## Corrigendum to: The damage number of the Cartesian product of graphs

Melissa A. Huggan

Department of Mathematics Vancouver Island University Nanaimo, BC, Canada

M.E. Messinger Amanda Porter

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science Mount Allison University Sackville, NB, Canada

## Abstract

In a recent paper [M.A. Huggan, M.E. Messinger, A. Porter, The damage number of the Cartesian product of graphs, *Australas. J. Combin.* 88 (2024), 362–384], the authors used an incorrect definition which then had implications to a few new theorems. In this corrigendum, we note the appropriate definition, and how it affects the statements, proofs, and a few discussion items.

The terms o-dominate and c-dominate, as defined below, were used throughout [4].

**Definition 1** ([2]). A vertex u of a graph G is *o*-dominated if there exists a vertex  $v \in V(G)$  such that  $N(u) \subseteq N(v)$ . A vertex u of a graph G is *c*-dominated if there exists a vertex  $v \in V(G)$  such that  $N[u] \subseteq N[v]$ .

In [4], the following definition of *dominated* should have been used instead of *o*-dominated in several instances which we highlight below.

**Definition 2** ([3]). A vertex u of a graph G is *dominated* if there exists a vertex  $v \in V(G)$  such that  $N(u) \subseteq N[v]$ . In such a case, we say that v dominates u.

On page 372 of [4], we discuss the relationship between dominated vertices in trees T and T'; and dominated vertices in the Cartesian product. It should read that if a vertex occupied by the cop dominates a vertex occupied by the robber in T and T', then in the Cartesian product,  $T\Box T'$ , the cop will *o*-dominate the vertex occupied by the robber.

In the following theorem, the change is from  $s \ o$ -dominating w, to s dominating w.

**Theorem 3.5.** For a graph G, dmg(G) = 1 if and only if rad(G) = 2 and a center of the graph  $c \in V(G)$  is such that for all  $w \in V(G) \setminus N[c]$  there exists  $s \in N[c]$  such that s dominates w.

In the proof of Theorem 3.5, the neighbourhood of s should be closed. In symbols, N(s) should be N[s]. Any mention of o-dominates, becomes dominates.

In the discussion immediately after the proof of Theorem 3.5, we consider a situation where a vertex s o-dominates w, where in fact, it should be that s dominates w. We note that for the class of graphs with cop number 2, a characterization for damage number 1 graphs was given by Carlson et al. [1] in the context of throttling.

The changes to Theorem 3.9 are that G cannot have damage number 1, which previously was implicitly assumed, and condition 2 changed from o-dominates to dominates. Again, in the proof, the only change is o-dominates becomes dominates.

**Theorem 3.9.** Let G be a graph with rad(G) = 2 or rad(G) = 3, and  $dmg(G) \neq 1$ . Then dmg(G) = 2 if and only if there exist vertices  $z, y \in V(G)$  and  $s_y \in N[z]$  such that

- 1.  $dist_G(z, y) \in \{2, 3\}$ , and
- 2. no vertex in N[z] dominates y, and
- 3.  $\forall x \in N(y) \setminus N[s_y], \exists s_x \in N[s_y] and v \in N[s_x] such that$

 $N(x) \setminus \{y\} \subseteq N[s_x] \text{ and } N(y) \setminus \{x\} \subseteq N[v];$ 

and for all  $w \in V(G) \setminus \{y\}$  such that  $\operatorname{dist}_G(z, w) \in \{2, 3\}$ , the above three conditions apply; or the conditions for  $\operatorname{dmg}(G) = 1$  apply.

## References

- J. Carlson, R. Eagleton, J. Geneson, J. Petrucci, C. Reinhart and P. Sen, The damage throttling number of a graph, Australas. J. Combin. 80 (2021), 361–385.
- [2] N. E. Clarke and R. J. Nowakowski, Tandem-win graphs, *Discrete Math.* 299 (2005), 56–64.
- [3] E. Dahlhaus, P. Hammer, F. Maffray and S. Olariu, On domination elimination orderings and domination graphs, In: *Graph-Theoretic Concepts in Computer Science*, (Eds.: E.W. Mayr, G. Schmidt and G. Tinhofer), pp. 81–92, Berlin, Heidelberg (1995), Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [4] M. A. Huggan, M. E. Messinger and A. Porter, The damage number of the Cartesian product of graphs, Australas. J. Combin. 88(3) (2024), 362–384.