

# **$t$ -Pebbling in $k$ -connected graphs with a universal vertex**

Liliana Alcón 

Marisa Gutierrez 

Glenn Hurlbert

## **Abstract**

The  $t$ -pebbling number is the smallest integer  $m$  so that any initially distributed supply of  $m$  pebbles can place  $t$  pebbles on any target vertex via pebbling moves. The 1-pebbling number of diameter 2 graphs is well-studied. Here we investigate the  $t$ -pebbling number of diameter 2 graphs under the lens of connectivity.

## **1 Introduction**

Graph pebbling models the transportation of consumable resources. It has an interesting history, with many challenging open problems, and with applications to zero-sum theory in abelian groups. Calculating pebbling numbers of graphs is a well known computationally difficult problem. See [4, 5] for more background.

A *configuration*  $C$  of pebbles on the vertices of a connected graph  $G$  is a function  $C : V(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  (the nonnegative integers), so that  $C(v)$  counts the number of pebbles placed on the vertex  $v$ . We write  $|C|$  for the size  $\sum_v C(v)$  of  $C$ ; i.e. the number of pebbles in the configuration. A

---

2000 AMS Subject Classification: 05C40, 05C75, 05C87 and 05C99.

Key Words and Phrases: graph pebbling, pebbling number, connectivity.

*pebbling step* from a vertex  $u$  to one of its neighbors  $v$  reduces  $C(u)$  by two and increases  $C(v)$  by one. Given a specified *root* vertex  $r$  we say that  $C$  is *t-fold r-solvable* if some sequence of pebbling steps starting from  $C$  places  $t$  pebbles on  $r$ . We are concerned with determining  $\pi_t(G, r)$ , the minimum positive integer  $m$  such that every configuration of size  $m$  on the vertices of  $G$  is *t-fold r-solvable*. The *t-pebbling number* of  $G$  is defined to be  $\pi_t(G) = \max_{r \in V(G)} \pi_t(G, r)$ . We omit  $t$  when  $t = 1$ . Clearly,  $\pi_t(G) \leq t\pi(G)$ .

Pebbling number of diameter 2 graphs was solved and characterized by the following theorem. For the purpose of the present work, it is enough to know that a pyramidal graph has no *universal* vertex (a vertex adjacent to every other vertex) and has connectivity 2.

**Theorem 1.** [2, 6] *For a diameter 2 graph  $G$  with connectivity  $k$  and  $n$  vertices,  $\pi(G) = n + 1$  if and only if  $k = 1$  or  $G$  is pyramidal. Otherwise (i.e.  $k = 2$  and  $G$  is not pyramidal, or  $k \geq 3$ ),  $\pi(G) = n$ .*

In contrast, other than the following bound, little is known about the *t*-pebbling number of diameter 2 graphs.

**Theorem 2.** [3] *If  $G$  is a diameter 2 graph on  $n$  vertices then  $\pi_t(G) \leq \pi(G) + 4t - 4$ . Moreover,  $\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \pi_t(G)/t = 4$ .*

The goal of the present paper is to determine the exact *t*-pebbling number of a large subfamily of diameter 2 graphs by considering their connectivity. Define  $\mathcal{G}(n, k)$  to be the set of all  $k$ -connected graphs on  $n$  vertices having a universal vertex. Set  $f_t(n, k) = n + 4t - k - 2$  and  $h_t(n) = n + 2t - 2$ . Notice that  $h_t(n) \geq f_t(n, k)$  if and only if  $k \geq 2t$ . Define  $p_t(n, k) = \max\{f_t(n, k), h_t(n)\}$ . The main result is the following theorem which is proved in Section 3.

**Theorem 3.** *If  $G \in \mathcal{G}(n, k)$  then  $\pi_t(G) = p_t(n, k)$ .*

We observe from our result that, for any fixed  $t$ , in the family of graphs with universal vertex, there are graphs whose *t*-pebbling number is much

lower than the bound given by Theorem 2, and also that there are graphs reaching that bound: when  $k \geq 2t$  we have  $\pi_t(n, k) = (n+4t-4)-2(t-1)$ ; when  $k < 2t$   $\pi_t(n, k) = (n+4t-4)-(k-2)$ .

It will be useful to take advantage of the following version of Menger's Theorem ([7], exercise 4.2.28).

**Theorem 4. (Menger's Theorem)** [7] *Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -connected graph and  $S = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$  be a multiset of vertices of  $G$ . For any  $r \notin S$  there are  $k$  pairwise-internally-disjoint paths, one from each  $v_i$  to  $r$ .*

## 2 Technical Lemmas

We begin with a lemma that is used to prove lower bounds on the pebbling number of a graph by helping to show that certain configurations are unsolvable.

For a vertex  $v$ , define its *open neighborhood*  $N(v)$  to be the set of vertices adjacent to  $v$ , and its *closed neighborhood*  $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$ . We say that a vertex  $y$  is a *junior sibling* of a vertex  $x$  (or, more simply, *junior to*  $x$ ) if  $N(y) \subseteq N[x]$ , and that  $y$  is a *junior* if it is junior to some vertex  $x$ .

**Lemma 5. (Junior Removal Lemma)** [1] *Given the graph  $G$  with root  $r$  and  $t$ -fold  $r$ -solvable configuration  $C$ , suppose that  $y \neq r$  is a junior with  $C(y) = 0$ . Then  $C$  (restricted to  $G - y$ ) is  $t$ -fold  $r$ -solvable in  $G - y$ .*

Given a configuration  $C$  of pebbles, we say that a path  $Q = (r, q_1, \dots, q_j)$  with  $j \geq 1$  is a *slide* from  $q_j$  to  $r$  if no  $q_i$  is empty and  $q_j$  has at least two pebbles.

A *potential move* is a pair of pebbles sitting on the same vertex. To say that  $C$  has  $j$  potential moves means that the  $j$  pairs are pairwise disjoint. For example, any configuration on 5 vertices with values 0, 1, 1, 2, and 7 has 4 potential moves. The *potential* of  $C$ ,  $\text{pot}(C)$ , is the maximum  $j$  for which  $C$  has  $j$  potential moves; i.e.,  $\text{pot}(C) = \sum_{v \in V} \lfloor (C(v)/2) \rfloor$ . Because every solution that requires a pebbling move uses a potential move, the following fact is evident.

**Fact 6.** *If  $C$  is a configuration with  $C(r) + \text{pot}(C) < t$  then  $C$  is not  $t$ -fold  $r$ -solvable.*

Basic counting yields the following lemma.

**Lemma 7. (Potential Lemma)** *Let  $G$  be a graph on  $n$  vertices. If  $C$  is a configuration on  $G$  of size  $n + y$  ( $y \geq 0$ ) having  $z$  zeros, then  $\text{pot}(C) \geq \lceil \frac{y+z}{2} \rceil$ .*

A nice application of the Potential Lemma is the following result, which we will use repeatedly in the arguments that follow.

**Lemma 8. (Slide Lemma)** *Let  $r$  be a vertex of a  $k$ -connected graph  $G$ . Let  $C$  be a configuration on  $G$  of size  $n + y$  ( $y \geq 0$ ) with  $z$  zeros. If  $\lceil \frac{y+3z}{2} \rceil \leq k$  then  $C$  is  $\lceil \frac{y+z}{2} \rceil$ -fold  $r$ -solvable.*

**Proof.** Set  $p = \lceil \frac{y+z}{2} \rceil$ . By Lemma 7 we can choose a set  $P$  of  $p$  potential moves. Note that the hypothesis implies that  $p \leq k - z$ . Delete all non-root zeros to obtain  $G'$ . Since  $G$  is  $k$ -connected,  $G'$  is  $p$ -connected. Thus Menger's Theorem 4 implies that there are  $p$  pair-wise disjoint slides in  $G'$  from  $P$  to  $r$ , which implies that  $C$  is  $p$ -fold  $r$ -solvable.  $\square$

### 3 Proof of Theorem 3

The proof will follow from Lemmas 9 and 10, below. Let  $u$  be a universal vertex of a graph  $G \in \mathcal{G}(n, k)$ . If  $C$  is a configuration of size  $n + 2t - 3$  with  $C(u) = 0$  and every other vertex odd then  $\text{pot}(C) = t - 1$ , and so  $C$  is not  $t$ -fold  $u$ -solvable. Hence  $\pi_t(G, u) \geq n + 2t - 2$ . On the other hand, if  $|C| \geq n + 2t - 2$  then  $\text{pot}(C) \geq t$  when  $u$  is empty, and  $\text{pot}(C) \geq t - 1$  when  $u$  is not; either way  $C$  is  $t$ -fold  $u$ -solvable because  $u$  is universal. Thus  $\pi_t(G, u) = n + 2t - 2$ , which is at most  $p_t(n, k)$  always.

#### 3.1 Lower bound

Clearly,  $\pi_t(G) \geq \pi_t(G, u) = h_t(n)$ . Now let  $r$  be any non-universal vertex of  $G$ , and let  $s$  be a vertex at distance 2 from  $r$ . Let  $X$  be any

$(r, s)$ -cutset of size  $k$  (in particular,  $u \in X$ ) and define the configuration

$\diagdown k^t$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2	0	4	8	12	16	20	24	28
3	0	(3)	7	11	15	19	23	27
4	0	2	6	10	14	18	22	26
5	0	2	(5)	9	13	17	21	26
6	0	2	4	8	12	16	20	24
7	0	2	4	(7)	11	15	19	23
8	0	2	4	6	10	14	18	22
9	0	2	4	6	(9)	13	17	21
10	0	2	4	6	8	12	16	20
11	0	2	4	6	8	(11)	15	19

Figure 1: The values  $m$  for which  $\pi_t(G) = |V(G)| + m$ .

$F_t(n, k)$  by placing 0 on  $r$  and on every vertex in  $X$ ,  $4t - 1$  on  $s$ , and 1 on each vertex of  $V(G) - (X \cup \{r, s\})$ ; then  $|F_t(n, k)| = (4t - 1) + (n - k - 2) = f_t(n, k) - 1$ .

Since the vertices of  $X - \{u\}$  have 0 pebbles and all them are juniors to  $u$ , Lemma 5 states that if  $t$  pebbles can reach  $r$  then  $2t$  pebbles can reach  $u$ . But, with exactly  $2t - 1$  potential moves in  $F$ , by Fact 6, we can place at most  $2t - 1$  pebbles on  $u$ . Therefore  $\pi_t(G, r) \geq f_t(n, k)$ , implying  $\pi_t(G) \geq f_t(n, k)$ .

We record these results as

**Lemma 9.** *For  $G \in \mathcal{G}(n, k)$  we have  $\pi_t(G) \geq p_t(n, k)$ .*

### 3.2 Upper bound

We will prove that any configuration of size  $f_t(n, k)$  when  $k \leq 2t$ , and of size  $h_t(n)$  when  $k \geq 2t$ , is  $t$ -fold  $r$ -solvable for any  $r \in V(G)$ .

**Lemma 10.** *For  $k \geq 2$ , let  $G \in \mathcal{G}(n, k)$  be a graph with a universal vertex  $u$ , and let  $r$  be any root vertex. Then  $\pi_t(G, r) \leq p_t(n, k)$ .*

**Proof.** First note that the lemma is true when  $t = 1$ . Indeed, in this case we have  $k \geq 2t$ , and so  $p_t(n, k) = h_t(n) = n + 2t - 2 = n$ . On the other hand, because no pyramidal graph has a universal vertex, we have from Theorem 1 that  $\pi(G) = n$ , hence  $\pi(G, r) \leq n$ .

In addition, the lemma holds for  $k = 2$ . Indeed, in this case we have  $k \leq 2t$ , and so  $p_t(n, k) = f_t(n, k) = n + 4t - k - 2 = n - 4t - 4$ . Also, we have by Theorem 2 that  $\pi_t(G, r) \leq n + 4t - 4$ .

Hence, we may assume that  $t \geq 2$  and  $k \geq 3$ . Figure 1 shows the structure of this proof. As was noted above, the grey section has been proven before. We continue by proving the dashed-bordered, lower left section and diagonal circled entries together, and then the solid-bordered, upper right section by induction.

#### *Base case.*

We will simultaneously address the case  $k = 2t - 1$  (the circled entries), for which  $|C| = f_t(n, k) = n + 2t - 1$ , and the case  $k \geq 2t$  (the dashed-bordered section), for which  $|C| = h_t(n) = n + 2t - 2$ , by writing  $k \geq 2t - 1$  and considering a configuration of size  $|C| = n + 2t - 2 + \phi$ , where  $\phi = 1$  if  $2t - 1 = k$  and 0 otherwise. The natural idea we leverage here is repeating the argument that increased zeros force increased potential, which, combined with connectivity, yields either more solutions or more zeros.

Let  $x \geq 0$  such that  $k = 2t - 1 + x$ . By Lemma 7, since we may assume that  $C(r) = 0$  (otherwise apply induction on  $t$ ), we have at least  $\lceil(2t-2+1)/2\rceil = t$  potential moves. Therefore, we have at least  $t$  solutions if there are at least  $t$  different slides from them to  $r$ .

Thus we consider the case in which there are at most  $t - 1$  slides; that is, from some of the vertices in which a potential move is sitting, say  $v$ , there is no path to  $r$  without an internal zero after considering the remaining  $t - 1$  slides. Since  $G$  is  $k$ -connected, that implies that  $C$  has at least  $k - (t - 1)$  zeros between  $v$  and  $r$  and so, because of  $r$ ,  $C$  has at least  $k - (t - 1) + 1 = t + 1 + x$  zeros.

Assume that there are exactly  $z = t + 1 + j$  zeros, for some  $j \geq x$ . Then, by Lemma 7,  $C$  has at least

$$\left\lceil \frac{(2t - 2) + (t + 1 + j)}{2} \right\rceil = t + \left\lceil \frac{t - 1 + j}{2} \right\rceil$$

potential moves. If there are at least  $t - \left\lceil \frac{t-1+j}{2} \right\rceil$  slides from them to  $r$ , then we can use those slides for that many solutions. Then, the other  $\left\lceil \frac{t-1+j}{2} \right\rceil$  solutions can be obtained from the remaining  $2 \left\lceil \frac{t-1+j}{2} \right\rceil$  potential moves, putting  $2 \left\lceil \frac{t-1+j}{2} \right\rceil$  pebbles on the universal vertex  $u$  and then  $\left\lceil \frac{t-1+j}{2} \right\rceil$  on  $r$ .

Otherwise, there are at most  $t - \left\lceil \frac{t-1+j}{2} \right\rceil - 1$  slides, from which we find, using  $k = 2t - 1 + x$ , at least

$$k - \left( t - \left\lceil \frac{t - 1 + j}{2} \right\rceil - 1 \right) + 1 = t + x + \left\lceil \frac{t - 1 + j}{2} \right\rceil + 1$$

zeros. Clearly, this number cannot exceed the total number of zeros  $z = t + 1 + j$ ; therefore  $j \geq x + \left\lceil \frac{t-1+j}{2} \right\rceil \geq x + \frac{t-1+j}{2}$ , and so  $j \geq t - 1 + 2x$ .

Let  $j = t - 1 + 2x + i$  for some  $i \geq 0$ ; then  $z = t + 1 + j = t + 1 + t - 1 + 2x + i = 2t + 2x + i$ . Applying Lemma 7 again, there are at least

$$\left\lceil \frac{(2t - 2) + (2t + 2x + i)}{2} \right\rceil = 2t + x - 1 + \lceil i/2 \rceil$$

potential moves.

If either  $x \geq 1$  or  $i \geq 1$ , then we can move  $2t$  pebbles to the universal vertex  $u$ , and then  $t$  to  $r$ .

Hence, we consider the case for which  $x = i = 0$ ; i.e.  $k = 2t - 1$ ,  $z = 2t$ , and  $|C| = n + 2t - 1$  (because  $\phi = 1$  in such a case). We let  $T$  be the star centered on  $u$ , having leaves  $r$  and the nonzero vertices of  $G$ . Clearly,  $T$  is a subgraph of  $G$  with  $n + 2t - 1$  pebbles on it and with either  $2 + (n - z)$  or  $1 + (n - z)$  vertices, depending on whether  $u$  is empty or not. In either case  $n(T) \leq 2 + n - z = 2 + n - 2t$ . Therefore, since

$$\pi_t(T, r) = n(T) + 4t - 3 \leq (2 + n - 2t) + 4t - 3 = n + 2t - 1 = |C(T)|,$$

we see that  $C$  is  $r$ -solvable.

#### *Induction step.*

Finally, we consider the case  $k < 2t - 1$  (the solid-bordered section); so  $|C| = f_t(n, k) = n + 4t - k - 2$ . Since  $2(t - 1) = 2t - 1 - 1 \geq k$ , we have  $\pi_{t-1}(G, r) = f_{t-1}(n, k) = n + 4(t - 1) - k - 2 = n + 4t - k - 2 - 4 = |C| - 4$ . Hence, if  $C$  has a solution of cost at most 4, we are done. Otherwise, there is at most one vertex  $v$  having two or more pebbles, and on such a vertex there are at most 3 pebbles. This implies the contradiction  $|C| \leq 3 + (n - 2)$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

In future work we intend to study  $k$ -connected diameter 2 graphs without a universal vertex, and use that work as a base step toward studying graphs of larger diameter.

## References

- [1] L. Alcón, M. Gutierrez, and G. Hurlbert, *Pebbling in semi-2-trees*, Discrete Math. **340** (2017), 1467–1480.
- [2] T. Clarke, R. Hochberg, and G. Hurlbert, *Pebbling in diameter two graphs and products of paths*, J. Graph Th. **25** (1997), no. 2, 119–128.
- [3] D. Herscovici, B. Hester, and G. Hurlbert,  *$t$ -Pebbling and extensions*, Graphs and Combin. **29** (2013), no. 4, 955–975.
- [4] G. Hurlbert, *General graph pebbling*, Discrete Appl. Math. **161** (2013), 1221–1231.
- [5] G. Hurlbert, *Graph Pebbling*, in Handbook of Graph Theory (2nd ed.), Discrete Mathematics and its Applications, J. Gross, J. Yellen, and P. Zhang, eds., CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2014.
- [6] L. Pachter, H. Snevily, and B. Voxman, *On pebbling graphs*, Congr. Numer. **107** (1995), 65–80.

- [7] D. West, Introduction to Graph Theory (2nd ed.), Pearson, London, 2000.

Liliana Alcón

Centro de Matemática La Plata  
Universidad Nacional de La Plata  
CONICET, Argentina  
[liliana@mate.unlp.edu.ar](mailto:liliana@mate.unlp.edu.ar)

Marisa Gutierrez

Centro de Matemática La Plata  
Universidad Nacional de La Plata  
CONICET, Argentina  
[marisa@mate.unlp.edu.ar](mailto:marisa@mate.unlp.edu.ar)

Glenn Hurlbert

Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
Richmond, Virginia, USA  
[ghurlbert@vcu.edu](mailto:ghurlbert@vcu.edu)