

L(j,k)-labeling numbers of square of paths

Wu, Qiong; SHIU, Wai Chee

Published in:
AKCE International Journal of Graphs and Combinatorics

DOI:
[10.1016/j.akcej.2017.07.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.akcej.2017.07.001)

Published: 01/12/2017

Document Version:
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Wu, Q., & SHIU, W. C. (2017). L(j,k)-labeling numbers of square of paths. *AKCE International Journal of Graphs and Combinatorics*, 14(3), 307-316. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.akcej.2017.07.001>

General rights

Copyright and intellectual property rights for the publications made accessible in HKBU Scholars are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners. In addition to the restrictions prescribed by the Copyright Ordinance of Hong Kong, all users and readers must also observe the following terms of use:

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from HKBU Scholars for the purpose of private study or research
- Users cannot further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- To share publications in HKBU Scholars with others, users are welcome to freely distribute the permanent publication URLs



$L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of square of paths[☆]

Qiong Wu^a, Wai Chee Shiu^{b,*}^a Faculty of Science, Tianjin University of Technology and Education, Tianjin, China^b Department of Mathematics, Hong Kong Baptist University, 224 Waterloo Road, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong, China

Received 28 March 2017; received in revised form 3 July 2017; accepted 21 July 2017

Available online 14 August 2017

Abstract

For $j \leq k$, the $L(j, k)$ -labeling arose from code assignment problem. That is, let j, k and m be positive numbers, an m - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of a graph G is a mapping $f : V(G) \rightarrow [0, m]$ such that $|f(u) - f(v)| \geq j$ if $d(u, v) = 1$, and $|f(u) - f(v)| \geq k$ if $d(u, v) = 2$. The span of f is the difference between the maximum and the minimum numbers assigned by f . The $L(j, k)$ -labeling number of G , denoted by $\lambda_{j,k}(G)$, is the minimum span over all $L(j, k)$ -labelings of G . The k th power G^k of an undirected graph G is the graph with the vertex set of G in which two vertices are adjacent when their distance in G is at most k . In this paper, the $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of P_n^2 are determined for $j \leq k$.

© 2017 Kalasalingam University. Publishing Services by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Keywords: $L(j, k)$ -labeling; Path; Square of path; Code assignment

1. Introduction

The rapid growth of computer wireless networks highlighted the scarcity of available codes (such as radio frequencies) for communication with minimum interference. For example, the *Packet Radio Network* (PRN) is a computer network that uses radio frequencies to transmit packet among computers. The two major types of interference in PRN are *Direct collision (or interference)*, which is caused by the transmission of adjacent stations (computers), and *Hidden terminal collision (or interference)*, which is caused by distance-two stations that transmit to the same receiving station or receive the data from the same transmitting station.

Let G be a graph and let $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ be its vertex set and edge set, respectively. For any two vertices u and v , let $d_G(u, v)$ (or simply $d(u, v)$) denote the distance (length of a shortest path) between u and v in G . Noted that all graphs considered in this article are simple connected and undirected. All notation not defined in this article can be found in the book [1].

Peer review under responsibility of Kalasalingam University.

[☆] This work is supported by Tianjin Research Program of Application Foundation and Advanced Technology, Tianjin Municipal Science and Technology Commission, Faculty Research Grant of Hong Kong Baptist University.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: wuqiong@tute.edu.cn (Q. Wu), wcsheu@math.hkbu.edu.hk (W.C. Shiu).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.akcej.2017.07.001>

0972-8600/© 2017 Kalasalingam University. Publishing Services by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

For positive numbers j and k , an $L(j, k)$ -labeling f of G is an assignment of numbers to vertices of G such that $|f(u) - f(v)| \geq j$ if $uv \in E(G)$, and $|f(u) - f(v)| \geq k$ if $d(u, v) = 2$. The *span* of f is the difference between the maximum and the minimum numbers assigned by f . In other words, if we list the image of f as a non-decreasing sequence $\{f(u_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, then the span of f is $f(u_n) - f(u_1)$ which is called the *span of the sequence*, where n is the order of G . The $L(j, k)$ -labeling number of G , denoted by $\lambda_{j,k}(G)$, is the minimum span over all $L(j, k)$ -labeling of G . Without loss of generality, we may assume the minimum value of each labeling f is 0.

In a computer network, suppose direct collision is so weak that it can be ignored, and two distance-two stations can generate a hidden terminal collision. In order to avoid the hidden terminal collision, Bertossi and Bonuccelli [2] introduced an optimal code assignment, that is, two distance-two stations have different codes. By corresponding codes to labels, this code assignment problem is equivalent to the $L(0, 1)$ -labeling problem, that is, two distance-two vertices must be assigned different labels.

In general, the direct collision cannot be ignored. Based on this premise, Jin and Yeh [3] generalized the code assignment problem to $L(j, k)$ -labeling problem with $j \leq k$. That is, to avoid direct collision, any two adjacent stations are required to be assigned at least j apart codes. Additionally, to avoid hidden terminal collision, any two distance-two stations need to be assigned at least k apart codes. Therefore, we face on the $L(j, k)$ -labeling problem with $j \leq k$.

On the other hand, $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of graphs for $j \geq k$ have been studied in many articles. Interested readers were referred to the surveys [4,5].

By now, about the $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of graphs for $j \leq k$, there already exist some results. For example, Jin and Yeh determined $L(0, 1)$, $L(1, 1)$, $L(1, 2)$ -labeling numbers of paths, cycles and grids in [3]. Furthermore, Niu [6] introduced $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of paths and cycles, and Griggs and Jin studied $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of lattices (grids) in [7]. Moreover, Jayasree and Nicholas [8] mentioned $L(1, 2)$ -labeling numbers of certain generalizes Petersen graphs and n -star. In [9], the authors introduced the $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of trees and stars with maximum degree. Lam, Lin and Wu [10] worked on $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of product of completed graphs. Recently, Shiu and Wu determined $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of direct and Cartesian product of path and cycle in [11] and [12], respectively. Moreover, the authors studied circular $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of tree and Cartesian products of graphs, direct product of path and cycle, and square of paths in [13–15], respectively.

The k th power G^k of a graph G is the graph with the vertex set of G in which two vertices are adjacent when their distance in G is at most k . G^2 is called the *square* of G .

Lemma 1.1. *Let j and k be two positive numbers with $j \leq k$. Suppose G is a graph and H is an induced subgraph of G . Then $\lambda_{j,k}(G) \geq \lambda_{j,k}(H)$.*

Note that Lemma 1.1 is not true if H is not an induced subgraph. Throughout this paper, $P_n = v_0v_1 \cdots v_{n-1}$ denotes the path of order n .

2. $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of P_4^2 and P_5^2

Theorem 2.1. *For $j \leq k$, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_4^2) = \max\{k, 3j\}$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = \max\{k, 3j\}$. Let f be the labeling of P_4^2 defined by $f(v_0) = 0$, $f(v_1) = j$, $f(v_2) = 2j$ and $f(v_3) = \lambda$. It is easy to verify that f is a λ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_4^2 . Hence $\lambda_{j,k}(P_4^2) \leq \lambda$.

On the other hand, since any two vertices of P_4^2 are adjacent or of distance two, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_4^2) \geq 3j$. Moreover, since $d(v_0, v_3) = 2$, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_4^2) \geq k$. It implies that $\lambda_{j,k}(P_4^2) \geq \max\{k, 3j\} = \lambda$. Hence, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_4^2) = \max\{k, 3j\}$. \square

Theorem 2.2. *For $j \leq k$, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_5^2) = \max\{j + k, 4j\}$.*

Proof. Let $\eta = \max\{k, 3j\}$ and $\lambda = \eta + j$. Let f be the labeling of P_5^2 defined by $f(v_0) = 0$, $f(v_1) = j$, $f(v_2) = 2j$, $f(v_3) = \eta$ and $f(v_4) = \eta + j$. It is easy to verify that f is a λ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_5^2 . Hence $\lambda_{j,k}(P_5^2) \leq \lambda$.

On the other hand, since any two vertices of P_5^2 are adjacent or of distance two, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_5^2) \geq 4j$. Moreover, since two adjacent vertices v_3 and v_4 are at distance two from vertex v_0 , $\lambda_{j,k}(P_5^2) \geq j + k$. It implies that $\lambda_{j,k}(P_5^2) \geq \max\{j + k, 4j\}$. Hence, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_5^2) = \max\{j + k, 4j\}$. \square

3. $L(j, k)$ -labeling numbers of P_n^2 for $n \geq 6$

In this section, we shall study the $L(j, k)$ -number of P_n^2 by separating the condition $j \leq k$ into three cases which are $j \leq k < 2j$, $3j \leq k$ and $2j \leq k < 3j$, where $n \geq 6$.

We consider $j \leq k < 2j$ first. Define a labeling f for P_n^2 by $f(v_i) = [i]_6 j$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$. Clearly, f is a $(5j)$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling for P_n^2 when $j \leq k < 2j$. So

$$\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) \leq 5j \text{ for } n \geq 6. \tag{3.1}$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let j and k be two positive numbers with $j \leq k < 3j$. Then $\lambda_{j,k}(P_6^2) \geq \min\{5j, 3j + k\}$.*

Proof. Suppose f is a λ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_6^2 and $\lambda < 5j$. Let $I_0 = [0, j)$, $I_1 = [j, (\lambda + j)/3]$, $I_2 = ((\lambda + j)/3, (2\lambda - j)/3)$, $I_3 = [(2\lambda - j)/3, \lambda - j]$ and $I_4 = (\lambda - j, \lambda]$. Here, each I_i is of length less than j , $0 \leq i \leq 4$. Since any two of vertices v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 are adjacent or of distance two, each interval I_i contains exactly one labels of $f(v_0), f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_3), f(v_4)$. Similarly, each interval I_i contains exactly one labels of $f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_3), f(v_4), f(v_5)$. By pigeonhole principle, two labels among $f(v_0), f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_3), f(v_4), f(v_5)$ fall into the same interval. By considering the distance between those vertices, we can see that only $f(v_0)$ and $f(v_5)$ lie in the same interval. By symmetry of the graph, it suffices to consider $f(v_0), f(v_5) \in I_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq 2$. Let $A = \{v_0, v_5\}$.

- Case 1.** Suppose $f(v_0), f(v_5) \in I_0$. Here $f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_3), f(v_4) \in [k, \lambda]$. Since $k \geq j$, by [Theorem 2.1](#) we have $\lambda - k \geq 3j$. Hence $\lambda \geq 3j + k$.
- Case 2.** Suppose $f(v_0), f(v_5) \in I_1$. We have $f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_3), f(v_4) \in [0, (\lambda + j)/3 - k) \cup [j + k, \lambda]$. Since $k \geq j$ and $\lambda < 5j$, the length of $[0, (\lambda + j)/3 - k)$ is less than j . Thus, $[j + k, \lambda]$ contains three of $f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_3)$ and $f(v_4)$. Now $\lambda - k - j \geq 2j$, i.e., $\lambda \geq 3j + k$.
- Case 3.** Suppose $f(v_0), f(v_5) \in I_2$. Let $f(w_i) \in I_i$ for some w_i , where $i = 0, 1, 3, 4$. Hence $\{w_0, w_1, w_3, w_4\} = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$. There exists $v \in A$ such that $d(v, w_1) = 2$. So $f(v) - f(w_1) \geq k$. Then the span of the increasing sequence $f(w_0) < f(w_1) < f(v) < f(w_3) < f(w_4)$ is at least $3j + k$. Hence $\lambda \geq 3j + k$.

Thus $\lambda_{i,j}(P_6^2) \geq \min\{5j, 3j + k\}$. \square

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose $6 \leq n \leq 10$. Let j and k be two positive numbers. If $j \leq k < 2j$, then $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) = 3j + k$.*

Proof. Define a labeling f for P_{10}^2 as follows:

$f(v_0) = f(v_5) = 0, f(v_1) = k, f(v_2) = j + k, f(v_3) = 2j + k, f(v_4) = 3j + k, f(v_6) = j, f(v_7) = 2j, f(v_8) = 3j, f(v_9) = 4j$. It is easy to verify that f is a $(3j + k)$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_{10}^2 when $j \leq k < 2j$.

By [Lemma 1.1](#), we have $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) \leq 3j + k$ for $n \leq 10$.

Since P_6^2 is an induced subgraph of P_n^2 , it suffices to show that $\lambda = \lambda_{j,k}(P_6^2) \geq 3j + k$. By [Lemma 3.1](#) and $j \leq k < 2j$, we have $\lambda_{i,j}(P_6^2) \geq 3j + k$. Thus $\lambda_{i,j}(P_6^2) = 3j + k$. By [Lemma 1.1](#) we get that $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) \geq \lambda_{i,j}(P_6^2) = 3j + k$ for $n \geq 6$.

Combining the discussion above, we have $\lambda(P_n^2) = 3j + k$ for $6 \leq n \leq 10$. \square

For any integer a , $[a]_m \in \{0, 1, \dots, m - 1\}$ denotes the residue of a modulo m , where m is a positive integer greater than 1. For convenience, we let $V_i = \{v_l \in V(P_n^2) \mid l \equiv i \pmod{5}\}$, $0 \leq i \leq 4$, where $n \geq 11$. And also let $E(A, B)$ be the set of edges from A to B and $f(A) = \{f(v) \mid v \in A\}$ for a labeling f of P_n^2 , where A and B are subsets of $V(P_n^2)$.

Theorem 3.3. *Suppose $11 \leq n \leq 15$. Let j and k be two positive numbers with $j \leq k < 2j$. Then $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) = \min\{2j + 2k, 5j\}$.*

Proof. Let $(0, k, 2k, j + 2k, 2j + 2k, 0, k, j + k, 2j + k, 2j + 2k, 0, j, 2j, 2j + k, 2j + 2k)$ be the list of the values of $(g(v_i))_{0 \leq i \leq 14}$. Hence this defines a $(2j + 2k)$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling g for P_{15}^2 . By [Lemma 1.1](#) and [\(3.1\)](#), we have $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) \leq \min\{2j + 2k, 5j\}$ for $11 \leq n \leq 15$.

Similar to the proof of [Theorem 3.2](#), in order to obtain the theorem it suffices to show that $\lambda = \lambda_{j,k}(P_{11}^2) \geq \min\{2j + 2k, 5j\}$. Thus we have to show that “if $\lambda < 5j$, then $\lambda \geq 2j + 2k$ ”.




Fig. 1. The graph $H - V_0$.

Now suppose $\lambda < 5j$. Let f be a λ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_{11}^2 . Let I_i be intervals defined in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Note that the length of each interval is less than j . By pigeonhole principle, at least one interval contains three vertex labels. Note that such labels may be the same. Let H be a graph with the vertex set $V(P_{11}^2)$ in which two vertices are adjacent if they are of distance at least 3 in P_{11}^2 . Note that, H is a compatibility graph, in which two vertices are adjacent if and only if their assigned labels can lie in the same interval I_i for some i . We can see that H contains only one 3-cycle which is $v_0v_5v_{10}v_0$. Thus, only $f(v_0)$, $f(v_5)$ and $f(v_{10})$ lie in the same interval I_{h_0} for some h_0 . Thus, each of other interval contains exactly two labels. By symmetry of the graph, we may assume that $0 \leq h_0 \leq 2$.

By considering the subgraph induced by $\{v_l \mid 0 \leq l \leq 5\}$ and the same argument in the proof of Theorem 3.2, each of $f(v_1)$, $f(v_2)$, $f(v_3)$, $f(v_4)$ lies in exactly one different interval. Let $f(v_i) \in I_{h_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$. Now $\{h_0, h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4\} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Similarly, by considering the subgraph induced by $\{v_l \mid 5 \leq l \leq 10\}$, each of $f(v_6)$, $f(v_7)$, $f(v_8)$, $f(v_9)$ lies in exactly one different interval I_{h_i} , $1 \leq i \leq 4$.

By considering another compatibility graph $H - V_0$ (Fig. 1), we can see that $f(V_1) \subset I_{h_1}$ and $f(V_4) \subset I_{h_4}$. This forces that $f(V_2) \subset I_{h_2}$ and $f(V_3) \subset I_{h_3}$.

Case 1. Suppose $h_0 = 0$. We want to determine the span of the set $S = \{f(v_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq 9, i \neq 5\}$, i.e., the maximum difference between each pair of labels in S . For each $w \in V_i$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, there is a $v \in V_0$ such that $d(w, v) = 2$. Thus, $S \subset [k, \lambda]$. We shall face on all permutations of $h_1h_2h_3h_4$. For example, suppose $h_1h_2h_3h_4 = 1234$. That means $f(V_1) \subset I_1$, $f(V_2) \subset I_2$, $f(V_3) \subset I_3$ and $f(V_4) \subset I_4$. Considering the path $v_6v_2v_3v_4$ at the graph H_2 shown in Fig. 2, we have an increasing subsequence $f(v_6) < f(v_2) < f(v_3) < f(v_4)$. Thus the span of S is at least $k + 2j$. The reflection case of this case is $h_1h_2h_3h_4 = 4321$. By means of reflection there are $4!/2 = 12$ permutations we have to deal with.

Combining all cases, we have $\lambda - k \geq 2j + k$. Hence $\lambda \geq 2j + 2k$.

Case 2. Suppose $h_0 = 1$. Similar to Case 2 of the proof of Theorem 3.2, $[j + k, \lambda]$ contains three of $f(V_1)$, $f(V_2)$, $f(V_3)$ and $f(V_4)$. No matter which case, the span of the union of these three subsets is at least $k + j$. So $\lambda - j - k \geq k + j$. Hence $\lambda \geq 2j + 2k$.

Case 3. Suppose $h_0 = 2$. Now $\{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4\} = \{0, 1, 3, 4\}$. Consider the graph H_2 . There is always a hard edge in $E(V_s, V_t)$, where $1 \leq s < t \leq 4$. Moreover, each vertex in H_2 is of distance either 1 or 2 to v_5 in P_{11}^2 . Thus, for each permutation of $h_1h_2h_3h_4$, there always exists an increasing subsequence of $f(V(P_{11}^2))$ involving $f(v_5)$ with the span at least $2j + 2k$. For example, when $h_1h_2h_3h_4 = 0314$, the required subsequence is $f(v_6) < f(v_3) < f(v_5) < f(v_7) < f(v_4)$. So the span of f is at least $2j + 2k$.

Combining the discussion above, we have $\lambda = 2j + 2k$ for $11 \leq n \leq 15$. \square

Theorem 3.4. Suppose $16 \leq n \leq 20$. Let j, k be two positive numbers with $j \leq k < 2j$. Then $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) = \min\{j + 3k, 5j\}$.

Proof. Let $(0, k, 2k, 3k, j + 3k, 0, k, 2k, j + 2k, 2j + 2k, 0, k, j + k, 2j + k, 2j + 2k, 0, j, 2j, 2j + k, 2j + 2k)$ be the list of the values of $(g(v_i))_{0 \leq i \leq 19}$. Hence this defines a $(j + 3k)$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling g for P_n^2 if $16 \leq n \leq 20$. By Lemma 1.1 and (3.1), we have $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) \leq \min\{j + 3k, 5j\}$ for $16 \leq n \leq 20$.

Conversely, we consider $\lambda = \lambda_{j,k}(P_{16}^2)$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.3 we assume $\lambda < 5j$ and show that $\lambda \geq j + 3k$ in the following.




Fig. 2. Graph H_2 : Dot and hard edges indicate distance 1 and 2 between the involved vertices in P_{11}^2 , respectively.

Table 1

Lower bound of the span S .

$h_1h_2h_3h_4$	Subsequence of labels	Lower bound of the span
1234	$f(v_6) < f(v_2) < f(v_3) < f(v_4)$	$2j + k$
1243	$f(v_6) < f(v_7) < f(v_4) < f(v_8)$	$j + 2k$
1324	$f(v_6) < f(v_3) < f(v_7) < f(v_4)$	$3k$
1342	$f(v_1) < f(v_4) < f(v_7) < f(v_3)$	$3k$
1423	$f(v_6) < f(v_3) < f(v_4) < f(v_7)$	$3k$
1432	$f(v_1) < f(v_4) < f(v_3) < f(v_7)$	$j + 2k$
2134	$f(v_2) < f(v_6) < f(v_3) < f(v_4)$	$j + 2k$
2143	$f(v_2) < f(v_6) < f(v_9) < f(v_8)$	$j + 2k$
2314	$f(v_3) < f(v_6) < f(v_2) < f(v_4)$	$j + 2k$
2413	$f(v_3) < f(v_6) < f(v_9) < f(v_7)$	$j + 2k$
3124	$f(v_7) < f(v_3) < f(v_6) < f(v_9)$	$3k$
3214	$f(v_3) < f(v_7) < f(v_6) < f(v_9)$	$j + 2k$

Let I_i be defined in Theorem 3.2. By considering the subgraphs induced by $\{v_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq 10\}$ and $\{v_i \mid 5 \leq i \leq 15\}$, we obtain that $f(V_0) \subset I_{h_0}$ for some $h_0 \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ (without loss of generality), $f(V_i) \subset I_{h_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, where $\{h_0, h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4\} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

- Case 1.** Suppose $h_0 = 0$. By Table 1, we only need to consider the case when $h_1h_2h_3h_4 = 1234$. In this case, there is a subsequence $f(v_{11}) < f(v_7) < f(v_3) < f(v_4)$. Now the span of S is at least $j + 2k$.
- Case 2.** Suppose $h_0 = 1$. Similar to Case 2 of the proof of Theorem 3.2, $[j + k, \lambda]$ contains three of $f(V_1)$, $f(V_2)$, $f(V_3)$ and $f(V_4)$. No matter which case (see Fig. 3), the span of the union of these three subsets is at least $2k$. So $\lambda - j - k \geq 2k$. Hence $\lambda \geq j + 3k$.
- Case 3.** Suppose $h_0 = 2$. Now $\{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4\} = \{0, 1, 3, 4\}$. We have to deal with the 12 permutations of $h_1h_2h_3h_4$. We only provide the discussion of the case when $h_1h_2h_3h_4 = 0314$ here. Other cases are similarly to show. For this case, we have an increasing subsequence $f(v_{11}) < f(v_8) < f(v_5) < f(v_7) < f(v_4)$. So the span of f is at least $j + 3k$.

Combining the discussion above, we have $\lambda = j + 3k$ for $16 \leq n \leq 20$. \square

Lemma 3.5. Let W_i be a set consisting of 4 vertices of a graph G , $1 \leq i \leq 4$. Assume that $E(W_i, W_{i+1})$ contains at least 3 disjoint edges, for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Then there is a path $w_1w_2w_3w_4$ with $w_i \in W_i$.

Proof. Let $w_{1j}w_{2j} \in E(W_1, W_2)$ for $1 \leq j \leq 3$, $w_{ij} \in W_i$. Since at most one vertex in W_2 is not incident with edge of $E(W_1, W_2)$, at least two edges of $E(W_2, W_3)$ are adjacent with $w_{1j}w_{2j}$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$. After renaming if necessary, we may assume that such two edges of $E(W_2, W_3)$ are $w_{21}w_{31}$ and $w_{22}w_{32}$. Since only one vertex in W_4 is not incident edges in $E(W_3, W_4)$, there is an edge, say $w_{31}w_{41} \in E(W_3, W_4)$. Now we have a path $w_{11}w_{21}w_{31}w_{41}$. \square

Corollary 3.6. Let W_i be a set consisting of 4 vertices of a graph G , $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Assume that $E(W_i, W_{i+1})$ contains at least 3 disjoint edges, for $1 \leq i \leq 2$. Then there are two disjoint paths $w_1w_2w_3$ with $w_i \in W_i$.




Fig. 3. Graph H_3 : Two vertices are adjacent if they are of distance 2 in P_{16}^2 .




Fig. 4. Graph H_4 .

Theorem 3.7. Suppose $n \geq 21$. Let j, k be two positive numbers with $j \leq k < 2j$. Then $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) = \min\{4k, 5j\}$.

Proof. Define a labeling g for P_n^2 by $g(v_i) = [i]_5 k$. Clearly g is a $(4k)$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_n^2 . By (3.1), we have $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) \leq \min\{4k, 5j\}$.

Consider the graph P_{21}^2 and assume $\lambda < 5j$. Let I_i be defined in Theorem 3.2. By a similar argument of the proof of Theorem 3.4, we have $f(V_0) \subset I_{h_0}$ for some $h_0 \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, $f(V_i) = \{f(v_1), f(v_6), f(v_{11}), f(v_{16})\} \subset I_{h_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, where $\{h_0, h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4\} = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Let H_4 be the graph in Fig. 4. Two vertices are adjacent if they are of distance 2 in P_{21}^2 .

Remark 1. For $1 \leq s < t \leq 4$, there are at least 3 disjoint edges in $E(V_s, V_t) \subset E(H_4)$. For each $w \in V_i$ with $1 \leq i \leq 4$, there is a unique $v \in V_0$ such that $wv \in E(V_0, V_i)$.

Case 1. Suppose $h_0 = 0$. Let $\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ h_1 & h_2 & h_3 & h_4 \end{pmatrix}$ be a permutation of $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Let $k_i = \sigma^{-1}(i)$. By Remark 1 and Lemma 3.5, there is a path $w_1 w_2 w_3 w_4$ in which $w_i \in V_{k_i}$. By Remark 1 again, there is $w_0 \in V_0$ such that $d(w_0, w_1) = 2$. Hence the path $w_0 \dots w_5$ induces a subsequence $f(w_0) < f(w_1) < f(w_2) < f(w_3) < f(w_4)$ and the span of this subsequence is $4k$. Hence we have $\lambda \geq 4k$.

Case 2. Suppose $h_0 = 1$. Let $\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ h_1 & h_2 & h_3 & h_4 \end{pmatrix}$ be a permutation of $\{0, 2, 3, 4\}$. Let $k_i = \sigma^{-1}(i)$, $2 \leq i \leq 4$ and $\sigma^{-1}(0) = \ell$. By Corollary 3.6, there are two disjoint paths $w_2 w_3 w_4$ and $u_2 u_3 u_4$ such that $w_i, u_i \in V_{k_i}$,

$2 \leq i \leq 4$. By Remark 1 there are $u_0, w_0 \in V_0$ such that w_0w_2 and u_0u_2 are edges of $E(V_0, V_{k_2})$. Since only one vertex in V_0 is not adjacent to vertex of V_ℓ , there is a $w_1 \in V_\ell$ such that either $w_1w_0 \in E(V_\ell, V_0)$ or $w_1u_0 \in E(V_\ell, V_0)$. Let us say $w_1w_0 \in E(V_\ell, V_0)$. There is a path $w_1w_0w_2w_3w_4$ that induces a subsequence $f(w_1) < f(w_0) < f(w_2) < f(w_3) < f(w_4)$. Hence we have $\lambda \geq 4k$.

Case 3. Suppose $h_0 = 2$. Let $\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 3 & 4 \\ h_1 & h_2 & h_3 & h_4 \end{pmatrix}$ be a permutation of $\{0, 1, 3, 4\}$. Let $k_i = \sigma^{-1}(i), i \in \{0, 1, 3, 4\}$. Note that $E(V_{k_0}, V_{k_1})$ and $E(V_{k_3}, V_{k_4})$ contain 3 disjoint edges, respectively; $E(V_{k_1}, V_0)$ and $E(V_0, V_{k_3})$ contain 4 disjoint edges, respectively. By a similar argument as above, there are three paths $u_1u_2u_0$ with $u_1 \in V_{k_1}, u_2 \in V_{k_1}$ and $u_0 \in V_0$ and three paths $w_0u_3u_4$ with $u_3 \in V_{k_3}, u_4 \in V_{k_4}$ and $w_0 \in V_0$. By pigeonhole principle, there are two paths $u_1u_2u_0$ and $w_0u_3u_4$ such that $u_0 = w_0$. Here we have a path $u_1u_2u_0u_3u_4$. Hence we have $\lambda \geq 4k$. \square

Now, we consider the case when $k \geq 3j$.

Theorem 3.8. *Let j and k be two positive numbers. If $k \geq 3j$, then $\lambda_{j,k}(P_6^2) = 2j + k$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = \lambda_{j,k}(P_6^2)$. Define $g(v_0) = 0, g(v_1) = j, g(v_2) = 2j, g(v_3) = k, g(v_4) = j + k, g(v_5) = 2j + k$. It is easy to verify that g is a $(2j + k)$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling for P_6^2 . Hence $\lambda \leq 2j + k$.

On the other hand, let f be a λ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_6^2 . Since v_3, v_4 are distance two apart from $v_0, f(v_3), f(v_4) \in [0, f(v_0) - k] \cup [f(v_0) + k, \lambda]$. If $f(v_3) < f(v_0) < f(v_4)$ or $f(v_4) < f(v_0) < f(v_3)$, then $\lambda \geq 2k > 2j + k$. Since we have just known that $\lambda \leq 2j + k$, this is not a case. So both $f(v_3)$ and $f(v_4)$ are either greater than or less than $f(v_0)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $f(v_3)$ and $f(v_4)$ are greater than $f(v_0)$, otherwise consider the labeling $\bar{f} = \lambda - f$. That is, $f(v_3), f(v_4) \in [f(v_0) + k, \lambda]$. Hence $\lambda - k \geq f(v_0)$. Moreover, since $d(v_1, v_4) = 2, f(v_1) \in [0, \lambda - k]$. Similarly, since $d(v_1, v_5) = 2, f(v_5) \in [k, \lambda]$. Since $d(v_2, v_5) = 2, f(v_2) \in [0, \lambda - k]$. Now, we can conclude that $f(v_0), f(v_1), f(v_2) \in [0, \lambda - k]$. Since v_0, v_1, v_2 are adjacent to each other, $\lambda - k \geq 2j$. Hence $\lambda \geq 2j + k$. Hence $\lambda_{j,k}(P_6^2) = 2j + k$. \square

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose $n \geq 7$. Let j, k be two positive numbers. If $k \geq 3j$, then $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) = 2k$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda = \lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2)$. Define $g(v_0) = 0, g(v_1) = j, g(v_2) = 2j, g(v_3) = k, g(v_4) = j + k, g(v_5) = 2j + k, g(v_6) = 2k$ and $g(v_i) = g(v_{i-7})$ for $i \geq 7$. It is easy to verify that g is a $2k$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_n^2 . Hence $\lambda \leq 2k$.

Since P_7^2 is an induced subgraph of P_n^2 , it suffices to show that $\lambda = \lambda_{j,k}(P_7^2) \geq 2k$. Let f be a λ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_7^2 . Consider the labels of v_0, v_3 and v_4 . By the same argument of the proof of Theorem 3.8, we only need to consider the case when $f(v_3), f(v_4) \in [f(v_0) + k, \lambda]$. By the proof of Theorem 3.8 again, we have $f(v_0), f(v_1), f(v_2) \in [0, \lambda - k]$.

Now, if $f(v_3) < f(v_6)$, then $f(v_0) < f(v_3) < f(v_6)$ implies $\lambda \geq 2k$. The remaining case is $f(v_6) < f(v_3)$. But this implies that $f(v_6) \in [0, \lambda - k]$. Now, $f(v_2), f(v_6) \in [0, \lambda - k]$. Hence $\lambda \geq 2k$.

This completes the proof. \square

Finally, we consider the case when $2j \leq k < 3j$.

Theorem 3.10. *Let j and k be two positive numbers. If $2j \leq k < 3j$, then $\lambda_{j,k}(P_6^2) = 5j$.*

Proof. Define a labeling g for P_6^2 by $g(v_i) = [i]_6j$. Clearly g is a $(5j)$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_6^2 . Thus, we have $\lambda_{j,k}(P_6^2) \leq 5j$.

Moreover, by Lemma 3.1, we have $\lambda_{j,k}(P_6^2) \geq \min\{5j, 3j + k\} = 5j$. Hence $\lambda_{j,k}(P_6^2) = 5j$. \square

Theorem 3.11. *Let j and k be two positive numbers. If $2j \leq k < 3j$ and $7 \leq n \leq 12$, then $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) = 3j + k$.*

Proof. Let $g(v_0) = 0, g(v_1) = j, g(v_2) = k, g(v_3) = j + k, g(v_4) = 2j + k, g(v_5) = 3j + k, g(v_6) = 0, g(v_7) = j, g(v_8) = 2j, g(v_9) = 3j, g(v_{10}) = 4j, g(v_{11}) = 5j$. It is easy to check that g is a $(3j + k)$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_{12}^2 . Thus, By Lemma 1.1, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) \leq 3j + k$ for $7 \leq n \leq 12$.

Let $\lambda = \lambda_{j,k}(P_7^2)$ and let f be a λ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling of P_7^2 . We have $\lambda \leq 3j + k$. As the proofs of those previous theorems, we only need to show $\lambda \geq 3j + k$.

Let $J_0 = [0, j]$, $J_1 = [j, 2j]$, $J_2 = [2j, \lambda/2]$, $J_3 = [\lambda/2, \lambda - 2j]$, $J_4 = [\lambda - 2j, \lambda - j]$ and $J_5 = [\lambda - j, \lambda]$. Since $\lambda \leq 3j + k$ and $k < 3j$, the length of each interval is less than j . Thus, if $f(u), f(w) \in J_i$ for some i , then $d(u, w) > 2$. Hence $\{u, w\}$ is either $A_0 = \{v_0, v_5\}$, $A_1 = \{v_1, v_6\}$ or $A_2 = \{v_0, v_6\}$. Also, each J_i cannot contain more than 2 vertices. Since the length of each $J_i \cup J_{i+1}$ is less than $2j < k$, for $0 \leq i \leq 4$, if $\{u, w\}$ is none of A_0, A_1 and A_2 but $f(\{u, w\}) \subset J_i \cup J_{i+1}$ for some i , then $d(u, w) = 1$. For this case, $f(\{u, w\}) \subset J_i \cup J_{i+1}$ associates a path uw of length 1. Furthermore, $J_i \cup J_{i+1}$ cannot contain three labels of $\{f(v_0), f(v_1), f(v_5), f(v_6)\}$.

Following we want to find an increasing sequence of labels with span at least $3j + k$. It is easy to get the following claim.

Claim 1. Suppose $v \in \{v_2, v_3, v_4\}$. For each $i, i = 0, 1, 2$, there exists $w_i \in A_i$ such that $d(v, w_i) = 2$.

Now, by pigeonhole principle, there is at least one J_q containing two labels. By symmetry we may assume that $q = 0, 1, 2$, otherwise consider the labeling $\bar{f} = \lambda - f$. Thus, J_q contains either $f(A_0), f(A_1)$ or $f(A_2)$.

Case A. Suppose there are two intervals, say J_q and J_r , containing 2 labels, where $0 \leq q \leq 2$ and $q < r$. In this case, $f(A_2)$ does not contain in $J_q \cup J_r$. By renumbering the vertex if necessary, we may assume that $f(A_1) \subset J_q$ and $f(A_0) \subset J_r$. Let $\{f(u_1), f(u_2), f(u_3)\} = \{f(v_2), f(v_3), f(v_4)\}$, where $f(u_1) < f(u_2) < f(u_3)$.

- A-1.** Suppose $f(v_0) < f(u_1)$. By Claim 1 there is $w_0 \in A_0$ such that $d(w_0, u_1) = 2$. Now we have $f(v_1) < f(w_0) < f(u_1) < f(u_2) < f(u_3)$ with span at least $3j + k$.
- A-2.** Suppose $f(v_1) < f(u_1) < f(v_0)$ or $f(u_1) < f(v_1) < f(u_2)$. By Claim 1 there is $w_1 \in A_1$ such that $d(w_1, u_1) = 2$. Thus, $f(v_0), f(u_2), f(u_3)$ lie in $[k + j, \lambda]$. So $\lambda - (k + j) \geq 2j$. Hence $\lambda \geq 3j + k$.
- A-3.** Suppose $f(u_2) < f(v_1)$ and $f(u_3) > f(v_1)$. In this case, we have $f(v_1) < f(u_3) < f(v_0)$ or $f(u_2) < f(v_0) < f(u_3)$. This is the reflexive case of Case A-2.
- A-4.** Suppose $f(u_3) < f(v_1)$. This is the reflexive case of Case A-1.

Case B. Suppose there is only one interval J_q containing 2 labels, where $0 \leq q \leq 2$.

B-1. Suppose J_0 contains two labels.

- a.** $f(A_0) \subset J_0$. The span of the set $\{f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_3), f(v_4)\}$ is at least $3j$. No matter which label is the minimum, there always exists a vertex $w \in A_0$ such that $f(w)$ is less than this minimum by at least k . Hence, the span of the set $\{f(w), f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_3), f(v_4)\}$ is at least $3j + k$.
- b.** $f(A_1) \subset J_0$. Consider the set $\{f(v_2), f(v_3), f(v_4), f(v_5)\}$. Similar to Case a, we will get the same result.
- c.** $f(A_2) \subset J_0$. Since the length of $J_0 \cup J_1$ is less than k , only $f(v_1)$ or $f(v_5)$ lies in J_1 . Renaming the vertex if necessary, we may assume $f(v_1) \in J_1$. By the same reason, only $f(v_2)$ or $f(v_3)$ lies in J_2 . Suppose $f(v_4) \in J_3$. Let $f(w_4) \in J_4$ and $f(w_5) \in J_5$. We have $f(v_0) < f(v_1) < f(v_4) < f(w_4) < f(w_5)$ with span at least $3j + k$. We will get the same result, if we replace v_4 by v_5 . Now the remaining cases are $f(v_2) < f(v_3) < f(v_4) < f(v_5)$, $f(v_2) < f(v_3) < f(v_5) < f(v_4)$, $f(v_3) < f(v_2) < f(v_4) < f(v_5)$ and $f(v_3) < f(v_2) < f(v_5) < f(v_4)$. The span of the last three sequences are at least $j + k$. So combining with the sequence $f(v_0) < f(v_1)$ we have a sequence with span $3j + k$. Finally, we consider the case $f(v_0) < f(v_1) < f(v_2) < f(v_3) < f(v_4) < f(v_5)$. Since $f(v_6)$ also in J_0 , we have the sequence $f(v_6) < f(v_2) < f(v_3) < f(v_4) < f(v_5)$ with span $3j + k$.

B-2. Suppose J_1 contains two labels. Let $f(A_i) \subset J_1$. Then $f(A_l) \cap (J_0 \cup J_2) = \emptyset$ for all l . Let $f(w_r) \in J_r$, for $0 \leq r \leq 5$ and $r \neq 1$. There is a $v \in A_i$ such that $d(v, w_2) = 2$. Hence the sequence $f(w_0) < f(v) < f(w_2) < f(w_3) < f(w_4) < f(w_5)$ is of span at least $3j + k$ (as the span of $\{f(w_2), f(w_3), f(w_4), f(w_5)\}$ is at least $2j$, $f(v) - f(w_0) \geq j$ and $f(w_2) - f(v) \geq k$).

B-3. Suppose J_2 contains two labels. Let $f(A_i) \subset J_2$. Then $f(A_l) \cap (J_1 \cup J_3) = \emptyset$ for all l . Let $f(w_r) \in J_r$, for $0 \leq r \leq 5$ and $r \neq 2$. There is a $v \in A_i$ such that $d(v, w_1) = 2$. Since $w_1 \in \{v_2, v_3, v_4\}$, $1 \leq d(w_0, w_1) \leq 2$. This implies that $f(w_1) - f(w_0) \geq j$. Since $w_1 \in \{v_2, v_3, v_4\}$, $f(w_3) - f(v) \geq j$. Note that the span of $\{f(w_3), f(w_4), f(w_5)\}$ is at least j . Hence the sequence $f(w_0) < f(w_1) < f(v) < f(w_3) < f(w_4) < f(w_5)$ is of span at least $3j + k$.

Combining the above cases, we have $\lambda \geq 3j + k$. Hence the proof is completed. \square

Theorem 3.12. Let j and k be two positive numbers with $2j \leq k < 3j$. If $n \geq 13$, then $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) = \min\{j + 2k, 6j\}$.

Proof. Suppose $6j \leq j + 2k$. Define $g(v_i) = [i]_7 j$ for all i . It is easy to verify that g is a $(6j)$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling for P_n^2 .

Suppose $6j > j + 2k$. Define $g(v_0) = 0, g(v_1) = j, g(v_2) = k, g(v_3) = j + k, g(v_4) = 2k, g(v_5) = j + 2k$ and $g(v_i) = g(v_{[i]_6})$ for $7 \leq i \leq n$. It is easy to verify that g is a $(j + 2k)$ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling for P_n^2 .

Let f be a λ - $L(j, k)$ -labeling for P_{13}^2 . It suffices to show that $\lambda \geq \min\{j + 2k, 6j\}$. Now, we assume $\lambda < j + 2k$. We want to show that $\lambda \geq 6j$. We may assume $f(v_0) < f(v_3)$, otherwise consider the labeling $\bar{f} = \lambda - f$.

Case A. Suppose $f(v_3) < f(v_6)$. Since $f(v_0) < f(v_3) < f(v_6)$, $f(v_0) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$, $f(v_3) \in [k, \lambda - k]$ and $f(v_6) \in [2k, \lambda]$. Since $d(v_3, v_7) = 2$, $f(v_7) \in [0, \lambda - 2k] \cup [2k, \lambda]$. Since the length $[2k, \lambda]$ is less than j , $f(v_7) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$. This implies that $f(v_7) < f(v_3)$. As the length of $[2k, \lambda]$ is less than j , we have $f(v_2), f(v_4)$ and $f(v_5)$ are not in $[2k, \lambda]$. By considering the distance apart from v_6 , we have $f(v_4), f(v_5) \in [0, \lambda - j]$ and $f(v_2) \in [0, \lambda - k]$. By $f(v_0), f(v_7) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$, we have $f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_5) \in [j, \lambda]$ and $f(v_4) \in [k, \lambda]$. As the length of $[k, \lambda - k]$ is less than j , we have $f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_4)$ and $f(v_5)$ are not in this interval. Now we summarize the range of some labels: $f(v_1) \in [j, k] \cup (\lambda - k, \lambda]$; $f(v_2) \in [j, k]$; $f(v_3) \in [k, \lambda - k]$; $f(v_4) \in (\lambda - k, \lambda - j]$ and $f(v_5) \in [j, k] \cup (\lambda - k, \lambda - j]$. Since the length of $[j, k]$ is less than k , $f(v_5) \notin [j, k]$ and hence $f(v_5) \in (\lambda - k, \lambda - j] \subset (\lambda - k, \lambda]$. Also since the length of $(\lambda - k, \lambda]$ is less than k , $f(v_1) \notin (\lambda - k, \lambda]$. Hence $f(v_1) \in [j, k)$. Now we have $f(v_0) < f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_3) < f(v_5)$. So $f(v_5) \geq 2j + k$. That is, $f(v_5) \in [2j + k, \lambda - j]$. Up to now we have $f(v_0), f(v_1), f(v_2), f(v_3), f(v_4)$ and $f(v_5)$ are at most $\lambda - j$. By **Theorem 3.10**, $\lambda - j \geq 5j$. Hence $\lambda \geq 6j$.

Case B. Suppose $f(v_3) > f(v_6)$. We have $f(v_6) \in [0, \lambda - k]$. Suppose $f(v_7) > f(v_3)$. Since $f(v_0) < f(v_3) < f(v_7)$, $f(v_0) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$, $f(v_3) \in [k, \lambda - k]$ and $f(v_7) \in [2k, \lambda]$. Since the lengths of $[0, \lambda - 2k]$ and $[2k, \lambda]$ are less than j , $f(v_4)$ does not lie in these two intervals. This implies that $f(v_0) < f(v_4) < f(v_7)$. Now, $f(v_3), f(v_4) \in [k, \lambda - k]$ which is impossible. That means $f(v_7) < f(v_3)$ and $f(v_7) \in [0, \lambda - k]$. Since v_3, v_{10} are of distance two from v_6 and v_7 and the length of $[0, \lambda - k]$ is less than $j + k$, $f(v_3), f(v_{10}) \geq \max\{f(v_6), f(v_7)\} + k \geq j + k$ or $f(v_3), f(v_{10}) \leq \min\{f(v_6), f(v_7)\} - k \leq (\lambda - k - j) - k < 0$. So the last case is impossible. Hence $f(v_3), f(v_{10}) \in [j + k, \lambda]$. Hence $f(v_6), f(v_7) < f(v_3), f(v_{10})$. Similarly, we have $f(v_{11}) \in [0, \lambda - 2k] \cup [k, \lambda]$.

B-1. Suppose $f(v_{11}) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$. Since the length of $[0, \lambda - 2k]$ is less than j , $f(v_7), f(v_8), f(v_9), f(v_{10})$ and $f(v_{12})$ are greater than $f(v_{11})$. Combining with $f(v_7) < f(v_3), f(v_{10})$, we have $f(v_7) \in [k, \lambda - k]$, $f(v_3), f(v_{10}) \in [2k, \lambda]$. Since $f(v_8)$ cannot lie in $[0, \lambda - 2k] \cup [2k, \lambda]$, $f(v_{11}) < f(v_8) < f(v_{10})$. Now we have $f(v_8) \in [k, \lambda - j]$. Since $f(v_8)$ cannot lie in $[k, \lambda - k]$, $f(v_8) > f(v_7)$ and hence $f(v_8) \in [j + k, \lambda - j]$. Comparing $f(v_4)$ with $f(v_7)$, we have $f(v_4) \in [0, \lambda - 2k] \cup [2k, \lambda]$. From the range of $f(v_3)$, we have $f(v_4) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$. From the range of $f(v_4)$, we have $f(v_5), f(v_6) \geq j$. Hence $f(v_i) \geq j$ for $5 \leq i \leq 10$. By **Theorem 3.10**, $\lambda - j \geq 5j$. Hence $\lambda \geq 6j$.

B-2. Suppose $f(v_{11}) \in [k, \lambda]$. Then $f(v_8) \in [0, \lambda - k] \cup [2k, \lambda]$. Suppose $f(v_8) \in [2k, \lambda]$. Since the length of $[2k, \lambda]$ is less than j , $f(v_i) \in [0, \lambda - j]$, where $4 \leq i \leq 12$ and $i \neq 8$. Moreover, since $d(v_8, v_{11}) = 2$, $f(v_{11}) \in [k, \lambda - k]$. Since the length of $[k, \lambda - k]$ is less than j , $f(v_6), f(v_7), f(v_9)$ and $f(v_{12})$ are less than $f(v_{11})$. Moreover, $f(v_6), f(v_7) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$ and $f(v_9), f(v_{12}) \in [0, \lambda - k - j]$. But it is impossible, since the length of $[0, \lambda - k - j]$ is less than k . Thus, $f(v_8) \in [0, \lambda - k]$.

a. When $f(v_5) < f(v_8)$. This implies that $f(v_5) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$ and hence $f(v_8) \in [k, \lambda - k]$ and $f(v_6), f(v_7) \in [j, \lambda - k]$. Since the length of $[k, \lambda - k]$ is less than j , $f(v_8)$ must be less than $f(v_{11})$ and $f(v_8)$ must be greater than $f(v_6)$ and $f(v_7)$. Thus, $f(v_{11}) \in [2k, \lambda]$. Now the length of $[2k, \lambda]$ is less than j , $f(v_9)$ and $f(v_{10})$ are less than $f(v_{11})$. That means, $f(v_5), f(v_6), f(v_7), f(v_8), f(v_9), f(v_{10})$ lie in $[0, \lambda - j]$. By **Theorem 3.10**, we have $\lambda \geq 6j$.

b. When $f(v_5) > f(v_8)$. Hence $f(v_5) \in [k, \lambda]$.

b-1. Suppose $f(v_2) > f(v_5)$. Since $f(v_2) > f(v_5) > f(v_8)$, $f(v_8) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$. Since the length of $[0, \lambda - 2k]$ is less than j , $f(v_4), f(v_5), f(v_6), f(v_7)$ are greater than j . Combining with the ranges of $f(v_2)$ and $f(v_3)$ we have $f(v_i) \in [j, \lambda]$ for $2 \leq i \leq 7$. By **Theorem 3.10**, we have $\lambda \geq 6j$.

- b-2.** Suppose $f(v_2) < f(v_5)$. Then $f(v_2) \in [0, \lambda - k]$. Since $f(v_6) \in [0, \lambda - k]$ and $d(v_2, v_6) = 2$, $f(v_2) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$ or $f(v_2) \in [k, \lambda - k]$. When $f(v_2) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$. We have $f(v_6) \in [k, \lambda - k]$. Since $f(v_3)$ and $f(v_{10})$ are greater than $f(v_6)$, $f(v_3), f(v_{10}) \in [2k, \lambda]$. Since the length of $[2k, \lambda]$ is less than j , $f(v_i) \in [0, \lambda - j]$ for $4 \leq i \leq 9$. By [Theorem 3.10](#), we have $\lambda \geq 6j$. When $f(v_2) \in [k, \lambda - k]$. Now $f(v_6) \in [0, \lambda - 2k]$ and $f(v_5) \in [2k, \lambda]$. By considering the distances from v_9 to v_5 and v_6 , we have $f(v_9) \in [k, \lambda - k]$. Since the lengths of $[0, \lambda - 2k]$ and $[k, \lambda - k]$ are less than j , then $f(v_7), f(v_8) \in [j, \lambda - j - k]$. It implies that $f(v_{12}) \in [2k, \lambda]$ or $f(v_{12}) \in [0, \lambda - j - 2k]$ by considering the distances from v_8 and v_9 . But the last case is impossible as $\lambda < j + 2k$. Now $j \leq f(v_i)$ for $7 \leq i \leq 12$. By [Theorem 3.10](#), we have $\lambda \geq 6j$. \square

According to [Theorems 3.2–3.12](#), we can obtain following conclusion.

Corollary 3.13. Let $n \geq 6$ and j, k be two positive numbers.

1. For $j \leq k < 2j$, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) = \begin{cases} 3j + k, & \text{if } 6 \leq n \leq 10, \\ \min\{2j + 2k, 5j\}, & \text{if } 11 \leq n \leq 15, \\ \min\{j + 3k, 5j\}, & \text{if } 16 \leq n \leq 20, \\ \min\{4k, 5j\}, & \text{if } n \geq 21. \end{cases}$
2. For $2j \leq k < 3j$, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) = \begin{cases} 5j, & \text{if } n = 6, \\ 3j + k, & \text{if } 7 \leq n \leq 12, \\ \min\{j + 2k, 6j\}, & \text{if } n \geq 13. \end{cases}$
3. For $k \geq 3j$, $\lambda_{j,k}(P_n^2) = \begin{cases} 2j + k, & \text{if } n = 6, \\ 2k, & \text{if } n \geq 7. \end{cases}$

References

- [1] J.A. Bondy, U.S.R. Murty, Graph Theory with Applications, The MacMillan Press Ltd., New York, 1976.
- [2] A.A. Bertossi, M.A. Bonuccelli, Code assignment for hidden terminal interference avoidance in multihop packet radio networks, *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.* 3 (1995) 441–449.
- [3] X.T. Jin, R.K. Yeh, Graph distance-dependent labeling related to code assignment in computer networks, *Nav. Res. Logist.* 52 (2005) 159–164.
- [4] T. Calamoneri, The $L(h, k)$ -labelling problem: An updated survey and annotated bibliography, *Comput. J.* 54 (2011) 1344–1371.
- [5] R.K. Yeh, A survey on labeling graphs with a condition at distance two, *Discrete Math.* 306 (2006) 1217–1231.
- [6] Q. Niu, $L(j, k)$ -Labeling of Graph and Edge Span (M.Phil. thesis), Southeast University, Nanjing, China, 2007.
- [7] J.R. Griggs, X.T. Jin, Recent progress in mathematics and engineering on optimal graph labellings with distance conditions, *J. Comb. Optim.* 14 (2007) 249–257.
- [8] K.R. Jayasree, T. Nicholas, The minimal $L(1, 2)$ labelings of generalized Petersen graphs, *Internat. J. Engrg. Sci. Technol.* 3 (2011) 318–328.
- [9] T. Calamoneri, A. Pelc, R. Petreschi, Labeling trees with a condition at distance two, *Discrete Math.* 306 (2006) 1534–1539.
- [10] P.C.B. Lam, W. Lin, J. Wu, $L(j, k)$ -labellings and circular $L(j, k)$ -labellings of products of complete graphs, *J. Comb. Optim.* 14 (2007) 219–227.
- [11] W.C. Shiu, Q. Wu, $L(j, k)$ -labeling number of direct product of path and cycle, *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)* 29 (2013) 1437–1448.
- [12] Q. Wu, W.C. Shiu, P.K. Sun, $L(j, k)$ -labeling number of Cartesian product of path and cycle, *J. Combin. Optim.* 31 (2016) 604–634.
- [13] Q. Wu, W. Lin, Circular $L(j, k)$ -labeling, *J. Southeast Univ. (English Ed.)* 26 (2010) 142–145.
- [14] Q. Wu, W.C. Shiu, P.K. Sun, Circular $L(j, k)$ -labeling number of direct product of path and cycle, *J. Combin. Optim.* 27 (2014) 355–368.
- [15] Q. Wu, W.C. Shiu, Circular $L(j, k)$ -labeling number of square of paths, *J. Comb. Number Theory* 9 (2017) in press.