vertex $w \in V(G)$ that is a neighbor of $v, u \in P$, then $S_1 \cup (P \setminus \{u, v\}) \cup \{w\}$ is a DS of $G$ with cardinality $|S_1| + |P| - 1 = \gamma(G) - 1$, a contradiction. Moreover, no vertex $x \in P$ has a neighbor in $S_1$ for otherwise $S_1 \cup (P \setminus \{x\})$ dominates $G$, a contradiction. Therefore, $P$ is a packing in $G$. 
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Let \( D \) be a \( \gamma(G \setminus P) \)-set. If \( \gamma(G \setminus P) < |S_1| \), then \( D \cup P \) is a DS of \( G \) with cardinality
\[
|D \cup P| = |D| + |P| < |S_1| + |P| = |S_1| + |P| = |S_1| + |S_2| = \gamma_r(GG) = \gamma(G),
\]
a contradiction. Hence, \( \gamma(G \setminus P) = |S_1| = \gamma(G) - |P| \). To see that \( \gamma(G \setminus P) = |S_1| \geq 2 \), assume to the contrary that \( \gamma(G \setminus P) = 1 \). Then, \( S_1 = \{v\} \) and \( N_{GG}(v) \subseteq P \cup \{v\} = S_2 \cup \{v\} \), contradicting that \( S \) is a \( \gamma_r(GG) \)-set. To see that for every vertex \( u \in P \), \( deg_G(u) \geq 1 \), assume to the contrary that there exists some vertex \( u \in P \), such that \( deg_G(u) = 0 \). Then \( deg_{GG}(u) = 1 \) hence, by Observation 9, \( u \) is in every \( \gamma_r(GG) \)-set. Hence, \( u \in S_1 \), and thus \( u \notin P \), a contradiction. Finally, to see that \( |P| \geq 2 \). Assume to the contrary that \( P = \{v\} \). Since \( deg_G(v) \geq 1 \), it follows that \( v \) is adjacent to some vertex \( w \in V(G \setminus P \cup S_1) \). In \( \overline{G} \), \( v \) does not dominate \( \overline{P} \), but then \( \overline{P} \) is not dominated by \( S_1 \cup S_2 \) a contradiction. \( \square \)

Next, we give another upper bound for \( \gamma_r(GG) \).

**Theorem 18** For any graph \( G \), \( \gamma_r(GG) \leq 2 \max\{\gamma(G), \gamma(G)\} \) and this bound is sharp.

**Proof:** Let \( R = \max\{\gamma(G), \gamma(G)\} \). If \( R = 1 \), then \( G = K_1 \) and \( \gamma_r(GG) = 2 \leq 2R \). Assume \( R \geq 2 \). Let \( D_1 \) be a \( \gamma(G) \)-set, and let \( D_2 \) be a \( \gamma(G) \)-set. If \( D_1 \cup D_2 \) forms a RDS for \( GG \), then \( \gamma_r(GG) \leq |D_1| + |D_2| \leq 2R \). Assume \( D_1 \cup D_2 \) is not a RDS of \( GG \). Then, without loss of generality, there exists a vertex \( w \in V(G \setminus D_1) \), such that \( N_{GG}(w) \subseteq D_1 \cup D_2 \). Thus \( \overline{w} \in D_2 \). Since \( D_1 \) dominated \( V(G) \), it follows that \( |N_{GG}(w) \cap D_1| \geq 1 \). We consider two cases:

**Case 1.** \( |N_{GG}(w) \cap D_1| = 1 \). Let \( v \in D_1 \) be a neighbor of \( w \). Since \( N_G(w) \subseteq D_1 \), we have \( deg_G(w) = 1 \). Hence, \( \overline{w} \) dominates \( \overline{G} \setminus \{\overline{v}\} \). If \( epn(v, D_1) = \{w\} \), then \( D_1 \setminus \{v\} \).
dominates $G \setminus \{w, v\}$. Thus $S = D_1 \setminus \{v\} \cup \{\overline{w}\} \cup \overline{D}_1$ is a DS of $G\overline{G}$. Furthermore, each vertex $x \in V(G) \setminus (D_1 \cup \{w\})$ has a neighbor $\overline{v} \in V(\overline{G}) \setminus (\overline{D}_1 \cup \{\overline{w}\}) \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$. Also, each $\overline{v} \in V(\overline{G}) \setminus (\overline{D}_1 \cup \{\overline{w}\})$, has a neighbor $x \in V(G) \setminus (D_1 \cup \{w\}) \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$. Both $v, w \in V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$ and $v$ is adjacent to $w$ so $S$ is an RDS of $G\overline{G}$, and $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \leq |S| = |D_1 \setminus \{v\}| + 1 + |\overline{D}_1| = 2|D_1| \leq 2R$.

If $|\text{epn}(v, D_1)| > 1$, then let $y \neq w$ and $y \in \text{epn}(v, D_1)$. If $\gamma(G) = 1$, then $\overline{v}$ is an isolate in $\overline{G}$. Since $\overline{w}$ dominates $V(\overline{G}) \setminus \{\overline{v}\}$, it follows that $\gamma(\overline{G}) = 2$. The set $\{\overline{v}, \overline{w}\}$ dominates $G\overline{G}$. The set $\{v, w\}$ dominates $V(G)$, so $S = \{v, \overline{v}, w, \overline{w}\}$ is a DS for $G\overline{G}$. Every $u \in V(G) \setminus S$ has a neighbor $\overline{v} \in V(\overline{G}) \setminus S \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$. Likewise every $\overline{v} \in V(\overline{G}) \setminus S$ has a neighbor $u \in V(G) \setminus S \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$. Therefore, $S$ is an RDS for $G\overline{G}$ and $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \leq |S| = 4 \leq 2R$. Assume that $\gamma(G) \geq 2$. The set $D_1$ dominates $V(G) \cup \overline{D}_1$. The vertex $\overline{w}$ dominates $V(\overline{G}) \setminus \overline{D}_1$. Therefore, the set $D_1 \cup \{\overline{w}\}$ is a DS for $G\overline{G}$. To see that the set $S = D_1 \cup \{w, \overline{w}\}$ is a RDS for $G\overline{G}$, consider the following. Every $u \in V(G) \setminus S$ has a neighbor $\overline{v} \in V(\overline{G}) \setminus S \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$, and every $\overline{v} \in V(\overline{G}) \setminus (S \cup \overline{D}_1)$ has a neighbor $u \in V(G) \setminus S \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$. Every $\overline{v} \in \overline{D}_1 \setminus \{\overline{v}\}$ is adjacent to $\overline{y} \in V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$. Since $\gamma(G) \geq 2$, it follows that there exists a vertex $\overline{q} \in V(\overline{G}) \setminus S \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$ such that $\overline{q}$ is adjacent to $\overline{v}$. Therefore, $S$ is an RDS for $G\overline{G}$ and $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \leq |S| = |D_1| + |\{w, \overline{w}\}| = \gamma(G) + 2 \leq 2R$.

Case 2. $|N_{G\overline{G}}(w) \cap D_1| \geq 2$. Let $u$ and $v$ be in $N_{G\overline{G}}(w) \cap D_1$. Assume first that $\text{epn}(u, D_1) = \emptyset$. Since $\{\overline{w}\}$ dominates $V(\overline{G}) \setminus \overline{D}_1$, $D_1 \setminus \{u\}$ dominates $V(G) \setminus \{u\}$ and $\overline{D}_1$ dominates $D_1$, it follows that the set $S = D_1 \setminus \{u\} \cup \overline{D}_1 \cup \{\overline{w}\}$ is a DS for $G\overline{G}$. Furthermore, each vertex $x \in V(G) \setminus (D_1 \cup \{w\})$ has a neighbor $\overline{v} \in
$V(G) \setminus (D_1 \cup \{w\}) \subseteq V(G) \setminus S$. In like manner, every vertex $x \in V(G) \setminus (D_1 \cup \{w\})$ has a neighbor $x \in V(G) \setminus (D_1 \cup \{w\}) \subseteq V(G) \setminus S$. Also, $u$ is adjacent to $w$. Therefore, $S$ is an RDS for $G$, and hence, $\gamma_r(G) \leq |S| = 2|D_1| \leq 2R$.

Assume that $epn(u, D_1) \neq \emptyset$ and $epn(v, D_1) \neq \emptyset$. Let $y \in epn(u, D_1)$ and let $z \in epn(v, D_1)$. Since $D_1$ dominates $V(G) \cup \overline{D_1}$ and $w$ dominates $V(G) \setminus \overline{D_1}$, it follows that the set $S = D_1 \cup \{w\} \cup \{\overline{w}\}$ is a DS for $\overline{G}$. Furthermore, every vertex $x \in V(G) \setminus (D_1 \cup \{w\})$ has a neighbor $x \in V(G) \setminus (D_1 \cup \{w\}) \subseteq V(G) \setminus S$. In like manner, every vertex $x \in V(G) \setminus (D_1 \cup \{w\})$ has a neighbor $x \in V(G) \setminus (D_1 \cup \{w\}) \subseteq V(G) \setminus S$. Finally, every vertex $x \in \overline{D_1}$ is adjacent to $x \in V(G) \setminus S$ or $x \in V(G) \setminus S$. Therefore, $S$ is an RDS for $G$ hence, $\gamma_r(G) \leq |D_1| + 2 \leq 2R$.

This bound is sharp, consider the graph $K_{1,m}$. For $m \geq 3$, $\gamma_r(K_{1,m} \overline{K_{1,m}}) = 4 = 2 \max\{\gamma(K_{1,m}), \gamma(\overline{K_{1,m}})\}$.

We conclude this chapter with a theorem on the realizability of the parameter $\gamma_r(G)$. 
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Theorem 19 The restrained domination number $\gamma_r(G\overline{G})$ is realizable for every possible integer $k$ where $2 \leq \max\{\gamma(G), \gamma(G)\} \leq k \leq 2\max\{\gamma(G), \gamma(G)\}$.

Proof: Let $R = \max\{\gamma(G), \gamma(G)\}$. We consider three cases.

Case 1. $R = 2$. Let $G = K_2$. Then $\gamma(G) = 1$, $\gamma(G) = 2$ and $G\overline{G} = P_4$, for which $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = \gamma_r(P_4) = 2 = R$. If $G = P_3$, then $\gamma(G) = 1$, $\gamma(G) = 2$ and by Proposition 12, $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 3 = R + 1$. If $G$ is a star of order at least 5, then $\gamma(G) = 1$, $\gamma(G) = 2$ and $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = 4 = 2R$.

Case 2. $R \geq 3$ and $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = R$ or $R + 1$. Let $G = K_R$, then $\gamma(G) = 1$, $\gamma(G) = R$ and $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = R$ by Proposition 10. Now let $G$ be a split graph formed by a clique of order $R - 1$ and an independent set of order two with all possible edges between the vertices of the clique and the vertices of the independent set. Thus $\gamma(G) = 1$, $\gamma(G) = R$ and $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = R + 1$.

Case 3. $R \geq 3$ and $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = R + i$, $2 \leq i \leq R$. The following construction is similar to the graph constructed in [1]. Define graph $G$ as follows. Let $V(G) = A \cup B \cup C$ where $A$ consists of $\binom{R^2}{i-1}$ vertices labeled by subsets of cardinality $i - 1$ taken from the first $R^2$ integers $\{1, 2, \ldots R^2\}$. Let $B = \{b_l|1 \leq l \leq R\}$, and let $C = \{c_j|1 \leq j \leq R^2\}$. Add edges as follows to obtain $G$. Make $\langle A \cup B \rangle$ a complete subgraph. For $1 \leq j \leq R^2$, $c_j$ is adjacent to the $\binom{R^2-1}{i-2}$ vertices in $A$ which contain $j$ in their labels. Make vertex $b_t$ $1 \leq t \leq R$ adjacent to vertex $c_s$, $1 \leq s \leq R^2$ if, and only if, $s$ and $t$ are congruent modulo $R$, denoted $s \equiv t \pmod{R}$.

The set $B$ forms a DS for $G$ since any element of $B$ dominates $A \cup B$, and every element of $C$ is adjacent to an element of $B$. Hence, $\gamma(G) \leq R$. Now if there exists a $\gamma(G)$-set $S$ that is missing at least one element of $B$, say element $b_w$, $1 \leq w \leq R$,
then since $C$ forms an independent set, the only way to dominate the $R$ elements
of $C$ of the form $c_j$ where $j \equiv w \pmod{R}$ requires at least $\lceil R/(i-1) \rceil$ elements of
$A \cup C$. Thus for every element $b_w \in B$ such that $b_w \notin S$, $S$ must contain at least
one unique element of $A \cup C$ to dominate the $R$ elements of $C$ of the form $c_j$ where
$j \equiv w \pmod{R}$. This implies that $|S| \geq R$. Therefore, $\gamma(G) = R$.

In the graph $\overline{G}$, $\langle A \cup B \rangle$ is an empty graph and $\langle C \rangle$ is a complete graph. Any
vertex $\tau_j \in C$ is adjacent to those elements of $A$ which do not include $j$ in their label.
As such, any subset of $C$ with cardinality of at least $i$ dominates the set $A$. Since
$\langle C \rangle$ is complete, any vertex of $C$ dominates $C$. Any two vertices $\tau_j, \tau_q \in C$ such that
$j \not\equiv q \pmod{R}$ dominate $B$ therefore, the set $\{\tau_1 \ldots \tau_i\}$ dominates $\overline{G}$. Now, assume
that there exists a $\gamma(G)$-set $S$ of $\overline{G}$ that contains fewer than $i$ vertices of $C$. If $S$
contains no vertices of $C$, then $|S| = \binom{R^2}{i-1} + R$ since $\langle A \cup B \rangle$ is an empty subgraph
and $|\langle A \cup B \rangle| = \binom{R^2}{i-1} + R$. For any $t$ such that $1 \leq t < i-1$, if $S$ contains exactly
t vertices of $C$, then it must also contain the $\binom{R^2-t}{i-1-t}$ vertices of $A$ that contain the
indices of the $t$ elements of $C$ in their label. This implies that $|S| \geq t + R^2 - t = R^2$
$> i$. If $S$ contains exactly $i-1$ elements of $C$, then $S$ must contain the one element
of $A$ which has the indices of each of the $i-1$ elements of $C$ in its label. This means
that $|S| \geq i$. In conclusion if $S$ is a $\gamma(G)$-set, then $|S| \geq i$. Since $\{\tau_1 \ldots \tau_i\}$ dominates
$\overline{G}$, it follows that $\gamma(G) = i$.

Let $D = \{\tau_1 \ldots \tau_i\}$. Since $B$ dominates $G$ and $D$ dominates $\overline{G}$, $B \cup D$ is a DS
for $G\overline{G}$ thus $\gamma(G\overline{G}) \leq |B \cup D| = R + i$. Assume (for purposes of contradiction), that
there exists a set $S$ such that $S$ dominates $G\overline{G}$, and $|S| \leq R + i - 1$. 
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Note that every \( c_i \in C \) dominates exactly one element of \( C \), every \( b_t \in B \) dominates \( R \) elements of \( C \), every \( a_r \in A \) dominates \( i - 1 \) elements of \( C \), and every \( \tau_j \in \overline{C} \) dominates exactly 1 element of \( C \). Since \( |C| = R^2 \), it follows that a minimum of \( R \) elements from \( A, B, C \) and \( \overline{C} \) are needed in \( S \) to dominate \( C \). Therefore, \( |S| \geq R \).

Since \( 2 \leq i \leq R \), it follows that \( |S| \leq R + R - 1 \) by assumption.

**Claim** \( |S \cap V(G)| \geq R \).

**Proof of Claim:** Assume (for purposes of contradiction) that \( |S \cap V(G)| = R - t, 1 < t \). Then the largest number of vertices of \( C \) that \( S \) can dominate is \( R + t - 1 + (R - t)R = R^2 - tR + R - t - 1 < R^2 \). This is a contradiction since \( |C| = R^2 \). If \( |S \cap V(G)| = R - 1 \), then \( |S \cap V(\overline{G})| \leq R \). If \( |S \cap V(\overline{G})| = K < R \), then the largest number of vertices of \( C \) that \( S \) can dominate is \( R(R-1) + K < R^2 \), a contradiction. Assume that \( |S \cap V(\overline{G})| = R \). Then it is necessary that \( S \cap V(\overline{G}) \) contain all except one element of \( B \) in order to dominate \( C \). Call this missing element \( b_w \). In order to dominate \( C \), it is necessary that \( S \cap V(\overline{G}) = \{\tau_j | j \equiv w(\mod R)\} \). Then the set \( S \) will dominate \( C \), but the vertex \( b_w \) will be undominated, a contradiction. (end of proof of claim)

**Claim** \( |S \cap V(\overline{G})| \geq i \).

**Proof of Claim:** Assume (for purposes of contradiction) that \( |S \cap \overline{C}| = t, 1 \leq t < i - 1 \). Since \( \langle A \cup B \rangle \) is empty in \( \overline{C} \), it necessarily follows that \( S \) must contain at least \( \binom{R^2-t}{i-t-1} \) vertices of \( A \cup \overline{A} \) to dominate the vertices of \( \overline{A} \) which have in their label all the indices of \( S \cap \overline{C} \). Hence, \( |S| \geq R^2 - t + t = R^2 > R + i \), a contradiction. If \( S \) contains exactly \( i - 1 \) vertices of \( \overline{C} \), then let \( T = \{\tau_{j_1} \ldots \tau_{j_{i-1}}\} \) represent these vertices. The set \( T \) dominates all of \( V(\overline{G}) \) except the one vertex in \( \overline{A} \) which has all
of the indices of the vertices of $T$ in its label. Call this vertex $\pi^*$. If $\pi^* \in S \cap V(\overline{G})$, then by the preceding claim, $|S| = |S \cap V(G)| + |S \cap V(\overline{G})| \geq R + i$, a contradiction. If $\pi^* \not\in S \cap V(\overline{G})$, then $a^* \in S \cap V(G)$. Vertex $a^*$ and the set $T$ both dominate the same $i - 1$ elements of $C$. Since $|C| = R^2$, and $i - 1 < R$, it necessarily follows that $|S \cap V(G)| \geq R + 1$. Therefore, $|S| = |S \cap V(G)| + |S \cap V(\overline{G})| \geq R + 1 + i - 1 = R + i$, a contradiction. Finally, if $S$ contains exactly $i$ elements of $\overline{C}$, then by the preceding claim, $|S| = |S \cap V(G)| + |S \cap V(\overline{G})| \geq R + i$, a contradiction. (end of proof of claim)

The above two claims imply that if $S$ is a DS for $G\overline{G}$ and $|S| < R + i$ then $|S| = |S \cap V(G)| + |S \cap V(\overline{G})| \geq R + i$. Hence, a contradiction has been reached thus $\gamma(G\overline{G}) \geq R + i$. Since $\gamma(G\overline{G}) \leq |B \cup D| = R + i$, it follows that $\gamma(G\overline{G}) = R + i$. Hence, $B \cup D$ is a $\gamma(G\overline{G})$-set.

The set $B \cup D$ is also an RDS for $G\overline{G}$. To see this, consider the following. Every vertex $a \in A$ is adjacent to its counterpart $\pi \in \overline{A} \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus (B \cup D)$. Every vertex $\overline{a} \in \overline{A}$ is adjacent to its counterpart $a \in A \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus (B \cup D)$. Every vertex $c_i \in C$ is adjacent to a vertex of $A \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus (B \cup D)$ that includes $i$ in its label. Every $\overline{b}_j \in \overline{B}$ is adjacent to some $\overline{c}_k \in \overline{C}$ such that $k > R$ and $k \not\equiv j \pmod{R}$. (Note: By definition, $\overline{c}_k \not\in D \cup B$). Every $\overline{c}_j \in \overline{C}$ is adjacent to $c_j \in C \subseteq V(G\overline{G}) \setminus (B \cup D)$. Therefore, $B \cup D$ is also a RDS for $G\overline{G}$ and thus $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \leq |B \cup D| = R + i$. However, since $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) \geq \gamma(G\overline{G}) = R + i$, it follows that $\gamma_r(G\overline{G}) = R + i$. □
4 OTHER DOMINATION PARAMETERS AND MISCELLANEOUS RESULTS

In this chapter, we study the distance \( - k \) domination number, 2-step domination number, stratification and domination, chromatic number and planarity of complementary prisms. We will also characterize Eulerian and bipartite complementary prisms.

4.1 The Distance \( - k \) Domination Number of \( G\bar{G} \)

In this section, we will determine the distance \( - k \) domination number of a complementary prism for all possible values of \( k \). We begin with a simple observation for the case when \( k = 1 \).

**Observation 20** For any graph \( G \), \( \gamma_{\leq 1}(G\bar{G}) = \gamma(G\bar{G}) \).

Now, we proceed to the case when \( k = 2 \).

**Proposition 21** For any graph \( G \), \( \gamma_{\leq 2}(G\bar{G}) = 1 \) if, and only if, \( \gamma_{\leq 2}(G) = 1 \) or \( \gamma_{\leq 2}(\bar{G}) = 1 \) and \( \gamma_{\leq 2}(G\bar{G}) = 2 \) otherwise.

**Proof:** Let \( u \in V(G) \). Consider the set \( S = \{u, \overline{u}\} \). Without loss of generality, let \( v \) be any vertex in \( V(G) \setminus S \). If \( v \) is adjacent to \( u \), then \( \text{dist}(v, S) = 1 \). If not, then \( \overline{v} \) is adjacent to \( \overline{u} \) in \( V(\bar{G}) \). The path \( P : v, \overline{v}, \overline{u} \) is of length two, so \( \text{dist}(v, S) = 2 \). A symmetric argument holds for every \( \overline{v} \in V(\bar{G}) \setminus S \). Therefore, \( S \) is a distance-2 dominating set for \( G\bar{G} \). Hence, \( \gamma_{\leq 2}(G\bar{G}) \leq |S| = 2 \).

Assume that \( \gamma_{\leq 2}(G\bar{G}) = 1 \). Without loss of generality, let \( S = \{u\} \subseteq V(G) \) be a \( \gamma_{\leq 2}(G\bar{G}) \)-set. Since \( \gamma_{\leq 2}(G\bar{G}) = 1 \), it follows that for every \( v \in V(G) \), \( \text{dist}_{G\bar{G}}(v, u) \leq 2 \).
No $v-u$ path of length at most two can contain any elements of $V(\overline{G})$, therefore, every $v-u$ path of length at most two is contained in $E(G)$. Thus $\gamma_{\leq 2}(G) = 1$. Now, assume without loss of generality, that $\gamma_{\leq 2}(G) = 1$. Let $S = \{u\}$ be any $\gamma_{\leq 2}(G)$-set. From this it follows that for every $v \in V(G)$, $\text{dist}_G(v, u) \leq 2$. Let $v, u$ be any vertex of $V(G)$. If $v$ is adjacent to $u$ or if $v = u$, then the path $P : v, u, u$ has length at most two. Thus $\text{dist}_G(v, S) \leq 2$. If $v$ is not adjacent to $u$, then $v$ is adjacent to $u$ in $V(G)$. The path $P : v, u, u$ has length 2, therefore, $\text{dist}_G(v, S) = 2$. Hence, $S = \{u\}$ forms a distance-2 dominating set for $G\overline{G}$, and since $|S| = 1$, it follows that $\gamma_{\leq 2}(G\overline{G}) = 1$. □

We now proceed to the case where $k = 3$.

**Proposition 22** For any graph $G$, $\gamma_{\leq 3}(G\overline{G}) = 1$.

**Proof.** Let $u \in V(G)$, and let $S = \{u\}$. Let $v \in V(G)$ and $u \neq v$. If $v$ is adjacent to $u$, then $\text{dist}(v, S) = 1$. If not, then $v$ is adjacent to $u$ in $V(\overline{G})$. The path $P : v, u, \overline{u}$, $u$ has length 3. Therefore, $\text{dist}(v, S) \leq 3$. Now let $v$ be any vertex of $V(\overline{G})$. If $v$ is adjacent to $\overline{u}$ or if $v = \overline{u}$, then the path $P : v, \overline{u}, \overline{u}$, $u$ has length at most 2. Thus $\text{dist}(v, S) \leq 2$. If $v$ is not adjacent to $\overline{u}$, then $v$ is adjacent to $u$ in $V(G)$. The path $P : \overline{u}, v, u$ has length 2, therefore, $\text{dist}(v, S) = 2$. In conclusion, $S = \{u\}$ forms a distance-3 dominating set for $G\overline{G}$, and since $|S| = 1$, it follows that $\gamma_{\leq 3}(G\overline{G}) = 1$. □

The following corollary is obvious.

**Corollary 23** For any graph $G$, if $k \geq 3$ then $\gamma_{\leq k}(G\overline{G}) = 1$. 


4.2 The 2-step Domination Number of $G^\overline{G}$

In this section we will restrict our attention solely to the study of 2-step domination in complementary prisms. We need the following lemma before proceeding.

**Lemma 24** For any graph $G$, $\gamma_=(G^\overline{G}) \neq 1$.

**Proof:** Assume that there exists a graph $G$ such that $\gamma_=(G^\overline{G}) = 1$. Without loss of generality, let $S = \{u\} \subseteq V(G)$ be any $\gamma_=(G^\overline{G})$-set. Consider the vertex $\overline{v} \in V(G)$. The $dist(u, \overline{v}) = 1$; therefore, $S$ is not a $\gamma_=(G^\overline{G})$-set, hence, a contradiction. □

The next proposition gives the 2-step domination number for the complementary prism of any graph $G$.

**Proposition 25** For any graph $G$, $\gamma_=(G^\overline{G}) = 2$.

**Proof:** Let $u \in V(G)$, and let $S = \{u, \overline{v}\}$. For every $\overline{v} \in V(G) \setminus S$, if $\overline{v}$ is adjacent to $\overline{u}$, then $P : \overline{v}, \overline{u}, u$ is a $\overline{v}$-$u$ path of length 2, and $dist(\overline{v}, u) = 2$. If $\overline{v}$ is not adjacent to $\overline{u}$, then $v$ is adjacent to $u$. Accordingly, $P : \overline{v}, v, u$ is a $\overline{v}$-$u$ path of length 2 thus $dist(\overline{v}, u) = 2$. For every $v \in V(G) \setminus S$, if $v$ is adjacent to $u$, then $P : v, u, \overline{v}$ is a $v$-$\overline{v}$ path of length 2 thus $dist(v, \overline{v}) = 2$. If $v$ is not adjacent to $u$, then $v$ is adjacent to $\overline{u}$. Thus $P : v, \overline{v}, \overline{u}$ is a $v$-$\overline{u}$ path of length 2, hence, $dist(v, \overline{u}) = 2$.

Therefore, $\gamma_=(G^\overline{G}) \leq |S| = 2$. However, by Lemma 24, $\gamma_=(G^\overline{G}) \neq 1$ for any graph $G$. So $\gamma_=(G^\overline{G}) = 2$. □
In this section, we study the $F$-domination number of a complementary prism $G\overline{G}$ when $F$ is a 2-stratified $P_3$ with 1 blue rooted vertex $v$. This gives 5 possibilities for the graph $F$.

4.4 The $F_1$ Domination Number of Complementary Prisms

The graph $F_1$, is a 2-stratified $P_3$, with one endvertex a rooted blue vertex, the center vertex a red vertex and the second endvertex a red vertex. In [2], the following proposition equates for a given graph $G$ the $F_1$ domination number $\gamma_{F_1}$, with the total domination number $\gamma_t$.

**Proposition 26** [2] If $G$ is a graph without isolated vertices, then $\gamma_{F_1}(G) = \gamma_t(G)$.

Every complementary prism $G\overline{G}$ is isolate free for any graph $G$. Hence, $\gamma_{F_1}(G\overline{G}) = \gamma_t(G\overline{G})$ for any graph $G$. The total domination number $\gamma_t(G\overline{G})$ of complementary prisms was studied extensively in [8].
4.5 The $F_2$ Domination Number of Complementary Prisms

The graph $F_2$, is a 2-stratified $P_3$, with both endvertices colored blue, one of them rooted, and the center vertex colored red. In [2], the following proposition equates for a given graph $G$ the $F_2$ domination number $\gamma_{F_2}$, with the domination number $\gamma$.

**Proposition 27** [2] If $G$ is a connected graph of order at least 3, then $\gamma_{F_2}(G) = \gamma(G)$.

In the case of complementary prisms, the only one with order less than three is $K_1K_1$. Since this is a graph of order two, it cannot contain a copy of $F_2$ hence, $\gamma_{F_2}(K_1K_1) = 2$. All other complementary prisms have order greater than or equal to four and are connected. The following corollary is obvious:

**Corollary 28** If $|V(G)| > 1$, then $\gamma_{F_2}(G \overline{G}) = \gamma(G \overline{G})$.

The domination number $\gamma(G \overline{G})$ of complementary prisms was studied extensively in [8].

4.6 The $F_3$ Domination Number of Complementary Prisms

The graph $F_3$, is a 2-stratified $P_3$, with one endvertex rooted and colored blue, the center vertex colored blue and the other endvertex colored red. The following lemma is needed before proceeding.

**Lemma 29** For any graph $G$, $\gamma_{F_3}(G \overline{G}) \neq 1$.

**Proof:** Assume that there exists a graph $G$, such that $\gamma_{F_3}(G \overline{G}) = 1$. Without loss of generality, let $S = \{u\} \subseteq V(G)$ be any $\gamma_{F_3}(G \overline{G})$-set. The vertex $\overline{u}$ is not rooted in a copy of $F_3$, a contradiction. □
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Proposition 30  For any graph $G$,

\[
\begin{cases}
\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) = 2, & \text{if } \gamma(G) \neq 2 \text{ and } \gamma(\overline{G}) \neq 2. \\
2 \leq \gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \leq 4, & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

Proof: We consider four cases:

Case 1. Assume that $\gamma(G) \geq 3$ and $\gamma(\overline{G}) \geq 3$. Let $u \in V(G)$, and let $S = \{u, \overline{u}\}$. Color the vertices of $S$ red. Color the vertices of $V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$ blue. It is claimed that $S$ forms a $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G})$-set. Consider the following.

Let $A = N_G(u)$ and $B = V(G) \setminus N_G[u]$. Note that $A = V(\overline{G}) \setminus N_{\overline{G}}[\overline{u}]$ and $B = N_{\overline{G}}(\overline{u})$.

Let $\overline{x}$ be any element of $\overline{A}$. The subgraph $\langle\{\overline{x}, x, u\}\rangle$ is a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $\overline{x}$. Let $v$ be any element of $B$. Vertex $\overline{v}$ is adjacent to $\overline{u}$ and the subgraph $\langle\{v, \overline{v}, \overline{u}\}\rangle$ is a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $\overline{v}$. Let $w \in A$. Vertex $w$ must have a neighbor $v \in A$ else if $w$ is isolated in $A$, then $\overline{w}$ dominates $\overline{A}$ hence, $\{\overline{w}, \overline{w}\}$ forms a DS for $V(\overline{G})$ implying that $\gamma(\overline{G}) \leq 2$, a contradiction. Therefore, vertex $w$ has a neighbor $v$ in $A$. The subgraph $\langle\{w, v, u\}\rangle$ contains a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $w$. Let $\overline{w}$ be any element of $\overline{B}$. Then, $\overline{w}$ must have a neighbor $\overline{r} \in \overline{B}$ else if $\overline{w}$ is an isolated vertex in $\langle\overline{B}\rangle$, then $\overline{w}$ dominates $\overline{B}$. Therefore, $\{u, w\}$ forms a DS for $V(G)$ implying that $\gamma(G) \leq 2$, a contradiction. Therefore, $\overline{w}$ has a neighbor $\overline{r}$ in $\overline{B}$, and the subgraph $\langle\{\overline{w}, \overline{r}, \overline{u}\}\rangle$ contains a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $\overline{w}$.

Thus, the red-blue coloring described is an $F_3$-coloring. Therefore, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \leq |S| = 2$. By Lemma 29, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \neq 1$ for any graph $G$. Therefore, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) = 2$. 
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Case 2. Assume, without loss of generality, that $\gamma(G) = 1$ and $\gamma(\overline{G}) \neq 2$. If $\gamma(G) = \gamma(\overline{G}) = 1$, then $G\overline{G} = K_2$ and $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) = 2$. Assume that $\gamma(\overline{G}) \geq 3$. Let $u \in V(G)$, such that $u$ dominates $V(G)$. Let $S = \{u, \overline{u}\}$. Color the vertices of $S$ red, and the vertices of $V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$ blue. It is claimed that $S$ forms a $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G})$-set. Let $A = N_G(u)$. Then $\overline{A} = V(\overline{G}) \setminus \{\overline{u}\}$.

Let $\overline{w} \in \overline{A}$. The subgraph $\langle \{\overline{w}, w, u\} \rangle$ is a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $\overline{w}$. Now, let $w \in A$. There must exist some vertex $v \in A$ that is a neighbor of $w$. If not, then $\overline{w}$ dominates $\overline{A}$. Thus $\{\overline{w}, \overline{u}\}$ is a DS for $V(\overline{G})$. This implies that $\gamma(\overline{G}) \leq 2$, a contradiction. Therefore, vertex $w$ has a neighbor $v \in A$. The subgraph $\langle \{w, v, u\} \rangle$ contains a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $w$.

Thus, the red-blue coloring described is an $F_3$-coloring. Therefore, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \leq |S| = 2$. By Lemma 29, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \neq 1$ for any graph $G$. Therefore, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) = 2$.

Case 3. Assume, without loss of generality, that $\gamma(G) = 2$ and $\gamma(\overline{G}) \neq 2$.

There are 2 possible sub-cases to consider:

Case 3a. If $\gamma(\overline{G}) = 1$, then let $\overline{u} \in V(\overline{G})$ be such that $\overline{u}$ dominates $V(\overline{G})$. Let $T$ be a $\gamma(G)$-set. Since vertex $u$ is isolated in $G$, it follows that $u \in T$. Hence, $T = \{u, x\}$ for some $x \in V(G)$. Let $S = \{u, x, \overline{u}, \overline{x}\}$. Color the vertices of S red and the vertices of $V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$ blue. Let $\overline{w} \in V(\overline{G}) \setminus S$. The subgraph $\langle \overline{w}, w, x \rangle$ is a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $\overline{w}$. Let $v \in V(G) \setminus S$. The subgraph $\langle \{v, \overline{v}, \overline{u}\} \rangle$ is a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $v$. Hence, the red-blue coloring is an $F_3$-coloring, therefore, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \leq |S| = 4$.

Case 3b. If $\gamma(\overline{G}) \geq 3$, then let $\overline{u} \in V(\overline{G})$. Let $S = \{u, \overline{u}\}$. Let $A = N_G(u)$, and $B = V(G) \setminus N_G[u]$. Note that $\overline{A} = V(\overline{G}) \setminus N_{\overline{G}}(\overline{u})$ and $\overline{B} = N_{\overline{G}}(\overline{u})$. Color the vertices of $S$ red, and color the vertices of $V(G\overline{G}) \setminus S$ blue. Let $w \in B$. Since $\overline{w}$ is
adjacent to \( u \), it follows that the subgraph \( \langle \{w, \overline{w}, \overline{w}\} \rangle \) contains a copy of \( F_3 \) rooted at \( w \). Let \( \overline{u} \in \overline{A} \). Then it follows that \( v \) is adjacent to \( u \), and the subgraph \( \langle \{\overline{w}, v, u\} \rangle \) is a copy of \( F_3 \) rooted at \( \overline{w} \). Let \( w \in A \). Since \( \gamma(G) \geq 3 \), it is necessary that \( w \) has at least one neighbor in \( A \). If this is not the case, then \( \{\overline{w}, \overline{u}\} \) forms a DS for \( V(\overline{G}) \), a contradiction. Therefore, there exists some vertex \( v \in A \), such that \( v \) is adjacent to \( u \). The subgraph \( \langle \{w, v, u\} \rangle \) contains a copy of \( F_3 \) rooted at \( w \). Let \( \overline{v} \in \overline{B} \). If \( \langle B \rangle \) is isolate free, then there exists a vertex \( \overline{p} \in B \) such that \( \overline{p} \) is adjacent to \( \overline{w} \). The subgraph \( \langle \{\overline{w}, \overline{p}, \overline{w}\} \rangle \) contains a copy of \( F_3 \) rooted at \( \overline{w} \). The red-blue coloring described is an \( F_3 \)-coloring therefore, \( \gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \leq 2 \).

If, on the other hand, \( \langle B \rangle \) contains isolates, then let \( T \) represent a maximum independent set of \( \langle B \rangle \). The subgraph \( \langle T \rangle \) forms a clique. Let \( x \) be any element of \( T \). Let \( R = \{u, \overline{w}, x, \overline{x}\} \). Color the vertices of \( R \) red, and the vertices of \( V(G\overline{G}) \setminus R \) blue. Let \( w \in B \setminus R \). Since \( \overline{w} \) is adjacent to \( \overline{u} \), it follows that the subgraph \( \langle \{w, \overline{w}, \overline{w}\} \rangle \) contains a copy of \( F_3 \) rooted at \( w \). Let \( \overline{v} \in \overline{A} \setminus R \). Then it follows that \( v \) is adjacent to \( u \), and the subgraph \( \langle \{\overline{v}, v, u\} \rangle \) contains a copy of \( F_3 \) rooted at \( \overline{v} \). Let \( w \in A \setminus R \). Since \( \gamma(G) \geq 3 \), it is necessary that \( w \) has at least one neighbor in \( A \setminus R \). If this is not the case, then \( \{\overline{w}, \overline{u}\} \) forms a DS for \( \overline{G} \), a contradiction. Therefore, there exists some vertex \( v \in A \setminus R \), such that \( v \) is adjacent to \( w \). The subgraph \( \langle \{w, v, u\} \rangle \) contains a copy of \( F_3 \) rooted at \( w \). Let \( \overline{w} \in \overline{B} \setminus R \). If \( \overline{w} \in T \), then the subgraph \( \langle \{\overline{w}, w, x\} \rangle \) contains a copy of \( F_3 \) rooted at \( \overline{w} \). If \( \overline{w} \notin T \), then there exists some vertex \( \overline{p} \in \overline{B} \setminus R \), such that \( \overline{p} \) is adjacent to \( \overline{w} \). Therefore, the subgraph \( \langle \{\overline{w}, \overline{p}, \overline{w}\} \rangle \) contains a copy of \( F_3 \) rooted at \( \overline{w} \).
In summary, the red-blue coloring described is an $F_3$-coloring therefore, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \leq 4$. By Lemma 29, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \neq 1$ for any graph $G$, so $2 \leq \gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \leq 4$.

**Case 4** The final case to consider is for $\gamma(G) = \gamma(G) = 2$. Let $R = \{u, v\}$ be any $\gamma(G)$-set, and let $\overline{T} = \{\overline{\tau}, \overline{\upsilon}\}$ be any $\gamma(G)$-set. Let $A = V(G) \setminus R$ and $B = V(G) \setminus T$. Color the vertices of $R \cup \overline{T}$ red and the vertices of $A \cup B$ blue. If every $w \in A \cup B$, has a neighbor $q \in A \cup B$, then one of the four subgraphs $\langle\{w, q, u\}\rangle \langle\{w, q, v\}\rangle \langle\{w, q, \overline{\upsilon}\}\rangle$ or $\langle\{w, q, \overline{\tau}\}\rangle$ either is or contains a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $w$. Hence, the given coloring is an $F_3$-coloring and therefore, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \leq 4$. If this is not the case, then there exists some vertex $p \in A \cup B$, such that $N_{G\overline{G}}(p) \subseteq R \cup \overline{T}$. Without loss of generality, assume that $p \in V(G)$. Then it follows that $N_G(p) \subseteq R$ and $\overline{p} \in \overline{T}$. If vertex $u$ is not adjacent to vertex $v$, or if each of $\overline{\tau}$ and $\overline{\upsilon}$ has a neighbor in $\overline{A} \setminus \{\overline{p}\}$, then $R \cup \{p, \overline{p}\}$ is an $F_3$-set for $G\overline{G}$. To see this, color the vertices $R \cup \{p, \overline{p}\}$ red, color the vertices of $V(G\overline{G}) \setminus \{R \cup \{p, \overline{p}\}\}$ blue, and consider the following. For each vertex $w \in A \setminus \{p\}$, since $\overline{p}$ dominates $\overline{A}$, the subgraph $\langle\{w, \overline{w}, \overline{p}\}\rangle$ is a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $w$. For each vertex $\overline{w} \in \overline{A} \setminus \{\overline{p}\}$, the subgraph $\langle\{\overline{w}, w, u\}\rangle$ or $\langle\{\overline{w}, w, v\}\rangle$ is a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $\overline{w}$. Finally, if $u$ is not adjacent to $v$, the subgraphs $\langle\{\overline{w}, \overline{w}, v\}\rangle$ and $\langle\{\overline{w}, \overline{w}, u\}\rangle$ are copies of $F_3$ rooted at $\overline{w}$ and $\overline{v}$ respectively. If $u$ and $v$ are adjacent, and if $\overline{\tau}$ has some neighbor $\overline{\sigma} \in \overline{A} \setminus \{\overline{p}\}$ and $\overline{\upsilon}$ has some neighbor $\overline{\tau} \in \overline{A} \setminus \{\overline{p}\}$, then the subgraphs $\langle\{\overline{w}, \overline{w}, \overline{p}\}\rangle$ and $\langle\{\overline{w}, \overline{w}, \overline{p}\}\rangle$ contain a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $\overline{w}$ and $\overline{v}$, respectively. The coloring is an $F_3$ coloring, and therefore, $\gamma_{F_3}(G\overline{G}) \leq 4$.

The only case left to consider is when $u$ and $v$ are adjacent in $G$ and at least one of the vertices $\overline{w}$ or $\overline{v}$ has no neighbors in $\overline{A} \setminus \{\overline{p}\}$. Assume, without loss of generality, that this is the case with vertex $\overline{w}$. The vertex $\overline{w}$ must be adjacent to $\overline{p}$,
else $\gamma(G) = 1$ a contradiction. Since $R$ must dominate $V(G)$, it follows that $v$ is adjacent to $p$. Color the vertices of $S= \{u, \overline{u}, \overline{v}, \overline{p}\}$ red and the vertices of $V(GG) \setminus S$ blue. To see that this coloring is an $F_3$ coloring, consider the following. For each vertex $w \in A \setminus \{p\}$, the subgraph $\langle \{w, \overline{w}, \overline{p}\}\rangle$ contains a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $w$. For every vertex $\overline{w} \in \overline{A} \setminus \{\overline{p}\}$, the subgraph $\langle \{\overline{w}, w, u\}\rangle$ is a copy of $F_3$ rooted at $\overline{w}$. Finally, the subgraphs $\langle \{p, v, \overline{v}\}\rangle \text{ and } \langle \{v, p, \overline{p}\}\rangle$ are copies of $F_3$ rooted at $p$ and $v$, respectively. In summary, the coloring is an $F_3$ coloring, hence, $\gamma_{F_3}(GG) \leq 4$. By Lemma 29, $\gamma_{F_3}(GG) \neq 1$ therefore, $2 \leq \gamma_{F_3}(GG) \leq 4$. □

4.7 The $F_4$ Domination Number of Complementary Prisms

The graph $F_4$, is a 2-stratified $P_3$, with one endvertex colored blue, the center vertex rooted and colored blue and the other endvertex colored red. This parameter is not new. For any graph $G$, $\gamma_{F_4}(G) = \gamma_r(G)$. The parameter $\gamma_{F_3}(GG)$ is the restrained domination number for a complementary prism, and has been studied extensively in this work.

4.8 The $F_5$ Domination Number of Complementary Prisms

The graph $F_5$, is a 2-stratified $P_3$, with both endvertices colored red and the center vertex rooted and colored blue. The parameter $\gamma_{F_5}(G)$ is not new. Some terminology is in order. For any graph $G$, a set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is a $k$-dominating set if for every vertex $v \notin S$, $v$ is adjacent to at least $k$ vertices in $S$. The $k$-domination number of $G$, denoted by $\gamma_k(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a $k$-dominating set of $G$. 44
An $F_5$-coloring of a graph $G$ requires every blue vertex to be adjacent to at least 2 red vertices. The parameter $\gamma_{F_5}$ is the minimum number of red vertices required in such a coloring. This is the same as the 2-domination number of $G$. Therefore, we make the following observation.

**Observation 31** For any graph $G$, $\gamma_2(G) = \gamma_{F_5}(G)$.

This leads to the following proposition that establishes the upper and lower bounds on $\gamma_{F_5}(G \overline{G})$ for any graph $G$.

**Proposition 32** For any graph $G$, $\max\{\gamma_{F_5}(G), \gamma_{F_5}(\overline{G})\} \leq \gamma_{F_5}(G \overline{G}) \leq \gamma_{F_5}(G) + \gamma_{F_5}(\overline{G})$, and these bounds are sharp.

**Proof:** Let $S$ be any $\gamma_{F_5}(G \overline{G})$-set. Without loss of generality, assume that $\gamma_{F_5}(G) \geq \gamma_{F_5}(\overline{G})$. Let $S_1 = S \cap V(G)$ and let $\overline{S_2} = S \cap V(\overline{G})$. Assume (for purposes of contradiction), that $|S| < \max\{\gamma_{F_5}(G), \gamma_{F_5}(\overline{G})\}$. The set $S_1 \cup \overline{S_2}$ forms a 2 dominating set for $V(G)$, but $|S_1 \cup \overline{S_2}| \leq |S| < \gamma_{F_5}(G)$ a contradiction. Therefore, $\gamma_{F_5}(G \overline{G}) \geq \max\{\gamma_{F_5}(G), \gamma_{F_5}(\overline{G})\}$. For sharpness, consider the graph $G = tK_2$ for $t \geq 3$. In this case, $\gamma_{F_5}(G) = 2t$, $\gamma_{F_5}(\overline{G}) = 2$ and $\gamma_{F_5}(G \overline{G}) = 2t$. 

Figure 6: $\overline{K}_4 + P_2$
Let $S_1$ be any $\gamma_{F_5}(G)$-set and let $S_2$ be any $\gamma_{F_5}(\overline{G})$-set. The set $S = S_1 \cup S_2$ forms a 2-dominating set for $G\overline{G}$ therefore, $\gamma_{F_5}(G\overline{G}) \leq |S| = |S_1| + |S_2| = \gamma_{F_5}(G) + \gamma_{F_5}(\overline{G})$. For sharpness, consider the following graph $G$. Take an empty graph $K_n$, $n \geq 4$. Join two new vertices $u$ and $v$ to this graph, each vertex adjacent to every vertex in the $K_n$, and adjacent to each other. From this, it follows that $\gamma_{F_5}(G) = 2$, $\gamma_{F_5}(\overline{G}) = 4$ and $\gamma_{F_5}(G\overline{G}) = 6$. This graph is known as the join of $K_n$ and $P_2$. It is symbolized by $K_n + P_2$, and is illustrated in Figure 6 for $n = 4$. $\square$

4.9 Miscellaneous Results

**Proposition 33** Given a graph $G$ of order $n$, $G\overline{G}$ is Eulerian if, and only if, every vertex in $G$ is of odd degree, and $n$ is odd.

**Proof:** Assume that $n$ is odd, and that $deg_G(u)$ is odd for every $u \in V(G)$. Since $deg_G(u) + deg_{\overline{G}}(\overline{u}) = n - 1$ for every $u \in V(G)$, it follows that $deg_{\overline{G}}(\overline{u}) = (n - 1) - deg_G(u)$. Hence, $deg_{\overline{G}}(\overline{u})$ is odd. Joining corresponding vertices between a copy of $G$ and $\overline{G}$ creates $G\overline{G}$ and all the vertices will have even degree thus by Theorem 4.1 in [3] $G\overline{G}$ is Eulerian. Now, assume that $G\overline{G}$ is Eulerian. By Theorem 4.1 in [3], it follows that $deg_{G\overline{G}}(v)$ is even for every $v \in V(G\overline{G})$. Removing the edges between the corresponding vertices of $G$ and $\overline{G}$ reduces the degree of every vertex in $V(G\overline{G})$ by 1. Hence, $deg_G(u)$ is odd for every $u \in V(G)$. Similarly $deg_{\overline{G}}(\overline{u})$ is odd for every $\overline{u} \in V(\overline{G})$. Since $deg_G(u) + deg_{\overline{G}}(\overline{u}) = n - 1$ for every $u \in V(G)$, it follows that $n - 1$ is even thus $n$ is odd.$\square$
Lemma 34 If $u$ and $v$ are adjacent vertices in $V(G)$ and $u$ and $v$ do not dominate $V(G)$, then $G \overline{G}$ contains a 5-cycle.

Proof: Let $u$ and $v$ be any 2 adjacent vertices in $V(G)$. If $u$ and $v$ do not dominate $V(G)$, then there exists a vertex $w \in V(G)$ that is not adjacent in $G$ to $u$ or $v$. In $\overline{G}$, $w$ is adjacent to $\overline{u}$ and $\overline{v}$. Thus the vertices \{$u, v, \overline{u}, \overline{v}, w$\} form a 5-cycle $(u, \overline{u}, w, \overline{v}, v)$ in $G \overline{G}$. \(\Box\)

Proposition 35 The complementary prism $G \overline{G}$ is bipartite, if, and only if, $G \in \{K_1, K_1, K_2, K_2\}$.

Proof: If $G \in \{K_1, K_1\}$, then $G \overline{G} = K_2$, which is bipartite. If $G \in \{K_2, K_2\}$, then $G \overline{G} = P_4$, which is bipartite. Now, assume that $G \overline{G}$ is bipartite. And assume $|V(G)| = n \geq 3$. By Theorem 1.2.18 in [3], it follows that it is necessary for $G \overline{G}$ to have no odd-cycles. Hence, by Lemma 34 it is necessary for every pair of adjacent vertices in $G$ to dominate $V(G)$. Analogously, it is necessary for every pair of adjacent vertices in $\overline{G}$ to dominate $V(\overline{G})$. This means that any two non-adjacent vertices in $G$ cannot have a common neighbor. The graph $G$ must have at least two adjacent vertices since if all the vertices of $G$ are isolated, then $\overline{G}$ is a complete graph of order at least three therefore, $G \overline{G}$ contains an odd cycle and consequently is not bipartite. Hence, assume that there are two adjacent vertices $u, v \in V(G)$. Consider $N(u)$ and $N(v)$. Both $N(u)$ and $N(v)$ must be complete graphs since any two vertices in $N(u)$ or $N(v)$ share a common neighbor hence, must be adjacent. Additionally, $N(u) \cup N(v)$ must be a complete graph since if there exists a vertex $r \in N(u)$ and $j \in N(v)$, $j$ and
r share the vertex u in common (since \( u \in N(v) \) and \( N(v) \) is complete). Finally since \( v \in N(u) \) and \( u \in N(v) \), it follows that u and v are both adjacent to every vertex in the graph thus G is complete. Since \( |V(G)| \geq 3 \), G contains a 3 cycle thus \( \overline{G} \) is not bipartite. Hence, it is necessary for \( |V(G)| \leq 2 \). If \( |V(G)| = 2 \), \( \overline{G} = P_4 \) If \( |V(G)| = 1 \), \( \overline{G} = P_2 \). Since both \( P_2 \) and \( P_4 \) are bipartite, we are finished. □

**Proposition 36** For any graph \( G \) of order \( n \geq 2 \), \( \max(\chi(G), \chi(\overline{G})) \leq \chi(\overline{G}) \leq \max(\Delta(G) + 1, n - \delta(G)) \). These bounds are sharp.

**Proof:** Brooks Theorem states that given a connected graph H, if H is not a complete graph or an odd cycle, then \( \chi(H) \leq \Delta(H) \). The complementary prism \( \overline{G} \) is connected and since it has \( 2n \) vertices, it is not an odd cycle. Additionally, since each vertex \( v \in V(G) \) dominates exactly one vertex \( \overline{v} \in V(\overline{G}) \), and since \( n \geq 2 \), it follows that \( \overline{G} \) is not a complete graph. The above allows us to conclude that \( \chi(\overline{G}) \leq \Delta(\overline{G}) \). But \( \Delta(\overline{G}) = \max(\Delta(G), \Delta(\overline{G})) + 1 \). Since \( \Delta(G) = n - 1 - \delta(G) \), it follows that \( \chi(\overline{G}) \leq \max(\Delta(G) + 1, n - \delta(G)) \).

For sharpness, let \( G = K_n \), then \( \Delta(G) = n - 1 \) and \( \delta(G) = n - 1 \) therefore, \( \max(\Delta(G) + 1, n - \delta(G)) = \max(n, 1) = n \). Since \( \omega(G) = n \), it follows that \( \chi(\overline{G}) \geq n \). Color the copy of \( G \) in \( \overline{G} \) with n colors. Color each vertex \( \overline{v} \in V(\overline{G}) \) with a different color than that utilized to color \( v \). This produces a coloring of \( \overline{G} \) of size \( n \) thus \( \chi(\overline{G}) = n = \max(\Delta(G) + 1, n - \delta(G)) \).

In order to color \( \overline{G} \), at least \( \max(\chi(G), \chi(\overline{G})) \) colors are needed. Therefore, \( \max(\chi(G), \chi(\overline{G})) \leq \chi(\overline{G}) \).

For sharpness, let \( G \) be a star of order \( n \geq 4 \). Then it follows that \( \chi(G) = 2 \).
and \( \chi(G) = n - 1 \). Hence, \( \max(\chi(G), \chi(G)) = n - 1 \). Therefore, \( \chi(GG) \geq n - 1 \). Note that \( G = K_1 \cup K_{n-1} \). Color the vertices of the induced \( K_{n-1} \) in \( GG \) with \( n - 1 \) colors. Call them \( \{c_1 \ldots c_{n-1}\} \). Color the support vertex \( v \in V(G) \) color \( c_1 \) and color \( \pi \in V(G) \) color \( c_2 \). Now for each leaf vertex \( u \in V(G) \), color the leaf vertex with color \( c_2 \) unless \( \pi \) is already colored \( c_2 \). When this occurs, color the vertex \( c_3 \). The result is a coloring of \( GG \) with \( n - 1 \) colors. Therefore, \( \chi(GG) = \max(\chi(G), \chi(G)) = n - 1 \).

Proposition 37 If \( G \) is a graph of order \( n \geq 10 \), then \( GG \) is not planar.

Proof: Let \( G \) be any graph of order \( n \). Hence, \( m(GG) = (n^2 + n)/2 \). By Theorem 11.5 in [3], every graph \( H \) of order \( b \geq 5 \) and size at least \( 3b - 5 \) contains either \( K_5 \) or a subdivision of \( K_5 \). By Kuratowski’s Theorem, such a graph is non-planar. In the present case, \( |V(GG)| = 2n \). Solving the equation \( (n^2 + n)/2 \geq 6n - 5 \) yields that \( n \geq 10 \). Therefore, if \( n \geq 10 \), then \( GG \) is non-planar.

Proposition 38 For any graph \( G \), \( \chi(GG) \leq \max(\chi(G), \chi(G)) + \lceil \min(\chi(G), \chi(G))/2 \rceil \).

Proof: Assume, without loss of generality, that \( \chi(G) \geq \chi(G) \). In \( GG \), properly color \( V(G) \) with the \( \chi(G) \) colors \( \{c_1, \ldots, c_{\chi(G)}\} \). Properly color \( V(G) \) with the colors \( \{c_1, \ldots, c_{\chi(G)}\} \). Let \( \{A_1 \ldots A_{\chi(G)}\} \) represent the subgraphs of \( G \) induced by each of the color classes defined by the \( \chi(G) \) coloring of \( V(G) \). In \( G \), each of \( \{A_1 \ldots A_{\chi(G)}\} \) forms a complete graph. Since \( G \) and \( G \) have been properly colored, the only possible color conflicts that can occur in \( GG \), are between a vertex \( u \in V(G) \) and \( \pi \in V(G) \). Since each of the \( \{A_1 \ldots A_{\chi(G)}\} \) forms a complete graph, there can be at most one conflicting
vertex $u \in A_i$, $1 \leq i \leq \chi(G)$ for each color class of $G$. We will show the result by iteratively constructing a proper coloring of $G\overline{G}$ of cardinality $\leq \chi(G) + \lceil \chi(G)/2 \rceil$.

Label the vertices of $V(G)$ that conflict with vertices of $V(\overline{G})$ as $\{u_1 \ldots u_r\}$. Note that $1 \leq r \leq \chi(\overline{G})$.

**Step 1** Set index $j = 1$. Let $S = \{u_1 \ldots u_r\}$ and $T = \{\overline{u_1} \ldots \overline{u_r}\}$. If $|S| \geq 2$, then goto step 2 else goto step 4.

**Step 2** Select $u_i \in S$, color $u_i$ with color $c_{\chi(G)+j}$. Color a different vertex $\overline{u}_k \in T$ $k \neq i$ with color $c_{\chi(G)+j}$.

**Step 3** Set $S = S \setminus \{u_i, u_k\}$. Set $T = T \setminus \{\overline{u}_i, \overline{u}_k\}$. Set $j=j+1$.

**Step 4** If $|S| \geq 2$, return to step 2. If $|S| = 1$ then color the sole vertex of set $S$ color $c_{\chi(G)+j}$ and goto end else set $j=j-1$ and goto end.

**Step 5** end

When the above process is complete, a proper $\chi(G) + j$ coloring of $G\overline{G}$ will be constructed. This process terminates after $j$ iterations, and $j \leq \lceil \chi(\overline{G})/2 \rceil$. Therefore, $\chi(G\overline{G}) \leq \chi(G) + j \leq \chi(G) + \lceil \chi(\overline{G})/2 \rceil$. □
Our primary goal in this thesis was to obtain results for restrained domination in complementary prisms similar to those obtained in \cite{8} for domination and total domination in complementary prisms. We successfully achieved this, and were able to show, in addition, that the restrained domination number of a complementary prism is realizable for every integer value between its lower and upper bound. Our results illustrated the contrasts between restrained domination and domination in complementary prisms in such areas as the lower bound on $\gamma_r(G \bar{G})$, seen in Theorem 16.

We subsequently investigated some other selected domination parameters in complementary prisms, such as distance $- k$ domination and $2 - step$ domination, and obtained results on the bounds for each of these. We found that for some domination parameters, such as $2 - step$ domination, the parameter only takes on a few possible values for complementary prisms. A consequence of our efforts was the miscellaneous results we discovered along the way dealing with the chromatic number of a complementary prism, planarity of complementary prisms and the characterization of when a complementary prism is Eulerian or bipartite.

Complementary prisms are a deeply intriguing family of graphs, whose study is just beginning. Many problems are still left to be solved, and new results are left to be discovered. Some unsolved problems and unanswered questions which arose during this research are:

- Characterize the graphs $G$ for which $\gamma_r(G \bar{G}) = \gamma_r(G) + \gamma_r(\bar{G})$. 


• Characterize the graphs $G$ for which $\gamma_r(GG) = 2 \max \{\gamma(G), \gamma(\overline{G})\}$.

• Characterize the graphs $G$ for which $\gamma_r(GG) = 4$.

• Are the bounds given in Theorem 30 for $\gamma_{F_5}(GG)$ sharp? At this point, many examples exist for the lower bound, but an example for the upper bound seems elusive.

• Is $\gamma_{F_5}(GG)$ realizable throughout the range of its limits?

• Can the upper bound on $\chi(GG)$ be improved?
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