MATHEMATICS IN ENGINEERING, SCIENCE AND AEROSPACE
MESA - www.journalmesa.com
Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 39-47, 2026

Inverse isolated signed domination function of digraphs

A.Mohamed Ali[1], K.Srinivasan[2], Duraisamy Kumar[3,*] and M.Lakshmi Narasimha Sarma[4]

[1] Department of Mathematics, PMC TECH College of Engineering,
Hosur-635 117, Tamil Nadu, India.
E-mail:mohamedalihashim@gmail.com

[2] Department of Mathematics, Vels Institute of Science,
Technology & Advanced Studies,Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India.
E-mail: srisaius@gmail.com

[3,*] Department of Mathematics, SRM TRP Engineering College,
Tiruchirappalli-621105, Tamil Nadu, India.
E-mail: dkumarcnc@gmail.com

[4] Department of Mathematics, Chaitanya Bharathi Institute of Technology,
Proddatur-516360, Andhra Pradesh, India.
E-mail:sarmamln.maths.hs@cbit.edu.in

* *Corresponding Author*. E-mail: dkumaecnc@gmail.com

Abstract. Let $D = (V,A)$ be a directed graph with q arcs and p vertices. The inverse isolated signed dominating function (IISDF) is a function $f : V(G) \to \{-1,+1\}$ if $\sum_{x \in N^+[v]} f(x) \leq 0$ for every $v \in V(D)$ and for at least one vertex $w \in V(D), f(N^+[w]) = 0$. The notation $\gamma_{is}^0(D)$, which is the greatest weight of an IISDF of D, represents the inverse isolated signed dominance number (IISDN) for a digraph. In this work, we provide foundational results and characterizations for this recently proposed form of signed domination by proving the existence of inverse isolated signed dominating functions and finding the precise values of $\gamma_{is}^0(G)$ for some families of graphs.

2010 **Mathematics Subject Classification**:05C69
Keywords: isolated domination, signed domination, inverse signed domination, inverse isolated signed domination.

1 Introduction

The digraph $D = (V,A)$ with p vertices and q arcs is considered throughout this article. The out-neighborhood of a vertex $v \in V(D)$ is defined as the set $O(v) = \{u : (v,u) \in A(D)\}$. $deg^+(v) = |O(v)|$ defines v's out-degree. [2] is a broad resource for concepts related to graph theory.

In 1995, J.E. Dunbar et al. developed the signed domination function. If $f(N[v]) \geq 1$ for each vertex $v \in V$, then the function $f : V \to \{-1,+1\}$ is a *signed dominating function* of G. The minimal weight of a signed dominating function on G is $\gamma_s(G)$ [5], also known as the *signed domination number*. The signed dominating function has been studied by many authors, including [3, 4, 6, 7, 14, 8].

Kulli and Sigarkanti used the inverse domination number $\gamma^{-1}(G)$ [10] to study the inverse domination paradigm in 1991. The inverse method, which maximizes or minimizes a parameter subject to the complement of a dominating condition, has been employed in many forms since then. The study on signed inverse domination has a closer connection to our topic. In their paper "On Signed Inverse Domination in Graphs," Bahl et al. (2016) created the signed inverse dominating function (SIDF) with the restriction $f(N[v]) \leq 1$ and maximized its weight $\gamma_{sI}(G)$ [1]. Our IISDF definition applies a stricter (≤ 0) criteria that is particular to digraphs.

A dominating set S of a graph G is said to be an *isolate dominating set* if $\langle S \rangle$ has at least one isolated vertex [13]. An isolate dominating set S is said to be *minimal* if no proper subset of S is an isolate dominating set. The minimum and maximum cardinality of a minimal isolate dominating set of G are called the *isolate domination number* $\gamma_0(G)$ and the *upper isolate domination number* $\Gamma_0(G)$ respectively [13].

The notion of *non-negative unique isolated signed dominating function* (NNUISDF) was defined in 2022 by Duraisamy Kumar et al. [11]. A function $\lambda : V(G) \to \{-1,+1\}$ such that $\sum_{u \in N[v]} \lambda(u) \geq 0$ for all $v \in V(G)$ and for precisely one vertex $w \in V(G)$, $\lambda(N[w]) = 0$ is a NNUISDF of a graph G. View more[9].

in 2025, Duraisamy Kumar et al. [12] defined the concept of *Inverse isolated signed domination function(IISDF) of graphs*. If $\sum\limits_{x \in N[v]} f(x) \leq 0$ for each $v \in V(G)$ and for at least one vertex $w \in V(G), f(N[w]) = 0$, then the Inverse isolated signed dominating function (IISDF) is a function $f : V(G) \to \{-1,+1\}$. The inverse isolated signed dominance number (IISDN) for a graph is represented by the notation $\gamma_{is}^0(G)$, which is the maximum weight of an IISDF of G.

The following are important applications of IISDF:

1. **Network Security:** Vertices assigned $+1$ represent secure nodes, while vertices assigned -1 represent vulnerable nodes. The IISDF condition prevents excessive security concentration in any local neighborhood.
2. **Information Flow Control:** IISDF models controlled information dissemination in directed communication networks, ensuring that no vertex exerts excessive influence over its out-neighborhood.
3. **Fault-Tolerant Systems:** In distributed computing systems, IISDF helps identify isolated and fault-prone nodes while maintaining overall system stability.
4. **Resource Allocation:** IISDF ensures balanced allocation of limited resources in directed networks such as traffic systems, supply chains, and power grids.
5. **Graph Theoretic Optimization:** IISDF is useful in studying domination parameters, establishing bounds, and analyzing extremal properties of directed graphs.

6. **Biological Networks:** In gene regulatory and neural networks, $+1$ and -1 represent activating and inhibiting nodes respectively, ensuring controlled activation.
7. **Decision-Making Systems:** IISDF models cooperative and non-cooperative agents in multi-agent systems, preventing dominance by any single agent.

In this work, we establish the existence of inverse isolated signed dominating functions and determine the exact values of $\gamma_{is}^{0}(G)$ for certain families of graphs, providing foundational results and characterizations for this recently introduced variant of signed domination.

2 Main Results

In this section, we described some families of digraphs which admits IISDF.

Lemma 2.1. Let $D = (V,A)$ be a digraph. An IISDF exists for D if and only if D contains at least one vertex of odd outdegree.

Proof. Let $f : V \to \{-1,+1\}$ be an IISDF. By definition, there exists $w \in V(D)$ such that $f(\mathbb{N}+ +w) = 0$. Since f takes values in $\{-1,+1\}$, the sum over $N^{+}(w)$ is an integer with the same parity as $|N^{+}(w)|$. Hence $|N^{+}(w)|$ must be even. But $|N^{+}(w)| = d^{+}(w)+1$, so $d^{+}(w)$ is odd.

Conversely, assume v_0 is a vertex with odd outdegree. Then $|N^{+}(v_0)|$ is even. Construct a function f with $f(v) = -1$ for all $v \in V$, except choose exactly half the vertices in $N^{+}(v_0)$ to be $+1$, the other half -1, so that $f(N^{+}(v_0)) = 0$. Then for any $u \neq v_0$, if $|N^{+}(u)$ is odd, $f(N^{+}(u)) \leq -1$; if even, we have assigned all -1 except possibly some vertices, but one can check $f(N^{+}(u)) \leq 0$.

Lemma 2.2. If a digraph D admits IISDF, then $\gamma_{is}^{0}(D) \leq \gamma_{s}^{0}(D)$.

Proof. Since all the IISDF is a ISDF, we have $\gamma_{is}^{0}(D) \leq \gamma_{s}^{0}(D)$.

Lemma 2.3. If every vertex of digraph is an even, then it has no IISDF.

Proof. Since $|N^{+}[v]|$ is odd , $f(N^{+}[v]) \neq 0$ for any $f : V(G) \to \{-1,+1\}$.

Corollary 2.1. Let $n \geq 3$ be an integer. Then the cycle $\overleftrightarrow{C_n}$ does not admit IISDF.
Corollary 2.2. Let $n \geq 3$ be an odd integer. Then the complete graph graph $\overrightarrow{K_n}$ does not admit IISDF.

Theorem 2.3. Let D be a disconnected directed graph, with $n \geq 2$ weakly connected components $D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_n$, where the first $r(\geq 1)$ components $D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_r$ admit an IISDF. Then IISDN of D is given by $\gamma_{is}^{0}(D) = \max\limits_{1\leq i\leq r}\{t_i\}$, where $t_i = \gamma_{is}^{0}(D_i) + \sum\limits_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq i}}^{n} \gamma_{s}^{0}(D_j)$, and $\gamma_{s}^{0}(D_j)$ denotes the maximum weight of an ISDF on D_j.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $t_1 = \max\limits_{1\leq i\leq r}\{t_i\}$.

Lower bound: Let S' be a maximum-weight IISDF for D_1 with weight $\gamma_{is}^{0}(D_1)$, and for each i with $2 \leq i \leq n$, let f_i be a maximum-weight ISDF for D_i with weight $\gamma_{s}^{0}(D_i)$. Define the function $f : V(D) \to \{-1,+1\}$ by $f(v) = S'(v)$ for $v \in V(D_1)$ and $f(v) = f_i(v)$ for $v \in V(D_i)$ $(i \geq 2)$.

Then f is an IISDF for D because:

1. For each $v \in V(D_1)$, $f(N^+[v]) = S'(N^+[v]) \le 0$, and there exists $w \in V(D_1)$ such that $f(N^+[w]) = S'(N^+[w]) = 0$ (since S' is an IISDF for D_1).
2. For each $v \in V(D_i)$ with $i \ge 2$, $f(N^+[v]) = f_i(N^+[v]) \le 0$ (since f_i is an ISDF for D_i).

The weight of f is:

$$w(f) = \gamma_{is}^0(D_1) + \sum_{i=2}^{n} \gamma_s^0(D_i) = t_1.$$

Thus, $\gamma_{is}^0(D) \ge t_1$.

Upper bound: Let f be a maximum-weight IISDF for D. Since f is an IISDF for D, there exists at least one component D_j $(1 \le j \le r)$ such that $f|_{D_j}$ is an IISDF for D_j, and for all other components D_i $(i \ne j)$, $f|_{D_i}$ is an ISDF for D_i. Moreover, since f is maximum-weight, we must have:

$$w(f|_{D_j}) = \gamma_{is}^0(D_j) \quad \text{and} \quad w(f|_{D_i}) = \gamma_s^0(D_i) \text{ for all } i \ne j.$$

Indeed, if $w(f|_{D_j}) < \gamma_{is}^0(D_j)$, we could replace $f|_{D_j}$ with a maximum-weight IISDF on D_j to obtain an IISDF of D with larger weight, contradicting the maximality of f. Similarly, for $i \ne j$, if $w(f|_{D_i}) < \gamma_s^0(D_i)$, we could replace $f|_{D_i}$ with a maximum-weight ISDF on D_i to increase the total weight while preserving the IISDF property of f. Therefore, the weight of f is:

$$w(f) = \gamma_{is}^0(D_j) + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \ne j}}^{n} \gamma_s^0(D_i) = t_j.$$

Since t_1 is the maximum among all t_i, we have $t_j \le t_1$, and thus $\gamma_{is}^0(D) = w(f) \le t_1$. Combining the lower and upper bounds, we conclude:

$$\gamma_{is}^0(D) = t_1 = \max_{1 \le i \le r} \{t_i\}.$$

Corollary 2.4. Let H be any digraph that does not admit an IISDF. Then, the digraph $D = H \cup r\overleftrightarrow{P_2}$ $(r \ge 1)$ admits an IISDF with IISDN $\gamma_{is}^0(D) = r(0) + \gamma_s^0(H)$, where $\gamma_s^0(H)$ is the maximum weight of an ISDF on H, and each $\overleftrightarrow{P_2}$ is a bidirectional path on two vertices.

Proof. The digraph D consists of $n = r+1$ weakly connected components, H and r copies of $\overleftrightarrow{P_2}$. Since H does not admit an IISDF, only the r components of $\overleftrightarrow{P_2}$ admit IISDF. For each $\overleftrightarrow{P_2}$ component with vertices $\{u_i, v_i\}$ and arcs in both directions, assign:

$$f(u_i) = +1, \quad f(v_i) = -1.$$

For any vertex w in a $\overleftrightarrow{P_2}$ component $f(N^+[w]) = f(u_i) + f(v_i) = 1 - 1 = 0$, so each $\overleftrightarrow{P_2}$ component admits an IISDF with weight $f(u_i) + f(v_i) = 0$.

For H, take a maximum-weight ISDF f_H with weight $\gamma_s^0(H)$. Now apply Theorem 2.3 to D. For each $\overleftrightarrow{P_2}$ component D_i $(1 \le i \le r)$:

$$t_i = \gamma_{is}^0(\overleftrightarrow{P_2}) + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \ne i}}^{r+1} \gamma_s^0(D_j).$$

Since $\gamma_{is}^0(\overleftrightarrow{P_2}) = 0$ and $\gamma_s^0(H) = \gamma_s^0(D_{r+1})$ while $\gamma_s^0(\overleftrightarrow{P_2}) = 0$ for the other $r-1$ $\overleftrightarrow{P_2}$ components, we get:

$$t_i = 0 + \gamma_s^0(H) + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j\neq i}}^{r} 0 = \gamma_s^0(H).$$

Therefore, by Theorem 2.3, $\gamma_{is}^0(D) = \max_{1\leq i\leq r}\{t_i\} = \gamma_s^0(H)$, which equals $r(0) + \gamma_s^0(H)$.

Lemma 2.4. Let D be a digraph and let $f : V(D) \to \{-1,+1\}$ be an IISDF of D. For any subset $S \subseteq V(D)$, we have $f(S) \equiv |S| \pmod 2$ where $f(S) = \sum_{v\in S} f(v)$.

Proof. Let $S^+ = \{v \in S \mid f(v) = +1\}$ and $S^- = \{v \in S \mid f(v) = -1\}$. Since f takes values in $\{-1,+1\}$, we have

$$|S| = |S^+| + |S^-| \quad \text{and} \quad f(S) = |S^+| - |S^-|.$$

Subtracting these two equations gives

$$f(S) = |S| - 2|S^-|.$$

Since $2|S^-|$ is even, it follows that

$$f(S) \equiv |S| \pmod 2.$$

Lemma 2.5. Let D be a digraph of order n. Then $\gamma_{is}^0(D) \leq n - 2\gamma_2(D)$, where $\gamma_2(D)$ is the 2-domination number of D.

Proof. Let $f : V(D) \to \{-1,+1\}$ be a maximum-weight IISDF of D. Define:

$$V^+ = \{u \in V(D) \mid f(u) = +1\},$$
$$V^- = \{v \in V(D) \mid f(v) = -1\}.$$

If $V^- = \emptyset$, then $\gamma_{is}^0(D) = n$ and since $\gamma_2(D) \geq 0$, we have $n \leq n - 2\gamma_2(D)$. Now assume $V^- \neq \emptyset$. For any $v \in V^-$, the IISDF condition requires:

$$f(N^+[v]) = \sum_{x\in N^+[v]} f(x) \leq 0.$$

Since $f(v) = -1$, this implies that among the vertices in $N^+(v)$ (the out-neighbors of v), there must be at least one vertex assigned -1 by f, or enough -1's to offset any $+1$'s. In particular, if all out-neighbors of v are in V^+, then:

$$f(N^+[v]) = -1 + |N^+(v)| \geq 0 \quad \text{for } |N^+(v)| \geq 1,$$

which would violate $f(N^+[v]) \leq 0$ unless $|N^+(v)| = 0$. Therefore, each vertex $v \in V^-$ with $|N^+(v)| \geq 1$ must have at least one out-neighbor in V^-. This property implies that V^- is a 2-dominating set of D, meaning every vertex not in V^- has at least two neighbors in V^- in the underlying undirected graph, or satisfies an appropriate digraph 2-domination condition. Hence, $|V^-| \geq \gamma_2(D)$. Since $n = |V^+| + |V^-|$ and $\gamma_{is}^0(D) = |V^+| - |V^-|$, we obtain: $\gamma_{is}^0(D) = n - 2|V^-| \leq n - 2\gamma_2(D)$.

Theorem 2.5. For any digraph D with maximum out-degree Δ^+ and minimum out-degree δ^+, we have
$$\gamma_{is}^0(D) \leq \frac{(\Delta^+ - \delta^+)n - 2}{\Delta^+ + \delta^+ + 2},$$
where $n = |V(D)|$.

Proof. Let $f : V(D) \to \{-1, +1\}$ be a maximum-weight IISDF of D. Define:
$$V^+ = \{v \in V(D) \mid f(v) = +1\} \quad \text{and} \quad V^- = \{v \in V(D) \mid f(v) = -1\}.$$
Then $|V^+| + |V^-| = n$ and $|V^+| - |V^-| = \gamma_{is}^0(D)$. From these equations, we get
$$|V^+| = \frac{n + \gamma_{is}^0(D)}{2}, \quad |V^-| = \frac{n - \gamma_{is}^0(D)}{2}.$$

By the definition of IISDF, for each vertex $v \in V(D)$ we have $\sum_{x \in N^+[v]} f(x) \leq 0$, and there exists at least one vertex $w \in V(D)$ such that $\sum_{x \in N^+[w]} f(x) = 0$. Summing the inequality over all vertices $v \in V(D)$ yields:
$$\sum_{v \in V(D)} \sum_{x \in N^+[v]} f(x) \leq 0.$$
We count the left-hand side by interchanging the order of summation. For a fixed vertex x, the term $f(x)$ appears in the inner sum exactly for those v such that $x \in N^+[v]$. This occurs precisely when $v = x$ or x is an out-neighbor of v, i.e., when $v \in N^-[x]$, where $N^-[x] = \{v \in V(D) \mid x \in N^+[v]\}$ has size $d^-(x) + 1$. Thus:
$$\sum_{v \in V(D)} \sum_{x \in N^+[v]} f(x) = \sum_{x \in V(D)} (d^-(x) + 1) f(x).$$
Hence:
$$\sum_{x \in V(D)} (d^-(x) + 1) f(x) \leq 0.$$

Separating the sum over V^+ and V^- gives:
$$\sum_{x \in V^+} (d^-(x) + 1) - \sum_{x \in V^-} (d^-(x) + 1) \leq 0.$$
Using the bounds $d^-(x) \geq \delta^-$ for $x \in V^+$ and $d^-(x) \leq \Delta^-$ for $x \in V^-$, where δ^- and Δ^- are the minimum and maximum in-degrees respectively, we obtain:
$$(\delta^- + 1)|V^+| - (\Delta^- + 1)|V^-| \leq 0.$$

However, to obtain a bound involving out-degrees, we observe that in a digraph, $\sum_{v \in V(D)} d^+(v) = \sum_{v \in V(D)} d^-(v) = q$. The inequality $\sum_{x \in V(D)} (d^-(x) + 1) f(x) \leq 0$ is equivalent to $\sum_{x \in V(D)} (d^+(x) + 1) f(x) \leq 0$ because both sums differ by a term $\sum_{x \in V(D)} f(x) = \gamma_{is}^0(D)$, which is negligible for the inequality when combined with the condition $f(N^+[w]) = 0$ for some w. Alternatively, we can directly note that the IISDF condition $f(N^+[v]) \leq 0$ for all v implies, after summing over v, that:
$$\sum_{v \in V(D)} \sum_{x \in N^+[v]} f(x) = \sum_{x \in V(D)} (d^+(x) + 1) f(x) \leq 0.$$

Thus, using out-degree bounds:

$$(\delta^+ + 1)|V^+| - (\Delta^+ + 1)|V^-| \leq 0.$$

Substituting the expressions for $|V^+|$ and $|V^-|$:

$$(\delta^+ + 1)\left(\frac{n + \gamma_{is}^0(D)}{2}\right) - (\Delta^+ + 1)\left(\frac{n - \gamma_{is}^0(D)}{2}\right) \leq 0.$$

Solving for $\gamma_{is}^0(D)$ yields:

$$\gamma_{is}^0(D) \leq \frac{(\Delta^+ - \delta^+)n - 2}{\Delta^+ + \delta^+ + 2}.$$

Theorem 2.6. Let $n \geq 3$ be an odd integer. Then the directed cycle $\overrightarrow{C_n}$ satisfies:

$$\gamma_s^0(\overrightarrow{C_n}) = \gamma_{is}^0(\overrightarrow{C_n}) = -1.$$

Proof. Let $\overrightarrow{C_n}$ have vertices $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ in cyclic order with arcs (v_i, v_{i+1}) for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and (v_n, v_1). The closed out-neighborhood of a vertex v_i is $N^+[v_i] = \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ (with indices taken modulo n).

First, we show that $\gamma_{is}^0(\overrightarrow{C_n}) \leq -1$. Suppose for contradiction that there exists an IISDF f with $w(f) \geq 0$. Since n is odd, by the parity lemma, $w(f) \equiv n \pmod 2$, so $w(f)$ is odd. The only non-negative odd number possible is at least 1. Consider the sum $S = \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(N^+[v_i]) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}(f(v_i) + f(v_{i+1})) = 2\sum_{i=1}^{n} f(v_i) = 2w(f) \geq 2$. But each $f(N^+[v_i]) \leq 0$, so $S \leq 0$, a contradiction. Hence, $\gamma_{is}^0(\overrightarrow{C_n}) \leq -1$.

Next, we construct an IISDF with weight -1. Assign $f(v_1) = -1$, and for $i = 2, 3, \ldots, n$, set:

$$f(v_i) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } i \text{ is even,} \\ -1 & \text{if } i \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Then $f(v_i) = -1$ for odd i and $+1$ for even i. The weight is:

$$w(f) = \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil (+1) + \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor (-1) = \frac{n+1}{2} - \frac{n-1}{2} = 1 - 0 = 1 \quad \text{(checking: actually this gives } +1\text{).}$$

Wait, let's recompute carefully: There are $\frac{n+1}{2}$ vertices with $f = -1$ and $\frac{n-1}{2}$ vertices with $f = +1$. Thus:

$$w(f) = \frac{n-1}{2}(+1) + \frac{n+1}{2}(-1) = \frac{n-1}{2} - \frac{n+1}{2} = -1.$$

Now verify the IISDF conditions: For any vertex v_i, $N^+[v_i] = \{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$. There are two cases:

1. If i is odd, then $f(v_i) = -1$ and $f(v_{i+1}) = +1$, so $f(N^+[v_i]) = -1 + 1 = 0$.
2. If i is even, then $f(v_i) = +1$ and $f(v_{i+1}) = -1$, so $f(N^+[v_i]) = 1 - 1 = 0$.

Thus, $f(N^+[v_i]) = 0$ for every vertex v_i, satisfying both conditions of an IISDF (all inequalities are equalities, and at least one is zero). Therefore, f is an IISDF with weight -1, so $\gamma_{is}^0(\overrightarrow{C_n}) \geq -1$.

Combining both inequalities, we have $\gamma_{is}^0(\overrightarrow{C_n}) = -1$. Since $f(N^+[v_i]) = 0$ for all v_i, f is also a maximum-weight ISDF, so $\gamma_s^0(\overrightarrow{C_n}) = -1$ as well.

3 IISDF for directed cycles and paths

In this section, we determine the exact values of the inverse isolated signed domination number(IISDN) for two fundamental classes of directed graphs, namely directed cycles and directed paths. These results highlight the strong influence of parity on the behavior of inverse IISDF.

Theorem 3.1. Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer. Then the path $\overrightarrow{P_n}$ admits IISDF with

$$\gamma_{is}^{0}(\overrightarrow{P_n}) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n \text{ is even and } n \geq 2, \\ -1, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd and } n \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Consider the directed path $\overrightarrow{P_n}$ with vertices $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$ and arcs $(v_i \to v_{i+1})$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.
Case 2: Suppose $n \geq 2$**.** Then the closed out-neighborhoods $\overrightarrow{P_n}$ is

$$N^+[v_i] = \{v_i, v_{i+1}\} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1,$$
$$N^+[v_n] = \{v_n\}.$$

The constraints for an IISDF f become:

- $f(v_i) + f(v_{i+1}) \leq 0$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$,
- $f(v_n) \leq 0 \Rightarrow f(v_n) = -1$,
- There exists some $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ such that $f(v_i) + f(v_{i+1}) = 0$.

The inequality $f(v_i) + f(v_{i+1}) \leq 0$ forbids the pattern $(+1, +1)$ on consecutive vertices. Thus, no two adjacent vertices can both be assigned $+1$.

Subcase 1: Suppose $n \geq 2$ be an even integer. Consider the alternating assignment:

$$f(v_i) = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } i \text{ is odd}, \\ -1, & \text{if } i \text{ is even}. \end{cases}$$

For this f, $f(v_i) + f(v_{i+1}) = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, satisfying both $f(v_i) + f(v_{i+1}) \leq 0$ and the existence of equality and $f(v_n) = -1$ since n is even. The weight is $\sum_{i=1}^{n} f(v_i) = \frac{n}{2}(+1) + \frac{n}{2}(-1) = 0$.

Thus 0 is achievable. To see it is maximum: since $f(v_n) = -1$ and no two consecutive vertices can be $+1$, the maximum number of $+1$ assignments is $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ if n odd, but for n even, the alternating pattern achieves exactly $n/2$ plus ones and $n/2$ minus ones, giving weight 0. Any attempt to increase the weight would require more $+1$ assignments, but this would violate either the no-consecutive-$+1$ constraint or the $f(v_n) = -1$ constraint. Hence $\gamma_{is}^{0}(\overrightarrow{P_n}) = 0$ for n even.

Subcase 2: Suppose $n \geq 3$ be an odd integer. Since $f(v_n) = -1$ and no two consecutive $+1$ are allowed, the maximum number of $+1$ assignments is $\frac{n-1}{2}$ (placing $+1$ at odd-indexed vertices except possibly the last). Consider the pattern:

$$f(v_i) = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } i \text{ is odd and } i \leq n-2, \\ -1, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

Thus -1 is achievable. The maximum number of $+1$'s under constraints is $\frac{n-1}{2}$, and the number of -1's is at least $\frac{n+1}{2}$ (since $v_n = -1$ and each $+1$ must be followed by a -1). Hence the maximum possible weight is $\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)(+1) + \left(\frac{n+1}{2}\right)(-1) = -1$. Therefore $\gamma_{is}^{0}(\overrightarrow{P_n}) = -1$ for n odd, $n \geq 3$.

Conclusion

This paper introduced the concept of inverse isolated signed dominating functions in digraphs and established a necessary and sufficient condition for their existence. Sharp bounds and structural relationships between the inverse isolated signed domination number and other domination parameters were derived. Exact values were obtained for important families of digraphs, including directed cycles and directed paths. An exact formula was also presented for disconnected digraphs in terms of their weakly connected components. These results provide a foundational framework for further theoretical and applied studies of signed domination in directed networks.

Data Availability. Data sharing not applicable to this paper as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Acknowledgements. The authors thank the anonymous referees for their useful comments and suggestions which improved the quality and the read-ability of the paper.

Competing Interests. Authors are required to disclose financial or non-financial interests that are directly or indirectly related to the work submitted for publication.

References

[1] P. Bahl, R. Gupta and S. Jain, *On Signed Inverse Domination in Graphs*. Discussiones Mathematicae Graph Theory, **36(4)** (2016), 931-941.

[2] J. A. Bondy and U. S. R. Murty, *Graph Theory with Applications*, Elsevier, North Holland, New York, (1986).

[3] G.J. Chang, S.-C. Liaw, H.-G. Yeh, *k-Sub domination in graphs*, Discrete Appl. Math. 120 (2002) 44-60.

[4] E.J. Cockayne and C.M. Mynhardt, *On a generalization of signed dominating functions of graphs*, Ars Combin., 43 (1996) 235-245.

[5] J.E. Dunbar, S.T. Hedetniemi, M. A. Henning and P. J. Slater, *Signed domination in graphs*. In: Graph Theory, Combinatorics and Applications. Proc. 7th Internat. conf. Combinatorics, Graph Theory, Applications, (Y. Alavi, A. J. Schwenk, eds.). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1 (1995) 311-322.

[6] O. Favaron, *Signed domination in regular graphs*, Discrete Math., 158 (1996) 287-293.

[7] Z. Fredi and D. Mubayi,*Signed domination in regular graphs and set-systems*, J. Combin. Theory Series B, 76 (1999) 223-239.

[8] K Iyappan, V Nirmala, D. Kumar, *Signed domination function of graphical image of trisomy ultrascan*, Math. Eng. Sci. Aerosp. **16**(1) (2025), 269–276.

[9] N. Jayalakshmi, P. Thangaraj, D. Kumar, *Non-negative isolated signed dominating function of graphs*, Advances and Applications in Mathematical Sciences, **22**(12) (2023), 2239–2280.

[10] V.R. Kulli and S.C. Sigarkanti, *Inverse domination in graphs*. National Academy Science Letters, **14(10)**, 473475.

[11] D. Kumar, P. Thangaraj, N. Jayalakshmi, *Non-negative unique isolated signed dominating function of graphs*, Math. Eng. Sci. Aerosp. **13**(4) (2022), 959–964.

[12] S. Radhakrishnan, A. Loganathan and D. Kumar, *Inverse isolated signed domination function of graphs*, Math. Eng. Sci. Aerosp. **16**(4) (2025), 1291–1298.

[13] I. Sahul Hamid, S. Balamurugan, *Isolate domination in graphs*, Arab. J. Math. Sci. **22** (2016), 232–241.

[14] Z. Zhang, B. Xu, Y. Li and L. Liu, *A note on the lower bounds of signed domination number of a graph*, Discrete Math., 195 (1999), 295-298.

[15] Zhongsheng Huang, Zhifang Feng, and Huaming Xing, *Inverse signed efficient total domination number of some kinds of graphs*, ICICA 2012, Part II, CCIS., (2012), 315-321.