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# ON (d; 2)-DOMINATING NUMBERS OF BUTTERFLY NETWORKS ${ }^{\text {ay }}$ 

Shao Rujun, Lu Changhong and Yao Tianxing


#### Abstract

In this paper, we study ( d ; 2) -dominating numbers for an important class of parallel networks - butterfly networks $B(n)$. The main result of this paper is to determine their ( $\mathrm{d} ; 2$ )-dominating numbers for $2 \mathrm{n}-1 \leq \mathrm{d} \leq 2 \mathrm{n}+1$.


## 1. Introduction

In this paper, we use graphs to represent networks. We use [1] for terminology and notation not defined here. In addition, the length of a path $P\left[v_{1} ; v_{p+1}\right]:=v_{1} \rightarrow$ $\mathrm{V}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{~V}_{3} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{p}} \rightarrow \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{p}+1}$ is the number p of edges of P and will be denoted by $|\mathrm{P}|$, where $\mathrm{v}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}+1}$ are called end-vertices of P and $\mathrm{v}_{2} ; \mathrm{v}_{3} ; \cdots ; \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{p}}$ are called internal vertices. For a nonempty and proper subset $S$ of the vertex set $V(G)$ and $\mathrm{x} \in \mathrm{V}(\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{S})$, an $(\mathrm{x} ; \mathrm{S})$-path is a path in G connecting x to some vertex in S .

The butterfly network $B(n)$ is the graph whose vertices are $x=\left(x_{0} ; x_{1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right)$ with $0 \leq \mathrm{x}_{0} \leq \mathrm{n}$ and $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}} \in\{0 ; 1\}$ for $1 \leq \mathrm{i} \leq \mathrm{n}$, and two vertices $\mathrm{x}=$ $\left(x_{0} ; x_{1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right)$ and $y=\left(y_{0} ; y_{1} ; \cdots ; y_{n}\right)$ are adjacent if and only if $y_{0}=x_{0}+1$ and $x_{i}=y_{i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $i \neq y_{0}$. Note that $B(1)$ is a 4 -cycle. For a vertex $x=\left(x_{0} ; x_{1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right)$ in $B(n)$, we say that $x$ is in level $x_{0}$ of $B(n)$ and call $x_{i}$ the ith coordinate of $x$. Fig. 1 shows an example of $B(3)$, in which the top line indicates the level numbers and the left column indicates the names ( $x_{1} ; x_{2} ; \cdots ; x_{n}$ ).

Let $T$ denote the vertices in level 0 , it is easy to know $B(n)-T$ is two disjoint butterfly networks $B(n-1)$, one denoted by $B(n-1)^{1}$ has all vertices $x$ with $x_{1}=0$ and $x_{0} \neq 0$; the other denoted by $B(n-1)^{2}$ has all vertices $x$ with $x_{1}=1$ and $x_{0} \neq 0$. Cao, Du, Hsu, and Wan [2] have shown that $B(n)$ is 2 -connected and its diameter is equal to 2 n .
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FIG. 1. The butterfly network B (3)

In order to characterize the reliability of transmission delay in a network, Hsu and Lyuu [5] introduce m-diameter (i.e. wide-diameter) as follows: For any pair $(x ; y)$ of vertices in a graph $G$, the minimum integer $d$ suth that there are at least m internally vertex-disjoint path of length at most d between x and y is called the m -distance of x and y and is denoted by $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathrm{x} ; \mathrm{y})_{\mathrm{G}}$. The m -diameter of G , denoted by $D_{m}(G)$, is the maximum of $D_{m}(x ; y)_{G}$ over all pairs $(x ; y)$ of vertices of $G$. General results on the $m$-diameters of $m$-connected graphs can be found in [4] and [5]. Results for some particular classes of graphs can be also found in [6], [7] and [9]. In particular, for a Butterfly network $B(n)$, its 2-diameter is $2 n+2$ for $\mathrm{n} \geq 2$. (see [9]).

Recently, H. Li and J. M. Xu in [8] define a new parameter ( $\mathrm{d} ; \mathrm{m}$ )-dominating number in m -connected graphs, in some sense, which can more accurately characterize the reliability of networks than the wide-diameter can.

Definition. Let G be a m -connected graphs, S a nonempty and proper subset of $V(G)$, y a vertex in $G-S$. For a given positive integer $d$, $y$ is $(d ; m)$-dominated by $S$ in the graph if there are at least $m$ internally vertex-disjoint $(y ; S)$-paths in $G$ such that each of which is of length at most $d$. $S$ is said to be a $(d ; m)$-dominating set of $G$, denoted by $S_{d ; m}(G)$ if either $S=V(G)$ or $S$ can $(d ; m)$-dominate every vertex in $G-S$. The parameter

$$
\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{d} ; \mathrm{m}}(\mathrm{G})=\min \left\{\left|\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{d} ; \mathrm{m}}(\mathrm{G})\right|: \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{d} ; \mathrm{m}}(\mathrm{G}) \text { is a }(\mathrm{d} ; \mathrm{m})-\text { dominating set of } \mathrm{G}\right\}
$$

will be called the $(\mathrm{d} ; \mathrm{m})$-dominating number of G .
Remark 1. ( $d ; m$ )-dominating number can be used to explain such a quesition: Let G be a communication network of the Department of National Defence. Given integer $d>0$ and $m>0$. How many command centers are necessary and sufficient such that there exist at least $m$ internally disjoint paths of length at most $d$ between each fight unit and these command centers? And how to select these vertices in $G$
as command centers? Results on $(\mathrm{d} ; \mathrm{m})$-dominating number can be found in [8], [10], [11].

In this paper, we will prove for $\mathrm{n} \geq 3$, the ( $\mathrm{d} ; 2$ )-dominating number of $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{n})$ is 2 for $2 n-1 \leq d \leq 2 n+1$.

## 2. Preliminary Results

In order to prove the theorem, we first give some lemmas.
Lemma 1. Let G be an m -connected $(\mathrm{m} \geq 2)$ graph of order n and $\mathrm{d} a$ positive integer; then
(a) If $\mathrm{d}=\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathrm{G})$; then $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{d} ; \mathrm{m}}(\mathrm{G})=1$;
(b) If $\mathrm{d}^{0}>\mathrm{d}^{\infty}$, then $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{d} 0} ; \mathrm{m}(\mathrm{G}) \leq \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{d} 0} 0 \mathrm{~m}(\mathrm{G})$.

Proof. (a) and (b) can be obtained directly by the definitions.
Lemma 2. For butterfly networks $B(n) ;(n \geq 2) ; s_{2 n+2 ; 2}(B(n))=1$.
Proof. Since 2-diameter of $B(n)$ is $2 n+2$; it is easy to prove $S_{2 n+2 ; 2}$ $(B(n))=1$.

Lemma 2 shows that it is interesting to determine ( $\mathrm{d} ; 2$ )-dominating numbers of $B(n)$ when $d \leq 2 n+1$, and lemma 1 shows that it is sufficient to prove $S_{2 n i} 1 ; 2(B(n))=2$ and $S_{2 n+1 ; 2}(B(n))>1$ in order to prove the main results.

Lemma 3. For any $\mathrm{x}=\left(0 ; \mathrm{x}_{1} ; \mathrm{x}_{2} ; \cdots ; \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ in $\mathrm{V}(\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{n})-\mathrm{S})$; where $\mathrm{S}=$ $\{(0 ; 0 ; \cdots ; 0) ;(0 ; 1 ; \cdots ; 1)\}$. If $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{n}}=1$, there exists a path of length no more than $2 \mathrm{n}-2$ between X and $(0 ; 1 ; \ldots ; 1)$; otherwise; there exists a path of length no more than $2 \mathrm{n}-2$ between X and $(0 ; 0 ; \cdots ; 0)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{n}}=1$ and let w denote the binary string $\left(x_{1} ; x_{2} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right)$. Let $w^{i_{1} i_{2}}=\left(x_{1} ; x_{2} ; \cdots ; x_{i_{1} 1}, x_{i_{1}} ; x_{i_{1}+1}\right.$; $\left.\cdots ; x_{i_{2 i} 1} ; x_{i_{2}} ; x_{i_{2}+1} ; \cdots ; x_{i_{g i} 1} ; x_{i_{g}} ; x_{i_{g}+1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right)$, where $x_{i}=1-x_{i}$. Suppose that $x_{i_{1}}=x_{i_{2}}=\cdots=x_{i_{g}}=0$ and $x_{i_{g+1}}=x_{i_{g+2}}=\cdots=x_{i_{n}}=1$ where $\left\{i_{1} ; i_{2} ;\right.$ $\left.\cdots ; \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{g}} ; \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{g}+1} ; \cdots ; \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{n}}\right\}=\{1 ; 2 ; \cdots ; \mathrm{n}\}$ and $\mathrm{i}_{1}<\mathrm{i}_{2}<\cdots<\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{g}} \neq \mathrm{n}$, We construct the path between X and $(0 ; 1 ; \cdots ; 1)$ as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
P: \mathrm{x} & \rightarrow(1 ; w) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow\left(i_{1}-1 ; w\right) \rightarrow\left(i_{1} ; w^{i_{1}}\right) \rightarrow\left(i_{1}+1 ; w^{i_{1}}\right) \rightarrow \cdots \\
& \rightarrow\left(i_{2}-1 ; w^{i_{1}}\right) \rightarrow\left(i_{2} ; w^{i_{1} i_{2}}\right) \rightarrow\left(i_{2}+1 ; w^{i_{1} i_{2}}\right) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow\left(i_{g} ; w^{i_{1} i_{2}}\right) \\
& \rightarrow\left(i_{g}-1 ; w^{i_{1} i_{2}}\right) \rightarrow\left(i_{g}-2 ; w^{i_{1} i_{2}}\right) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow\left(0 ; w^{i_{1} i_{2}}\right) \rightarrow\left(i_{g}\right) \\
& =(0 ; 1 ; \cdots ; 1):
\end{aligned}
$$

We easily know that $|\mathbf{P}|=2 \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{g}} \leq 2 \mathrm{n}-2$.
Lemma 4. For $\mathrm{u}=(\mathrm{k}-1 ; 0 ; \cdots ; 0)$ and $\mathrm{v}=(\mathrm{k}+1 ; 1 ; \cdots ; 1)$ in $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{n})$ $\left(\mathrm{n} \geq 3 ; 1 \leq \mathrm{k} \leq \frac{\mathrm{n}}{2}\right) ; \mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]$ must pass the vertex $\mathrm{w}=\left(\mathrm{w}_{0} ; \mathrm{w}_{1} ; \cdots ; \mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ if $|\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]| \leq 2 \mathrm{n}+1$; where $\mathrm{w}_{0}=\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{w}_{1}=\cdots=\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{k}}=1$ and $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{k}+1}=\cdots=\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{n}}=0$.

Proof. First $\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]$ must pass some vertex x in level 0 of $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{n})$ since the first coordinates of $u$ and $v$ are distinct; Similarly, $\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]$ must pass some vertex $y$ in level $n$ of $B(n)$ since the last coordinates of $u$ and $v$ are distinct. If $P[u ; v]$ first pass $y$ then $x$, we easily know $|P[u ; v]|=|P[u ; y]|+|P[y ; x]|+|P[x ; v]|$ $\geq(n-k+1)+n+(k+1)=2 n+2$, a contradiction. So, $P[u ; v]$ must first pass $x$ then y and $|\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]|$ is no less than $2 \mathrm{n}-2$ for $|\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]|=|\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{x}]|+|\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{x} ; \mathrm{y}]|+|\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{y} ; \mathrm{v}]|$ $\geq(k-1)+n+(n-k-1)=2 n-2$. If $P[u ; v]$ has only one vertex $t$ in level $k$, then $t_{k+1}=\cdots=t_{n}=0$ since all vertices of $P[u ; t]$ are in level less than $k+1$ in $B(n)$ and $u_{k+1}=\cdots=u_{n}=0$. We also know $t_{1}=\cdots=t_{k}=1$ since all vertices of $P[v ; t]$ are in level no less than $k$ and $v_{1}=\cdots=v_{k}=1$. i.e., $t=w$. Note that it is impossible that $\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]$ has more than two vertices in level k . (If not, we easily find $|\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]|$ is more than $2 \mathrm{n}+1$.) We assume $\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]$ has just two vertices t and $z$ in level $k$ of $B(n)$. Without loss of generality, we say $t$ is the first vertex in level k which is in $\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]$. Obviously, z is the last vertex in level k which is in $\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]$. If all vertices of $P[v ; t]$ are in level no less than $k$, then we know $t=w$ as above. If all vertices of $\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{z}]$ are in level no more than k , then we also know $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{w}$.

Remark 2. We can easily find the following result from the proof of Lemma 4. For $u=\left(k-1 ; u_{1} ; \cdots ; u_{n}\right)$ and $v=\left(k+1 ; \bar{u}_{1} ; \cdots ; \bar{m}_{n}\right)$ in $B(n)(n \geq 3$, $1 \leq \mathrm{k} \leq \mathrm{n}-1), \mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]$ must pass the vertex $\mathrm{w}=\left(\mathrm{k} ; \overline{1}_{1} ; \cdots ; \overline{\mathrm{u}}_{\mathrm{k}} ; \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{k}+1} ; \cdots ; \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ if $|\mathrm{P}[\mathrm{u} ; \mathrm{v}]| \leq 2 \mathrm{n}+1$.

We can easily find the following mappings are automorphisms of $B(n)$ :

$$
\begin{gathered}
\circledR\left(x_{0} ; x_{1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right) \rightarrow\left(x_{0} ; x_{1} ; \cdots ; x_{i_{i} 1} ; x_{i} ; x_{i+1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right) \quad(1 \leq i \leq n) \\
-\quad:\left(x_{0} ; x_{1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right) \rightarrow\left(n-x_{0} ; x_{n} ; \cdots ; x_{1}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

These are useful in the proof of our main results.

## 3. The Main Results

Theorem 1. The ( $\mathrm{d} ; 2$ )-dominating number of $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{n} \geq 3)$ is 2 for $\mathrm{d}=2 \mathrm{n}-1$.
Proof. Now we prove $S=\left\{s_{1}=(0 ; 0 ; \ldots ; 0) ; s_{2}=(0 ; 1 ; \ldots ; 1)\right\}$ is a (2n-1;2)-dominating set of $B(n)(n \geq 3)$. For any $x \in V(B(n)-S)$, we
shall construct two vertex-disjoint paths between $x$ and $S$, each of which has length no more than $2 \mathrm{n}-1$.

Case 1. $x=\left(x_{0} ; x_{1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right)$ with $x_{0} \geq 1$.
Suppose that $x_{i_{1}}=x_{i_{2}}=\cdots=x_{i_{g}}=0$ and $x_{i_{g+1}}=x_{i_{g+2}}=\cdots=x_{i_{n}}=$ 1 where $\left\{i_{1} ; i_{2} ; \cdots ; i_{g} ; i_{g+1} ; \cdots ; i_{n}\right\}=\{1 ; 2 ; \cdots ; n\}$ and $i_{1}<i_{2}<\cdots<i_{g}$, $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{g}+1}<\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{g}+2}<\cdots<\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{n}}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}} \leq \mathrm{x}_{0} \leq \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}}$ where $i_{t} \in\left\{i_{1} ; i_{2} ; \cdots ; i_{g}\right\}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{P}_{1}: \mathrm{x} \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{x}_{0}+1 ; \mathrm{w}\right) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}}-1 ; \mathrm{w}\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}} ; \mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}}}\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}}+1 ; \mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}}}\right) \rightarrow \cdots \\
& \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}+1}-1 ; w^{i_{t}}\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}+1} ; w^{i_{t} i_{t+1}}\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{t}+1}+1 ; w^{i_{t} i_{t+1}}\right) \rightarrow \cdots
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow\left(0 ; w^{i_{1} i_{2}}\right)=(0 ; 1 ; \ldots ; 1):
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, let $\boldsymbol{i}_{m_{i}} \leq x_{0} \leq i_{m}$ where $i_{m} \in\left\{i_{g+1} ; i_{g+2} ; \cdots ; i_{n}\right\}$, we can construct a path $P_{2}$ between $X$ and $S_{1}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{P}_{2}: \mathrm{x} \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{x}_{0}+1 ; \mathrm{w}\right) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{m}}-1 ; \mathrm{w}\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{m}} ; \mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{~m}\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{m}}+1 ; \mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{~m}\right) \\
& \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow\left(i_{m+1}-1 ; w^{i_{m}}\right) \rightarrow\left(i_{m+1} ; w^{i_{m} i_{m+1}}\right) \rightarrow\left(i_{m+1}+1 ; w^{i_{m} i_{m+1}}\right) \rightarrow \cdots \\
& \rightarrow\left(i_{n} ; w^{i_{m} i_{m+1}}{ }_{n}\right) \rightarrow\left(i_{n}-1 ; w^{i_{m} i_{m+1}}{ }_{n}\right) \rightarrow\left(i_{n}-2 ; w^{i_{m} i_{m+1}}{ }^{n}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow\left(i_{m i}-1 ; w^{i_{m i}} 2_{m_{i}}{ }_{n}\right) \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow\left(0 ; w^{i_{g+1} i_{g+2}}{ }_{n}\right)=(0 ; 0 ; \cdots ; 0)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that if $x_{0}>i_{g}$ or $x_{0}>i_{n}$, we can construct $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ as above. We easily know that $\left|P_{1}\right|=2\left(i_{g}-x_{0}\right)+x_{0} \leq 2 n-1$ and $\left|P_{2}\right|=2\left(i_{n}-x_{0}\right)+x_{0} \leq 2 n-1$ since $x_{0} \geq 1$. For any vertices $\left.y=p y_{0} ; y_{1} ; \cdots \dot{p} y_{n}\right) \in V\left(P_{1}\right)$ and $z=\left(z_{0}: z_{1} ; \cdots ; z_{n}\right) \in$ $V\left(P_{2}\right)$, we have the fact that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_{i}>\sum_{i=1}^{n} z_{i}$ if $y \neq x$ or $z \neq x$. Thus, $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ are internally vertex-disjoint.

Case 2. $x=\left(x_{0} ; x_{1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right)$ with $x_{0}=0$.
We consider two neighbors of $x, x^{0}=\left(1 ; x_{1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right)$ and $x^{\oplus}=\left(1 ; x_{1} ; x_{2} ; \cdots\right.$; $x_{n}$ ). Without loss of generality, we assume $x_{1}=0$. Thus $x^{0}$ is in the level 0 of $B(n-1)^{1}$ and $x^{\Phi}$ is in the level 0 of $B(n-1)^{2}$. By lemma 3, there is
a path $P$ in $B(n-1)^{1}$ of length no more than $2(n-1)-2$ between $x^{0}$ and $(1 ; 0 ; \cdots ; 0)$ or $(1 ; 0 ; 1 ; \cdots ; 1)$. Since $(1 ; 0 ; \cdots ; 0)$ is a neighbor of $(0 ; 0 ; \cdots ; 0)$ and $(1 ; 0 ; 1 ; \ldots ; 1)$ is a neighbor of $(0 ; 1 ; \ldots ; 1)$, we easily find a path between $x$ and $(0 ; 0 ; \cdots ; 0)$ or $(0 ; 1 ; \cdots ; 1)$, which includes $P$ and has length no more than $2 n-2$. Similarly, we have there exists a path $P^{0}$ in $B(n-1)^{2}$ of length no more than $2(n-1)-2$ between $x^{\oplus}$ and $(1 ; 1 ; 0 \cdots ; 0)$ or $(1 ; 1 ; 1 ; \cdots ; 1)$ by lemma 3 and we also find a path between $x$ and $(0 ; 0 ; \cdots ; 0)$ or $(0 ; 1 ; \cdots ; 1)$, which includes $\mathrm{P}^{0}$ and has length no more than $2 \mathrm{n}-2$. It is obvious that the paths are internally vertex-disjoint.

Thus, $S_{2 n_{i} 1 ; 2}\left(B_{n}\right) \leq 2$. For any vertex $x=\left(x_{0} ; x_{1} ; \cdots ; x_{n}\right)$, there exists a vertex $\mathrm{y}=\left(\mathrm{x}_{0} ; \mathrm{x}_{1} ; \mathrm{x}_{2} ; \cdots ; \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\mathrm{x} ; \mathrm{y})=2 \mathrm{n}$. So, it is impossible that $S_{2 n_{i} 1 ; 2}\left(B_{n}\right)=1$. Thus $S_{2 n_{i} 1 ; 2}\left(B_{n}\right)=2$.

The proof of Theorem 1 is completed.
Theorem 2. The $(\mathrm{d} ; 2)$-dominating numbers of $\mathrm{B}(\mathrm{n})(\mathrm{n} \geq 3)$ are 2 for $2 \mathrm{n} \leq$ $d \leq 2 n+1$.

Proof. By Theorem 1 and Lemma 1(b), we know $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{d} ; 2}(\mathrm{~B}(\mathrm{n})) \leq 2$ for $\mathrm{n}=2 \mathrm{n}$ or $2 n+1$. Suppose that $S_{2 n+1 ; 2}(B(n))=1$. i.e., all vertices of $B(n)$ can be dominated by some vertex $u$. By some automorphisms of $\left\{\mathbb{R}_{1} ; \cdots ; \mathbb{R}^{\prime} ;{ }^{-}\right\}$, we can assume $u=(k-1 ; 0 ; \cdots ; 0)$ with $1 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{2}$. But $v=(k+1 ; 1 ; \cdots ; 1)$ is can't dominating by u since any two paths between u and V with length no more than $2 n+1$ must be intersecting in the vertex $w$ with $w_{0}=k$ and $w_{1}=\cdots=$ $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{k}}=1, \mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{k}+1}=\cdots=\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{n}}=0$ by Lemma 4. This is a contradiction. Thus, $S_{2 n+1 ; 2}(B(n))=2$.
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