

REVISITING AND IMPROVING UPPER BOUNDS FOR IDENTIFYING CODES*

FLORENT FOUCAUD[†] AND TUOMO LEHTILÄ[‡]

Abstract. An identifying code C of a graph G is a dominating set of G such that any two distinct vertices of G have distinct closed neighborhoods within C . These codes have been widely studied for over two decades. We give an improvement over all the best known upper bounds, some of which have stood for over 20 years, for identifying codes in trees, proving the upper bound of $(n + \ell)/2$, where n is the order and ℓ is the number of leaves (pendant vertices) of the graph. In addition to being an improvement in size, the new upper bound is also an improvement in generality, as it actually holds for bipartite graphs having no twins (pairs of vertices with the same closed or open neighborhood) of degree 2 or greater. We also show that the bound is tight for an infinite class of graphs and that there are several structurally different families of trees attaining the bound. We then use our bound to derive a tight upper bound of $2n/3$ for twin-free bipartite graphs of order n and characterize the extremal examples as 2-corona graphs of bipartite graphs. This is the best possible, as there exist twin-free graphs, and trees with twins, that need $n - 1$ vertices in any of their identifying codes. We also generalize the existing upper bound of $5n/7$ for graphs of order n and girth at least 5 when there are no leaves to the upper bound $\frac{5n+2\ell}{7}$ when leaves are allowed. This is tight for the 7-cycle C_7 and for all stars.

Key words. identifying codes, trees, bipartite graphs, upper bound

MSC codes. 05C69, 05C05

DOI. 10.1137/22M148999X

1. Introduction. An identifying code of a graph is a subset of its vertices that allows us to distinguish all pairs of vertices by means of their neighborhoods within the identifying code. This concept is related to other similar notions that deal with domination-based identification of the vertices/edges of a graph or hypergraph, such as locating-dominating sets [27], separating systems [6, 7], or test covers [24], to name a few. These types of problems have natural applications in fault-detection in networks [22, 28], biological diagnosis [24], or machine learning [8].

A lot of the research in the area has been dedicated to understanding the behavior of these types of problems for graphs of specific graph classes by proving lower and upper bounds on the smallest cardinality of a solution. One of the simplest classes of graphs to consider is the one of trees, and indeed a large number of papers in the area consider identifying codes of trees; see, for example, [1, 4, 5, 11, 17, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27]. We improve and generalize some of these results. As some of the best known bounds

*Received by the editors April 11, 2022; accepted for publication (in revised form) August 16, 2022; published electronically November 9, 2022. A shorter version of the article has been presented at the 11th International Colloquium on Graph Theory and Combinatorics, Montpellier, France, 2022.

<https://doi.org/10.1137/22M148999X>

Funding: The first author's research is supported by the French government IDEX-ISITE initiative 16-IDEX-0001 (CAP 20-25) and by the ANR project GRALMECO (ANR-21-CE48-0004-01). The second author's research is supported by the Finnish Cultural Foundation and by the Academy of Finland grant 338797.

[†]Université Clermont-Auvergne, CNRS, Mines de Saint-Étienne, Clermont-Auvergne-INP, LIMOS, 63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France and University of Orléans, INSA Centre Val de Loire, LIFO EA 4022, F-45067 Orléans Cedex 2, France (florent.foucaud@uca.fr).

[‡]Université Lyon, Université Claude Bernard, CNRS, LIRIS - UMR 5205, F69622, Villeurbanne, France and Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Turku, Turku, Finland (tualeh@utu.fi).

(see Theorem 1), which are tight for some trees, have been around for more than twenty years, it is quite surprising that we manage to improve the upper bound for the smallest size of identifying codes of trees by a notable amount with a quite simple proof. Moreover, our bounds do not only hold for trees but also for larger classes of graphs, in particular, bipartite graphs without twins of degree at least 2. We also apply the new bound to get a new tight bound for graphs of girth at least 5.

Notations and definitions. We consider connected finite undirected graphs on at least three vertices. Let us first define some basic notations. A vertex $u \in V(G)$ is said to be a *leaf*, that is, a pendant vertex, if it has degree 1. A vertex $v \in V(G)$ is said to be a *support vertex* if it is adjacent to a leaf. We denote by $L(G)$ the set of leaves and by $S(G)$ the set of support vertices in graph G . Moreover, we denote the number of leaves and support vertices by $\ell(G) = |L(G)|$ and $s(G) = |S(G)|$, respectively. A graph is *bipartite* if it does not contain any odd cycles, and it has *girth* g if the length of its smallest cycle is g . The *2-corona* $H \circ_2$ of a graph H (defined in [20, section 1.3]) is the graph of order $3|V(H)|$ obtained from H by adding a vertex-disjoint copy of a path P_2 for each vertex v of H and adding an edge joining v to one end of the added path. We define the *k-corona* $H \circ_k$ of H in an analogous way with P_k for any $k \geq 1$.

We denote by $N(v) \subseteq V(G)$ the *open neighborhood* of vertex v and by $N[v] = N(v) \cup \{v\}$ its *closed neighborhood*. If C is a set of vertices, or a *code*, and v a vertex, we denote the intersection between $N[v]$ and code C by the *I-set* of v , $I(C; v) = N[v] \cap C$. When code C is clear from the context, we use $I(v)$. Identifying codes were defined over twenty years ago in [22] by Karpovsky, Chakrabarty, and Levitin, and since then they have been studied in a large number of articles; see [23] for an online bibliography. A set $C \subseteq V(G)$ is called an *identifying code* of G if, for each pair of distinct vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, we have that (i) they are *covered/dominated*, that is, $I(u) \neq \emptyset$ and $I(v) \neq \emptyset$, and (ii) they are *distinguished/separated*, that is, their *I-sets* are distinct, that is,

$$I(u) \neq I(v).$$

The vertices of the code are called *codewords*. Two distinct vertices are *open twins* if their open neighborhoods are the same and *closed twins* if their closed neighborhoods are the same. A graph admits an identifying code if and only if it has no pair of closed twins [22]; in that case we say the graph is *identifiable*. Note that any connected bipartite (in fact, triangle-free) graph is identifiable, with the exception of the complete graph of order 2. We say that a graph is *twin-free* if it contains neither open nor closed twins. Twins are important for identifying codes; indeed closed twins cannot be identified, and for any set of mutually open twins, at most one can be absent from the identifying code. For an identifiable graph G , we denote by $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G)$ the smallest size of an identifying code of G .

Identifying codes and related concepts have been extensively studied for trees; in particular, lower and upper bounds involving the number of leaves and support vertices have been proposed. Among these, the following two (due to Gimbel et al. and Rahbani, Jafari Rad, and MirRezaei) are the currently best known upper bounds.

THEOREM 1 ([17, Theorem 15]). *Let T be a tree on $n \geq 3$ vertices. Then*

$$\gamma^{\text{ID}}(T) \leq \frac{n+2\ell(T)-2}{2}.$$

THEOREM 2 ([26, Theorem 11]). *Let T be a tree on $n \geq 3$ vertices. Then*

$$\gamma^{\text{ID}}(T) \leq \frac{3n+2\ell(T)-1}{5}.$$
 Equality holds if and only if $T = P_4$.

The bound in Theorem 1 is better when the tree has few leaves, while the bound in Theorem 2 is better when there are many leaves. Both bounds are tight for the

4-vertex path P_4 , for which $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(P_4) = 3$. Moreover, Theorem 1 is tight for any path on at least four vertices since $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(P_n) = \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil$ as proved in [3, 17]. However, we will see that tightness only holds for this case and on some trees of odd order with three leaves.

The following bound for graphs of girth at least 5 with no leaves was also proved by Balbuena, Foucaud, and Hansberg.

THEOREM 3 ([2, Theorem 13]). *Let G be a graph of order n and girth at least 5 with minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq 2$. Then $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq 5n/7$.*

Our results. Inspired by the aforementioned results from the literature, we present improved (and tight) upper bounds. Our bounds not only improve on the known results for trees but also hold for a larger class of graphs: bipartite graphs which do not have any twins of degree 2 or greater. Observe that this class of graphs contains, for example, the class of C_4 -free bipartite graphs.

In particular, we show in Theorem 6 that the bound $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq \frac{n+\ell(G)}{2}$ holds for every bipartite graph G of order n which does not have any twins of degree 2 or greater. This bound is never larger than either of the bounds of Theorems 1 or 2. In fact, Theorem 1 is only tight when $\ell(T) \leq 3$. (Otherwise, one can check that our bound is smaller; indeed then we have $\lfloor (n + \ell(T))/2 \rfloor < \lfloor (n + 2\ell(T) - 2)/2 \rfloor$.) The bound of Theorem 2 can be modified into the equivalent form $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(T) \leq (3n - 3\ell(T) - 1)/5 + \ell(T)$. If we similarly modify the bound of Theorem 6 to $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(T) \leq (n - \ell(T))/2 + \ell(T)$, then we can clearly observe the improvement provided by our bound. Moreover, as opposed to the existing bounds, our bound is tight for a very rich class of graphs, in particular, for many trees: paths, stars, and more complicated examples that will be described in section 2.3. Our proof is also rather simple.

We also extend the bound $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq n - s(G)$ (even holding for identifying codes that are also total dominating sets), which was known to hold for trees [19], to a class that includes all triangle-free graphs. We also show that the slightly larger bound $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq n - s(G) + 1$ holds for all identifiable graphs. Both bounds are tight.

We then apply two of the above upper bounds to *twin-free* bipartite graphs, showing that, for such a graph G of order n , we always have $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq 2n/3$ (unless G is the path P_4). Moreover, we characterize those graphs reaching this bound, as the 2-coronas of bipartite graphs.

Finally, we extend the bound of Theorem 3 to all graphs of girth at least 5, showing that, for such a graph G of order n , we have $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq \frac{5n+2\ell(G)}{7}$. This bound is tight for all stars and for the cycle C_7 . We also present a new infinite family of graphs of girth at least 5 which has largest known ratio $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G)/n$ for graphs with $\delta(G) \geq 2$.

We present our upper bounds for identifying codes in bipartite graphs in section 2. The application to twin-free graphs is presented in section 3. The bound for graphs of girth at least 5 is proved in section 4. We conclude in section 5.

Further related work. For a tree T of order $n \geq 4$, the lower bounds $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(T) \geq \frac{3(n-1)}{7}$ [4, 17], $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(T) \geq \frac{2n-s(T)+3}{4}$ [26], and $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(T) \geq \frac{3n+\ell(T)-s(T)+1}{7}$ [5] have been proved.

We note that a polynomial-time algorithm to compute $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(T)$ for a tree T has been provided in [1]; however, the problem is hard to approximate within any sub-logarithmic factor even for bipartite graphs with no 4-cycles [10] (bipartite graphs without 4-cycles do not have any twins of degree 2 or greater). Identifying codes in graphs of girth at least 5 were also considered in [2, 15].

Many upper bounds for trees similar to those of Theorems 1 and 2 have been

obtained for related graph parameters. In particular, tight upper bounds on trees for identifying codes that are also total dominating sets have been considered in [21, 25]. Similar results have also been proved for the related locating-dominating sets (where one only needs to distinguish pairs of vertices that are not part of the solution set) [5, 9, 21] and their total dominating variant locating-total dominating sets [11].

Bounds for twin-free graphs have been studied for locating-dominating sets. It was proved in [16] that every twin-free bipartite graph and every twin-free graph with no 4-cycles has a locating-dominating set of size at most $n/2$; the bound is tight for infinitely many trees, which are characterized in [14]. It is conjectured that this bound holds for all twin-free graphs [16].

2. Two upper bounds. In this section, we present our main result in Theorem 6. However, first we give some upper bounds which are useful when the number of support vertices in G is large.

2.1. A first pair of upper bounds using the number of support vertices.

Our first lemma holds for identifying codes that are also *total dominating sets*; that is, every vertex of the graph has a neighbor in the dominating set [20]. A graph admits no total dominating set only if it has isolated vertices. For an identifiable graph G with no isolated vertices, we denote by $\gamma_t^{\text{ID}}(G)$ the smallest size of a total dominating identifying code of G . Total dominating identifying codes have usually been called *differentiating-total dominating sets* in the literature; see, for example, [17, 19, 21, 25].

The following lemma has previously been proven for trees in [19]. We extend it to a larger class which contains, for example, all triangle-free graphs (note that, for every triangle-free graph G , $G - L(G)$ is identifiable, unless $G - L(G)$ contains a component isomorphic to P_2).

LEMMA 4. *Let G be a connected graph on $n \geq 4$ vertices that is not the path P_4 such that $G - L(G)$ is identifiable or G is triangle-free. Then*

$$\gamma_t^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq n - s(G).$$

Proof. Let us choose for each support vertex $u \in S(G)$ exactly one adjacent leaf $v \in L(G)$ and say that these vertices form the set C' . Hence, $|C'| = s(G)$. Next, we form the code $C = V(G) \setminus C'$. We show that C is a total dominating identifying code in G . We have $|C| = n - s(G)$.

Observe that each noncodeword v is a leaf. Moreover, if $u, v \in C'$ and $I(C; v) = I(C; u) = \{w\}$, then $w \in S(G)$, but we have chosen two vertices adjacent to w into C' , a contradiction. Since $C' \subseteq L(G)$, $G[C]$ is a connected induced subgraph of G . Moreover, as $n \geq 4$, we have $|I(C; c)| \geq 2$ for each codeword $c \in C$. Thus, codewords and noncodewords have different I -sets. Furthermore, we have $I(c) \neq I(c')$ for two codewords $c \neq c'$ since $|V(G[C])| \geq 3$ (as G is not P_4), and there are no triangles in $G[C]$, or $G[C]$ is identifiable, and hence, each closed neighborhood is unique in $G[C]$. Finally, C is total dominating since $G[C]$ is connected. \square

Lemma 4 is tight, for example, for 3-coronas of graphs (but for these graphs the regular identifying code number is smaller). It is also tight for both identifying codes and total dominating identifying codes by considering, for example, the 1-corona of any triangle-free graph of order at least 3 or any star of order at least 4.

Moreover, we require the stated restrictions in the claim. For example, for the 1-corona $K_m \circ_1$ of a complete graph of order $m \geq 3$ (for which $K_m \circ_1 - L(K_m \circ_1)$ is far from identifiable), we have $\gamma_t^{\text{ID}}(K_m \circ_1) = 2m - 1$ and not $2m - s(K_m \circ_1) = m$. Indeed, all vertices of the m -clique need to be in the code to totally dominate the

leaves. Moreover, for any two vertices of the clique, one of their two leaf neighbors needs to be in the code to identify them, and hence $\gamma_t^{\text{ID}}(K_m \circ_1) \geq 2m - 1$. Moreover, $\gamma_t^{\text{ID}}(K_m \circ_1) \leq 2m - 1$ by considering the whole vertex set except one leaf as a code.

The same example shows that the statement of Lemma 4 is also not true for identifying codes on general graphs, as $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(K_m \circ_1) = m + 1$ and not $2m - s(K_m \circ_1) = m$. Indeed, as above, we need at least $m - 1$ leaf codewords to distinguish the vertices of the m -clique. Moreover, to distinguish leaves from their neighbor support vertex, we need at least two codewords inside the m -clique. This implies $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(K_m \circ_1) \geq m + 1$. Conversely, consider $L(G)$ together with any two vertices in the m -clique, and remove a leaf neighbor of one of the clique code vertices: this set forms an identifying code of size $m + 1$.

In the following theorem, we show that the previous construction is actually the worst case for identifying codes: in this case, a very similar upper bound to the one of Lemma 4 is true.

THEOREM 5. *Let G be a connected identifiable graph on $n \geq 3$ vertices. Then*

$$\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq n - s(G) + 1.$$

Proof. When $s(G) \leq 2$, the claim is clear since $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq n - 1$ for any connected identifiable graph on at least three vertices [18]. Hence, we may assume that $s(G) \geq 3$ which implies $n \geq 2s(G) \geq 6$, and so the claim is true when $n \leq 5$. Let us then prove the claim by induction on n . We thus assume that, for any graph G' of order $n' \leq n - 1$, we have $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G') \leq n' - s(G') + 1$ and wish to prove it for graphs of order n . We know that the claim is true for $s(G) \leq 2$; thus we assume also that $s(G) \geq 3$. If $G' = G - L(G)$ is identifiable, then $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq n - s(G)$ by Lemma 4. Thus, we may assume that $N_{G'}[u] = N_{G'}[v]$ for some distinct vertices u, v in $V(G')$. Since G is identifiable, we have u or $v \in S(G)$. Assume that $u \in S(G)$, and let $L_u = N(u) \cap L(G)$. Let us form graph $G_u = G - u - L_u$.

Observe that G_u is connected since $N_{G'}[v] = N_{G'}[u]$. Moreover, since $s(G) \geq 3$ and G is identifiable, also G_u is identifiable. Indeed, if $N_{G_u}[x] = N_{G_u}[y]$ for some vertices y and x , then u separates them in G , let us say, $u \in N_G[x] \setminus N_G[y]$. However, we have $N_{G'}[u] = N_{G'}[v]$. Hence, $v \in N_{G_u}[x] \setminus N_{G_u}[y]$, a contradiction, or $v = x$ and y is a leaf in G which is adjacent to v , but now $N_{G_u}[v] = N_{G_u}[y]$, and G_u is a path on two vertices which is impossible since then $s(G) = 2$. Notice that we have $s(G_u) \geq s(G) - 1 \geq 2$ since we removed at most one support vertex. Since $s(G_u) \geq 2$, G_u has order at least 4.

By the induction hypothesis, G_u has an identifying code of cardinality at most $(n - 1 - |L_u|) - s(G_u) + 1 \leq n - |L_u| - s(G) + 1$. Let C_u be an identifying code with such cardinality. Let us first consider the case with $|L_u| \geq 2$. Now, we may take $C = C_u \cup L_u$, and it is an identifying code of G with at most $n - s(G) + 1$ vertices, and we are done. However, if $|L_u| = 1$ and let us say that u' is the leaf in L_u , then, just by adding u' to C_u , we might have $I(C; u) = I(C; u')$. Let us divide this into two cases. First assume that $I(C_u; v) \not\subseteq L(G)$; now $I(v) \cap N(u) \neq \emptyset$, and $C_u \cup \{u'\}$ is an identifying code in G of cardinality at most $n - s(G) + 1$, as required. Hence, we may assume that $I(C_u; v) \subseteq L(G)$. In this case we have $|I(C_u; v)| = |N(v) \cap L(G)| \geq 2$. Now, to form code C , we may shift one codeword from $N(v) \cap L(G)$ to v and add u to the code. The resulting code is identifying in G and has cardinality at most $n - s(G) + 1$. \square

2.2. A second upper bound using the number of leaves. Now, we prove an upper bound for identifying codes in some bipartite graphs based on the number of

leaves. In particular, this bound is an improvement for trees. Notice that the graphs in the following theorem contain C_4 -free bipartite graphs.

THEOREM 6. *Let G be a connected bipartite graph on $n \geq 3$ vertices which does not have any twins of degree 2 or greater. We have*

$$\gamma^{ID}(G) \leq \frac{n + \ell(G)}{2}.$$

Proof. Let G be a connected bipartite graph on $n \geq 3$ vertices which does not have any twins of degree 2 or greater. Let us fix a nonleaf vertex $x \in V(G) \setminus L(G)$ as the root of the graph. We present the bipartite graph as a layered graph so that vertex u is in layer i if $d(x, u) = i$. Observe that adjacent vertices have different distances to the root x since G is bipartite. Our goal is to construct two identifying codes and to show that at least one of them has the claimed cardinality.

Let us first construct code C'_e by choosing $u \in C'_e$ if $d(x, u)$ is even or if $u \in L(G)$. Next we will shift some codewords to construct an identifying code C_e . Observe that if $u \in L(G)$ has an odd distance to root x , then there is an adjacent support vertex $v \in S(G) \cap I(C'_e; u)$. Let us first have $C_e = C'_e$. We modify code C_e by shifting some codewords in leaves according to the following rule. If $N(v) \cap L(G) = \{u\}$ and $d(x, u)$ is odd, then we remove u from C_e , and we add some vertex $v' \in N(v)$ with $d(v', x) = d(v, x) - 1$ to C_e (if $v = x$, we instead add some nonleaf vertex adjacent to x to C_e). We illustrate codes C'_e and C_e together with the shift in the left graph of Figure 1. We next prove that C_e is an identifying code in G .

If $w \notin L(G)$ is in layer i , where i is odd, then w has at least two adjacent codewords, and $N(w) \subseteq I(C_e; w)$. Thus, w has a unique I -set since if $I(w') = I(w)$ for some vertex $w' \neq w$, then w' is a nonleaf in an odd layer, and $N(w') \subseteq I(w)$. Thus, w and w' are twins of degree at least 2, a contradiction. Let us then consider the case where $w \in L(G)$ and $d(w, x)$ is odd; assume $u \in S(G)$ is the adjacent support vertex. Now, if $|N(u) \cap L(G)| \geq 2$, then $I(w) = \{w, u\}$ and $|I(u)| \geq 3$. Thus, $I(w)$ is unique. If $|N(u) \cap L(G)| = 1$, then $w \notin C_e$ due to shifting and $I(w) = \{u\}$. However, $|I(u)| \geq 2$, and hence, $I(w)$ is again unique. Let us then consider the case where $d(w, x)$ is even. Now, $w \in C_e$, and hence, if $I(w) = I(w')$, then $w' \in N(w)$. But then $d(w', x)$ is odd, and thus, $I(w')$ is also unique by our earlier arguments. Thus, C_e is an identifying code in G .

As the second code, we construct C'_o similarly as we constructed C'_e , except that we choose vertices in odd layers; that is, we have $u \in C'_o$ if $d(x, u)$ is odd or if $u \in L(G)$. Then, we again use the shifting to obtain the code C_o . This time, we shift some codewords away from some leaves in even layers. Let $u \in L(G)$ be a leaf with $d(u, x)$ even and $v \in S(G) \cap N(u)$. Thus, the distance between vertices v and x




FIG. 1. Gray circle and white square vertices form the codes C'_e (left) and C'_o (right). Arrows and squared vertices depict the shifts in the forming of identifying codes C_e and C_o which contain gray circled and squared vertices.

odd, and $v \in C'_o$. Moreover, let, again, $v' \in N(v)$ be the vertex adjacent to v with $d(v', x) = d(v, x) - 1$. Now, if $N(v) \cap L(G) = \{u\}$, then we remove u from C_o and add v' to C_o . Codes C'_o and C_o are illustrated in the right graph of Figure 1, and they can be compared with the codes C'_e and C_e . The proof that the code C_o is identifying is similar to the proof for C_e .

Thus, we have $\gamma^{ID}(G) \leq \min\{|C_e|, |C_o|\} \leq \min\{|C'_e|, |C'_o|\}$. Moreover, C'_e and C'_o both contain every leaf, and at least one of them contains at most half of the nonleaf vertices. Thus, $\gamma^{ID}(G) \leq \min\{|C'_e|, |C'_o|\} \leq \ell(G) + (n - \ell(G))/2 = (n + \ell(G))/2$. \square

2.3. Remarks and consequences. Observe that the conditions (being bipartite and not having twins of degree 2 or greater) in the statement of Theorem 6 are necessary. For example, we have $\gamma^{ID}(C_4) = \gamma^{ID}(C_5) = 3$, and when $n \geq 7$ is odd, we have $\gamma^{ID}(C_n) = \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1$ [17]; for a complete bipartite graph K_{k_1, k_2} of order n , with $k_1 > k_2 \geq 2$, we have $\gamma^{ID}(K_{k_1, k_2}) = n - 2$.

The upper bound given by Theorem 6 is tight for quite a rich class of graphs that includes many structurally different graphs. Those graphs include, for example, any path or even-length cycle with at least six vertices [3] or any star on at least three vertices (for a star S_n of order n , we have $\gamma^{ID}(S_n) = n - 1$). The bound is also tight for any *spider graph* where the length of each leg is odd (that is, a star whose edges are subdivided an even number of times) and for 2-coronas of bipartite graphs discussed in Theorem 10, as well as for some other trees like the ones presented in Figure 2. It seems difficult to obtain a full characterization of this family (even for trees), given the diversity of these examples.

Note that the same bound as the one in Theorem 6 has been proved for trees, in [11], for locating-total dominating sets, and the trees reaching the bound are characterized therein. (A *locating-total dominating set* is a set D of vertices such that each vertex of G has a neighbor in D , and any two vertices not in D are separated by D . In other words, it is a locating-dominating set and total dominating set.) However, the extremal families are not the same: for example, the trees of Figure 2 have locating-total dominating sets smaller than the bound (examples of such sets are formed by the square vertices). Moreover, the upper bound for locating-total dominating sets cannot be generalized in the same way to bipartite graphs since the cycle C_6 requires at least four codewords in the case of locating-total domination.

We get the following corollary of Lemma 4 and Theorem 6.

COROLLARY 7. *Let G be a connected bipartite graph on $n \geq 5$ vertices which does not have any twins of degree 2 or greater. We have*

$$\gamma^{ID}(G) \leq \min \left\{ \frac{n + \ell(G)}{2}, n - s(G) \right\}.$$




FIG. 2. The gray vertices form optimal identifying codes in these two trees, whose sizes are equal to the bound presented in Theorem 6. The squared vertices form optimal locating-total dominating sets.

3. An application to twin-free bipartite graphs. We next apply our bounds to obtain upper bounds for twin-free graphs. Similar upper bounds have been studied in the context of location-domination; see [13, 14, 16].

COROLLARY 8. *Let G be a twin-free bipartite graph on $n \geq 3$ vertices that is not P_4 . Then*

$$\gamma^{ID}(G) \leq \frac{2n}{3}.$$

Proof. Since G is twin-free, we have $s(G) = \ell(G)$. Hence, Corollary 7 gives $\gamma^{ID}(G) \leq \min\{(n + \ell(G))/2, n - \ell(G)\}$. We first assume that $\ell(G) \leq n/3$. Then, $(n + \ell(G))/2 \leq 2n/3$. Now, assume that $\ell(G) \geq n/3$. In that case, $n - \ell(G) \leq 2n/3$. Thus, the claim follows. \square

Note that the conditions in the statement of Corollary 8 are the best possible in the sense that there exist twin-free nonbipartite graphs that need $n - 1$ vertices in any of their identifying codes, such as the complements of half-graphs; see [12]. Those graphs have very large cliques, but there are twin-free graphs with a small clique number that also have large identifying codes: for any $\Delta \geq 3$, arbitrarily large twin-free graphs of order n , maximum degree Δ , and optimal identifying codes of size $\frac{(\Delta-1)n}{\Delta}$ have been presented in [15]. The condition on twin-freeness cannot be relaxed either, as stars of order n also have no identifying code smaller than $n - 1$, and all other complete bipartite graphs (except C_4) need $n - 2$ vertices in their identifying codes. Moreover, this bound does not hold for nonbipartite graphs of girth at least 5 since $\gamma^{ID}(C_7) = 5$.

We next show that the bound of Corollary 8 is tight.

PROPOSITION 9. *Let H be any connected graph of order at least 2. Then, the 2-corona $H \circ_2$ is twin-free, and $\gamma^{ID}(H \circ_2) = 2n/3$, where n is the order of $H \circ_2$.*

Proof. For any vertex v of H , let v_1 be the vertex adjacent to v that was not in H , and let v_2 be the leaf adjacent to v_1 . To separate v_1 from v_2 , v needs to belong to any identifying code of $H \circ_2$. Moreover, to dominate v_2 , one of v_1, v_2 needs to belong to any identifying code. This shows that $\gamma^{ID}(H \circ_2) \geq 2n/3$.

For the upper bound, one can consider the set containing v and v_2 for each vertex v of H : this is an identifying code of $H \circ_2$. If H has at least three vertices, the set containing v and v_1 for each vertex v of H also works. \square

In the following theorem, we characterize all the twin-free bipartite graphs achieving the upper bound of $2n/3$ of Corollary 8 by showing that they are exactly the 2-coronas of bipartite graphs.

THEOREM 10. *Let G be a connected twin-free bipartite graph on n vertices with $\gamma^{ID}(G) = 2n/3$. Then G is the 2-corona $H \circ_2$ of some bipartite graph H .*

Proof. Since G is twin-free, we have $s(G) = \ell(G)$. Together with Corollary 7 and the fact that $\gamma^{ID}(G) = 2n/3$, this means that $V(G)$ can be partitioned into three equal-sized parts:

$$s(G) = \ell(G) = |V(G) \setminus (L(G) \cup S(G))| = n/3.$$

We will call the vertices in $V(G) \setminus (L(G) \cup S(G))$ *central vertices*.

Let us first assume that v is a central vertex without an adjacent support vertex. Notice that v has at least two adjacent central vertices. Let us now construct code $C' = V(G) \setminus (L(G) \cup \{v\})$. Clearly, v and each leaf are distinguished. Moreover, since G is bipartite, all the codewords are distinguished (in other words, $G - \{v\} - L(G)$ is

identifiable), unless there exists at least one 2-vertex component w, w' in $G - \{v\} - L(G)$. One of w, w' must be a central vertex adjacent to v and the other a support vertex. Assume that $w \in N(v)$, and let w' be the support vertex in G . Now, we may just shift the codeword from w' to the leaf adjacent to w' in G . Moreover, we repeat this shifting for every 2-vertex component of $G - \{v\} - L(G)$. Since v has at least two code neighbors, the code C we get in this way is identifying in G and $|C| = 2n/3 - 1$, a contradiction. Hence, we may next assume that each central vertex is adjacent to a support vertex.

Let us now assume that there exists a support vertex u such that it has at least two adjacent central vertices u_1 and u_2 . Then, we have $n/3$ central vertices but at most $n/3 - 1$ support vertices with exactly one adjacent central vertex. Hence, there exists a central vertex v such that each support vertex adjacent to v also has another adjacent central vertex as a neighbor. Let us again choose $C' = V(G) \setminus (L(G) \cup \{v\})$. Notice that $|I(v)| \geq 2$; thus v and each leaf are distinguished. Moreover, we may apply the same argument on $G - \{v\} - L(G)$ as above, and we may form C in the same way. Again, C is identifying in G , and it has cardinality $2n/3 - 1$, a contradiction.

Therefore, each support vertex is adjacent to exactly one central vertex, and each central vertex is adjacent to exactly one support vertex. Finally we only need to show that no two support vertices are adjacent. If $u, w \in S(G)$, $d(u, w) = 1$ and if the central vertex adjacent to u is v , then the code $G - \{v\} - L(G)$ is again identifying in G , unless there exists a component of size two in $G - \{v\} - L(G)$, but in that case we can apply the earlier argument of shifting a codeword from a support vertex to a leaf to get an identifying code. This means that $(G - L(G) - S(G))_{\circ 2} = G$, and the claim follows. \square

4. Graphs of girth at least 5. In this section we prove our upper bound for graphs of girth at least 5, which generalizes Theorem 3. It is natural to study these graphs here since bipartite graphs of girth at least 5 are contained in Theorem 6 and since trees can be considered as graphs with unbounded girth. Notice that the new upper bound is tight for C_7 and stars. Moreover, it is the best possible bound, using only the order of graph n and the number of leaves $\ell(G)$, in the sense that every nonleaf vertex has to increase the upper bound by $5/7$ as witnessed by the graph C_7 and that each leaf has to increase the upper bound by 1 as we have seen in the case of star graphs. Besides a new upper bound, we also present a new infinite family of graphs of girth at least 5 which has large identifying codes.

THEOREM 11. *Let G be an identifiable graph of order n with girth at least 5 without isolated vertices. Then $\gamma^{ID}(G) \leq \frac{5n+2\ell(G)}{7}$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to prove the claim for connected graphs, as each connected component can be considered independently. Note that a graph of girth at least 5 is identifiable if and only if no connected component is a P_2 . Thus, let G be a connected identifiable graph on n vertices of girth at least 5 without isolated vertices.

We prove the claim by induction. Note that the upper bound can be written as $(n - \ell(G))5/7 + \ell(G)$, which will be used in this way in the proof. Assume first that $n = 3$ ($n \geq 3$ since G is identifiable and is not an isolated vertex). In this case, G is P_3 , and we have $\gamma^{ID}(G) = 2$. Let us then assume that the claim holds for all n with $n \leq k$, and let us consider $n = k + 1$. Observe that if G has minimum degree at least 2 or if G is bipartite, then we are done by Theorems 3 and 6. Hence, we may assume that there exists a vertex $v \in V(G)$ such that v belongs to a cycle or there are two disjoint paths from v to two cycles, and there is a cut-edge vu such that

$G - vu$ is disconnected, and one of the components is a tree T_u on $n_u \geq 1$ vertices which contains vertex u . We will perform a case analysis based on the structure of this tree and the surroundings of v . The basic idea is to apply Theorem 6 on T_u and use the induction hypothesis on $G_u = G - T_u$. Let us denote by T_v the tree $G[V(T_u) \cup \{v\}]$, $G_v = G - T_v$, and let C_u and C_v be an optimal identifying code in G_u and G_v , respectively.

We will use the following observations throughout this proof. (i) If a noncodeword is dominated by two codewords, then it has a unique I -set since G has girth at least 5. Indeed, if any other vertex has those two codewords in its neighbourhood, then we have a 4-cycle. (ii) Similarly, we notice that if a codeword has three or more vertices in its I -set, then this I -set is unique.

We will next consider five cases.

Case 1. Let us assume that $T_u = K_1$; that is, it is a single leaf-vertex u attached to v . Moreover, let us assume that $v \notin C_u$. We have one vertex less and one leaf less; thus, by the induction hypothesis, $|C_u| \leq (n - 1 - (\ell(G) - 1))5/7 + \ell(G) - 1 = (n - \ell(G))5/7 + \ell(G) - 1$, and hence, $C = C_u \cup \{u\}$ has cardinality at most $(n - \ell(G))5/7 + \ell(G)$. Moreover, C is an identifying code of G since $I(C; u) = \{u\}$, and if $I(x) = \{u\}$, then x is not dominated by C_u , a contradiction. If $v \in C_u$ and $I(C_u; v) \neq \{v\}$, then we may again consider code $C = C_u \cup \{u\}$. If $I(C_u; v) = \{v\}$, then v has a noncodeword neighbor v' in G_u . Now, instead of u , we add v' to code C_u , that is, $C = C_u \cup \{v'\}$. Observe that, since C_u is an identifying code in G_u , we have $|I(C; v')| \geq 3$ in G , and thus, u is the only vertex with $I(u) = \{v\}$, and thus, it is separated from all other vertices. All other vertex pairs are separated by the vertices of C_u .

Case 2. Let us now assume that T_u is a star $K_{1, n_u - 1}$, where $n_u \geq 3$. Let us assume first that u is the central vertex of the star. In this case, $\ell(G) = \ell(G_u) + n_u - 1$. Thus, we may just add all the $n_u - 1$ leaves of T_u to C_u , and the resulting code is an identifying code of the claimed cardinality. If u is one of the leaves and u' is the central vertex, then $\ell(G) = \ell(G_u) + n_u - 2$. However, we also increase the number of nonleaf vertices by 2 when we transform G_u into G , and hence, we may add $\lfloor n_u - 2 + 10/7 \rfloor$, that is, $n_u - 1 = \ell(T_u)$, codewords to C_u . If $n_u \geq 4$ (T_u is not a path), then we may add to C_u each vertex in $V(T_u)$ except u to form an identifying code. If $n_u = 3$, then T_u is the path P_3 . If $v \in C_u$, then we add vertices u and u' to C_u , and if $v \notin C_u$, then we add the two leaves of T_u to C_u . In both cases we obtain an identifying code of the claimed size.

Case 3. Let us now assume that $n_u - \ell(T_u) \geq 2$ and $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(T_u) \leq \lfloor \frac{n_u - \ell(T_u)}{2} \rfloor + \ell(T_u) - 1$. Let us denote by C'_u the optimal identifying code in T_u . If $u \notin C'_u$ or $v \notin C_u$, then we may just consider $C = C_u \cup C'_u$ as the identifying code, and we are done. If $v \in C_u$ and $u \in C'_u$, then we may be required to do some modifications to the code as we may have $I(v) = I(u)$. Since we have $\ell(G) \geq \ell(G_u) + \ell(T_u) - 1$ depending on whether $u \in L(T_u)$, we may just add some codeword u' adjacent to u , and we get an identifying code $C_u \cup C'_u \cup \{u'\}$ of claimed cardinality. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 5 \frac{n - \ell(G)}{7} + \ell(G) \\ & \geq 5 \frac{(n - n_u) - \ell(G_u) + n_u + 1 - \ell(T_u)}{7} + \ell(G_u) + \ell(T_u) - 1 \\ & \geq |C_u| + \frac{n_u - \ell(T_u)}{2} + \ell(T_u) - 1 + \frac{3(n_u - \ell(T_u)) + 10}{14} \\ & > |C_u| + |C'_u| + 1. \end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality we use $\ell(G) \geq \ell(G_u) + \ell(T_u) - 1$. We can do this since $5 \frac{n-\ell(G)}{7} + \ell(G) = \frac{5n+2\ell(G)}{7}$. In the second inequality, we use the induction hypothesis with $|C_u| \leq 5 \frac{n-n_u-\ell(G_u)}{7} + \ell(G_u)$. In the third inequality, we use our assumption $|C'_u| \leq \gamma^{\text{ID}}(T_u) \leq \lfloor \frac{n_u-\ell(T_u)}{2} \rfloor + \ell(T_u) - 1$ and the assumption $n_u - \ell(T_u) \geq 2$ to show that $\frac{3(n_u-\ell(T_u))+10}{14} > 1$. Hence, we may add the new codeword adjacent to u and we are done.

Case 4. Let us now assume that $n_u - \ell(T_u) \geq 2$ and $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(T_u) = \lfloor \frac{n_u-\ell(T_u)}{2} \rfloor + \ell(T_u)$. Notice that in this case Theorem 6 provides a tight bound, and we may assume that identifying code C'_u of T_u has the structure provided by the proof. In particular, we may assume that, for any noncodeword $w \in V(T_u) \setminus L(T_u)$, we have $|I(w)| \geq 2$. Moreover, we notice that Theorem 6 actually offers two identifying codes with cardinalities $\lfloor \frac{n_u-\ell(T_u)}{2} \rfloor + \ell(T_u)$ and $\lceil \frac{n_u-\ell(T_u)}{2} \rceil + \ell(T_u)$. Moreover, if a vertex w is a noncodeword vertex in one these codes, then it is a codeword in the other one, and if w is a codeword in both of them, then it has an adjacent codeword in at least one of these codes.

Let us assume first that $v \notin C_u$ or $u \notin C'_u$. Then we may consider the identifying code $C = C_u \cup C'_u$. Since $n_u - \ell(T_u) \geq 2$, this code has the desired cardinality. Thus, we may assume from now on that $u \in C'_u$ and $v \in C_u$. We further split this case based on whether $u \in L(T_u)$ (and the parity of $n_u - \ell(T_u)$).

Subcase 4.1: $u \notin L(T_u)$. In this case, if $n_u - \ell(T_u)$ is even, Theorem 6 offers two identifying codes with equal cardinalities, and we may choose the code in which u either is a noncodeword or has adjacent codeword(s), and we are done.

When $n_u - \ell(T_u)$ is odd, we have to do some calculations since the two codes have cardinalities $\frac{n_u-1-\ell(T_u)}{2} + \ell(T_u)$ and $\frac{n_u+1-\ell(T_u)}{2} + \ell(T_u)$, respectively. However, even the larger of these two codes is small enough. Indeed, $\frac{n_u+1-\ell(T_u)}{2} + \ell(T_u) + 5 \frac{n-n_u-\ell(G_u)}{7} + \ell(G_u) = 5 \frac{n-\ell(G)}{7} + \ell(G) + \frac{3(\ell(T_u)-n_u)+7}{14}$. Since $n_u - \ell(T_u)$ is odd and at least 3, the last sum term is negative, and hence, we may use either of the two codes also in this case. Notice that, since $u \notin L(T_u)$, we used $\ell(G) = \ell(G_u) + \ell(T_u)$.

Subcase 4.2: $u \in L(T_u)$. In this case, we have $\ell(G) = \ell(G_u) + \ell(T_u) - 1$. Moreover, we have $\lfloor \frac{n_u-\ell(T_u)}{2} \rfloor + \ell(T_u) \leq \lfloor 5 \frac{n_u+1-\ell(T_u)}{7} \rfloor + \ell(T_u) - 1$ when $n_u - \ell(T_u) \geq 2$. Thus, code $C_u \cup C'_u$ has the claimed cardinality. Let u' be the support vertex adjacent to u in T_u . If $u' \in C'_u$, then we may use $C_u \cup C'_u$ as our identifying code. Hence, let us assume that $u' \notin C'_u$. Notice that if u' has an adjacent leaf other than u , then, by the construction of C'_u , $|I(u')| \geq 3$, and we can shift the codeword in u to u' . In fact, each neighbor of u' is a codeword in C'_u since the structure of C'_u is as in the proof of Theorem 6, and hence, we may assume from now on that $\text{deg}(u') = 2$.

If $n_u - \ell(T_u)$ is even, then there is also another identifying code of the same cardinality as C'_u in T_u by the proof of Theorem 6. Moreover, this other code will have u' as a codeword.

If $n_u - \ell(T_u)$ is odd, consider the tree $T' = T_u - u$. We have $\ell(T_u) = \ell(T')$, since $\text{deg}(u') = 2$, and hence, T' has an even number of nonleaves. If the optimal identifying code in T' has cardinality $\frac{n_u-1-\ell(T_u)}{2} + \ell(T_u)$, then there exist two codes of this size, and in one of the codes, let us say in $C_{T'}$, u' is a codeword. Now $C_u \cup C_{T'}$ is an identifying code of G . On the other hand, if T' has a smaller identifying code $C'_{T'}$, then $C_u \cup C'_{T'} \cup \{u'\}$ is an identifying code of G of the correct size.

Case 5. We are left with the case where T_u is a path on two vertices. By applying the previous cases if possible, we may assume that each leaf of G is part

of a P_2 which is joined with a single edge to some vertex similar to v , belonging to a cycle or connected to at least two cycles. In particular, every support vertex has degree 2. Since P_2 is not identifiable, C'_u does not exist. Let u' be the leaf neighbor of u in T_u . Observe that if $v \in C_u$, then we can consider the code $C_u \cup \{u'\}$, which is identifying and of the correct size. Thus, we assume that $v \notin C_u$. In particular, if multiple P_2 's are connected to v , v is forced to be a codeword in C_u to separate a leaf and its support vertex, and we are done. Hence, we may assume that there is at most one support vertex adjacent to v in G . This implies that G_v is identifiable. We further split this case based on the number of leaves in G_v .

If we have $\ell(G_v) < \ell(G)$, that is, $\ell(G_v) = \ell(G) - 1$, then we may consider the graphs G_v and the path on three vertices formed by v, u , and u' . If $C_v \cap N(v) = \emptyset$, then we may consider code $C = C_v \cup \{v, u'\}$, and if $C_v \cap N(v) \neq \emptyset$, then we may consider code $C = C_v \cup \{v, u\}$. Both of these codes have the claimed cardinality, and they are identifying codes.

For the rest of the proof we may assume that $\ell(G_v) = \ell(G)$. In other words, exactly one vertex in $N_G(v)$ is a leaf in G_v ; that is, it has degree 2 in G . Let us denote this vertex by v_1 and by v'_1 the second neighbor of v_1 . If $\deg(v'_1) \geq 3$, then $\ell(G_v - v_1) = \ell(G_v) - 1 = \ell(G) - 1$. Let C_{v_1} be an optimal identifying code in $G_v - v_1$ (note that this graph is identifiable). By induction we have $|C_{v_1}| \leq 5(n - 4 - \ell(G_v) + 1)/7 + \ell(G_v) - 1 = 5(n - 3 - \ell(G))/7 + \ell(G) - 1$. We may now consider the code $C = C_{v_1} \cup \{v, u, u'\}$. This code has cardinality at most $5(n - 3 - \ell(G))/7 + \ell(G) - 1 + 3 < 5(n - \ell(G))/7 + \ell(G)$ and is an identifying code. Thus, we may assume that $\deg(v'_1) = 2$. Moreover, let us denote by $C_{v'_1}$ the optimal identifying code in $G_{v'_1} = G_v - v_1 - v'_1$ (note that this graph is also identifiable). Observe that $\ell(G_{v'_1}) \leq \ell(G_v)$. We now consider the code $C = C_{v'_1} \cup \{u, v, v_1\}$, which is identifying. It has cardinality $|C| \leq 5(n - 5 - \ell(G_{v'_1}))/7 + \ell(G_{v'_1}) + 3 \leq 5(n - \ell(G_v))/7 + \ell(G_v) = 5(n - \ell(G))/7 + \ell(G)$.

For the rest of the proof we may assume that in G_v we have leaves v_1 and v_2 which are of degree 2 and adjacent to v in G . We know that $\deg(v) \geq 3$ in G . Let us construct tree T_v^* by starting from T_v and adding to T_v vertex v_1 and, iteratively, any vertex of degree 2 adjacent to the previous vertex. We do this until we reach a vertex (denoted by w) that does not have degree 2. Let us denote by x_t the last vertex we add to T_v^* in this way. It is possible that $w = v$ if we have a suitable cycle in G . In that case, if $t > 1$, we do not include the final edge between v and x_t . We denote by P_t the path from v_1 to the leaf x_t in T_v^* that is adjacent to w in G . Let P_t be the path on vertices x_1, x_2, \dots, x_t , where consecutive vertices are adjacent and $x_1 = v_1$, and let us denote graph $G_P = G - P_t$ with an optimal identifying code C_P (note that this graph is identifiable). Notice that $|V(G_P)| \geq 3$ since it at least contains vertices v, u , and u' . Moreover, if $|V(G_P)| = 3$, then G consists of a cycle, leaf, and support vertex. Now we may choose some optimal identifying code for the cycle so that v is a codeword which gives us a case which we have already considered. Hence, $|V(G_P)| > 3$ and $\ell(G_P) = \ell(G)$.

Let us further split this case into five subcases, based on the value of t .

Subcase 5.1: $t \geq 5$. Recall that $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(P_t) = \lceil (t+1)/2 \rceil$ since $t \geq 5$ [3]. Notice that $v \in C_P$, as it is the only vertex which can separate u and u' . Assume first that t is even. In that case $|C_P| + \gamma^{\text{ID}}(P_t) \leq 5(n - t - \ell(G_P))/7 + \ell(G_P) + t/2 + 1 = 5(n - \ell(G))/7 + \ell(G) + (14 - 3t)/14$. We will use code $\{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{t-2}, x_{t-1}, x_t\}$ for the path. Together with C_P it has the claimed cardinality and is identifying in G (notice that $I(x_1) = \{v, x_2\}$).

Let us then consider the case where $t \geq 5$ is odd. As above, we get that $|C_P| + \gamma^{\text{ID}}(P_t) \leq 5(n - t - \ell(G_P))/7 + \ell(G_P) + (t+1)/2 = 5(n - \ell(G))/7 + \ell(G) + (7 - 3t)/14$.

We may use set $\{x_2, x_4, \dots, x_{t-3}, x_{t-2}, x_{t-1}\}$ together with C_P . Therefore, we may now assume that $t \leq 4$.

Subcase 5.2: $t = 4$. When $t = 4$, we can add two codewords to C_P to form a code in G since $4 \cdot 5/7 \geq 2$ and $\ell(G) = \ell(G_P)$. Recall that $v \in C_P$ and that $x_1 = v_1$. If $w \notin C_P$, we add x_2, x_4 on P_t to C_P . If $w \in C_P$, then, if $u' \in C_P$, we shift it to u and after that add codewords x_1, x_3 . Notice that to dominate u' at least one of u and u' is a codeword of C_P .

Subcase 5.3: $t = 3$. When $t = 3$, we can again add two codewords since $3 \cdot 5/7 \geq 2$. The codewords we add are x_1 and x_2 .

Subcase 5.4: $t = 2$. When $t = 2$, we can add at most one codeword. Again we shift the codeword possibly in u' to u and after that add vertex x_1 as a codeword.

Subcase 5.5: $t = 1$. Consider the graph $G^* = G - v_1 - u'$ (which is identifiable) with optimal identifying code C^* . We have $\ell(G) = \ell(G^*)$ since v_1 has degree 2 and has no adjacent vertices of degree 2. Hence, if we can construct an identifying code C for graph G by adding at most one codeword to C^* , then C has the claimed cardinality. Observe that at least one of u and v belongs to code C^* to dominate u . Moreover, we have $|I(v)| \geq 2$, as one vertex is needed to separate u, v .

Let us assume first that $v \notin C^*$ and $u \in C^*$. In that case, we can consider code $C^* \cup \{v\}$ for G . Now $I(u') = \{u\}$, and if $I(v_1) = I(z)$, then $v \in I(z)$, and hence, $|I(z)| \geq 2$ since z was dominated by C^* . Since z is 2-dominated, v_1 and z are separated. Thus, C is an identifying code.

Consider then the case with $v, u \in C^*$. In this case, we consider code $C = C^* \cup \{v_1\}$. Clearly $I(u')$ is unique, and v_1 and v are the only vertices with v_1 and v in their I -sets. Since $u \in I(v)$, also $I(v_1)$ is unique. Hence, C is an identifying code.

Finally, we are left with the case $v \in C^*$ and $u \notin C^*$. We consider the code $C = C^* \cup \{u\}$. Again $I(u')$ is unique. Moreover, in G^* vertex u is the only vertex whose I -set is $\{v\}$. Thus, if $I(v_1) = \{v\}$, then v_1 is separated from every other vertex, and if $|I(v_1)| \geq 2$, then $I(v_1)$ is clearly unique. Thus, C is an identifying code of claimed cardinality in G . As this was final case, we have now proven the claim. \square

In [2], the authors have constructed an infinite family of connected graphs without leaves which have girth at least 5 and $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) = 3(n-1)/5$, where n is the order. To date, this infinite family of graphs features the largest known ratio between $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G)$ and the number of vertices, among graphs without leaves and with girth at least 5 (apart from some small examples such as the 7-cycle). The interest toward these kinds of constructions is due to the fact that Theorem 3 is tight only for the 7-cycle, and so, perhaps there exists a way to improve the bound for connected graphs by excluding the 7-cycle as a single exception. New constructions which increase the ratio $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G)/n$ give new limits to how much the bound of Theorem 3 could possibly be improved. In the following proposition, we give a new infinite family of such graphs which offers the largest known ratio for $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G)/n$ for graphs of girth at least 5 with no leaves.

PROPOSITION 12. *For each integer $k \geq 1$, there exists a connected graph G on $n = 8k + 1$ vertices with $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) = 5k = \frac{5(n-1)}{8}$.*

Proof. Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer, and let us construct graph G by taking a star $K_{1,k}$ and by attaching a unique 7-cycle to each leaf of the star with a single edge. The resulting graph has $k + 1 + 7k = 8k + 1$ vertices. Let us denote the leaves of $K_{1,k}$ by x_1, \dots, x_k and vertices in the 7-cycles adjacent to them by v_1, \dots, v_k . Graph G is illustrated in Figure 3.




FIG. 3. Graph G of girth 7 with no leaves on $8k + 1$ vertices with $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) = 5k$. Gray vertices form an optimal identifying code.

Let us now consider the identifying code number of G . Let C be an optimal identifying code. We claim that there are at least five code vertices among the eight vertices in x_i and the 7-cycle attached to it. Recall that we have $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(C_7) = 5$. Thus, if $x_i \notin C$, then we have at least five code vertices in the 7-cycle. Assume then that $x_i \in C$ and that there exists a set C' of three vertices in the 7-cycle such that $C' \cup \{x_i\}$ dominates and distinguishes all of these vertices. If $I(v_i) = \{x_i\}$, then C' is an identifying code for $C_7 - v_i$. However, $C_7 - v_i$ is a 6-path P_6 , and we have $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(P_6) = 4$, a contradiction. Hence, C' is a dominating set of C_7 . Since $C' \cup \{x_i\}$ distinguishes every vertex in C_7 and $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(C_7) = 5$, we have $N[v_i] \cap C' = N[w] \cap C'$ for some $w \in V(C_7)$, and there are no other vertices with the same I -sets. Let u be a vertex in $N[w] \setminus N[v_i]$. Now $C' \cup \{u\}$ is an identifying code of size 4 in C_7 , a contradiction. Thus, $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \geq 5k$.

Finally, we show that $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq 5k$. To construct an identifying code C , we choose vertices x_i and v_i for each i , and for each vertex v_i we choose one adjacent vertex w_i in the cycle, and then we choose two additional code vertices u_1 and u_2 in each cycle so that $I(u_i) = \{u_i\}$. This code is depicted with gray vertices in Figure 3. One can easily check that the code is indeed identifying. \square

5. Concluding remarks. We have improved several bounds from the literature, both in terms of the values of the bounds and in terms of the generality of the considered graph classes. Our bounds confirm the known facts that certain structural graph features such as leaves, twins, or short cycles are crucial for a graph to have a large identifying code. By considering the number of leaves on graphs other than trees, our bounds enable us to quantify the effect of these structures on the identifying code number.

In section 2, we have given a new tight upper bound $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq (n + \ell(G))/2$ for bipartite graphs without twins of degree 2 or greater. We have characterized all twin-free graphs attaining this bound. However, it would be interesting to see a characterization for all graphs attaining the bound.

Our bound $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq \frac{5n+2\ell(G)}{7}$ from Theorem 11 for graphs of girth at least 5 is tight for stars, the path P_4 , and the 7-cycle. However, we do not know of any other tight examples. Perhaps this bound can be extended by considering other structural properties of the graph to give a bound that is tight for a more diverse class of graphs.

Perhaps it can also be improved by excluding the 7-cycle as an exception? We have shown in Proposition 12 that there are arbitrarily large connected twin-free graphs of girth 7 without leaves with $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) = 5(n-1)/8$; hence such an improved bound could not be less than that.

More generally, it would be interesting to see whether other bounds can be proved for graphs of larger girth. For example, perhaps a stronger version of the bound $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(G) \leq \frac{5n+2\ell(G)}{7}$ (for graphs of girth at least 5) of Theorem 11 can be proved for graphs of girth at least g with $g \geq 9$. As we have $\gamma^{\text{ID}}(C_g) = (g+1)/2 + 1$ for odd g , such an upper bound cannot be less than that.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. AUGER, *Minimal identifying codes in trees and planar graphs with large girth*, European J. Combin., 31 (2010), pp. 1372–1384.
- [2] C. BALBUENA, F. FOUCAUD, AND A. HANSBERG, *Locating-dominating sets and identifying codes in graphs of girth at least 5*, Electron. J. Combin., 22 (2015), P2.15.
- [3] N. BERTRAND, I. CHARON, O. HUDRY, AND A. LOBSTEIN, *Identifying and locating-dominating codes on chains and cycles*, European J. Combin., 25 (2004), pp. 969–987.
- [4] N. BERTRAND, I. CHARON, O. HUDRY, AND A. LOBSTEIN, *1-identifying codes on trees*, Australas. J. Combin., 31 (2005), pp. 21–35.
- [5] M. BLIDIA, M. CHELLALI, F. MAFFRAY, J. MONCEL, AND A. SEMRI, *Locating-domination and identifying codes in trees*, Australas. J. Combin., 39 (2007), pp. 219–232.
- [6] B. BOLLOBÁS AND A. D. SCOTT, *On separating systems*, European J. Combin., 28 (2007), pp. 1068–1071.
- [7] J. A. BONDY, *Induced subsets*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B, 12 (1972), pp. 201–202.
- [8] É. BONNET, P. GIANNOPOULOS, AND M. LAMPIS, *On the parameterized complexity of red-blue points separation*, J. Comput. Geom., 10 (2019), pp. 181–206.
- [9] N. BOUSQUET, Q. DESCHAMPS, T. LEHTILÄ, AND A. PARREAU, *Locating-dominating sets: From graphs to oriented graphs*, Discrete Math., 346 (2023), 113124, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2022.113124>
- [10] N. BOUSQUET, A. LAGOUTTE, Z. LI, A. PARREAU, AND S. THOMASSÉ, *Identifying codes in hereditary classes of graphs and VC-dimension*, SIAM J. Discrete Math., 29 (2015), pp. 2047–2064.
- [11] X. CHEN AND M. Y. SOHN, *Bounds on the locating-total domination number of a tree*, Discrete Appl. Math., 159 (2011), pp. 769–773.
- [12] F. FOUCAUD, E. GUERRINI, M. KOVŠE, R. NASERASR, A. PARREAU, AND P. VALICOV, *Extremal graphs for the identifying code problem*, European J. Combin., 32 (2011), pp. 628–638.
- [13] F. FOUCAUD AND M. A. HENNING, *Locating-total dominating sets in twin-free graphs: A conjecture*, Electron. J. Combin., 23 (2016), P3.9.
- [14] F. FOUCAUD, M. A. HENNING, C. LÖWENSTEIN, AND T. SASSE, *Locating-dominating sets in twin-free graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math., 200 (2016), pp. 52–58.
- [15] F. FOUCAUD AND G. PERARNAU, *Bounds on identifying codes in terms of degree parameters*, Electron. J. Combin., 19 (2012), P32.
- [16] D. GARJO, A. GONZÁLEZ, AND A. MÁRQUEZ, *The difference between the metric dimension and the determining number of a graph*, Appl. Math. Comput., 249 (2014), pp. 487–501.
- [17] J. GIMBEL, B. D. VAN GORDEN, M. NICOLESCU, C. UMSTEAD, AND N. VAIANA, *Location with dominating sets*, Congr. Numer., 151 (2001), pp. 129–144.
- [18] S. GRAVIER AND J. MONCEL, *On graphs having a $V \setminus \{x\}$ set as an identifying code*, Discrete Math., 307 (2007), pp. 432–434.
- [19] T. W. HAYNES, M. A. HENNING, AND J. HOWARD, *Locating and total dominating sets in trees*, Discrete Appl. Math., 154 (2006), pp. 1293–1300.
- [20] M. A. HENNING AND A. YEO, *Total Domination in Graphs*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2013.
- [21] N. JAFARI RAD AND H. RAHBANI, *Bounds on the locating-domination number and differentiating-total domination number in trees*, Discuss. Math. Graph Theory, 38 (2018), pp. 455–462.
- [22] M. G. KARPOVSKY, K. CHAKRABARTY, AND L. B. LEVITIN, *On a new class of codes for identifying vertices in graphs*, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, 44 (1998), pp. 599–611.
- [23] A. LOBSTEIN, *Watching Systems, Identifying, Locating-Dominating and Discriminating Codes in Graphs: A Bibliography*, 2022, <https://www.lri.fr/~lobstein/debutBIBidetlocdom.pdf>

- [24] B. M. E. MORET AND H. D. SHAPIRO, *On minimizing a set of tests*, SIAM J. Sci. Statist. Comput., 6 (1985), pp. 983–1003.
- [25] W. NING, M. LU, AND J. GUO, *Bounds on the differentiating-total domination number of a tree*, Discrete Appl. Math., 200 (2016), pp. 153–160.
- [26] H. RAHBANI, N. JAFARI RAD, AND S. M. MIRREZAEI, *Bounds on the identifying codes in trees*, Graphs Combin., 35 (2019), pp. 599–609.
- [27] P. J. SLATER, *Domination and location in acyclic graphs*, Networks, 17 (1987), pp. 55–64.
- [28] R. UNGRANGSI, A. TRACHTENBERG, AND D. STAROBINSKI, *An implementation of indoor location detection systems based on identifying codes*, in Proceedings of the IFIP International Conference on Intelligence in Communication Systems, INTELLICOMM 2004, 2004, pp. 175–189.