Annals of Pure and Applied Mathematics Vol. 10, No.1, 2015, 49-58 ISSN: 2279-087X (P), 2279-0888(online) Published on 22 April 2015 www.researchmathsci.org

# Results on $\beta_M$ -Excellent Graphs

J. Joseline Manora<sup>1</sup> and B. John<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>PG & Research Department of Mathematics, T.B.M.L College, Porayar,Nagapattinam Dt., Tamilnadu, India <sup>2</sup>Department of Science and Humanities E.G.S.Pillay Engineering College Nagapattinam Dt., Tamilnadu, India Corresponding author. Email: johnvisle@gmail.com

Received 19 February 2015; accepted 1April 2015

Abstract. A graph G is  $\beta_M$ -excellent if every vertex of G is contained in a maximal majority independent set of a graph G. In this paper, we study some standard graphs G which are  $\beta_M$ -excellent and not  $\beta_M$ -excellent graphs. Also we have obtained some results on  $\beta_M$ -excellent graphs in the case of a Cartesian product, generalization of Petersen graph and trees.

*Keywords:* Majority independence number- $\beta_M(G)$ ,  $\beta_M$  excellent graphs

### AMS Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 05C69

### 1. Introduction

Claude Berge in 1980, introduced B graphs. These are graphs in which every vertex in the graph is contained in a maximum independent set of the graph. Fircke et al. [1] in 2002 made a beginning of the study of graphs which are excellent with respect to various parameters.  $\gamma$  -excellent trees and total domination excellent trees have been studied in [1].Also Sridharan and Yamuna [9]made an extensive work in this area. Swaminathan and Pushpalatha have defined  $\beta_o$ -excellent graphs, just  $\beta_o$ -excellent graphs and very  $\beta_o$ -excellent graphs and they have made a detailed study in this paper [8].

By a graph *G*, we mean a finite, simple graph which is undirected and nontrivial. Let G = (V, E) be a graph of order p and size q. For every vertex  $v \in V(G)$ , the open neighbourhood  $N(v) = \{ u \in V(G) / uv \in E(G) \}$  and the closed neighbourhood  $N[v] = N(v) \bigcup \{v\}$ . Let *S* be a set of vertices, and let  $u \in S$ . The private neighbour set of *u* with respect to *S* is  $pn[u, S] = \{v / N[v] \cap S = \{u\}\}$ 

**Definition 1.1. [2]** A set D of vertices in a graph G is called an independent set if no two vertices in D are adjacent. An independent set D is called a maximal independent set if

any vertex set properly containing D is not independent. The independence number  $\beta_o(G)$  is the maximum cardinality of a maximal independent set in G. Let G = (V, E) be a simple graph. Let  $u \in V(G)$ . The vertex u is said to be  $\beta_o$ -good if u is contained in a  $\beta_o$ -set of G. The vertex u is said to be  $\beta_o$ -bad if there exists no  $\beta_o$ -set of G containing u [8].

**Definition 1.2.** [4] A set S of vertices of a graph G is said to be a Majority Independent set(or MI-set) if it induces a totally disconnected subgraph with  $|N[S]| \ge \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil$  and  $|pn[v,S]| > |N[S]| - \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil$  for every  $v \in S$ . If any vertex set S properly containing S is not majority independent. Then S is called Maximal Majority Independent set. The minimum cardinality of a maximal majority independent set is called lower majority independent of G and it is also called Independent Majority Demination number

independence number of Gand it is also called Independent Majority Domination number of G. It is denoted by  $i_M(G)$ . The maximum cardinality of a maximal majority independent set of G is called Majority Independence number of G and it is denoted by  $\beta_M(G)$ . A  $\beta_M$ -set is a maximum cardinality of a maximal majority independent set of G. This parameter has been studied by Swaminathan and Joseline Manora.

#### 2. Majority independence number of some graphs

We have determined  $\beta_M(G)$  for several standard graphs in [4]. Here we consider some classes of graphs which are needed for our study and compute its  $\beta_M(G)$ .

1. Let 
$$G = P_p$$
,  $p \ge 2$ . Then  $\beta_M(G) = \begin{cases} \left| \frac{p}{4} \right| & \text{if } p \le 6. \\ \left[ \frac{p-2}{4} \right] & \text{if } p > 6. \end{cases}$   
2. Let  $G = K_{1,p-1}$ ,  $p \ge 2$ . Then  $\beta_M(G) = \left\lfloor \frac{p-1}{2} \right\rfloor$ .  
3. Let  $G = W_p$ ,  $p \ge 5$ . Then  $\beta_M(G) = \left\lceil \frac{p-2}{6} \right\rceil$ .  
4. Let  $G = D_{r,s}$ ,  $r, s \ge 2$ . Then  $\beta_M(G) = \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} r & \text{if } r = s, \ p = r + s + 2 \\ \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil - 1 & \text{if } r < s. \end{cases}$   
5. Let  $G = \overline{K_p}$ ,  $p \ge 2$  Then  $\beta_M(G) = \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil$ .

### 3. $\beta_M$ -Excellency on some standard graphs

**Definition 3.1.** [3] Let G = (V, E) be a simple graph. Let  $u \in V(G)$ . The vertex u is said to be  $\beta_M$ -good if u is contained in a  $\beta_M$ -set of G. The vertex u is said to be  $\beta_M$ -bad if there exists no  $\beta_M$ -set of G containing u. A graph G is said to be  $\beta_M$ -excellent if every vertex of G is  $\beta_M$ -good.

**Example 3.2.** In the following graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ ,



#### Figure 1:

The vertices  $v_1$ ,  $v_6$ ,  $v_7$ ,  $v_8$  and  $v_9$  are  $\beta_M$ -bad vertices in  $G_1$ .  $\therefore$   $G_1$  is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

All vertices are  $\beta_M$  -good vertices in  $G_2$ . Therefore,  $G_2$  is  $\beta_M$  -excellent.

# Results 3.3. Some standard $\beta_{M}$ -excellent graphs

- 1.  $K_p, p \ge 2$  is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.
- 2.  $C_p, p \ge 3$  is  $\beta_M$  -excellent.
- 3.  $K_{m,n}$  is  $\beta_M$  -excellent if m = n.
- 4.  $\overline{K_{p}}$  is a  $\beta_{M}$  -excellent graph.
- 5. The tri-partite graph  $K_{m,n,r}$  is  $\beta_M$ -excellent if m=n=r otherwise not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.
- 6. Let  $G = C_n \square C_m$ ,  $m \ge 3$ . Then the Torus is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

# Results 3.4. Some examples for not $\beta_{M}$ -excellent graphs

- 1.  $K_{1,p-1}, p \ge 4$  is not  $\beta_M$  -excellent.
- 2. Let  $G = P_n \Box P_m$ ,  $n, m \ge 2$ . Then the Grid graph is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.
- 3. The Wounded spider and a binary tree are not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.
- 4. The Caterpillar is not  $\beta_M$  -excellent.
- 5.  $K_{m,n}$ , m < n is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

6. If 
$$G = D_{rs}$$
,  $r, s \ge 1$ , then G is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Theorem 3.5.** [4] Let G be a cycle of p vertices,  $p \ge 3$ . Then  $\beta_M(G) = \left| \frac{p}{6} \right|$ .

**Theorem 3.6.** If  $G = C_p$ ,  $p \ge 3$ , then G is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Proof:** When p = 3, 4, 5, 6. Since  $\beta_M(G) = \left\lceil \frac{p}{6} \right\rceil$ , every single vertex is a  $\beta_M$ -set and all vertices are  $\beta_M$ -good. Then G is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Case (i):** When p = (n+6),  $n = 1, 2, ..., 6 \Rightarrow p = 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12$ . Since

 $\beta_{M}(G) = \left\lceil \frac{p}{6} \right\rceil, \ \beta_{M} \text{-sets are } \left\{ v_{i}, v_{i+3 \pmod{p}} ; i=1, ..., p \right\}. \text{ All vertices of } G \text{ belong to any one of the } \beta_{M} \text{-sets of } G \therefore G \text{ is } \beta_{M} \text{-excellent.}$ Case (ii): When  $p = (n+6), n=7, 8, ..., 12 \Rightarrow p=13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18.$  Since  $\beta_{M}(G) = \left\lceil \frac{p}{6} \right\rceil = 3, \beta_{M} \text{-sets are } \left\{ v_{i}, v_{i+3 \pmod{p}}, v_{i+6 \pmod{p}} ; i=1, 2, ..., p \right\}.$ Case (iii): When  $p = (n+6), n=13, 14, ..., 18 \Rightarrow p=19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24.$  Since  $\beta_{M}(G) = \left\lceil \frac{p}{6} \right\rceil = 4, \beta_{M} \text{-sets are}$   $\left\{ v_{i}, v_{i+3 \pmod{p}}, v_{i+6 \pmod{p}}, v_{i+9 \pmod{p}} ; i=1, 2, ..., p \right\}.$ 

In general, when p = (n-5), (n-4), ..., n. Since  $\beta_M$  -sets of G consist of  $\left| \frac{p}{6} \right|$ vertices,  $\beta_M$  -sets are  $\left\{ v_i, v_{i+3 \pmod{p}}, v_{i+6 \pmod{p}}, ..., v_{i+3 r \pmod{p}} \right\}$ ; i = 1, 2, ..., p and  $r = 0, 1, 2, ..., \left\lceil \frac{p}{6} \right\rceil - 1 \right\}$ .

: All vertices in G are  $\beta_M$ -good. Hence  $G = C_p$ ,  $p \ge 3$  is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

### 4. Results on $\beta_M$ -excellent graphs

**Proposition 4.1.** If  $G \neq K_p$  has a full degree vertex and all other vertices are of degree  $< \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil - 1$ , then G is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Definition 4.2.** [6] If the degree of a vertex  $v \in V(G)$  satisfies the condition

 $d(v) \ge \left|\frac{p}{2}\right| - 1$ , then the vertex v is called a majority dominating vertex of G.

**Observation 4.3.** If G has all vertices of majority dominating vertices then G is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Proposition 4.4.** Suppose G has a majority dominating vertex, then G is not  $\beta_M$  - excellent.

**Proof:** Suppose G has a majority dominating vertex u and other vertices of degree  $d(v_i) < \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil - 1$ , i = 1, 2, ..., p - 1. Then u is a  $\beta_M$ -bad vertex and  $v_i$ , i = 1, 2, ..., p - 1 are  $\beta_M$ -good vertices.  $\therefore$  G is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Theorem 4.5.** Suppose G has  $pC_{\lceil \frac{p}{2} \rceil} - \beta_M$  sets. Then G is  $\beta_M$ -excellent if and only if  $G = \overline{K_n}$ .

**Proof:** Assume that *G* is  $\beta_M$ -excellent  $\Rightarrow$  All vertices of *G* are  $\beta_M$ -good  $\Rightarrow$  All vertices of *V*(*G*) must belong to any one of the majority independent set of *G*. Since *G* has  $pC_{\left[\frac{p}{2}\right]} - \beta_M$  sets, each majority independent set *D* contains  $\left[\frac{p}{2}\right]$  vertices and also each

 $\beta_M$ -set is a combination of  $\left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil$  vertices of V(G). Then, each  $\beta_M$ -set consists of only isolates of G and  $|D| = \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil$ .  $\therefore$  The graph is disconnected with isolates.

Suppose  $G = K_2 \bigcup \overline{K_{p-2}}$ , then *G* contains exactly one edge and others are isolates. In *G*, every maximal majority independent set *D* contains only isolates and the combination of  $\left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil$  vertices of  $\overline{K_{p-2}}$  is also a  $\beta_M$ -set of *G*. Thus, we have obtained that there are  $(p-2)C_{\left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil}\beta_M$ -sets for the graph *G* and vertices of  $K_2$  are  $\beta_M$ -bad vertices. It gives a contradiction. Hence, if *G* is  $\beta_M$ -excellent with  $pC_{\left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil} - \beta_M$  sets then  $G = \overline{K_p}$ . The converse is obvious.

**Theorem 4.6.** Let  $G=P_p$ ,  $p \ge 2$ . Then (i) G is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent if p=5,6.

(ii) G is  $\beta_M$  -excellent if p < 13.

(iii) Let  $p \ge 13$ . If  $p \equiv 1, 2, 5, 6 \pmod{8}$ , G is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

(iv) If  $p \equiv 0,3,4,7 \pmod{8}$  and  $p \ge 15$ , G is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Proposition 4.7.** If a tree T with more than two pendants with  $p \ge 4$ , then T is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Proof:** Let *e* be the number of pendants in *T*. If *T* has p = 4 and e = 3 pendants then  $T = K_{1,3}$ . Suppose *T* has p = 5 and e = 4 pendants, then  $T = K_{1,4}$  or *T* has an induced subgraph  $K_{1,3}$ . With the same argument, Suppose *T* has (p-1) vertices and  $3 \le e \le (p-2)$  pendants, then  $T = K_{1,p-2}$  or *T* has an induced subgraph of  $K_{1,e}$ , where  $3 \le e \le (p-3)$ . If *T* has *p* vertices and  $3 \le e \le (p-1)$  pendants then  $T = K_{1,p-1}$  or *T* has an induced subgraph of  $K_{1,e}$ , where  $3 \le e \le (p-3)$ . If *T* has *p* vertices and  $3 \le e \le (p-2)$ . By result (3.4.1), we found that every  $K_{1,p-1}$ ,  $p \ge 4$  is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent. Hence, the tree *T* with more than two pendants is not a  $\beta_M$ -excellent graph.

**Corollary 4.8.** If a tree T has a vertex v with  $d(v) \ge 3$  then T is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Definition 4.9.** [8] For each  $n \ge 3$  and 0 < k < n, P(n,k) denotes the generalized Petersen graph with vertex set  $V(G) = \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_n, v_1, v_2, ..., v_n\}$  and the edge set  $E(G) = \{u_i u_{i+1 \pmod{n}}, u_i v_i, v_i v_{i+k \pmod{n}}\}, 1 \le i \le n$ .

**Theorem 4.10.** Let G be a generalization of Petersen graph P(n,k) with  $k=1, n\geq 3$ .

Then 
$$\beta_M(G) = \begin{cases} \left\lceil \frac{p-4}{4} \right\rceil & \text{if } n < 7 \\ \left\lceil \frac{p}{7} \right\rceil & \text{if } n = 7 \\ \left\lfloor \frac{p-3}{4} \right\rfloor & \text{if } n \ge 8 \end{cases}$$
 and also  $G = P(n,1)$  is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Proof:** Let G be a generalized Petersen graph P(n,1) with |V(G)|=2n=p vertices. Then G consists of two cycles  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  such that the cycle  $C_1$  with vertex set  $\{v_1, v_2, ..., v_n\}$  is nested by the another cycle  $C_2$  with vertex set  $\{u_1, u_2, ..., u_n\}$  and each  $u_i$  in  $C_2$  is incident with exactly one  $v_i$  in  $C_1$  and  $d(v_i)=d(u_i)=3$ , i=1,2,...,n.

**Case (i):** When n < 7. The maximum majority independent sets are  $\{v_i, u_{i+1 \pmod{n}}\}$ , i = 1, 2, ..., n. Then  $\beta_M(G) = 2 = \left\lceil \frac{p-4}{4} \right\rceil$ , if n < 7.

**Case (ii):** When n = 7. The maximum majority independent sets are

$$\{v_i, u_{i+2 \pmod{n}}, i=1,2,...,7\}$$
  $\therefore \beta_M(G)=2=\left(\frac{p}{7}\right)$ .

**Case (iii):** When  $n \ge 8$ . Let  $D = \{u_1, u_2, ..., u_i\}$ ,  $t = \left\lfloor \frac{p-3}{4} \right\rfloor$  and  $d(u_i, u_j) \ge 2$ ,  $i \ne j$ . Then  $|N[D]| = \sum_{i=1}^{i} (d(u_i)+1) = 4t = 4 \left\lfloor \frac{p-3}{4} \right\rfloor \ge \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil$ . Also, for every  $v \in D$ ,  $|pn[v,D]| \ge |N[D]| - \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil$ . Hence D is a  $\beta_M$ -set of G.  $\therefore \beta_M(G) \ge |D| = \left\lfloor \frac{p-3}{4} \right\rfloor$ . Suppose  $S = \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_r\}$ ,  $r = \left\lfloor \frac{p-3}{4} \right\rfloor + 1$  with  $d(v_i, v_j) \ge 2$ ,  $i \ne j$ . But  $|pn[v,S]| \le |N[S]| - \left\lceil \frac{p}{2} \right\rceil$ , for any  $v \in S$ .  $\therefore S$  is not a  $\beta_M$ -set of G. Hence  $\beta_M(G) < |S| = \left\lfloor \frac{p-3}{4} \right\rfloor + 1 \Longrightarrow \beta_M(G) \le \left\lfloor \frac{p-3}{4} \right\rfloor$ . Therefore  $\beta_M(G) = \left\lfloor \frac{p-3}{4} \right\rfloor$ . The maximum majority independent sets are  $\{v_i, u_{i+1(\text{mod }n)}, v_{i+2(\text{mod }n)}, u_{i+3(\text{mod }n)}, \dots\}$ ,  $\{u_i, v_{i+1(\text{mod }n)}, u_{i+2(\text{mod }n)}, v_{i+3(\text{mod }n)}, \dots\}$ , i=1, 2, ..., n. In all the above cases, all vertices of V(G) are  $\beta_M$ -good. Hence G = P(n, 1) is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Remark 4.11.** We have determined that the most popular regular graphs such as complete graph, cycle, generalization of Petersen graph and  $K_{m,n}$  if m=n are  $\beta_M$  excellent graphs. But all regular graphs are not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Example 4.12.** This graph  $G_3$  is a cubic graph. Here  $\{v_1, v_2, v_5, v_7, v_9, v_{11}, v_{13}, v_{16}\}$  are  $\beta_M$  -good vertices and  $\{v_3, v_4, v_6, v_8, v_{10}, v_{12}, v_{14}, v_{15}\}$  are  $\beta_M$  -bad vertices. Therefore  $G_3$  is not  $\beta_M$  -excellent.

J.Joseline Manora and B.John



**Theorem 4.13.** Let *H* be a graph without pendants. Then  $\overline{K_p} \Box H$  is  $\beta_M$ -excellent if and only if *H* is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Proof:** Let *H* be a  $\beta_M$ -excellent graph. Let  $\{u_1, u_2, ..., u_q\}$  be the vertices of *H*. The construction of  $\overline{K_p} \square H$  is the graph of *H* in *p* times. Since all vertices of *H* are  $\beta_M$ -good, all vertices of the graph  $\overline{K_p} \square H$  are  $\beta_M$ -good. Therefore,  $\overline{K_p} \square H$  is  $\beta_M$ -excellent. Suppose *H* is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent then any vertex  $u \in V(H)$  is not contained in any  $\beta_M$ -set of *H*. Suppose *S* is a  $\beta_M$ -set of  $\overline{K_p} \square H$  containing (v, u) for some  $v \in V(\overline{K_p})$ , then *S* is of the form  $V(\overline{K_p}) \times A$ , where *A* is a  $\beta_M$ -set of *H*. Therefore  $u \in A$ , which is a contradiction.

**Theorem 4.14.** Let *H* be a graph without pendants. Then  $K_n \Box H$  is  $\beta_M$ -excellent if and only if *H* is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Proposition 4.15.** Let  $G = P_2 \Box P_m$ . Then  $\beta_M(G) = \begin{cases} \left\lfloor \frac{p}{4} \right\rfloor & \text{if } p \le 10 \\ \left\lfloor \frac{p-4}{4} \right\rfloor & \text{if } p > 10 \end{cases}$ 

**Theorem 4.16.** If  $G = P_2 \square P_m$ , then the following results are true in G.

- (i) When m=2,3,5, G is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.
- (ii) When m=4, G is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.
- (iii) When m > 6 and m is odd, G is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.
- (iv) If *m* is even and  $m \ge 6$ , *G* is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Proof:** Let  $G = P_2 \square P_m$ . Here  $\Delta(G) = 3$  and  $\delta(G) = 2$ . Then  $V(P_2) = (u_1, u_2)$  and  $V(P_m) = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_m\}$ .

**Case** (i): When m=2,3. Then every vertex in G is a  $\beta_M$ -set of  $G \, \therefore \, G$  is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

When m=5. The  $\beta_{M}$ -sets are  $(u_{1}v_{1}, u_{2}v_{i+1}), (u_{2}v_{1}, u_{1}v_{i+1}), i=1,2,3,4$ . Also,  $(u_{1}v_{1}, u_{1}v_{i+2})$  and  $(u_{2}v_{1}, u_{2}v_{i+2}), i=1,2,3$ . Hence G is  $\beta_{M}$ -excellent.

**Case (ii):** When m=4. The  $\beta_M$ -sets are  $(u_1v_1, u_2v_{i+2}), (u_2v_1, u_1v_{i+2}), i=1, 2$  and also  $(u_1v_1, u_1v_4), (u_2v_1, u_2v_4)$ . In  $V(G), (u_1v_i), (u_2v_i), i=2, 3$  are  $\beta_M$ -bad vertices of  $G \therefore G$  is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Case (iii):** When m > 6 and m is odd. Here, there are some  $\beta_M$ -bad vertices such as  $(u_1 v_i), (u_2 v_i), i = 4, 5, ...$  The remaining vertices are  $\beta_M$ -good vertices. Hence G is not  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

**Case (iv):**  $m \ge 6$  and *m* is even. When m = 6, i = 1, 2, 3, 4. Then the  $\beta_M$ -sets are  $(u_1v_1, u_2v_{i+2}), (u_1v_1, u_1v_{i+2}), (u_2v_1, u_1v_{i+2}), (u_2v_1, u_2v_{i+2}).$ 

When m=8, i=1,2,3,4. The  $\beta_M$ -sets are  $(u_1v_1, u_2v_{i+2}, u_2v_{i+4})$ ,  $(u_1v_1, u_1v_{i+2}, u_1v_{i+4})$ ,  $(u_2v_1, u_1v_{i+2}, u_1v_{i+4})$ ,  $(u_2v_1, u_2v_{i+2}, u_2v_{i+4})$ .

In general, m > 8, i=1,2,3,4. The  $\beta_M$ -sets are  $(u_1v_1, u_2v_{i+2}, u_2v_{i+4}, ...)$ ,  $(u_1v_1, u_1v_{i+2}, u_1v_{i+4}, ...)$ ,  $(u_2v_1, u_1v_{i+2}, u_1v_{i+4}, ...)$ ,

 $(u_2 v_1, u_2 v_{i+2}, u_2 v_{i+4}, ...)$ . Since every vertex of *G* belongs to any  $\beta_M$ -set of *G*. Hence *G* is  $\beta_M$ -excellent.

### REFERENCES

- 1. G.H.Fricke, T.W.Haynes, S.T.Hadetniemi, S.M.Hedetniemi and R.C.Laskar, Excellent trees, *Bull. Inst. Combin. Appl.*, 34 (2002) 27-38.
- T.W.Haynes, S.T.Hedetniemi and P.J.Slater, Fundamentals of domination in graphs, Marcel Dekkar, New York, 1998.
- 3. J.JoselineManora and B.John,  $\beta_M(G)$  -excellent graphs, *Proceedings of the International Conference on Jamal Research Journal: An Interdisciplinary (Special Issue)*, (2015) 513-517.
- 4. J.Joseline Manora and B.John, Majority independence number of a graph, *International Journal of Mathematical Research*, 6(1) (2014) 65-74.
- 5. J.Joseline Manora and I.Paulrajjaya simman, Neighborhood sets and neighborhood polynomials of cycles, *Annals of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 7(2) (2014) 45-51.

- 6. J.Joseline Manora and V.Swaminathan, Results on majority dominating set, *Science Magna*, 7(3) (2011) 53-58.
- 7. J.Joseline Manora and S.Veeramanikandan, The split majority domination number of a graph, *Annals of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 9(1) (2015) 13-22.
- 8. A.P.Pushpalatha, G.Jothilakshmi, S.Suganthi and V.Swaminathan,  $\beta_o$  -excellent graphs, WSEAS Transaction on Mathematics, 10(2) (2011).
- 9. N.Sridharan and M.Yamuna, A note on excellent graphs, *ARS Combinatoria*, 78 (2006) 267-276.