

The domination polynomial of powers of paths and cycles

David Galvin* Yufei Zhang†

August 26, 2024

Abstract

A dominating set in a graph is a set of vertices with the property that every vertex in the graph is either in the set or adjacent to something in the set. The domination sequence of the graph is the sequence whose k th term is the number of dominating sets of size k .

Alikhani and Peng have conjectured that the domination sequence of every graph is unimodal. Beaton and Brown verified this conjecture for paths and cycles. Here we extend this to arbitrary powers of paths and cycles.

1 Introduction

A *dominating set* in a graph G is a subset D of vertices of G with the property that every vertex in G is either in D or adjacent to something in D . Write $\gamma_k(G)$ for the number of dominating sets of size k in G . For a thorough survey of dominating sets, see the monograph by Haynes, Hedetniemi and Slater [9].

In [3] Alikhani and Peng propose the following conjecture. Here a sequence $(a_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is *unimodal* if there is an index m — a *mode* of the sequence — with

$$a_0 \leq a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_m \geq a_{m+1} \geq a_{m+2} \cdots .$$

Note that a unimodal sequence does not necessarily have a unique mode.

Conjecture 1.1. *For all graphs G the sequence $(\gamma_k(G))_{k \geq 0}$ is unimodal.*

There are partial results in the direction of Conjecture 1.1 (see below) but it remains open in general. As observed by Beaton and Brown [7] the domination sequence of a graph does not in general satisfy the stronger property of log-concavity (a sequence $(a_k)_{k \geq 0}$ is *log-concave* if $a_k^2 \geq a_{k-1}a_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$). This may partly explain why Conjecture 1.1 has proven tricky; there are fewer techniques available to establish unimodality than log-concavity.

*Department of Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame IN USA; dgalvin1@nd.edu. Galvin in part supported by a Simons Collaboration Grant for Mathematicians.

†Department of Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame IN USA.

We now briefly mention some of the recent partial results on unimodality of the domination sequence (for some less recent result see Beaton’s survey [5]). Beaton and Brown [7] settle the conjecture in the affirmative for complete multipartite graphs (and other families — see below). Burcroff and O’Brien [8] establish the conjecture for spiders (trees with at most one vertex of degree greater than two) whose maximum degree is at most 400; for lollipop graphs (complete graphs with a path dropped from one vertex), direct products of complete graphs, and Cartesian products of two complete graphs. S. Zhang [12] shows that if G has a universal vertex (one adjacent to all other vertices) and more than 2^{13} vertices then its domination sequence is unimodal.

Alikhani and Peng [2] show that the domination sequence of every n -vertex graph is weakly increasing up to $\lceil n/2 \rceil$. In [6] Beaton shows that if an n -vertex graph has no isolated vertices then its domination sequence is weakly decreasing from $\lfloor 3n/4 \rfloor$ on. Burcroff and O’Brien [8] show that if n -vertex G has m universal vertices then its domination sequence is weakly decreasing from $\lceil n/2 + n/2^{m+1} \rceil$ on.

Two results — Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 below, both due to Beaton and Brown [7] — are particularly relevant to the present paper.

Theorem 1.2. *If G is a graph with n vertices and with minimum degree at least $2 \log_2 n$ then the domination sequence of G is unimodal with mode at $\lceil n/2 \rceil$.*

From Theorem 1.2 Beaton and Brown deduce that for any $p \in (0, 1)$ the probability that the Erdős-Rényi random graph $G(n, p)$ has unimodal domination sequence tends to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ (i.e., “Conjecture 1.1 is almost always true”).

Theorem 1.3. *For every $n \geq 0$, both the path on n vertices and the cycle on n vertices have unimodal domination sequences.*

The main point of this note is to extend Theorem 1.3. For a graph G and a positive integer ℓ the ℓ th power of G is the graph on the same vertex set as G , with two vertices adjacent if their distance (in G) is at most ℓ (so the first power of a graph is the graph itself). Denote by P_n^ℓ the ℓ th power of the path on n vertices, and by C_n^ℓ the ℓ th power of the cycle on n vertices. We interpret both P_0^ℓ and C_0^ℓ to be the graph with no vertices (this graph has one dominating set, of size 0). We interpret C_1^ℓ to be a single isolated vertex and C_2^ℓ to be the complete graph on two vertices.

Theorem 1.4. *For every $n \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$, both P_n^ℓ and C_n^ℓ have unimodal domination sequences.*

Denote by $\gamma(G, x)$ the *domination polynomial* of graph G , that is, the polynomial

$$\gamma(G, x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \gamma_k(G) x^k.$$

One step in the proof of Theorem 1.4 involves recurrence relations for $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x)$ and $\gamma(C_n^\ell, x)$.

Theorem 1.5. *For $\ell \geq 1$ and $n \geq 2\ell + 1$*

$$\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) = x \sum_{j=1}^{2\ell+1} \gamma(P_{n-j}^\ell, x). \tag{1}$$

For $\ell \geq 1$ and $n \geq 2\ell + 2$

$$\gamma(C_n^\ell, x) = x \sum_{j=1}^{2\ell+1} \gamma(C_{n-j}^\ell, x). \quad (2)$$

The case $\ell = 1$ of (1) was first established by Alikhani and Peng in [1], via a quite involved argument, and a much simplified proof was given by Arocha and Llano in [4]. The cases $\ell = 2, 3$ of (1) were obtained by Vijayan and Gibson [11] and Medone and Christilda [10], also by quite long arguments. The case $\ell = 1$ of (2) appears in [7]. Our proofs of (1) and (2) for general ℓ are quite short and direct.

The recurrence relations (1) and (2) will take center stage in the proof of Theorem 1.4. The proof will also require us to understand the initial conditions of these recurrences, so it will be useful to have a way to easily compute $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x)$ and $\gamma(C_n^\ell, x)$ for values of n that are small compared to ℓ . For cycles, this is very easy. For $n \leq 2\ell + 1$ we have that C_n^ℓ is the complete graph on n vertices, for which every non-empty subset of vertices is dominating, and so

$$\gamma(C_n^\ell, x) = (1 + x)^n - 1. \quad (3)$$

For paths things are not as simple, since for $\ell + 2 \leq n \leq 2\ell$ the graph P_n^ℓ is not a complete graph. Nevertheless we have two ways to compute $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x)$ for small values of n . The first is a direct extension of (1), while the second uses (1) as a starting point but then goes in a different direction.

Theorem 1.6. *For $n \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$ we can compute $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x)$ via the following recurrence:*

A1 $\gamma(P_0^\ell, x) = 1$ for $\ell \geq 1$.

A2 $\gamma(P_1^\ell, x) = x$ for $\ell \geq 1$.

A3 $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) = nx + x \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \gamma(P_{n-j}^\ell, x)$ for $2 \leq n \leq \ell + 1$.

A4 $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) = (2\ell + 2 - n)x + x \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \gamma(P_{n-j}^\ell, x)$ for $\ell + 2 \leq n \leq 2\ell$.

A5 $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) = x \sum_{j=1}^{2\ell+1} \gamma(P_{n-j}^\ell, x)$ for $2\ell + 1 \leq n$ (note that this is just (1)).

Alternatively for $n \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$ we can compute $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x)$ via

B1 $\gamma(P_0^\ell, x) = 1$ for $\ell \geq 1$.

B2 $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) = (1 + x)^n - 1$ for $1 \leq n \leq \ell + 1$.

B3 $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) = (1 + x)\gamma(P_{n-1}^\ell, x) - x$ for $\ell + 2 \leq n \leq 2\ell + 1$.

B4 $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) = (1 + x)\gamma(P_{n-1}^\ell, x) - x\gamma(P_{n-2(\ell+1)}^\ell, x)$ for $n \geq 2\ell + 2$.

A second step in the proof of Theorem 1.4 involves a generalization of a result of Beaton and Brown [7]. Say that a polynomial is *unimodal* if its coefficient sequence is unimodal, and say that a sequence $(a_k)_{k=c}^d$ is *barely increasing* if $0 \leq a_{k+1} - a_k \leq 1$ for all $c \leq k \leq d - 1$.

Theorem 1.7. Fix $k \geq 3$. Let $f_0(x), f_1(x), \dots$ be a sequence of polynomials satisfying

$$f_n(x) = x \sum_{j=1}^k f_{n-j}(x)$$

for all $n \geq k$. Let \mathcal{P}_n be the property that

- the coefficient sequence of f_i is non-negative and unimodal for each $0 \leq i \leq n$, and
- the f_i 's have a sequence of modes $(m_i)_{i=0}^n$ that is barely increasing.

If \mathcal{P}_k holds then \mathcal{P}_n holds for all $n \geq k$.

The case $k = 3$ of Theorem 1.7 appears in [7]. Note that we cannot replace \mathcal{P}_k with \mathcal{P}_{k-1} in Theorem 1.7. For example, setting $f_0(x) = 3$, $f_1(x) = x$ and $f_i(x) = 2x^2$ for $2 \leq i \leq k-1$, we have that \mathcal{P}_{k-1} holds but not \mathcal{P}_k .

The final ingredient needed for the proof of Theorem 1.4 is Theorem 1.2, introduced earlier.

We briefly describe the layout of the paper here.

- We establish the first part of Theorem 1.5 ((1), the recurrence for the domination polynomial of powers of paths) in Section 2.1.1. The proof of the second part of Theorem 1.5 ((2), the recurrence for the domination polynomial of powers of cycles) is given in Section 2.1.2.
- The proof of Theorem 1.6 (the recurrences for the domination polynomials of powers of paths when n is small compared to ℓ) is presented in Section 2.1.3.
- In Section 2.1.4 we make a digression to give a cleaner verification of a slightly weaker version of the path recurrence (1).
- The proof of Theorem 1.7 (on unimodality of sequences of polynomials) is given in Section 2.2.
- The proof of the main result, Theorem 1.4 (unimodality of domination sequence for powers of paths and cycles) appears in Section 2.3.

To conclude the introduction, we note that while the domination sequence of a graph is not in general log-concave, it may be for powers of paths and cycles. Indeed, we have checked via `Mathematica` that both $(\gamma(P_n^\ell, k))_{k \geq 0}$ and $(\gamma(C_n^\ell, k))_{k \geq 0}$ are log-concave for all $n, \ell \leq 500$, and even satisfy the stronger property of ultra log-concavity. (A sequence $(a_k)_{k=0}^n$ is *ultra log-concave* if $(a_k / \binom{n}{k})_{k=0}^n$ is log-concave.)

Conjecture 1.8. For all $n \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$ both of $(\gamma(P_n^\ell, k))_{k \geq 0}$ and $(\gamma(C_n^\ell, k))_{k \geq 0}$ are ultra log-concave.

2 Proofs

2.1 Recurrences for powers of paths and cycles

2.1.1 The main recurrence for powers of paths

We prove (1) combinatorially, starting by considering $n \geq 2\ell + 2$.

Let the path P_n underlying P_n^ℓ have vertices v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n , with v_i adjacent to v_{i+1} for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. Put an order on the vertices in the natural way, by saying that v_i is smaller than v_j iff $i < j$.

A dominating set D in P_n^ℓ must have at least two vertices. To ensure that v_1 is either in D or adjacent to something in D , the smallest vertex of D must be one of $\{v_1, \dots, v_{\ell+1}\}$, say v_f . To ensure that $v_{f+\ell+1}$ is either in D or adjacent to something in D , the second smallest vertex of D must be one of $\{v_{f+1}, \dots, v_{f+2\ell+1}\}$, say v_{f+s} . For each $f = 1, \dots, \ell + 1$ and $s = 1, \dots, 2\ell + 1$, denote by $\mathcal{P}_n^\ell(f, s)$ the set of dominating sets of P_n^ℓ in which the first vertex is v_f and the second is v_{f+s} . Note that $\mathcal{P}_n^\ell(f, s)$ will be empty if $f + s > n$ and non-empty otherwise.

For each $s = 1, \dots, 2\ell + 1$ let the path P_{n-s} underlying P_{n-s}^ℓ have vertices $v_1^s, v_2^s, \dots, v_{n-s}^s$, with v_i^s adjacent to v_{i+1}^s for $i = 1, \dots, n-s-1$, and put the natural linear order on the vertices as before. To ensure that v_1^s is either in the dominating set or adjacent to something in the dominating set, a dominating set in P_{n-s}^ℓ must have at least one vertex from among $\{v_1^s, \dots, v_{\ell+1}^s\}$. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_{n-s}^\ell(f)$ the set of dominating sets of P_{n-s}^ℓ in which the first vertex is v_f^s . Note that $\mathcal{P}_{n-s}^\ell(f)$ will be empty if $f + s > n$ and non-empty otherwise.

Claim 2.1. *For $f + s \leq n$ (when both $\mathcal{P}_n^\ell(f, s)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{n-s}^\ell(f)$ are non-empty) there is a bijection $m_n^\ell(f, s) : \mathcal{P}_n^\ell(f, s) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n-s}^\ell(f)$ that reduces sizes of sets by 1.*

Claim 2.1 would imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(P_n^\ell, x) &= [f + s \leq n] \sum_{s=1}^{2\ell+1} \sum_{f=1}^{\ell+1} \sum_{D \in \mathcal{P}_n^\ell(f, s)} x^{|D|} \\ &= [f + s \leq n] \sum_{s=1}^{2\ell+1} x \sum_{f=1}^{\ell+1} \sum_{D \in \mathcal{P}_{n-s}^\ell(f)} x^{|D|} \\ &= x \sum_{s=1}^{2\ell+1} \gamma(P_{n-s}^\ell, x) \end{aligned}$$

which is (1). Here $[\cdot]$ is the Iverson bracket that takes the value 1 if \cdot is true, and takes the value 0 otherwise.

Proof. (Proof of Claim 2.1) Define a map $m_n^\ell(f, s)$ from $\mathcal{P}_n^\ell(f, s)$ to subsets of the vertex set of P_{n-s}^ℓ as follows. Let $D = \{v_f, v_s, v_{s_1}, v_{s_2}, \dots, v_{s_k}\}$ (with $s < s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_k$) be a dominating set of P_n^ℓ of size $k + 2$ ($k \geq 0$) that lies in $\mathcal{P}_n^\ell(f, s)$. Set

$$m_n^\ell(f, s)(D) = \{v_f^s, v_{s_1-(s-f)}^s, v_{s_2-(s-f)}^s, \dots, v_{s_k-(s-f)}^s\}.$$

Informally this map deletes the vertices between v_f and v_s and identifies v_f and v_s , to go from P_n^ℓ to P_{n-s}^ℓ . It leaves D unchanged, except that the identification of v_f and v_s drops the size of D by 1.

Evidently $|m_n^\ell(f, s)(D)| = |D| - 1$. Evidently also $m_n^\ell(f, s)$ is an injective map (if $D \neq D' \in \mathcal{P}_n^\ell(f, s)$, and v_t is in one of D, D' but not in the other, then $v_{t-(s-f)}^s$ is in one of $m_n^\ell(f, s)(D), m_n^\ell(f, s)(D')$ but not the other).

We claim that $m_n^\ell(f, s)(D)$ is in $\mathcal{P}_{n-s}^\ell(f)$. Clearly v_f^s is the smallest vertex in $m_n^\ell(f, s)(D)$. We now must show that $m_n^\ell(f, s)(D)$ is a dominating set in P_{n-s}^ℓ . Each of v_1^s, \dots, v_{f-1}^s is adjacent to v_f^s . Now consider a vertex v_t^s in P_{n-s}^ℓ , for $t > f$. There are three possibilities:

1. $v_{t+(s-f)}$ (in P_n^ℓ) is in D . In this case $v_t^s \in m_n^\ell(f, s)(D)$.
2. $v_{t+(s-f)} \notin D$, but $v_{t+(s-f)}$ is adjacent to v_s . In this case v_t^s is adjacent to v_f^s (in P_{n-s}^ℓ).
3. $v_{t+(s-f)} \notin D$, $v_{t+(s-f)}$ is not adjacent to v_s , but $v_{t+(s-f)}$ is adjacent to some $v_{s'} \in D$. In this case v_t^s is adjacent to $v_{s'-(s-f)}^s$ in P_{n-s}^ℓ , and $v_{s'-(s-f)}^s \in m_n^\ell(f, s)(D)$.

This shows that indeed $m_n^\ell(f, s)(D)$ is a dominating set in P_{n-s}^ℓ and so is in $\mathcal{P}_{n-s}^\ell(f)$.

To complete the proof of Claim 2.1 we need to show that $m_n^\ell(f, s)(D)$ is surjective. Let $D' = \{v_f^s, v_{s_1}^s, \dots, v_{s_k}^s\}$ (with $f < s_1 < \dots < s_k$) be in $\mathcal{P}_{n-s}^\ell(f)$. Set

$$D = \{v_f, v_s, v_{s_1+(s-f)}, \dots, v_{s_k-(s-f)}\}.$$

By almost identical reasoning to the argument in the last paragraph we have that $D \in \mathcal{P}_n^\ell(f, s)$; the one point that needs to be added is that each of v_{f+1}, \dots, v_{s-1} in P_n^ℓ is adjacent to at least one of v_f, v_s , by the condition that $s \leq 2\ell + 1$. The proof is completed by noting that it is evident that $m_n^\ell(f, s)(D) = D'$. \square

The combinatorial proof just presented is only valid when $n \geq 2\ell + 2$. Modifying it slightly we can extend the recurrence to be valid for smaller values of n . We start with $n = 2\ell + 1$ (thus completing the proof of (1)). Note that for this value of n it is no longer the case that every dominating set of P_n^ℓ has at least two elements. Specifically, there is exactly one dominating set, namely $\{v_{\ell+1}\}$, that has size 1, and this set contributes x to $\gamma(P_{2\ell+1}^\ell, x)$.

As before, for each $s = 1, \dots, 2\ell$ we have that

$$\bigcup_{f:(f,s) \neq \emptyset} m_{2\ell+1}^\ell(f, s)(\mathcal{P}_{2\ell+1}^\ell(f, s))$$

is the set of all dominating sets of $P_{2\ell+1-s}^\ell$. However, this is no longer the case when $s = 2\ell + 1$, since $\mathcal{P}_{2\ell+1}^\ell(1, 2\ell + 1)$ is empty (there is no $(2\ell + 2)$ nd vertex in $P_{2\ell+1}^\ell$).

It follows that in this case the combinatorial argument expressing $\gamma(P_{2\ell+1}^\ell, x)$ in terms of $\gamma(P_m^\ell, x)$'s (with $m < 2\ell + 1$) yields the relation

$$\gamma(P_{2\ell+1}^\ell, x) - x = x \sum_{j=1}^{2\ell} \gamma(P_{2\ell+1-j}^\ell, x).$$

Noting that $\gamma(P_0^\ell, x) = 1$ we obtain from this that $\gamma(P_{2\ell+1}^\ell, x) = x \sum_{j=1}^{2\ell+1} \gamma(P_{2\ell+1-j}^\ell, x)$, which is (1).

2.1.2 The recurrence for powers of cycles

Now we turn to (2), the recurrence relation for cycles. The proof is very similar to the proof of (1), so we aim to be brief here.

Label the vertices of C_n (the cycle underlying C_n^ℓ) v_1, \dots, v_n with v_i adjacent to v_{i+1} for all $i < n$, and v_n adjacent to v_1 . All dominating sets of C_n^ℓ have at least two vertices (a single vertex has only 2ℓ neighbours; recall $n \geq 2\ell + 2$ here), so we may partition the set of dominating sets of C_n^ℓ as $\cup_{f,s} \mathcal{C}_n^\ell(f,s)$, where $\mathcal{C}_n^\ell(f,s)$ is the set of dominating sets of C_n^ℓ in which the smallest vertex (in the natural ordering of the vertices) is v_f and the second smallest is v_{f+s} .

Labelling the vertices of C_{n-s} (the cycle underlying C_{n-s}^ℓ) v_1^s, \dots, v_{n-s}^s we may also partition the set of dominating sets of C_n^ℓ as $\cup_f \mathcal{C}_{n-s}^\ell(f)$, where $\mathcal{C}_{n-s}^\ell(f)$ is the set of dominating sets of C_{n-s}^ℓ in which the smallest vertex is v_f^s .

Using essentially the same proof as we used in the verification of (1), we get that there is a bijection from $\mathcal{C}_n^\ell(f,s)$ to $\mathcal{C}_{n-s}^\ell(f)$ that reduces the sizes of dominating sets by one. This immediately implies (2). The bijection is (informally) obtained by deleting all the vertices of C_n^ℓ that lie between v_f and v_s , and then identifying v_f and v_s .

2.1.3 The recurrence for powers of paths, $n \leq 2\ell + 1$

We now turn to the first recurrence for powers of paths presented in Theorem 1.6. **A5** has already been established, and **A1**, **A2** are easy initial conditions. For **A3** and **A4** we consider what happens for smaller n ($2 \leq n \leq 2\ell$) in the combinatorial argument that was presented in Section 2.1.3. As observed earlier the argument only makes sense for the set of dominating sets of P_n^ℓ of size at least two, and so it yields

$$\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) - \gamma_1(P_n^\ell)x = x \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \gamma(P_{n-j}^\ell, x) \quad (4)$$

where recall that $\gamma_1(G)$ is the number of dominating sets of size 1 in G (note when G has at least one vertex, it has no dominating sets of size 0).

We can easily compute $\gamma_1(P_n^\ell)$ directly:

$$\gamma_1(P_n^\ell) = \begin{cases} n & \text{if } 2 \leq n \leq \ell + 1 \\ 2\ell + 2 - n & \text{if } \ell + 2 \leq n \leq 2\ell. \end{cases}$$

Inserting this into (4) we get **A3** and **A4** of Theorem 1.6.

We now turn to the second recurrence of Theorem 1.6. **B1** is a simple initial condition, and **B2** follows from the fact that for $\ell \geq n - 1$, i.e. $1 \leq n \leq \ell + 1$, P_n^ℓ is a complete graph, in which every non-empty set of vertices is dominating.

For $n \geq 2\ell + 2$ (the regime of **B4**) we obtain from (1) that

$$\gamma(P_{n-1}^\ell, x) = x \sum_{i=2}^{2\ell+2} \gamma(P_{n-i}^\ell, x).$$

Rearranging and using (1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(P_{n-1}^\ell, x) - x\gamma(P_{n-2(\ell+1)}^\ell, x) &= x \sum_{i=2}^{2\ell+1} \gamma(P_{n-i}^\ell, x) \\ &= \gamma(P_n^\ell, x) - x\gamma(P_{n-1}^\ell, x).\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms again we have

$$\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) = (1+x)\gamma(P_{n-1}^\ell, x) - x\gamma(P_{n-2(\ell+1)}^\ell, x)$$

for $n \geq 2\ell + 2$. This is **B4**.

We now consider what happens when $\ell + 2 \leq n \leq 2\ell + 1$ (the regime of **B3**). Since $\ell \geq 1$ we may assume $n \geq 3$. For this regime of n we present a combinatorial verification of **B3**. Notice that what we want to show is that for $m \geq 2$

$$\gamma_m(P_n^\ell) = \gamma_m(P_{n-1}^\ell) + \gamma_{m-1}(P_{n-1}^\ell) \quad (5)$$

and also that

$$\gamma_1(P_n^\ell) = \gamma_1(P_{n-1}^\ell) - 1. \quad (6)$$

In (6) we are using that for $n \geq 3$ there is no empty dominating set of P_n^ℓ ; this fact also deals with the constant terms in **B3**.

As before, let the path P_n underlying P_n^ℓ have vertices v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n , with v_i adjacent to v_{i+1} for $i = 1, \dots, n-1$.

First note that for $m \geq n-\ell$, we have $\gamma_m(P_n^\ell, x) = \binom{n}{m}$. Indeed, any set $D = \{v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_m}\}$ of m vertices in P_n^ℓ (with $i_1 < \dots < i_m$) partitions the complement of D into $m+1$ blocks — the first block being $\{v_j : j < i_1\}$, the second block being $\{v_j : i_1 < j < i_2\}$, and so on. The sum of the sizes of the blocks is $n-m$, so each block has size at most $n-m$, which is at most ℓ . It follows that every vertex in the first block is adjacent to v_{i_1} , every vertex in the second block is adjacent to both v_{i_1} and v_{i_2} , and so on, and so D is a dominating set. By Pascal's identity this yields $\gamma_m(P_n^\ell) = \gamma_m(P_{n-1}^\ell) + \gamma_{m-1}(P_{n-1}^\ell)$ for $m \geq n-\ell$.

What remains is to establish (5) for $2 \leq m < n-\ell$, and also to establish (6). We start with (5). For each $2 \leq m < n-\ell$ we partition the set of all dominating sets of P_n^ℓ of size m into two classes:

1. the set $\mathcal{A}(n, \ell, m)$ of all dominating sets of P_n^ℓ of size m that include v_n , and
2. the set $\mathcal{B}(n, \ell, m)$ of all dominating sets of P_n^ℓ of size m that do not include v_n .

With $k = n - m - \ell$, we will show

$$|\mathcal{A}(n, \ell, m)| = \gamma_{m-1}(P_{n-1}^\ell) + \binom{m+k-2}{m-1} \quad (7)$$

and

$$|\mathcal{B}(n, \ell, m)| = \gamma_m(P_{n-1}^\ell) - \binom{m+k-2}{m-1}. \quad (8)$$

Summing (7) and (8) gives (5).

We first prove (7). Note that for any dominating set $D = \{v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_{m-1}}\}$ of size $m-1$ of P_{n-1}^ℓ , $D \cup \{v_n\}$ dominates P_n^ℓ . Let \mathcal{D} be the set of dominating sets D of P_{n-1}^ℓ of size m with $v_n \in D$ and with $D \setminus \{v_n\}$ not a dominating set of P_{n-1}^ℓ . To establish (7) we need to show that $|\mathcal{D}| = \binom{m+k-2}{m-1}$.

Let D be in \mathcal{D} . Since v_n is in D , there must exist a $D' \subseteq D$ such that D' is a dominating set of $P_{n-\ell-1}^\ell$. Notice that for such a D' , $D' \cup \{v_i\}$ is a dominating set of P_{n-1}^ℓ for any v_i in $\{v_{n-\ell}, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$. So, using that $D \setminus \{v_n\}$ doesn't dominate P_{n-1}^ℓ , we see that all the $m-1$ vertices in $D \setminus \{v_n\}$ must come from $\{v_1, \dots, v_{\ell+1}\}$. Moreover, none of the vertices v_i with $m+k-1 \leq i \leq n-1$ can be in D (recall $k = n - m - \ell$). This says that $D \setminus \{v_n\} \subseteq \{v_1, \dots, v_{m+k-2}\}$ (here the final index really should be $\min\{m+k-2, \ell+1\}$; but note since $n \leq 2\ell+1$ and $m+k = n - \ell$, we have $m+k-2 \leq \ell+1$).

We have shown $|\mathcal{D}| \leq \binom{m+k-2}{m-1}$. To see the equality, note that any $m-1$ vertices in $\{v_1, \dots, v_{m+k-2}\}$ will dominate $P_{n-\ell-1}^\ell$ but won't dominate P_{n-1}^ℓ (because $k \leq \ell$). This concludes the proof of (7).

We now move on to (8). Again, we see that every dominating set of P_n^ℓ that does not include v_n is a dominating set of P_{n-1}^ℓ . So we want to count the number of dominating sets D of size m of P_{n-1}^ℓ that do not dominate P_n^ℓ . A necessary condition here is that $D \subseteq \{v_1, \dots, v_{n-1-j}\}$, and more precisely we must have $D \subseteq \{v_1, \dots, v_{m+k-1}\}$ and $v_{m+k-1} \in D$ (with again $k = n - m - j$). As in the verification of (8), since any $m-1$ vertices of $\{v_1, \dots, v_{m+k-2}\}$ dominate P_{m+k-1}^ℓ (because $j \geq k$) we get that the number of dominating sets D of size m of P_{n-1}^ℓ that don't dominate P_n^ℓ is equal to $\binom{m+k-2}{m-1}$. This establishes (8), and so (5).

We now move on to (6). All dominating sets of P_n^ℓ of size 1 are dominating sets of P_{n-1}^ℓ . The only dominating set of P_{n-1}^ℓ of size 1 that doesn't dominate P_n^ℓ is $\{v_{n-1-\ell}\}$. This yields (6), and so completes the verification of **B3**.

2.1.4 A shorter proof of (1) when $n \geq 3\ell + 2$

We note, as an aside, that there is a particularly clean way to present the above argument that establishes (1) for $n \geq 3\ell + 2$. Say that D is a *relaxed dominating set* in P_n^ℓ if every vertex in P_n^ℓ , other than possibly the first ℓ vertices of the underlying path P_n , is either in D or adjacent to something in D . Denote by $\gamma^r(P_n^\ell, k)$ the number of relaxed dominating sets of size k , and let

$$\gamma^r(P_n^\ell, x) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \gamma^r(P_n^\ell, k) x^k.$$

We can express $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x)$ in terms of the $\gamma^r(P_n^\ell, x)$'s. Note that any dominating set of P_n^ℓ must include at least one of the first $\ell+1$ vertices of the underlying path P_n^ℓ (to ensure that the first vertex of the path is either in the set or adjacent to something in the set). Let the $\ell+1$ initial vertices of the path be $v_1, \dots, v_{\ell+1}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, \ell+1$ there is a one-to-one correspondence between on the one hand

dominating sets of P_n^ℓ in which the first vertex from among $v_1, \dots, v_{\ell+1}$ that is in the set is v_i

and on the other hand

relaxed dominating sets of P_{n-i}^ℓ .

The correspondence is obtained by deleting the first i vertices of P_n^ℓ to go from P_n^ℓ to P_{n-i}^ℓ , and removing v_i from the dominating set of P_n^ℓ to get a relaxed dominating set of P_{n-i}^ℓ . This correspondence drops the size of a set by one, and so it follows that

$$\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) = x \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} \gamma^r(P_{n-i}^\ell, x). \quad (9)$$

Note that (9) makes sense for $n \geq \ell + 1$.

Similarly we can express $\gamma^r(P_n^\ell, x)$ in terms of the $\gamma^r(P_m^\ell, x)$'s. Note that any relaxed dominating set of P_n^ℓ must include at least one of the first $2\ell + 1$ vertices of the underlying path P_n^ℓ (to ensure that the $(\ell + 1)$ st vertex of the path is either in the set or adjacent to something in the set). Let the $2\ell + 1$ initial vertices of the path be $v_1, \dots, v_{2\ell+1}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, 2\ell + 1$ there is a one-to-one correspondence between on the one hand

relaxed dominating sets of P_n^ℓ in which the first vertex from among $v_1, \dots, v_{2\ell+1}$ that is in the set is v_i

and on the other hand

relaxed dominating sets of P_{n-i}^ℓ .

The correspondence is obtained by deleting the first i vertices of P_n^ℓ to go from P_n^ℓ to P_{n-i}^ℓ , and removing v_i from the relaxed dominating set of P_n^ℓ to get a relaxed dominating set of P_{n-i}^ℓ . This correspondence drops the size of a set by one, and so it follows that

$$\gamma^r(P_n^\ell, x) = x \sum_{i=1}^{2\ell+1} \gamma^r(P_{n-i}^\ell, x). \quad (10)$$

Note that (10) makes sense for $n \geq 2\ell + 1$.

Using (9) for the first equation below, (10) for the second, then changing the order of summation, and finally using (9) in the fourth equation, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(P_n^\ell, x) &= x \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} \gamma^r(P_{n-i}^\ell, x) \\ &= x^2 \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} \sum_{j=1}^{2\ell+1} \gamma^r(P_{n-i-j}^\ell, x) \\ &= x^2 \sum_{j=1}^{2\ell+1} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell+1} \gamma^r(P_{n-i-j}^\ell, x) \\ &= x \sum_{j=1}^{2\ell+1} \gamma(P_{n-j}^\ell, x). \end{aligned}$$

Note that this is valid for $n \geq 3\ell + 2$.

2.2 Unimodality of sequences of polynomials

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 1.7. For each fixed $k \geq 3$ we proceed by induction on n , with $n = k$ as the base case.

For the inductive step, let us assume that \mathcal{P}_n holds for some $n \geq k$. Our goal is to establish \mathcal{P}_{n+1} .

That the coefficients of f_{n+1} are non-negative follows immediately from the recurrence relation satisfied by the $f_i(x)$'s.

For $0 \leq r \leq n+1$ and $c \geq 0$ let $a_{r,c}$ be the coefficient of x^c in $f_r(x)$. By the induction hypothesis each of the sequences $(a_{r,c})_{c \geq 0}$ is non-negative and unimodal for $0 \leq r \leq n$, and there is a barely increasing sequence $(m_r)_{r=0}^n$ such that a_{r,m_r} is a mode of the sequence $(a_{r,c})_{c \geq 0}$.

That each $a_{n+1,c}$, for $c \geq 0$, is non-negative follows immediately from the recurrence relation satisfied by the $f_i(x)$'s. Thus to establish \mathcal{P}_{n+1} , we need to show that $(a_{n+1,c})_{c \geq 0}$ is unimodal with a mode at $c = m_n$ or $m_n + 1$.

We begin by observing that $(a_{n+1,c})_{c \geq m_n+1}$ is monotone decreasing. Indeed, for $t \geq m_n + 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n+1,t} &= \sum_{j=1}^k a_{n-k+1,t-1} \\ &\geq \sum_{j=1}^k a_{n-k+1,t} \\ &= a_{n+1,t+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The equalities above are simply applications of the recurrence relation satisfied by the $f_i(x)$'s. The inequality follows from the fact that $(a_{n-k+1,c})_{c \geq 0}$ has a mode at m_{n-k+1} , and by the increasing property of the sequence of modes we have $m_{n-k+1} \leq m_n \leq t-1$, so $a_{n-k+1,t-1} \geq a_{n-k+1,t}$.

It thus remains to show that $(a_{n+1,c})_{c \leq m_n}$ is monotone increasing. Let $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ be such that $m_{n-k+1} = m_n - j$ (note $j \geq 0$ because the sequence of modes is increasing, and $j \leq k-1$ because the sequence of modes is barely increasing). By an almost identical argument to the one used to show that $(a_{n+1,c})_{c \geq m_n+1}$ is monotone decreasing, we see that $(a_{n+1,c})_{c \leq m_n-j+1}$ is monotone increasing.

To complete the argument that $(a_{n+1,c})_{c \leq m_n}$ is monotone increasing, fix i with $m_n - j + 1 \leq i \leq m_n - 1$. We need to show that $a_{n+1,i} \leq a_{n+1,i+1}$, which is equivalent to

$$\sum_{p=1}^k a_{n+1-p,i} \geq \sum_{p=1}^k a_{n+1-p,i-1}. \quad (11)$$

Note that because $i \leq m_n - 1$ we have $a_{n,i+1} \geq a_{n,i}$. By the recurrence this says that

$$\left(\sum_{p=2}^k a_{n+1-p,i} \right) + a_{n-k,i} \geq \left(\sum_{p=1}^k a_{n+1-p,i-1} \right) + a_{n-k,i-1}. \quad (12)$$

Now because $i \geq m_n - j + 1$, so $i - 1 \geq m_n - j$, and by increasing property of the sequence of modes (which says that $m_{n-k} \leq m_n - j$) we have that $a_{n-k,i} \leq a_{n-k,i-1}$. Inserting into (12) we get

$$\left(\sum_{p=2}^k a_{n+1-p,i} \right) \geq \left(\sum_{p=1}^k a_{n+1-p,i-1} \right). \quad (13)$$

Finally noting that $a_{n,i} \geq a_{n,i-1}$ (since $i \leq m_n - 1$) we deduce (11) from (13), completing the induction.

2.3 Unimodality for powers of paths and cycles

Here we give the proof of Theorem 1.4 — unimodality of the domination sequence of powers of paths and cycles — beginning with the case of paths.

We start with large ℓ , specifically $\ell \geq 9$. Note that $\gamma(P_0^\ell, x) = 1$, which has a unimodal coefficient sequence with a mode at $\lceil 0/2 \rceil$, while for $1 \leq n \leq \ell + 1$ we have that P_n^ℓ is simply the complete graph on n vertices, and so

$$\gamma(P_n^\ell, x) = (1 + x)^n - 1,$$

which for each n has unimodal coefficient sequence with a mode at $\lceil n/2 \rceil$.

For $n \geq \ell + 2$ the graph P_n^ℓ has minimum degree ℓ . As long as $n \leq 2^{\ell/2}$ we get from Theorem 1.2 that $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x)$ has unimodal coefficient sequence with a mode at $\lceil n/2 \rceil$. Noting that $(\lceil n/2 \rceil)_{n \geq 0}$ is barely increasing, and bearing the recurrence (1) in mind, we conclude that as long as $\lfloor 2^{\ell/2} \rfloor \geq 2\ell + 1$ we can apply Theorem 1.7 to conclude that the coefficient sequence of $\gamma(P_n^\ell, x)$ is unimodal for all $n \geq 0$. This establishes the path case of Theorem 1.4 for all $\ell \geq 9$.

To complete the path case of Theorem 1.4 we simply have to establish that for each $1 \leq \ell \leq 8$, each of the polynomials in the sequence $(\gamma(P_n^\ell, x))_{n=0}^{2\ell+1}$ has a unimodal coefficient sequence, and that the family has a sequence of modes that is barely increasing. Using either of the recurrences given in Theorem 1.6 this finite task is easily accomplished (we used `Mathematica` for this computation), and specifically it is easily established that each polynomial under examination has a mode at $\lceil n/2 \rceil$.

We now turn to the cycle case of Theorem 1.4. By (3) we have that for $1 \leq n \leq 2\ell + 1$ each of $\gamma(C_n^\ell, x)$ has non-negative and unimodal coefficient sequence, and has a mode at $\lceil n/2 \rceil$. By (2) and (3) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(C_{2\ell+2}^\ell, x) &= \sum_{i=1}^{2\ell+1} ((1+x)^i - 1) \\ &= (1+x)^{2\ell+2} - (2\ell+2)x - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

(We can also see (14) directly — all subsets of the vertex set of $C_{2\ell+2}^\ell$ of size two or more are dominating sets, but no subset of size 1 or 0 is.) So $\gamma(C_{2\ell+2}^\ell, x)$ also has non-negative and unimodal coefficient sequence with a mode at $\ell + 1$. By Theorem 1.7 we conclude that $\gamma(C_n^\ell, x)$ is unimodal for all n .

References

- [1] Saeid Alikhani and Yee-Hock Peng, Dominating Sets and Domination Polynomials of Paths, *Int. J. Math. Math. Sci.* **2009** (2009), Art. ID 542040.
- [2] Saeid Alikhani and Yee-hock Peng, Dominating sets and domination polynomials of certain graphs, II, *Opuscula Math.* **30**, 37–51 (2010).
- [3] Saeid Alikhani and Yee-hock Peng, Introduction to Domination Polynomial of a Graph, *Ars Combin.* **114** (2014), 257–266.
- [4] Jorge L. Arocha and Bernardo Llano, The number of dominating k -sets of paths, cycles and wheels, arXiv:1601.01268v1 (2016).
- [5] Iain Angus Cameron Beaton, Domination polynomials: a brief survey and analysis, Master’s Thesis at Dalhousie University, <https://dalspace.library.dal.ca/handle/10222/73123>, (2017).
- [6] Iain Angus Cameron Beaton, On Dominating Sets and the Domination Polynomial, Ph.D. Thesis at Dalhousie University, <https://dalspace.library.dal.ca/handle/10222/80765> (2021).
- [7] Iain Beaton and Jason I. Brown, On the Unimodality of Domination Polynomials, *Graphs Combin.* **38** (2022), Paper No. 90.
- [8] Amanda Burcroff and Grace O’Brien, Unimodality and monotonic portions of certain domination polynomials, *Discrete Math.* **346** (2023), Paper No. 113508.
- [9] Teresa W. Haynes, Stephen T. Hedetniemi and Peter J. Slater, Fundamentals of domination in graphs, *Monogr. Textbooks Pure Appl. Math.* **208**, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1998.
- [10] Audin Medona and S Christilda, Dominating sets and domination polynomials of cubic paths, *J. Pure Appl. Math.* **6** (2022), 32–35.
- [11] A. Vijayan and K. Lal Gipson, Dominating Sets and Domination Polynomials of Square of Paths, *Open Journal of Discrete Mathematics* **3** (2013), 60–69.
- [12] Shengtong Zhang, Domination polynomial is unimodal for large graphs with a universal vertex, arXiv:2111.00641 (2021).