TOTALLY ANTIMAGIC TOTAL LABELING OF COMPLETE BIPARTITE GRAPHS

MOHAMMED ALI AHMED, J. BASKAR BABUJEE

ABSTRACT. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ of order $|V(G)|$ and size $|E(G)|$ a bijection from the union of the vertex set and the edge set of G into the set $\{1, 2, \dots, |V(G)| + |E(G)|\}$ is called a total labeling of G. The vertex-weight of a vertex under a total labeling is the sum of the label of the vertex and the labels of all edges incident with that vertex. The edge-weight of an edge is the sum of the label of the edge and the labels of the end vertices of that edge. A total labeling is called edge-antimagic (respectively, vertex-antimagic) if all edge-weights (respectively, vertex-weights) are pairwise distinct. If a total labeling is simultaneously edge-antimagic and vertex-antimagic at the same time, then it is called a totally antimagic total labeling.
In this paper we prove that complete bipartite graphs admit totally antimagic total labeling.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 05C78
Keywords: complete bipartite graphs, totally antimagic total labeling

Article history:
Received 9 December 2016
Received in revised form 20 March 2017
Accepted 26 March 2017

ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, 2017, VOLUME 7, ISSUE 1, p.21-28

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we consider finite, simple and undirected graphs. In 1990, Hartsfield and Ringel [6] introduced the notion of an antimagic labeling of graph. A graph with q edges is called antimagic if its edges can be labeled with $1, 2, \dots, q$ without repetition, such that the sums of the labels of the edges incident to each vertex are distinct. They conjectured that every tree except P_2 is antimagic and moreover, every connected graph except P_2 is antimagic. This conjecture was proved true, for all graphs having minimum degree Ω $(\log |V(G)|)$ by Alon, etc in [1], for more results about antimagic labeling on graphs see [5]. If G is a graph, then $V(G)$ is the vertex set and $E(G)$ is an edge set of G, respectively. A bijection $f : V(G) \cup E(G) \to \{1, 2, \dots, |V(G)| + |E(G)|\}$ is called a total labeling of G. A total labeling is called edge-antimagic, if the edge-weights are all distinct. A total labeling is called vertex-antimagic, if the vertex-weights are all distinct. The notion of edge-antimagic total labeling was introduced by Simanjuntak, Bertault and Miller in [8] as a natural extension of magic valuation defined by Kotzing and Rosa in [7]. Simanjuntak, Bertault and Miller [8] proved that $C_n, C_{2n}, C_{2n+1}, P_{2n}$ and P_{2n+1} have edge-antimagic total labeling. And the notion of vertex-antimagic total labeling of graphs was introduced by Bača, etc in [2], were they proved that paths, cycles and other graphs have vertex-antimagic total labeling. If a graph G with p vertices and q edges possessing a labeling that is simultaneously edge-antimagic total labeling and vertex-antimagic total labeling, then this labeling is called a totally antimagic total labeling, and a graph that admits such a labeling is called totally antimagic total graph. The concept of totally antimagic total labeling was introduced by Bača, etc in [3], were they proved that paths, cycles, stars, double-stars and wheels are totally antimagic total. This concept was introduced as natural extension of the concept of totally magic labeling defined by Exoo, etc in [4], were they proved that K_1, K_3, P_3, cycle C_3 and complete bipartite graph $K_{1,2}$ are the only graphs admits totally magic labeling.

2. MAIN RESULTS

Theorem 2.1. *The complete bipartite graph $K_{n,n}$, admits totally antimagic total labeling, for every $n \geq 3$.*

Proof. Let the vertex set and the edge set of $K_{n,n}$, $n \geq 3$ be

$$V(K_{n,n}) = V_1 \cup V_2 = \{v_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\} \cup \{u_j : j = 1, 2, \dots, n\},$$
$$E(K_{n,n}) = \{v_i u_j : i = 1, 2, \dots, n, j = 1, 2, \dots, n\}.$$

For $n \geq 3$, we define a bijection $f : V(K_{n,n}) \cup E(K_{n,n}) \to \{1, 2, \dots, n^2 + 2n\}$ such that

Case 1: if n is even,

$$f(v_i) = \begin{cases} i(n+1) - n & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{n}{2}, \\ i(n+1) & \text{for } i = \frac{n}{2}+1, \frac{n}{2}+2, \dots, n, \end{cases}$$

$$f(u_j) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + j \qquad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$

$$f(v_i u_j) = \begin{cases} i(n+1) - n + j & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{n}{2}, j = 1, 2, \dots, n, \\ i(n+1) + j & \text{for } i = \frac{n}{2}+1, \frac{n}{2}+2, \dots, n, j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \end{cases}$$

For the edge-weights for $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(v_i u_j) &= f(v_i) + f(u_j) + f(v_i u_j) \\ &= \begin{cases} i(n+1) - n + \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + j + i(n+1) - n + j & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{n}{2}, \\ i(n+1) + \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + j + i(n+1) + j & \text{for } i = \frac{n}{2}+1, \frac{n}{2}+2, \dots, n, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{n^2-3n+4ni+4i+4j}{2} & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{n}{2}, \\ \frac{n^2+4ni+n+4i+4j}{2} & \text{for } i = \frac{n}{2}+1, \frac{n}{2}+2, \dots, n. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus the edge-weights are all distinct, and it easy to observe that edge-weights form the square matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{n \times n}$, where

$$a_{ij} = \frac{n^2-3n+4ni+4i+4j}{2} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, \frac{n}{2}, j = 1, 2, \dots, n,$$
$$a_{ij} = \frac{n^2+4ni+n+4i+4j}{2} \quad \text{for } i = \frac{n}{2}+1, \frac{n}{2}+2, \dots, n, j = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Hence A is

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{n^2+n+8}{2} & \frac{n^2+n+12}{2} & \frac{n^2+n+16}{2} & \dots & \frac{n^2+5n}{2} & \frac{n^2+5n+4}{2} \\ \frac{n^2+5n+12}{2} & \frac{n^2+5n+16}{2} & \frac{n^2+5n+20}{2} & \dots & \frac{n^2+9n+4}{2} & \frac{n^2+9n+8}{2} \\ \vdots & & & & & \vdots \\ \frac{5n^2+n}{2} & \frac{5n^2+n+4}{2} & \frac{5n^2+n+8}{2} & \dots & \frac{5n^2+5n-8}{2} & \frac{5n^2+5n-4}{2} \\ \frac{5n^2+5n+4}{2} & \frac{5n^2+5n+8}{2} & \frac{5n^2+5n+12}{2} & \dots & \frac{5n^2+9n-4}{2} & \frac{5n^2+9n}{2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, 2017, VOLUME 7, ISSUE 1, p.21-28

ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, 2017, VOLUME 7, ISSUE 1, p.21-28

From the matrix A it is easy to see that edge-weights are all distinct. For vertex-weights we have the following. First for the set of vertices in V_1, when $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
wt_f(v_i) &= f(v_i) + \sum_{u_j \in V_2} f(v_i u_j) \\
&= \begin{cases} i(n+1) - n + \sum_{j=1}^{n} f(v_i u_j) & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{n}{2}, \\ i(n+1) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} f(v_i u_j) & \text{for } i = \frac{n}{2}+1, \frac{n}{2}+2, \ldots, n, \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} i(n+1) - n + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (i(n+1) - n + j) & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{n}{2}, \\ i(n+1) + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (i(n+1) + j) & \text{for } i = \frac{n}{2}+1, \frac{n}{2}+2, \ldots, n, \end{cases} \\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{2i(n^2+2n+1) - n(n+1)}{2} & \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{n}{2}, \\ \frac{2i(n^2+2n+1) + n(n+1)}{2} & \text{for } i = \frac{n}{2}+1, \frac{n}{2}+2, \ldots, n. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

It is easy to show that $wt_f(v_1) < wt_f(v_2) < \cdots < wt_f(v_n)$. Second for vertex-weights of set of vertices V_2, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
wt_f(u_j) &= f(u_j) + \sum_{v_i \in V_1} f(u_j v_i) = f(u_j) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(u_j v_i) \\
&= \tfrac{n(n+1)}{2} + j + \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{n}{2}} (i(n+1) - n + j) + \sum_{i=\frac{n}{2}+1}^{n} (i(n+1) + j) \\
&= \tfrac{n(n^2+2n+2)}{2} + (n+1)j \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, n.
\end{aligned}
$$

So that $wt_f(u_1) < wt_f(u_2) < \cdots < wt_f(u_n)$.
Finally, we want to show that the sets of the vertex-weights of vertices V_1 and V_2 do not overlap.
For $i = \frac{n}{2}$, we have

$$wt_f(v_{\frac{n}{2}}) = \tfrac{2(\frac{n}{2})(n^2+2n+1) - n(n+1)}{2} = \tfrac{n^3+n^2}{2} < \tfrac{n^3+2n^2+4n+2}{2} = wt_f(u_1).$$

On the other hand

$$wt_f(u_n) = \tfrac{n^3+4n^2+4n}{2} < \tfrac{n^3+5n^2+6n+2}{2} = wt_f(v_{\frac{n}{2}+1}).$$

So that

$$
\begin{aligned}
wt_f(v_1) <& wt_f(v_2) < \cdots < wt_f(v_{\frac{n}{2}}) < wt_f(u_1) < wt_f(u_2) < \cdots < wt_f(u_n) \\
<& wt_f(v_{\frac{n+2}{2}}) < wt_f(v_{\frac{n+4}{2}}) < \cdots < wt_f(v_n).
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence, vertex-weights are all distinct.

Case 2: if n is odd,

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(v_i) &= i(n+1) - n && \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \\
f(u_j) &= n(n+1) + j && \text{for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \\
f(v_i u_j) &= i(n+1) - n + j && \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n.
\end{aligned}
$$

ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, 2017, VOLUME 7, ISSUE 1, p.21-28

For the edge-weights we have

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(v_iu_j) &= f(v_i) + f(u_j) + f(v_iu_j) \\ &= i(n+1) - n + n(n+1) + j + i(n+1) - n + j \\ &= n^2 - n + 2i(n+1) + 2j \quad \text{for } i = 1,2,\dots,n, j = 1,2,\dots,n. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the edge-weights are all distinct.
For the vertex-weights we have the following. First for the set of vertices in V_1 we get,

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(v_i) &= f(v_i) + \sum_{u_j \in V_2} f(v_iu_j) = i(n+1) - n + \sum_{j=1}^{n} f(v_iu_j) \\ &= i(n+1) - n + \sum_{j=1}^{n}[i(n+1) - n + j] \\ &= \tfrac{2i(n^2+2n+1)-n(n+1)}{2} \quad \text{for } i = 1,2,\dots,n. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to show that $wt_f(v_1) < wt_f(v_2) < \cdots < wt_f(v_n)$.
Second for vertex-weights of the set of vertices in V_2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(u_j) &= f(u_j) + \sum_{v_i \in V_1} f(u_jv_i) = n(n+1) + j + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(u_jv_i) \\ &= n(n+1) + j + \sum_{i=1}^{n}[i(n+1) - n + j] \\ &= \tfrac{n^3+2n^2+3n+2j(n+1)}{2} \quad \text{for } j = 1,2,\dots,n. \end{aligned}$$

So that $wt_f(u_1) < wt_f(u_2) < \cdots < wt_f(u_n)$.
Finally, we want to show that the sets of the vertex-weights of vertices V_1 and V_2 do not overlap.
For $i = \frac{n+1}{2}$, we have

$$wt_f(v_{\frac{n+1}{2}}) = \frac{2(\frac{n+1}{2})(n^2+2n+1)-n(n+1)}{2} = \frac{n^3+2n^2+2n+1}{2} < \frac{n^3+2n^2+5n+2}{2} = wt_f(u_1).$$

On the other hand

$$wt_f(u_n) = \tfrac{n^3+4n^2+5n}{2} < \tfrac{n^3+4n^2+6n+3}{2} = wt_f(v_{\frac{n+1}{2}+1}).$$

So that

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(v_1) <& wt_f(v_2) < \cdots < wt_f(v_{\frac{n+1}{2}}) < wt_f(u_1) < wt_f(u_2) < \cdots < wt_f(u_n) \\ <& wt_f(v_{\frac{n+1}{2}+1}) < wt_f(v_{\frac{n+1}{2}+2}) < \cdots < wt_f(v_n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, vertex-weights are all distinct, this concludes the proof. □

Theorem 2.2. *The complete bipartite graph $K_{n,m}$, $n \leq m/2$ admits totally antimagic total labeling for every $n \geq 3$.*

Proof. Let the vertex set and the edge set of $K_{n,m}$, $n \geq 3$ be

$$\begin{aligned} V(K_{n,m}) &= V_1 \cup V_2 = \{v_i : i = 1,2,\dots,n\} \cup \{u_j : j = 1,2,\dots,m\}, \\ E(K_{n,m}) &= \{v_iu_j : i = 1,2,\dots,n, j = 1,2,\dots,m\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $n \geq 3$, $n \leq \frac{m}{2}$ we define a bijection $f : V(K_{n,m}) \cup E(K_{n,m}) \to \{1,2,\dots,nm+n+m\}$ such that

Case 1: if n is even,

$$\begin{aligned} f(v_i) &= nm + m + i && \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \\ f(u_j) &= j && \text{for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, m, \\ f(v_i u_j) &= m + nj - n + i && \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m. \end{aligned}$$

For the edge-weights we get

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(v_i u_j) &= f(v_i) + f(u_j) + f(v_i u_j) \\ &= (nm + m + i) + j + (m + nj - n + i) \\ &= m(n+2) + j(n+1) - n + 2i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, j = 1, 2, \ldots, m. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the edge-weights are all distinct.
For vertex-weights we have the following. For the set of vertices in V_1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(v_i) = f(v_i) + \sum_{u_j \in V_2} f(v_i u_j) &= f(v_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} f(v_i u_j) \\ &= (mn + m + i) + \sum_{j=1}^{m} (m + nj - n + i) \\ &= (mn + m + i) + (m^2 + \tfrac{m^2 n + mn}{2} - mn + im) \\ &= \tfrac{m^2(n+2) + m(n+2) + 2i(m+1)}{2} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to show that $wt_f(v_1) < wt_f(v_2) < \cdots < wt_f(v_n)$.
Second for vertex-weights of the set of vertices in V_2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(u_j) = f(u_j) + \sum_{v_i \in V_1} f(v_i u_j) &= f(u_j) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(v_i u_j) \\ &= j + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (m + nj - n + i) \\ &= \tfrac{n^2(2j-1) + n(2m+1) + 2j}{2} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, m. \end{aligned}$$

So that $wt_f(u_1) < wt_f(u_2) < \cdots < wt_f(u_m)$.

Finally, we want to show that the sets of the vertex-weights of vertices V_1 and V_2 do not overlap. For $j = m$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(u_m) &= \tfrac{n^2(2m-1) + n(2m+1) + 2n}{2} \\ &= \tfrac{2n(nm) + nm + nm + 2m + (n - n^2)}{2} \\ &\le \tfrac{nm^2 + nm + nm + 2m + (n - n^2)}{2} \quad \text{since } (n \le \tfrac{m}{2}) \\ &< \tfrac{nm^2 + 2m^2 + nm + 2m + (n - n^2)}{2} \quad \text{since } (n < m) \Rightarrow (n < 2m^2) \\ &< \tfrac{nm^2 + 2m^2 + nm + 2m + (2m+2)}{2} \quad \text{since } (n - n^2 < 0 < 2m + 2) \\ &= wt_f(v_1). \end{aligned}$$

So that
$wt_f(u_1) < wt_f(u_2) < \cdots < wt_f(u_m) < wt_f(v_1) < wt_f(v_2) < \cdots < wt_f(v_n)$.

ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, 2017, VOLUME 7, ISSUE 1, p.21-28

Case 2: if n is odd,

$$\begin{aligned} f(v_i) &= nm+m+n+2-2i \qquad \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,n,\\ f(u_j) &= j \qquad \text{for } j=1,2,\dots,m,\\ f(v_iu_j) &= \begin{cases} m+nj-n+i & \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,n, j=1,2,\dots,m-1,\\ m+nm+2-2i & \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,\frac{n+1}{2}, j=m,\\ m+nm+2-2i+2n & \text{for } i=\frac{n+1}{2}+1,\frac{n+1}{2}+2,\dots,n, j=m. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

For the edge-weights we get

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(v_iu_j) &= f(v_i)+f(u_j)+f(v_iu_j) \quad \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,n, j=1,2,\dots,m,\\ &= \begin{cases} (nm+m+n+2-2i)+j+(m+nj-n+i)\\ \qquad \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,n, j=1,2,\dots,m-1,\\ (nm+m+n+2-2i)+j+(m+nm+2-2i)\\ \qquad \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,\frac{n+1}{2}, j=m,\\ (nm+m+n+2-2i)+j+(m+nm+2-2i+2n)\\ \qquad \text{for } i=\frac{n+1}{2}+1,\frac{n+1}{2}+2,\dots,n, j=m, \end{cases}\\ &= \begin{cases} m(n+2)+2+j(n+1)-i & \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,n, j=1,2,\dots,m-1,\\ 2m(n+1)+n+4+j-4i & \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,\frac{n+1}{2}, j=m,\\ 2m(n+1)+3n+4+j-4i & \text{for } i=\frac{n+1}{2}+1,\frac{n+1}{2}+2,\dots,n, j=m. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the edge-weights are all distinct. For vertex-weights we have the following. First for the set of vertices in V_1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} wt_f(v_i) &= f(v_i)+\sum_{u_j\in V_2} f(v_iu_j) = f(v_i)+\sum_{j=1}^{m} f(v_iu_j)\\ &= \begin{cases} (nm+m+n+2-2i)+\sum\limits_{j=1}^{m-1}(m+nj-n+i)+(m+nm+2-2i)\\ \qquad \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,\frac{(n+1)}{2},\\ (nm+m+n+2-2i)+\sum\limits_{j=1}^{m-1}(m+nj-n+i)+(m+nm+2-2i+2n)\\ \qquad \text{for } i=\frac{(n+1)}{2}+1,\frac{(n+1)}{2}+2,\dots,n, \end{cases}\\ &= \begin{cases} nm+m+\frac{nm^2}{2}+(m^2+2n+mi-5i+4-\frac{nm}{2}) & \text{for } i=1,2,\dots,\frac{n+1}{2},\\ nm+m+\frac{nm^2}{2}+(m^2+2n+mi-5i+4-\frac{nm}{2}+2n) & \text{for } i=\frac{n+1}{2}+1,\frac{n+1}{2}+2,\dots,n. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

So that $wt_f(v_1) < wt_f(v_2) < \cdots < wt_f(v_n)$.

ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, 2017, VOLUME 7, ISSUE 1, p.21-28

ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, 2017, VOLUME 7, ISSUE 1, p.21-28

Second for vertex-weights of the set of vertices in V_2, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
wt_f(u_j) &= f(u_j) + \sum_{v_i \in V_1} f(u_j v_i) = f(u_j) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(u_j v_i) \\
&= j + \sum_{i=1}^{n} (m + nj - n + i) \\
&= mn + n^2 j + j + \tfrac{n-n^2}{2} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \ldots, m-1, \\
wt_f(u_m) &= j + \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{n+1}{2}} (m + nm + 2 - 2i) + \sum_{i=\frac{n+1}{2}+1}^{n} (m + nm + 2 - 2i + 2n) \\
&= mn + m + n^2 m.
\end{aligned}
$$

So that $wt_f(u_1) < wt_f(u_2) < \cdots < wt_f(u_m)$.
Finally, we want to show the sets of the vertex-weights of vertices V_1 and V_2 do not overlap.
For $j = m$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
wt_f(u_m) &= mn + m + n^2 m = mn + m + n(nm) \\
&\leq mn + m + \tfrac{m}{2}(nm) \quad \text{since } (n \leq \tfrac{m}{2}) \\
&\leq mn + m + \tfrac{nm^2}{2} \\
&< mn + m + \tfrac{nm^2}{2} + (m^2 + 2n + m - 1 - \tfrac{nm}{2}) \\
&= wt_f(v_1).
\end{aligned}
$$

So that $wt_f(u_1) < wt_f(u_2) < \cdots < wt_f(u_m) < wt_f(v_1) < wt_f(v_2) < \cdots < wt_f(v_n)$. Hence, vertex-weights are all distinct, this cocludes the proof. □

3. CONCLUSION

In this paper we proved that complete bipartite graphs $K_{n,n}, n \geq 3$ and $K_{n,m}, n \leq m/2$ are simultaneously vertex-antimagic total and edge-antimagic total.

Acknowledgements

Mohammed Ali Ahmed gratefully acknowledges the financial support from Baghdad University, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, Iraq and to Indian Council for Cultural Relations for supporting to peruse research in Anna University, Chennai, India. And the authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions to improve the quality of the paper.

References

[1] N. Alon, G. Kaplan, A. Lev, Y. Roditty and R. Yuster, Dense graphs are antimagic, *J. Graph Theory.* **47** (2004), 297-309.

[2] M. Bača, F. Bertault, J.A. MacDougall, M. Miller, R. Simanjuntak and Slamin, Vertex-antimagic total labelings of graphs, *Discuss. Math. Graph Theory.* **23** (2003), 67-83.

[3] M. Bača, M. Miller, O. Phanalasy, J. Ryan, A. Semaničová-Feňovčíková and A.A. Sillasen, Totally antimagic total graphs, *Australasian J. Combin.* **61**(1), (2015), 42-56.

[4] G. Exoo, A.C.H. Ling, J.P. McSorley, N.C.K. Phillips and W.D. Wallis, Totally magic graphs, *Discrete Math.* **254**(1-3)(2002), 103-1135.

[5] J. Gallian, A dynamic survey of graph labeling, *Electron. J. Combin.*.**18** (2015), #DS6.

[6] N. Hartsfield and G. Ringel, Pearls in Graph Theory, *Academic Press, Boston-San Diego-New York-London.*(1990).
[7] A. Kotzig and A. Rosa, Magic valuations of finite graphs, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **13** (1970), 451-461.
[8] R. Simanjuntak, F. Bertault and M. Miller, Two new (a, d)-antimagic graph labelings, *Proc. of Eleventh Australasian Workshop on Combinatorial Algorithms.* (2000), 179-189.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION FOR PURE SCIENCES IBN AL HAITHAM, UNIVERSITY OF BAGHDAD, IRAQ
E-mail address: mohammedali1975@yahoo.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ANNA UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI - 600 025, INDIA
E-mail address: baskarbabujee@yahoo.com

ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, 2017, VOLUME 7, ISSUE 1, p.21-28