

A fast algorithm on average for solving the Hamilton Cycle problem

Michael Anastos
 Freie Universität Berlin
 manastos@zedat.fu-berlin.de

Abstract

We present CertifyHAM, an algorithm which takes as input a graph G and either finds a Hamilton cycle of G or it outputs that such a cycle does not exist. If $G \sim G(n, p)$ and $p \geq \frac{5000}{n}$ then the expected running time of CertifyHAM is $O(\frac{n}{p})$. This improves upon previous results due to Gurevich and Shelah, Thomason and Alon and Krivelevich.

1 Introduction

A Hamilton cycle in a graph is a cycle that visits every vertex exactly once. We say that a graph is Hamiltonian if it contains a Hamilton cycle. The Hamilton cycle problem, which we denote by HAM, asks to determine whether a given graph G has a Hamilton cycle; it belongs to the list of Karp's 21 NP-complete problems [12] and if $P \neq NP$ then there does not exist an algorithm that determines the Hamiltonicity of G in $poly(n)$ time for every graph G on n vertices. The fastest deterministic algorithm known today that solves HAM is the Held–Karp algorithm, also called Bellman–Held–Karp algorithm [5],[11]; it is a dynamic programming algorithm with worst-case time complexity $\Theta(n^2 2^n)$ time and worst-case space complexity $\Theta(\sqrt{n} 2^n)$. An algorithm that solves HAM and has $O(n^6 2^n)$ worst-case time complexity and $O(n^2)$ worst-case space complexity was given by Karp [13]; it is based on the principle of inclusion-exclusion and for the purpose of this paper we call it the Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm.

In [10], Gurevich and Shelah gave an algorithm that determines the Hamiltonicity of an n -vertex graph in polynomial time on average. Equivalently, as $G(n, 1/2)$ is the uniform measure over all graph on n vertices, the expected running time of their algorithm over the input distribution $G \sim G(n, p)$ is polynomial in n when $p = 1/2$. This last statement raises the following question, for which values of p does there exist an algorithm that solves HAM in polynomial expected running time over the input distribution $G \sim G(n, p)$. Gurevich and Shelah [10], Thomason [18] and Alon and Krivelevich [1] gave such an algorithm for $p \in [0, 1]$ being constant, $p \geq 12n^{-1/3}$ and $p \geq 70p^{-1/2}$ respectively.

In this paper we introduce CertifyHAM, a deterministic algorithm that solves HAM. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *CertifyHAM solves HAM in $O\left(\frac{n}{p}\right)$ expected running time over the input distribution $G \sim G(n, p)$ for $p \geq \frac{5000}{n}$.*

CertifyHAM arises from derandomizing RCertifyHAM, a randomized algorithm that solves HAM. We are able to bound the expected running time of RCertifyHam for a larger range of values of p , without any extra effort, as it is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *RCertifyHAM solves HAM in $O\left(\frac{n}{p}\right)$ expected running time over the input distribution $G \sim G(n, p)$ for $p \geq \frac{1000}{n}$.*

In both of the above theorems we assume that we are given A_G , the adjacency matrix of G , and that each entry of A_G can be accessed in $O(1)$ time. Observe that any algorithm that solves HAM has to identify at least n edges of G ; hence w.h.p.¹ it has to read at least $(1 + o(1))n/p$ entries of the matrix A_G . Thus the expected running time of CertifyHAM is optimal.

One of the most interesting features of Theorem 1.1 is that it can also deal with $G(n, p)$ below the Hamiltonicity threshold of $G(n, p)$. A celebrated result of Bollobás [7] and of Komlós and Szemerédi [14] states that the threshold for Hamiltonicity is the same as the threshold for minimum degree 2 in the model $G(n, p)$ and it is equal to $(1 + o(1))\frac{\log n}{n}$. For a complete survey on Hamilton cycles in random graphs see [8].

Theorem 1.1 falls into the area of average-case analysis of algorithms. For a complete survey on this area see [6]. It is motivated by the idea that the worst-time complexity of an algorithm is usually based on some well orchestrated instance and such instances are atypical. Thus the average time complexity may be a better measure of the performance of an algorithm. In addition using algorithms that run fast on average is one way to cope with NP-hard problems.

A distributional problem is a pair (L, D) where L is a decision problem and $D = \{D_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ where D_n is a probability distribution on the inputs of L of size n . We say that a distributional problem (L, D) belongs to *AvgP* if there exists an algorithm A (with running time $t_A(x)$ for an instance x of L), a constant ϵ and a polynomial $p()$ with the property that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_n}(t_A^\epsilon(x)) = O(p(n)).$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_p = \{G(n, p)\}_{n \geq 1}$. Theorem 1.1 and the upper bound on $\Pr(\delta(G) \geq 2)$ given in Lemma 4.3, give the following.

Corollary 1.3. *(HAM, \mathcal{P}_p) belongs to AvgP for all $p \geq 0$.*

1.1 Description of CertifyHam

CertifyHAM implements 2 algorithms. First it implements an algorithm given in [2] which, for the purpose of this paper, we call CerHam1. CerHam1 is a deterministic algorithm that takes as input the adjacency matrix of a graph G and outputs either a Hamilton cycle of G or a certificate that G is not Hamiltonian or FAILURE. If $G \sim G(n, p)$ for some $p = p(n) \geq 0$ then, with probability $1 - o(n^{-7})$ it runs in $O(\frac{n}{p})$ time and outputs either a Hamilton cycle of G or a certificate that G is not Hamiltonian. If CerHam1 fails to solve HAM for a given instance G then CertifyHAM implements CerHam2(G, D). CerHam1 is detailed in [2]. In this paper we introduce and analyse CerHam2. CerHam2 takes as an input a graph G and a letter in $\{D, R\}$ which indicates whether we

¹We say that a sequence of events $\{\mathcal{E}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ holds with high probability (w.h.p. in short) if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_n) = 1$.

want to implement the deterministic or randomized version of CerHam2; hence CerHam2(\cdot, D) is a deterministic algorithm while CerHam2(\cdot, R) is a randomized one. Their performances are given by the following Theorems.

Theorem 1.4. *CerHAM2(G, D) solves HAM in $O(n^7)$ expected running time over the input distribution $G \sim G(n, p)$ for $p \geq \frac{5000}{n}$.*

Theorem 1.5. *CerHAM2(G, R) solves HAM in $O(n^7)$ expected running time over the input distribution $G \sim G(n, p)$ for $p \geq \frac{1000}{n}$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.1: For an instance x denote by $t_1(x), t_2(x)$ and $t(x)$ the running time with input x of CerHam1, CerHam2(\cdot, D) and CertifyHam respectively. For $p \geq \frac{5000}{n}$, Theorem 1.4 implies,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{G \sim G(n, p)}(t(G)) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{G \sim G(n, p)}(t_1(G)) + \mathbb{E}_{G \sim G(n, p)}(t_2(G) \mid \text{CerHam1 fails}) \Pr(\text{CerHam1 fails}) \\ &\leq O\left(\frac{n}{p}\right) + n^{-7} \cdot O(n^7) = O\left(\frac{n}{p}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

The description of RCertifyHam is identical to the description of CertifyHam with the sole difference that it implements CerHam(\cdot, R) in place of CerHam(\cdot, D). The proof of Theorem 1.2 follows in an identical manner.

CerHam2 takes as an input a graph G and a letter in $X \in \{D, R\}$. Given X it generates a set of edges $F_0 = F_0(X)$ and queries the edges of G in F_0 . By querying an edge of G we refer to reading the corresponding entry of the adjacency matrix of G . When $G \sim G(n, p)$ is taken we consider that initially all of the entries of A_G are blank. Once we query an edge of G we reveal whether the edge belongs to G , equivalently whether the corresponding entry of A_G is filled with 0 or 1. As $G \sim G(n, p)$ the corresponding entry is equal to 1 independently of all the entries that we have revealed so far. This initial set of queries is the single point in which the descriptions of CerHam2(G, R) and CerHam2(G, D) differ. At the execution of CerHam2(G, R), we will let F_0 be the edge set of a random graph $G' \sim G(n, 1/2)$. Later on, at the execution of CerHam2(G, D) we derandomize this step by letting F_0 be the edge set of H_n . H_n will be a well chosen pseudorandom graph containing a constant fraction of the edges of K_n .

Once CerHam2 has made its initial queries it proceeds and iterates over a while loop. Each iteration starts with a full path packing \mathcal{P} of G and a set S . A full path packing of G is a set of vertex disjoint paths in G that cover $V(G)$. Here we consider single vertices to be paths of length 0. Thus G has at least 1 full path packing, namely the one that consists of the n paths of length 0. Then the algorithm adds to G a set of edges R that join the paths in \mathcal{P} into a Hamilton path. It continues by performing sequences of restricted Pósa rotations, defined in Section 2, and identifies sets $End, \{End_u\}_{u \in End}$ such that for every $u \in End$ and $w \in End_u$ there exists a Hamilton path in $G \cup R$ from u to w . Now either (I) all of the sets $End, \{End_u\}_{u \in End}$ are large or (II) at least one of them is small. In the first case it identifies and queries an edge uw with $u \in End$ and $w \in End_u$ that has not been queried yet. If $wu \in E(G)$ then it updates \mathcal{P} to a full path packing of a smaller size or it claims that G is Hamiltonian; in such a case we say it improves on $|\mathcal{P}|$. In the unlikely event that (II) occurs and one of the sets $End, \{End_u\}_{u \in End}$ is small then it adds this set to S , along with possibly some other sets. It then attempts to pack paths in $S \cup N(S)$ such that every

vertex in S is in the interior of some path. If no such path packing exists then it outputs “ G is not Hamiltonian”. If such a path packing \mathcal{P}' does exist then it adjusts \mathcal{P} such that it contains \mathcal{P}' as a subset. The algorithm exits the while-loop if S gets too large or too many attempts to improve $|\mathcal{P}|$ have been made. In the unlikely event that CerHam2 exits its while loop it implements the Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we present the tools needed for the presentation and analysis of the basic version of CerHam2(\cdot, R). This basic version suffices for dealing with dense graphs. We give its description at Section 3. There we also analyse the expected running time of CerHam2(G, R) with $G \sim G(n, p)$ for $p \geq \frac{1000 \log n}{n}$. At Section 4 we augment this basic version of CerHam2(\cdot, R) by adding to it a preprocessing step and analyse CerHam2(G, R) for sparse random graphs G . We close Section 4 with the proof of Theorem 1.5. In Section 5 we derandomize CerHam2(\cdot, R) and proof Theorem 1.4. For ease of the presentation of the paper we have moved the proofs of technical intermediate results to the Appendix. In addition we assume that n is significantly large and we omit ceilings and floors.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 The Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm

For a graph G , $u, v \in V(G)$, $S \subset V(G)$ and $e \in E(G)$ denote by $G - S$ the subgraph of G induced by $V(G) \setminus S$, by $G - e$ the graph obtained by removing e from G , by A_G the adjacent matrix of G and finally by $A_G(v, u)$ the entry of A_G that corresponds to the pair of vertices v, u . The Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm is based on the observations that $A_G^{n-1}(u, v)$ equals the number of walks from v to u of length $n - 1$ and that the number of Hamiltonian paths from v to u can be obtained from the Inclusion-Exclusion principle and the matrices $\{A_{(G-uv)-S}^{n-1}\}_{S \subseteq V(G) \setminus \{v, u\}}$.

More concretely for each $e \in E(G)$ the Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm executes the following steps. It lets $F = G - e$, $e = \{v, u\}$ and calculates,

$$H(v, u) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-2} (-1)^k \sum_{S \in \binom{V(F) \setminus \{v, u\}}{k}} A_{F-S}^{n-1}(v, u).$$

If $H(v, u) \neq 0$ it then outputs that G has a Hamilton cycle that passes through the edge $e = \{v, u\}$.

For the correctness of the algorithm observe that $A_{F-S}^{n-1}(v, u)$ equals the number of walks from v to u of length $n - 1$ that do not pass through S . Thus the inclusion-exclusion principle gives that $H(v, u)$ equals to the number of Hamiltonian paths of G from v to u . Finally as for each edge at most $n2^n$ matrix multiplications are performed its worst-time running complexity is $O(|E(G)| \cdot n^3 \cdot n2^n) = O(n^6 2^n)$.

2.2 Restricted Pósa Rotations

Given a Hamilton path $P = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$ and $v_i v_n$, $1 \leq i < n$ we say that the path $P' = v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i, v_n, v_{n-1}, \dots, v_{i+1}$ is obtained from P via a Pósa rotation that fixes v_1 . We call v_i and

v_{i+1} the pivot vertex and the new endpoint respectively. We call v_nv_i and v_iv_{i+1} the inserted and the deleted edge respectively. We will not perform all Pósa rotations possible. Instead we will perform only the Pósa rotations for which the pivot vertex does not belong to some prescribed set S . The exact procedure which we call *RPR*, for *Restricted Pósa Rotations*, follows shortly. It takes as an input a graph G , a Hamilton path P of G with endpoints v, u and a set S not containing u . It then outputs sets End and \mathcal{P} such that for each $w \in End$ there exists a Hamilton path in \mathcal{P} from v to w .

Algorithm 1 $RPR(G, P, v, S)$

```

1: Let  $u$  be such that  $u, v$  are the endpoints of  $P$ .
2: Set  $Q = u$ ,  $\mathcal{P} = \{P\}$ ,  $End = \{u\}$ .
3: while  $Q \neq \emptyset$  do
4:   Let  $w$  be the first vertex in  $Q$  and  $P_w$  be the unique Hamilton path in  $\mathcal{P}$  from  $v$  to  $w$ .
5:   for  $z \in N(w) \setminus S$  do
6:     if the Pósa rotation starting from  $P_w$  that fixes  $v$  and the inserted edge is  $wz$  results
       to an endpoint which does not belong to  $End$  then
7:       Perform the corresponding Pósa rotation, add the new endpoint to  $End$  and to the
       end of  $Q$  and the corresponding path to  $\mathcal{P}$ .
8:     end if
9:   end for
10:  Remove  $w$  from  $Q$ .
11: end while
12: Output  $End, \mathcal{P}$ .
```

As every vertex enters at most once the set Q , both End, \mathcal{P} have size at most n throughout the above algorithm which runs in $O(n^2)$ time.

We replace the classical Pósa Lemma with the following one.

Lemma 2.1. *Let G be a graph, $S \subset V(G)$, P a Hamiltonian path of G with endpoints u, v and $End, \mathcal{P} = RPR(G, P, v, S)$. Then,*

$$|N_G(End) \setminus S| < 2|End|.$$

Proof. Let $u = u_1, u_2, \dots, u_\ell$ be the vertices in End in the order that are added to Q and $P_{u_1}, P_{u_2}, \dots, P_{u_\ell}$ be the corresponding Hamiltonian paths. Let $T_1 = \{u_1, r_{1,1}\}$ and $T_i = \{u_i, r_{i,1}, r_{i,2}\}$ for $2 \leq i \leq \ell$, where $r_{i,2}u_i$ is the deleted edge at the Pósa rotation that results to the Hamilton path P_{u_i} for $2 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $r_{i,1}$ is the vertex preceding u_i on P_{u_i} for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$.

Let $w \in \cup_{i \in \ell} N(u_i)$ be such that $w \notin S$ and k be minimum such that $w \in N(u_k)$. Let x be the neighbor of w between w and u_k (included) on the path P_k (so $xw \in E(P_k)$). Then either $x = u_k$ or, due the minimality of k , $x \notin \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$. In the first case $w = r_{k,1}$. In the second case during the k^{th} execution of the while loop of *RPR* a Pósa rotation is performed where the inserted edge is the edge $u_k w$ and the new endpoint is x . Therefore, in the second case, $x = u_{k'}$ for some $k' > k$ and $w = r_{k',2}$. Thus $N_G(End) \setminus S \subseteq \cup_{i \leq \ell} T_i$ and

$$|N_G(End) \setminus S| \leq 1 + 2(|End| - 1) < 2|End|.$$

□

The key advantage of performing restricted Pósa rotations as opposed to normal Pósa rotations is given by the following observation.

Observation 2.2. *If $S = W \cup N(W)$ and $End, \mathcal{P} = RPR(G, P, v, S)$ then End and W are disjoint. Indeed, let u, v be the endpoints of P . Then, $u \notin S$. Thereafter for a vertex $w \in [n]$ only a Pósa rotation with a pivot vertex in $N(w) \setminus S$ may result to a path with w as an endpoint. As $N(w) \setminus S = \emptyset$ for $w \in W$ we have that no vertex in W ever enters End .*

At the analysis of CerHam2, at the regime $p = O\left(\frac{1000 \log n}{n}\right)$, we will also use the following observation.

Observation 2.3. *If $End, \mathcal{P} = RPR(G, P, v, S)$ then the set $End \cup (N(End) \setminus S)$ is connected in G .*

We use RPR as a subroutine of the algorithm $ReducePaths$ stated below. $ReducePaths$ takes as an input a full path packing \mathcal{P} . It then performs RPP and outputs sets $End, \{End_u\}_{u \in End}$ and a set of full path packings \mathcal{U} with the following property. For $u \in End$ and $w \in End_u$ there exists a full path packing $\mathcal{P}_{u,w} \in \mathcal{U}$ of size at most $|\mathcal{P}|$ with the property that adding uw to $\mathcal{P}_{u,w}$ either creates a Hamilton cycle, if $|\mathcal{P}_{u,w}| = 1$, or joins two paths in $\mathcal{P}_{u,w}$ and creates a full path packing of size at most $|\mathcal{P}| - 1$.

Algorithm 2 $ReducePaths(G, \mathcal{P}, S)$

- 1: Let $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k\}$. Let v_i, u_i be the endpoints of P_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$.
 - 2: Let $R = \{u_i v_{i+1} : 1 \leq i \leq k-1\}$ and $P = v_1 P_1 u_1 v_2 P_2 u_2, \dots, u_{k-1} v_k P_k u_k$.
 - 3: $End, \mathcal{P} = RPR(G \cup R, P, v_1, S)$
 - 4: **for** $u \in End$ **do**
 - 5: Let P_u be the Hamilton path from v to u in \mathcal{P} .
 - 6: $End_u, \mathcal{P}_u = RPR(G \cup R, P_u, u, S)$.
 - 7: For $w \in End_u$ let $P_{u,w} \in \mathcal{P}_u$ be the u - w Hamilton path in $G \cup R$ and let $\mathcal{P}_{u,w}$ be the full path packing obtained from $P_{u,w}$ by removing the edges in R .
 - 8: **end for**
 - 9: Set $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathcal{P}_{u,w} : u \in End, w \in End_w\}$
 - 10: Output $End, \{End_u\}_{u \in End}, \mathcal{U}$.
-

$ReducePaths(G, \mathcal{P}, S)$ calls RPR $O(n)$ times, hence its running time is $O(n^3)$.

2.3 Covering non-expanding sets

In this subsection we introduce the algorithm $CoverAndAdjust$ which is the subroutine that we will use to deal with “problematic sets”. These sets will be non (sufficiently) expanding and will contain small sets output by $ReducePaths$. $CoverAndAdjust$ takes as an input a graph G' , a set $S \subseteq V(G')$ and a full path packing \mathcal{P} and tries to adjust \mathcal{P} so that every vertex in S is found in the interior of some path in \mathcal{P} . It first finds a set of paths \mathcal{P}' such that every vertex in S is in the interior of some path in \mathcal{P}' . It then adjusts \mathcal{P} so that it contains \mathcal{P}' .

Algorithm 3 *CoverAndAdjust*(G', S, \mathcal{P})

- 1: Let G'_S be the subgraph of G' whose edge set is exactly the set of edges incident to S in G' .
 - 2: **for** each component C of G'_S **do**
 - 3: Let $Q = Q(C, S)$ be a maximum size subset of $S \cap V(C)$ with the property $2|N_{G'_S}(Q)| < 2|Q|$.
 - 4: Set $R = (S \cap V(C)) \setminus Q$.
 - 5: Let F_C be the graph with vertex set $V(F_C) = Q \cup N_{G'_S}(Q) \cup \{v\}$ and whose edge set $E(F_C)$ contains every edge of G' incident to Q and every edge spanned by $N_{G'_S}(Q) \cup \{v\}$.
 - 6: Implement the Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm to find a Hamilton cycle H of F_C . If no such a cycle exists output “ G' is not Hamiltonian”.
 - 7: Let $R' = N(R) \setminus (Q \cup N_{G'_S}(Q))$.
 - 8: Find a maximum matching M_1 in $R \times R'$ and let R'_1 be the M_1 -saturated vertices in R' .
 - 9: Find a maximum matching M_2 in $R \times (R' \setminus M_1)$.
 - 10: Remove from $E(H)$ all the edges not incident to Q , then add to it M_1 and M_2 and let \mathcal{P}'_C be the set of paths induced by $E(H)$ of length at least 1.
 - 11: Remove from the paths in \mathcal{P} the vertices that are incident to $E(H)$ and add \mathcal{P}'_C to \mathcal{P} .
 - 12: **end for**
 - 13: Output \mathcal{P} .
-

If there exists a subset W of R that satisfies $|N(W) \cap R'| < 2|W|$ then $|N(W \cup Q)| < 2|W \cup Q|$ contradicting the maximality of Q . Therefore $|N(W) \cap R'| \geq 2|W|$ for every $W \subseteq R$. Hall's Theorem implies that both M_1, M_2 saturate R . To construct the matchings M_1, M_2 at lines 8 and 9 we may use any augmenting path algorithm that runs in $O(2^{|R|})$ time.

The extra vertex v at line 5 is needed to ensure that the set of edges of H incident to Q do not form a cycle hence indeed it induces a set of paths in G' . To these paths we add the $|R|$ paths induced by $M_1 \cup M_2$ to get the paths in \mathcal{P}'_C . The following Lemma is related to line 6 of CoverAndAdjust. We say a path P covers a vertex v if $v \in V(P)$.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $G' \subseteq G$ and $S \subset V(G)$ be such that each vertex in S has the same neighborhood in both G and G' . If *CoverAndAdjust*(G', S, \mathcal{P}) outputs “ G' is not Hamiltonian” then G is not Hamiltonian.*

Proof. Assume that G has a Hamilton cycle H and let C be an arbitrary component of G'_S . Then the edges of H incident to the set $Q = Q(C, S)$ (as it is defined in the description of CoverAndAdjust) induce a path packing $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k\}$ that covers Q such that the endpoints of P_i lie in $N_{G'_S}(Q)$ for $i \in [k]$. As each vertex in S has the same neighborhood in both G and G' these paths are present in F_C . Finally as each pair of vertices in $N_{G'_S}(Q) \cup \{v\}$ forms an edge in F_C the paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k can be used to form a Hamilton cycle of F_C . Thus CoverAndAdjust(G', S, \mathcal{P}) does not output “ G' is not Hamiltonian”. \square

Observation 2.5. *Let \mathcal{P}' be the union of the sets \mathcal{P}'_C over the components C of G'_S . After the execution of *CoverAndAdjust*(G', S, \mathcal{P}) the cardinality of \mathcal{P} may increase by at most $4|S|$. This is because there are at most $|S|$ paths in \mathcal{P}' covering S . These paths cover in total at most $3|S|$ vertices. Deleting the vertices that are covered by these paths from paths in \mathcal{P} increases the cardinality of \mathcal{P} by at most $3|S|$. We then add to \mathcal{P} the at most $|S|$ paths in \mathcal{P}' .*

The running time of CoverAndAdjust(G', S, \mathcal{P}) is dominated by the time needed to execute the

Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm, hence it is $O(n^6 2^n)$. Another useful bound on it can be obtained as follows. Let s be the maximum $|C|$ over subsets C of S with the property that the edges incident to C in G' span a connected graph on $C \cup N_{G'}(C)$ (thus s is equal to the maximum number of vertices of S that are contained in a single component of G'_S). Then for each component C' of G'_S we may identify Q in $O(s2^s)$ time, apply the Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm at line 6 in $(s^6 2^{3s})$ time (here we are using that $2|N_{G'_S}(Q)| < 2|Q|$) and run the rest of the lines from 3 to 11 in $O(2^s)$ time. Hence the running time of $\text{CoverAndAdjust}(G', S, \mathcal{P})$ is also $O(ns^6 2^{3s})$.

2.4 Chernoff bounds

In various places we use the Chernoff bounds, stated below, to bound the probability that the binomial random variable $\text{Bin}(n, p)$ deviates from its expectation by a multiplicative factor.

Theorem 2.6. *For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \in (0, 1)$ and $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\Pr(\text{Bin}(n, p) \geq (1 + \epsilon)np) \leq \exp\{-\epsilon^2 np / (2 + \epsilon)\} \quad (1)$$

and

$$\Pr(\text{Bin}(n, p) \leq (1 - \epsilon)np) \leq \exp\{-\epsilon^2 np / 2\}. \quad (2)$$

3 A randomized algorithm for certifying Hamiltonicity

$\text{CerHam2}(G, R)$ starts by generating $G' \sim G(n, 0.5)$, letting F_0 be the edges of G' that are present in G and setting $G_1 = ([n], F_0)$. Then it calculates $p' = |E(G_1)| / \binom{n}{2}$ and sets $S = \emptyset$. If $p' \geq \frac{10 \log n}{n}$ then it implements $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$. Else if $\frac{100 \log \log n}{n} < p' \leq \frac{10 \log n}{n}$ then it implements $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$. Otherwise it implements $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$.

Ham2 is a deterministic algorithm that solves HAM and take as an input 3 or 4 arguments. The last one is a number between 1 and 3 and indicates which of the 3 slightly different versions of Ham2 is implemented. In this section we introduce the simplest one, it takes as an input a graph G on $[n]$, a set of edges F_0 such that the pair (G, F_0) has the property \mathcal{R} (defined shortly), a set S and the number 1, and suffices for the description and analysis of $\text{CerHam2}(G, R)$ use for fairly dense random graphs G . When Ham2 is executed as part of $\text{CerHAM2}(G, R)$, initially, every edge in F_0 belongs to G . This will not be true in the execution of $\text{CerHAM2}(G, D)$ for the corresponding set F_0 . Throughout the execution of Ham2 the set F consists of the edges of G that have been queried so far and G_R is the subgraph of G with edge set the edges in F that belong to G .

The variables i, j, X_i and Y_j defined in the description of Ham2 are used at its analysis and should be consider parts of the analysis of Ham2 rather than its description.

Notation 3.1. *We say that a pair (G, F_0) has the property \mathcal{R} , equivalently $(G, F) \in \mathcal{R}$, if G is a graph, F_0 is an edges set and every set $S \subseteq V(G)$ is incident to at most $0.11|S| + n^{7/3}$ edges in $F_0 \setminus E(G)$.*

Ramark 3.2. *The arguments given in this and the next section are given in a slight generality so that we can reuse them later on. For example, for the purposes of this section it suffices to take $S = \emptyset$ at the execution of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, S, 1)$.*

Ham2 utilizes as a subroutine the algorithm FindSparse which aims to find sufficiently large sets that do not sufficiently expand in subgraphs of G . The variable j and sets Q_j defined in the description of FindSparse are used at its analysis and should be considered parts of its analysis rather than its description.

Algorithm 4 FindSparse(G, G_R, F, S)

```

1: Set  $w = 1$ ,  $j = 1$  and  $Q_0 = S$ .
2: while  $w = 1$  do
3:   Set  $w = 0$ .
4:   Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the set of subsets of  $V(G) \setminus S$  of size at most  $|S|$ .
5:   for  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$  do
6:     if  $w = 0$  and  $|N_{G_R}(Q) \setminus S| < 2|Q \setminus S|$  then
7:       Add  $Q$  to  $S$  and set  $w = 1$ .
8:       Add to  $F$  all the edges incident to  $Q$  and query the edges of  $G$  that have just been
       added to  $F$ . Add any edges of  $G$  that have just been revealed to  $G_R$ .
9:       Set  $Q_j = S$  and  $j = j + 1$ .
10:    end if
11:  end for
12: end while
13: Return  $G_R, F, S$ .
```

Observation 3.3. Let G be such that $|V(G)| = n$ and $s^* = s^*(G, G_R, F, S)$ be the size of the set S that is returned by FindSparse(G, G_R, F, S). If $s^* \leq 0.5n$ then the running time of FindSparse with input G, G_R, F, S is $O((s^*)^3 \binom{n}{s^*} + n^2)$. Indeed if FindSparse outputs a set of size s^* then it updates the set S at most s^* times. After each update it examines whether there exists a set in $[n] \setminus S$ of size at most $|S| \leq s^*$ such that the condition at line 6 is satisfied. There exists at most $\binom{n}{|S|} \leq \binom{n}{s^*}$ such sets (as $|S| \leq s^*$ and $s^* \leq 0.5n$) each examination taking $O((s^*)^2)$ time. At line 8 it queries at most $\binom{n}{2}$ edges in total. This yields a total running time of $O((s^*)(s^*)^2 \binom{n}{s^*} + n^2)$.

Algorithm 5 Ham2($G, F_0, S, 1$)

```
1: Set  $count = 0, i = j = 1, S_0 = S, F = F_0$  and  $\mathcal{P} = [n]$ .
2: Query the edges in  $F$  and set  $G_R = ([n], E(G) \cap F)$ .
3: while  $|S_{i-1}| < 0.25n$  and  $count < 0.01n^2$  do
4:    $End, \{End_u\}_{u \in End}, \mathcal{U} = ReducePaths(G, \mathcal{P}, S_{i-1} \cup N_{G_R}(S_{i-1}))$ .
5:   if there exists  $W_i \in \{End_u : u \in End\} \cup \{End\}$  such that  $|W_i| < 0.25n$  then
6:     Set  $S'_i = S_{i-1} \cup W_i$ .
7:      $G_R, F, S_i = FindSparse(G, G_R, F, S'_i)$ .
8:     Execute  $CoverAndAdjust(G_R, S_i, \mathcal{P})$ . If it outputs “ $G_R$  is not Hamiltonian” then output
     “ $G$  is not Hamiltonian”; else set  $\mathcal{P}' = \mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{P} = CoverAndAdjust(G_R, S_i, \mathcal{P}')$ .
9:     Set  $Y_i = |\mathcal{P}| - |\mathcal{P}'|$  and  $i = i + 1$ .
10:  else
11:    if there exists  $u \in End$  and  $w \in End_u$  such that  $uw \in F$  and  $uw \in G_R$  then
12:      Set  $E' = \{uw\}$ .
13:    else
14:      Let  $u \in End$  and  $w \in End_u$  be such that  $uw \notin F$ .
15:      Add  $uw$  to  $F$  and query whether  $uw \in E(G)$ . If  $uw$  belongs to  $E(G)$  then add  $uw$  to
       $G_R$ , set  $X_j = 1$  and  $E' = \{uw\}$ ; else set  $X_j = 0$  and  $E' = \emptyset$ .
16:      Set  $count = count + 1$  and  $j = j + 1$ .
17:    end if
18:    if  $E' \neq \emptyset$  then let  $E' = \{uw\}$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{u,w}$  be a full path packing in  $\mathcal{U}$  such that none of
       $u, w$  lies in the interior of a path in  $\mathcal{P}_{u,w}$ . Add to the graph spanned by the paths in  $\mathcal{P}_{u,w}$  the
      edge  $uw$ . If it spans a Hamilton cycle output “ $G$  is Hamiltonian”. Else let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the induced
      full path-packing.
19:    end if
20:  end if
21: end while
22: Reveal  $G$ .
23: Execute the Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm with input the graph  $G$ .
```

Observe that if Ham2($G, F_0, S, 1$) outputs “ G is not Hamiltonian” at line 8 then this statement is indeed true due to Lemma 2.4; here we are using that due to line 8 of FindSparse we have revealed all the edges in G incident to S_i and hence the edge sets incident to S_i in G_R and G are identical.

At any point of the execution of Ham2($G, F_0, S, 1$) if the input $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$ and the line 14 is executed then a pair of vertices u, w such that $uw \notin F$ does exist. For that recall that Observation 2.2 implies that at each iteration of the while-loop at line 3 the sets $End, \{End_u\}_{u \in End}$ are disjoint from S_{i-1} . In addition observe that $count$ is an upper bound on the number of edges in $F \setminus F_0$ not incident to S_{i-1} . Thus, if the algorithm proceeds to line 14 then due line 5 we have that every set in $\{End_u : u \in End\} \cup \{End\}$ has size at least $0.25n$ and due line 11 we have that

$$|\{uw : u \in End, w \in End_u \text{ and } uw \in F \cap E(G)\}| = 0.$$

In addition, $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$ and therefore

$$|\{uw : u \in End, w \in End_u \text{ and } uw \in F_0 \setminus E(G)\}| \leq 0.11n|End| + n^{7/4}.$$

Hence, as $F_0 \subseteq F$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\{uw : u \in \text{End}, w \in \text{End}_u \text{ and } uw \notin F\}| &= |\{uw : u \in \text{End}, w \in \text{End}_u\}| \\
&\quad - |\{uw : u \in \text{End}, w \in \text{End}_u \text{ and } uw \in F \setminus F_0\}| \\
&\quad - |\{uw : u \in \text{End}, w \in \text{End}_u \text{ and } uw \in F_0 \setminus E(G)\}| \\
&\quad - |\{uw : u \in \text{End}, w \in \text{End}_u \text{ and } uw \in F_0 \cap E(G)\}| \\
&\geq 0.25n|\text{End}| - \text{count} - 0.11n|\text{End}| - n^{7/4} - 0 \\
&\geq 0.14n|\text{End}| - 0.011n^2 \geq 0.14 \cdot 0.25n^2 - 0.03n^2 \geq 1.
\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma upper bounds the number of edges in G we need to identify at line 15. We later use Lemma 3.4 to upper bound the probability that $\text{count} \geq 0.01n^2$ at the end of the main while-loop of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, S, 1)$. Given a set of edges F_0 and a graph G on $[n]$ define the event

$$\mathcal{E}'_{\text{exp}}(G, F_0) = \{\exists S \subset [n] \text{ with size in } [0.02n, 0.27n] \text{ such that } |N_{G \cap G_{F_0}}(S)| < 2|S|\},$$

where $G_{F_0} = ([n], F_0)$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $G \sim G(n, p)$ and F_0 be an edge set on $[n]$ with the property $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. In addition let $G_1 = ([n], F_0 \cap E(G))$. Let t be the larger i such that the set S_i is defined by $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, S, 1)$ and S_0, S_1, \dots, S_t be the corresponding sets. Then, $|N_{G_1}(S_t)| < 2|S_t|$. In addition, if the event $\mathcal{E}'_{\text{exp}}(G, F_0)$ does not occur then $|S_t| \leq 0.02n$. Furthermore,*

$$t \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{|S_t|}{|S_1|} \right) + 1. \quad (3)$$

Finally, if $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, S, 1)$ exits the while-loop and $|S_t| < 0.25n$ then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i < 8|S_t| + n. \quad (4)$$

Proof. Let $\emptyset = Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_r = S_t$ be the sequence of sets generated by $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, S, 1)$, i.e. for $1 \leq i \leq r$ either (i) $Q_{i-1} = S_j$, $Q_i \setminus Q_{i-1} = W_{j+1}$ and $Q_i = S'_{j+1}$ for some $1 \leq j+1 \leq t$ or (ii) $Q = Q_i \setminus Q_{i-1}$ is a subset of $[n] \setminus Q_{i-1}$ of size at most $|Q_{i-1}|$ such that $|N_{G_R}(Q) \setminus Q_{i-1}| < 2|Q|$ for some graph G_R with $G_1 \subseteq G_R \subseteq G$ (i.e the set Q satisfied line 6 of FindSparse at some point during the execution of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, S, 1)$). Lemma 2.1 implies that in the first case, and therefore in both cases, $|N_{G_1}(Q_i \setminus Q_{i-1}) \setminus Q_{i-1}| < 2|Q_i \setminus Q_{i-1}|$ and $|Q_i \setminus Q_{i-1}| \leq \max\{|Q_{i-1}|, 0.25n - 1\}$.

We first show by induction that $|N_{G_1}(Q_i)| < 2|Q_i|$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Taking $i = r$ yields that $|N_{G_1}(S_t)| < 2|S_t|$. The base case holds as $Q_1 \setminus Q_0 = Q_1 = W_1$. Assume that $|N_{G_1}(Q_i)| < 2|Q_i|$ for some $1 \leq i < r$. Then,

$$|N_{G_1}(Q_{i+1})| \leq |N_{G_1}(Q_{i+1} \setminus Q_i) \setminus Q_i| + |N_{G_1}(Q_i)| < 2|Q_{i+1} \setminus Q_i| + 2|Q_i| \leq 2|Q_{i+1}|,$$

completing the induction.

Now assume that the event $\mathcal{E}'_{\text{exp}}(G, F_0)$ does not occur. We will show that $|Q_i| \leq 0.02n$ for $0 \leq i \leq r$ by induction. Taking $i = r$ yields that $|S_t| < 0.02n$. The base case holds as $Q_0 = \emptyset$. Assume that $|Q_i| < 0.02n$ for some $0 \leq i < r$. Then,

$$|Q_{i+1}| = |Q_{i+1} \setminus Q_i| + |Q_i| \leq \max\{|Q_i|, 0.25n - 1\} + |Q_i| < 0.25n - 1 + 0.02n < 0.27n.$$

As $|N_{G_1}(Q_{i+1})| < 2|Q_{i+1}|$ and the event $\mathcal{E}'_{exp}(G, F_0)$ does not occur we have that $|Q_{i+1}| < 0.02n$.

Now we will show that $2|S_i| < |S_{i+1}|$ for $0 \leq i < t$. For that observe that once $\text{FindSparse}(G, G_R, F, S'_i)$ terminates there does not exist a subset W of $[n] \setminus S_i$ of size at most $|S_i|$ with the property $|N_{G_R}(W) \setminus S_i| < 2|S_i|$. On the other hand Lemma 2.1 implies that $|N_{G_R}(W_{i+1}) \setminus S_i| < 2|W_{i+1}|$. Therefore, $|W_{i+1}| > |S_i|$ and

$$|S_{i+1}| \geq |S'_{i+1}| = |S_i| + |W_{i+1}| > |S_i| + |S_i| = 2|S_i| \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq t.$$

$2|S_i| < |S_{i+1}|$ for $0 \leq i < t$ implies that $|S_t| \geq 2^{t-1}|S_1|$ and therefore (3) holds.

Finally for (4) observe that if $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, S, 1)$ exits the while-loop and $|S| < 0.25n$ then line 15 has been executed $0.01n^2$ times. Say $|\mathcal{P}| = 0$ if a Hamilton cycle has been constructed. The i^{th} time line 8 is executed the number of paths in \mathcal{P} is increased by $|Y_i|$. Observation 2.5 implies that $|Y_i| \leq 4|S_i|$. On the other hand $X_j = 1$ implies a decrease in $|\mathcal{P}|$ after the j^{th} time line 15 is executed. If $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, S, 1)$ exits the while-loop then $|\mathcal{P}| > 0$ throughout the algorithm and as initially $|\mathcal{P}| = n$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< n + \sum_{i=1}^t Y_i - \sum_{j=1}^{0.01n^2} X_j \leq n + 4 \sum_{i=1}^t |S_i| - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \\ &\leq n + 4 \sum_{i=1}^t 2^{-i+t} |S_t| - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \leq n + 8|S_t| - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i. \end{aligned}$$

At the second line of the calculations above we used that $2|S_i| < |S_{i+1}|$ for $0 \leq i < t$. \square

3.1 Analysis of Ham2 in the randomised setting - the dense regime

For the analysis of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$ in addition to the event $\mathcal{E}'_{exp}(G, F_0)$ we consider the following ones,

$$\mathcal{E}_{count_1}(G, F_0) = \{\text{count reaches the value of } 0.01n^2 \text{ at the execution of } \text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}'_i(G, F_0) = \{\exists S \subset [n] \text{ such that } S = i \text{ and } |N_{F \cap G_{F_0}}(S)| < 2|S|\}, \quad i \leq 0.02n.$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let G be a graph on $[n]$ and F_0 be an edge set on $[n]$ with the property $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. Then, the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$ is*

$$O\left(n^7 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}'_{exp}(G, F_0) \vee \mathcal{E}_{count_1}(G, F_0)) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} \left[j^4 \binom{n}{j} + j^7 2^{3j} n \right] \Pr(\mathcal{A}'_j(F_0)) + n^5\right). \quad (5)$$

In addition, the worst-case running time of $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, 1)$ is $O(n^7 2^n)$.

Proof. Let $G_1 = ([n], F_0 \cap E(G))$. Write \mathcal{E}'_{exp} , \mathcal{E}_{count} and \mathcal{A}'_j for the events $\mathcal{E}'_{exp}(G, F_0)$, $\mathcal{E}_{count_1}(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{A}'_j(G, F_0)$ respectively. Lemma 3.4 implies that $t \leq \log_2 n$ and therefore $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$ may execute line 4 at most $\log_2 n + 0.01n^2$ times. Each execution of line 4 runs in $O(n^3)$ time; hence

line 4 takes in total $O(n^5)$ time. This is also the running time of $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, 1)$ in the event that it never proceeds to line 7 and it does not exit the while-loop at line 3.

In the event $\mathcal{E}'_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{count}$ the algorithm may exit the while loop. Before exiting the while loop it may reach line 6 at most $\log_2 n < n$ times, each time spending at most $O(n^6 2^n)$ time at lines 6 to 9. After exiting the while-loop it executes the Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm whose complexity is $O(n^6 2^n)$. Hence in the event $\mathcal{E}'_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{count}$ $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$ runs in $O(n^7 2^n)$ time. This is also the worst-case running time of $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, 1)$.

On the other hand, if none of \mathcal{E}_{count} , \mathcal{E}'_{exp} occurs, by Lemma 3.4 we have that $|S_t| \leq 0.02n$. Hence we may partition the event $\neg \mathcal{E}'_{exp} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{count}$ into the events $\{\mathcal{F}_j\}_{j=0}^{0.02n}$ where $\mathcal{F}_j = \{|S_t| = j\} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{count}$. In the event \mathcal{F}_j $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$ executes lines 6 to 9 at most $t \leq |S_t| = j$ times. Each of the at most j executions of FindSparse runs in $O(j^3 \binom{n}{j} + n^2)$ time (see Observation 3.3). Thereafter each of the executions of CoverAndAdjust at line 8 runs in $O(nj^6 2^{3j})$ time (see the last paragraph of Section 2). Thus lines 6 to 9 are executed in $O(j^4 \binom{n}{j} + j^7 2^{3j} n + jn^2)$ time.

Equation (5) follows from the observation that if the event \mathcal{F}_j occurs then the event $\mathcal{A}'_j \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{count}$ also does and therefore $\Pr(\mathcal{F}_j) \leq \Pr(\mathcal{A}'_j \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}'_{exp} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{count}) \leq \Pr(\mathcal{A}'_j)$. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' \sim G(n, 0.5)$ and $F_0 = E(G) \cap E(G')$. Then, the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$ is $O(n^7)$ for $p \geq \frac{10 \log n}{n}$.*

Proof. $F_0 \subseteq E(G)$ implies that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. Let $G_1 = ([n], F_0)$. Write \mathcal{E}'_{exp} , \mathcal{E}_{count} and \mathcal{A}'_j for the events $\mathcal{E}'_{exp}(G, F_0)$, $\mathcal{E}_{count_1}(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{A}'_j(G, F_0)$ respectively. In the event \mathcal{E}'_{exp} there exists a set $S \subset [n]$ with size in $[0.02n, 0.27n]$ such that $|N_{G_1}(S)| < 2|S|$. Therefore $|S| \geq 0.02n$, $|[n] \setminus (S \cup N_{G_1}(S))| \geq (1 - 0.27 \cdot 3)n = 0.19n$ and no edge from S to $[n] \setminus (S \cup N_{G_1}(S))$ belongs to G_1 . Thus,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}'_{exp}) \leq 2^n \cdot 2^n \cdot (1 - 0.5p)^{0.02n \cdot 0.19n} \leq 4^n e^{-10^{-3}pn^2} = o(n^{-7}2^{-n}).$$

In the event $\mathcal{E}_{count} \setminus \mathcal{E}'_{exp}$ (4) implies that $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i < n + 8 \cdot 0.02n \leq 1.2n$. For $1 \leq i \leq 0.01n^2$, $X_i = 1$ only if the corresponding edge belongs to G but not to G' , hence with probability $0.5p$ independently of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{i-1} . Thus, as $p \geq \frac{10 \log n}{n}$, (2) gives,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{count} \setminus \mathcal{E}'_{exp}) \leq \Pr\left(\text{Bin}\left(n, \frac{5 \log n}{n}\right) \leq 1.2n\right) = o(n^{-7}2^{-n}).$$

Finally, for $j \leq 0.02n$, in the event \mathcal{A}'_j one may identify sets S and W of size j and $2j$ respectively such that $N_{G_1}(S) \subset W$. In addition note that for $j \leq 0.02n$ we have that $j^3 2^{3j} n \leq 8 \binom{n}{j}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left[j^4 \binom{n}{j} + j^7 2^{3j} n \right] \Pr(\mathcal{A}'_j) &\leq 10j^4 \binom{n}{j} \binom{n}{j} \binom{n}{2j} (1 - 0.5p)^{j \cdot (n-3j)} \\ &\leq 10j^4 \cdot n^{4j} e^{-0.5pj(1-0.06)n} \leq 10j^4 \cdot n^{4j} e^{-4.5j \log n} = O(n^6). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In the last inequality we used that $p \geq \frac{10 \log n}{n}$. (5) and the above calculation imply that the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$ is $O(n^7)$ for $p \geq \frac{10 \log n}{n}$. \square

4 A randomized algorithm for certifying Hamiltonicity in sparse graphs

The analysis of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$ done at Lemma 3.6 at Section 3 cannot be extended to smaller values of p , the main obstacle being that (6) stops to hold. More specifically it is no longer true that $\Pr(|N_{G_1}(S)| < 2|S|) \leq e^{-4|S|\log n}$ for $G_1 \sim G(n, 0.5p)$, $|S| < 0.02n$ and $1000/n \leq p \leq 10 \log n/n$.

To bypass this obstacle we slightly modify $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, 1)$ and get $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, 2)$ and $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, 3)$. These new variants of $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, 1)$ have a pre-processing step where they generate 2 sets K and S with $K \subseteq S$ before implementing $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, S, 1)$. The set K is such that every vertex not in K has many neighbors in $[n] \setminus (K \cup N_{G_1}(K))$. As a consequence for any set S_i that will be generated by $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, S, 1)$ in addition to $|N_{G_1}(S_i \setminus K)| < 2|S_i \setminus K|$ (observe that this inequality was true earlier for $K = \emptyset$) we will have that the set $N_{G_1}(S_i \setminus K) \cup (S_i \setminus K)$ is fairly dense; thus a version of (6) will hold.

Upon introducing the set K we have to make some corrections to equations (3) and (4), the main one being substituting (4) by $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i < t|S_0| + 8|S_t| + n$ where $K \subseteq S = S_0$ and typically $K = S_0$. As $t \leq \log_2 n$ in the event $|K| = o(\frac{n}{\log n})$ we will have that $K = S_0$ and the additional $t|S_0|$ factor will not affect the calculations done for upper bounding $\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{count_1})$ which are based on (4). In the unlikely event that $|K|$ is far larger than expected and the minimum degree is at least 2, to control the size of $t|S_0|$, we implement $\text{FindSparse}(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot, K)$ to generate the set S before executing $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, S, 1)$. $|S|$ will be sufficiently large. As a result $|S_1|$ will be sufficiently large and consequentially t , which will depend on S_t, S_1 and S_0 , will be sufficiently small so that $t|S_0| = O(n)$.

To generate the set K we use a coloring process given at the next subsection. At the generation of S_0 we take into account the likelihood of $|K|$ and of the event that $G(n, p)$ has minimum degree 2. We give bounds on $\Pr(\delta(G(n, p)) \geq 2)$ at Subsection 4.2.

4.1 A coloring process

Given a graph G we implement the following red/blue/black coloring procedure to partition its vertex set into 3 sets-colors. Initially color all the vertices of G black. While there exists a blue or black vertex v with at most 5 black neighbors in G recolor v red and the black neighbors of v blue.

We denote by $V_{5,red}(G)$, $V_{5,blue}(G)$ and $V_{5,black}(G)$ the sets of vertices that their final color given by the above procedure applied to G are red, blue and black respectively. Let W be the maximal subset of $V(G)$ with the property that every vertex in $W \cup N(W)$ has at least 6 neighbors in W . No vertex in $W \cup N(W)$ will ever be colored red by the above process and therefore $W \subset V_{5,black}$. On the other hand for every $W' \supset W$, due maximality of W , we have that there exists a vertex in $W' \cup N(W')$ that has at most 5 neighbors in W' . Therefore $V_{5,black} \subset W'$. It follows that $W = V_{5,black}(G)$, hence $V_{5,blue}(G) = N(W)$ and the sets $V_{5,red}(G)$, $V_{5,blue}(G)$ and $V_{5,black}(G)$ do not depend on the order in which the vertices of G are processed.

The motivation of the above procedure is to separate the sparse (red) portion of the graph from the dense one (black) by a cut (blue) while ensuring that the vertices in the cut are robustly connected to the dense part. In our analysis for the sparse regimes we use this decomposition and

take advantage of the following observation and lemma.

Observation 4.1. *During the above coloring process every time a vertex v is colored red at most 5 other vertices incident to v are colored blue. Thus, for every component C of the subgraph of G induced by $V_{5,red}(G) \cup V_{5,blue}(G)$ we have that $|V_{5,blue}(G) \cap C| \leq 5|V_{5,red}(G) \cap C|$.*

Given a set of edges F_0 and a graph G on $[n]$, with $G_{F_0} = ([n], F_0)$, define the events:

$$\mathcal{E}_{red,s}(G, F_0) = \{|V_{5,red}(G \cap G_{F_0})| \geq s\}$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0) = \{\exists S \subset [n] : 0.02n \leq S \leq 0.27n \text{ and } N_{G \cap G_{F_0}}(S) \leq 2s + 0.05n\},$$

$$\mathcal{A}_i(G, F_0) := \{ \exists S \subset [n] \setminus V_{5,red}(G \cap G_{F_0}) \text{ of size at most } 0.02n \text{ with the property} \\ \text{that } |N_{G \cap G_{F_0}}(S) \setminus V_{5,red}(G \cap G_{F_0})| < 2|S| \text{ has size } i \},$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0) := \{\exists W_1, W_2 \subset [n] \text{ such that } |W_2| \leq j \leq |W_1| \leq 2j, |N_{G \cap G_{F_0}}(W_1)| \leq 5|W_1| \\ \text{and the set of edges incident to } W = W_1 \cup W_2 \text{ spans a connected graph on } W \cup N_G(W)\}.$$

The proof of the following Lemma is located at Appendix A.2

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\frac{1000}{n} \leq p$, $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' \sim G(n, 0.5)$ and $F_0 = E(G) \cap E(G')$. Then, for $1 \leq i \leq 0.02n$, $1 \leq j \leq 0.02n$ and $\frac{n}{\log^2 n} \leq s \leq 0.01n$ the following hold.*

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,s}(G, F_0)) \leq n \left(\frac{e^7 n (0.5np)^5 e^{-0.45np}}{s} \right)^s, \quad \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0)) \leq 2^{-n}, \quad (7)$$

$$\binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i(G, F_0)) = O(n) \quad \text{and} \quad j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j) + j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)) = O(n). \quad (8)$$

4.2 Minimum degree 2

De facto if $G \sim G(n, p)$ does not have minimum degree 2 then G is not Hamiltonian. Such a feature can be detected in $O(n^2)$ time. In the event that $\delta(G(n, p)) \geq 2$ we can initialize Ham2 with implementing an algorithm for preprocessing G that runs in time inversely proportional to $\Pr(\delta(G) \geq 2)$. Thus it becomes crucial to upper bound $\Pr(\delta(G) \geq 2)$. This can be done via the following Lemma. Its proof can be found at Appendix A.4. We let $G(n, m)$ be the uniform random graph model. That is for $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ if $G \sim G(n, m)$ then G is distributed uniformly over all the graphs on n vertices with m edges.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $m = O(n \log \log n)$ and $G \sim G(n, m)$. Then,*

$$\Pr(\delta(G_{n,m}) \geq 2) \leq ne^{-2me^{-\frac{2m}{n}}}. \quad (9)$$

4.3 Analysis of Ham2 in the randomised setting - the middle range

Given a graph G and a set of edges F_0 such that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$ the algorithm $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$ executes the following steps. First it lets $G_1 = ([n], F_0 \cap E(G))$. Then it runs the coloring process described earlier in this section and lets $K = V_{5,red}(G_1)$. If $|K| < \frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}$ then it lets $S = K$ and $F = F_0$. Else it sets $G_R, F, S' = \text{FindSparse}(G, G_1, E(G_1), K)$ and $S = K \cup S'$. Finally it runs $\text{Ham2}(G, F, S, 1)$.

In place of Lemma 3.4 we have the following one. Its statement for $j = 3$ is related to $\text{Ham}(\cdot, \cdot, 3)$. The proof for the cases $j = 2$ and $j = 3$ are identical. Here we present parts of its proof for $j = 2$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $j \in \{2, 3\}$, G be a graph on $[n]$ and F_0 be an edge set on $[n]$ with the property $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. In addition let $G_1 = ([n], F_0 \cap E(G))$. Let t be the larger i such that the set S_i is defined by $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, j)$ and S_0, S_1, \dots, S_t be the corresponding sets. Then, $|N_{G_1}(S_t \setminus K) \setminus K| < 2|S_t \setminus K|$. In addition, if the events $\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0)$ do not occur then $|S_t| \leq 0.02n$. Furthermore,*

$$t \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{|S_t| - |S_0|}{|S_1| - |S_0|} \right) + 1. \quad (10)$$

Finally, if $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, j)$ exits the while-loop and $|S_t| < 0.25n$ then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i < 4t|S_0| + 8|S_t| + n. \quad (11)$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 4.4 is almost identical to the proof of Lemma 4.4. Here we only present only parts of the proof of (11) for $j = 2$.

Write \mathcal{E}_{exp} and $\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$ for the events $\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0)$ respectively. As in the proof of (4) one has $2|S_i \setminus S_0| < |S_{i+1} \setminus S_0|$ for $0 \leq i < t$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< n + \sum_{i=1}^t Y_i - \sum_{j=1}^{0.01n^2} X_j \leq n + 4 \sum_{i=1}^t |S_i| - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \leq n + 4t|S_0| + 4 \sum_{i=1}^t (|S_i| - |S_0|) - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \\ &\leq n + 4t|S_0| + 4 \sum_{i=1}^t 2^{-i+t} (|S_t| - |S_0|) - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \leq n + 4t|S_0| + 8|S_t| - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i. \end{aligned}$$

□

Given a set of edges F_0 and a graph G on $[n]$ define the event $\mathcal{E}_{count_2}(G, F_0)$ by,

$$\mathcal{E}_{count_2}(G, F_0) = \{\text{count reaches the value of } 0.01n^2 \text{ at the execution of } \text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)\}.$$

Lemma 4.5. *Let G be a graph on $[n]$ and F_0 be an edge set on $[n]$ with the property $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. At the execution of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$, if the event $\neg \mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0) \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0) \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count_2}(G, F_0)$ occurs then $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \leq 2n$.*

Proof. Write $\mathcal{E}_{exp}, \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$ and \mathcal{E}_{count} for the events $\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{count_2}(G, F_0)$ respectively. Let S_0, S_1, \dots, S_t be as in the previous lemma, $G_1 = ([n], E(G) \cap F_0)$ and $K = V_{5,red}(G_1)$.

First assume that the event $\neg\mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \left\{ |K| < \frac{n}{10\log_2 n} \right\}$ occurs. Then $K = S_0$. In addition, by Lemma 4.4, we have that in the event $\neg\mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$ the set S_t has size at most $0.02n$ and $t \leq \log_2 |S_t| + 1$. Hence (11) gives,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i < 4t|S_0| + 8|S_t| + n \leq 4(\log_2 n + 1) \cdot \frac{n}{10\log_2 n} + 0.16n + n \leq 2n.$$

On the other hand, if the event $\neg\mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \left\{ |K| \geq \frac{n}{10\log_2 n} \right\}$ occurs then the algorithm $\text{FindSparse}(G, G_1, E(G_1), K)$ is executed. Upon termination of $\text{FindSparse}(G, G_1, E(G_1), K)$, $S = S_0$ and there does not exist a subset Q of $[n] \setminus S_0$ of size at most $|S_0|$ with the property that $|N_{G_1}(Q) \setminus S_0| < 2|Q \setminus S_0|$. Since W_1 has this property we have that $|W_1| \geq |S_0|$ and $|S_1| - |S_0| = |S_1 \setminus S_0| \geq |W_1| \geq |S_0|$. (10) implies that

$$t \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{|S_t \setminus S_0|}{|S_1 \setminus S_0|} \right) \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{|S_t|}{|S_0|} \right) \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{0.02n}{|S_0|} \right).$$

Recall that $|S_0| \leq |S_t| \leq 0.02n$ in the event $\neg\mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$, thus combining the above inequality with (11) we get,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i < (4 + o(1))n \cdot \max \left\{ x \log_2 \left(\frac{0.02}{x} \right) : 0 \leq x \leq 0.02 \right\} + 0.16n + n < 2n.$$

□

In place of Lemma 3.5 we have the following one.

Lemma 4.6. *Let G be a graph on $[n]$ and F_0 be an edge set on $[n]$ with the property $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. Then, the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$ is*

$$\begin{aligned} & O \left(n^7 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0) \vee \mathcal{E}_{count_2}(G, F_0) \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0)) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} j^4 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)) + n^5 \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n^2 j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0) \vee \mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)) + \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10\log_2 n}}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{i} \Pr(\{|S_0| = i\}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In addition, the worst-case running time of $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, 2)$ is $O(n^7 2^n)$.

Proof. Write $\mathcal{E}_{exp}, \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}, \mathcal{E}_{count}, \mathcal{A}_j$ and \mathcal{B}_j for the events $\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{count_2}(G, F_0), \mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)$ respectively. In addition let $G_1 = ([n], E(G) \cap F_0)$. The steps preceding $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, 1)$ at the execution of $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, 2)$ can be executed in $O(n^7 2^n)$ time. Lemma 3.5 states that the running time of $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, 1)$ is $O(n^7 2^n)$, hence the worst-case running time of $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, 2)$ is $O(n^7 2^n)$.

As in (5) we have that the first 3 terms of (12) account for the expected running time of executing $\text{Ham2}(G, F, S, 1)$ minus the expected running time spend on running the Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm at line 8 of $\text{Ham2}(G, F, S, 1)$ due to executing line 6 of CoverAndAdjust . The only

difference in the corresponding justification is the use of Lemma 4.4 in place of Lemma 3.4 used earlier.

The term $\sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n^2 j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \vee \mathcal{B}_j)$ is a better estimate on the total expected running time spend on the Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm at line 8 of $\text{Ham2}(G, F, S, 1)$ due to executing line 6 of CoverAndAdjust than the one given in (5) in the event $\neg \mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{count} \subseteq \{|S_t| \leq 0.02n\}$. In the event $\{|S_t| \leq 0.02n\}$ we may run the Inclusion-Exclusion HAM algorithm at most $t \leq 1 + \log_2 |S_t| = O(\log n)$ times. Each time, its running time is $O(n|C|^{6 \cdot 2^{3|C|}})$ where $|C|$ is maximum over pairs (C, i) with the property that $0 \leq i \leq t$ and C is the largest subset of S_i such that $C \cup N_G(C)$ spans a connected graph on $C \cup N_G(C)$ that has no edge with both of its endpoints in $N_G(C)$ (see last paragraph of Subsection 2.3). Now if $|C| \in \{2j, 2j - 1\}$ and $|S_t \setminus V_{5,red}(G_1)| \geq j$ then the event \mathcal{A}_j occurs. Else if $|C| \in \{2j, 2j - 1\}$ and $|S_t \setminus V_{5,red}(G_1)| < j$ then $|C \cap V_{5,red}(G_1)| \geq j$. Now observe that, since $V_{5,red}(G_1)$ is a subset of every set S_i , for $v \in V_{5,red}(G_1)$ if v belongs to the set $C \cap V_{5,red}(G_1)$ then due the maximality of C all the vertices in $V_{5,red}(G_1)$ that lie in the same component as v in the subgraph of G_1 induced by $V_{5,red}(G_1) \cup V_{5,blue}(G_1)$ also belong to C . Observation 4.1 implies that $|N_{G_1}(C \cap V_{5,red}(G_1))| \leq 5|C \cap V_{5,red}(G_1)|$ hence the event \mathcal{B}_j occurs (with $W_1 = C \cap V_{5,red}(G_1)$ and $W_2 = C \setminus V_{5,red}(G_1)$).

Finally, the term $O(n^2 \binom{n}{i})$ is equal to the running time of $\text{FindSparse}(G, G_1, E(G_1), K)$ which we may run in order to construct the set $S_0 \setminus K$ in the event $\{|S_0| = i\} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \subseteq \{|S_0| = i\}$. \square

Lemma 4.7. *Let $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' \sim G(n, 0.5)$ and $F_0 = E(G) \cap E(G')$. Then, the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$ is $O(n^7)$ for $\frac{100 \log \log n}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{30 \log n}{n}$.*

Proof. $F_0 \subseteq E(G)$ implies that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. Write $\mathcal{E}_{exp}, \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}, \mathcal{E}_{count}, \mathcal{A}_j$ and \mathcal{B}_j for the events $\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{count_2}(G, F_0), \mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)$ respectively. In addition let $G_1 = ([n], E(G) \cap F_0)$ and $K = V_{5,red}(G_1)$.

For the first term of (12), Lemma 4.2 implies that

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \leq n \left(100e^7 (0.5np)^5 e^{-0.45np} \right)^{0.01n} + 2^{-n} = O(2^{-n}).$$

Thereafter Lemma 4.8 states that in the event $\neg \mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count}$ one has $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \leq 2n$. As $X_i = 1$ with probability $0.5p$ independently of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{i-1} one has,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_{count}) &\leq \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) + \Pr(\neg \mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_{count}) \\ &\leq O(2^{-n}) + \Pr(\text{Bin}(0.01n^2, p) < 2n) = O(2^{-n}). \end{aligned}$$

For the last equality we used the Chernoff bound given in (2).

$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_{count}) = O(2^{-n})$ and (8) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} n^7 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_{count}) &+ \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} j^4 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j) \\ &+ \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n j^6 2^j \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \vee \mathcal{B}_j) + n^5 = O(n^7). \end{aligned}$$

The set $S_0 \setminus K$ generated by $\text{FindSparse}(G, G_1, E(G_1), K)$ has the property, $|N_{G_1}(S_0 \setminus K) \setminus K| < 2|S_0 \setminus K|$. Therefore,

$$|N_{G_1}(S_0)| \leq |N_{G_1}(K)| + |N_{G_1}(S_0 \setminus K)| \leq 5|K| + 2|S_0 \setminus K| \leq 5|S_0 \setminus K|$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{i} \Pr(\{|S_0| = i\}) &\leq \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{i} \binom{n}{i} \binom{n}{5i} (1 - 0.5p)^{i(n-6i)} \\ &\leq n^2 \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} \left(\frac{n^7}{i^7} e^{-0.4pn} \right)^i \leq n^2 \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} \left((10 \log n)^7 e^{-40 \log \log n} \right)^i = O(n^7). \end{aligned}$$

At the last inequality we used that $p \geq \frac{100 \log \log n}{n}$. Lemma 4.6 and the above calculations imply that the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$ is $O(n^7)$. \square

4.4 Analysis of Ham2 in the randomised setting - the sparse regime

Given a graph G and a set of edges F_0 such that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$ the algorithm $\text{Ham3}(G, F_0, 2)$ executes the following steps. First it checks if the minimum degree of G is 2. If it is not then it returns that G is not Hamiltonian. Else it lets $G_1 = ([n], F_0 \cap E(G))$, $c = \frac{2|E(G_1)|}{(n-1)}$, runs the coloring process described earlier in this section and lets $K = V_{5, \text{red}}(G_1)$. Thereafter if $|K| \leq \frac{10n}{c^2}$ then it lets $W = [n + e^{-2c}n] \setminus [n]$; else it lets $W = [n + c^{-2}n] \setminus [n]$. Then it lets $G'_R, F', S = \text{FindSparse}(G - K, G_1 - K, E(G_1), W)$ and sets $S_0 = K \cup (S \setminus W)$. Finally it runs $\text{Ham2}(G, F, S, 1)$.

The sole purpose of W at the execution of $\text{FindSparse}(G - K, G_1 - K, E(G_1), W)$ is to ensure that $\text{FindSparse}(G - K, G_1 - K, E(G_1), W)$ examines all the subsets of $[n] \setminus K$ of size up to $|W|$.

Let \mathcal{E}_K be the event that $K > \frac{10n}{c}$ and

$$\mathcal{E}_{\text{count}_3}(G, F_0) = \{\text{count reaches the value of } 0.01n^2 \text{ at the execution of } \text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)\}.$$

In place of Lemma 4.5 we have the following one.

Lemma 4.8. *Let G be a graph on $[n]$ and F_0 be an edge set on $[n]$ with the property $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. Let $c = 2|F_0|/(n-1)$. At the execution of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$ if $c \geq 400$ and the event $\neg \mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}}(G, F_0) \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n}(G, F_0) \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_K \wedge \mathcal{E}_{\text{count}_3}(G, F_0)$ occurs then $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \leq 2n$.*

Proof. Write $\mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}}, \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\text{count}}$ for the events $\mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n}(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\text{count}_3}(G, F_0)$ respectively. Let $G_1 = ([n], E(G) \cap F_0)$ and $K = V_{5, \text{red}}(G_1)$. Let S_0, S_1, \dots, S_t be as in Lemma 4.4 and assume that $c \geq 400$. Let $G_1 = ([n], F)$.

First, in the event $\neg \mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_K \wedge \mathcal{E}_{\text{count}} \wedge \{|K| \leq \frac{10n}{c^2}\} \wedge \{|S_0| < 1.01|K|\}$, as $|K| \leq \frac{10n}{c^2}$, $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$ lets $W = [n + e^{-2c}n] \setminus [n]$ and sets $G'_R, F, S = \text{FindSparse}(G - K, G_1 - K, E(G_1), W)$ and $S_0 = K \cup (S \setminus W)$. Upon termination of $\text{FindSparse}(G - K, G_1 - K, E(G_1), W)$ there does not exist a subset Q of $[n] \setminus S_0$ of size at most $\max\{|W|, |S|\} \geq e^{-2c}n$ with the property that $|N_{G_1}(Q) \setminus S_0| < 2|Q \setminus S_0|$. Since W_1 has this property we have that $|S_1| - |S_0| = |S_1 \setminus S_0| \geq$

$|W_1| \geq e^{-2c}n$. Recall that in the event $\neg\mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$ we have that $|S_0| \leq |S_t| \leq 0.02n$ and therefore (10) implies that $t \leq \log_2\left(\frac{0.02n}{e^{-2c}n}\right) \leq 2c \log^{-1} 2$. Substituting this last inequality into (11), as $c \geq 400$, $|S_0| < 1.01|K| \leq \frac{10.1n}{c^2}$ and $|S_t| \leq 0.02n$, we get that,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i < 4 \cdot (2c \log^{-1} 2) \cdot \frac{10.1n}{c^2} + 0.16n + n \leq \frac{81 \log^{-1} 2}{c} + 1.16n < 2n.$$

Similarly, in the event $\neg\mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \wedge \neg\mathcal{E}_K \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \left\{\frac{10n}{c^2} < |K| \leq \frac{10n}{c}\right\} \wedge \{|S_0| < 1.01|K|\}$ we have that $|S_0| < 1.01|K| \leq \frac{10.1n}{c}$, $|S_1| - |S_0| = |S_1 \setminus S_0| \geq |W_1| \geq |K| \geq \frac{10n}{c^2}$, $t \leq \log_2\left(\frac{0.02n}{10c^{-2}n}\right) = \log_2 0.002c^2$ and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i &\leq 4 \cdot \log_2(0.002c^2) \cdot \frac{10.1n}{c} + 0.16n + n \leq \left(\max \left\{ \frac{40.1 \log_2(20x)}{100x} : x \geq 4 \right\} + 1.16 \right) n \\ &\leq \left(\max \left\{ \frac{\log(x)}{3.5x} : x \geq 4 \right\} + \frac{40.1 \log_2(20)}{400} + 1.16 \right) n \leq 2n. \end{aligned}$$

At the last inequality we used that the function $x^{-1} \log(x)$ is decreasing for $x \geq 4$.

Finally in the event $\neg\mathcal{E}_{exp} \wedge \neg\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \wedge \neg\mathcal{E}_K \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \{|S_0| > 1.01|K|\}$ we have that upon termination of $\text{FindSparse}(G - K, G_1 - K, E(G_1), W)$ there does not exist a subset Q of $[n] \setminus S_0$ of size at most $|S_0 \setminus K|$ with the property that $|N_{G_1}(Q) \setminus S_0| < 2|Q \setminus S_0|$. Since W_1 has this property we have that $|S_1| - |S_0| = |S_1 \setminus S_0| \geq |S_0 \setminus K| \geq 0.01|S_0|$. (10) implies that $t \leq \log_2\left(\frac{0.02n}{0.01|S_0|}\right)$. Substituting this last inequality into (11), we get that,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \leq 4|S_0| \cdot \log_2\left(\frac{2n}{|S_0|}\right) + 1.16n \leq 4 \max\{x(\log_2 2x^{-1}) : 0 \leq x \leq 0.02\}n + 1.16n < 2n.$$

In all 3 cases we have that $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \leq 2n$. □

For a graph G we define the event $\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}(G) = \{\delta(G) \geq 2\}$. In place of Lemma 4.6 we have the following one.

Lemma 4.9. *Let G be a graph on $[n]$ and F_0 be an edge set on $[n]$ with the property $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. Let $G_1 = ([n], E(G) \cap F)$ and $c = n|E(G_1)|/(n-1)$. Then, the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$ is*

$$\begin{aligned} &O\left(n^7 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0) \vee \mathcal{E}_{count_3}(G, F_0) \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0))\right) \\ &+ \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} j^4 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0) \vee \mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)) + n^5 \\ &+ n^7 2^n \Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0) \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0) \vee \mathcal{E}_K \vee \{c < 400\}\right) \\ &+ \sum_{\ell=400}^n n^2 \binom{n}{ne^{-2\ell}} \Pr\left(\left\{|K| \leq \frac{10n}{\ell^2}\right\} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}(G) \wedge \{c = \ell\}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

$$+ \sum_{\ell=400}^n n^2 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{\ell^2}} \Pr \left(\left\{ \frac{10n}{\ell^2} < |K| \leq \frac{10n}{\ell} \right\} \wedge \{c = \ell\} \right).$$

In addition, the worst-case running time of $\text{Ham2}(\cdot, \cdot, 3)$ is $O(n^7 2^n)$.

Proof. Write $\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}$, \mathcal{E}_{exp} , $\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$, \mathcal{E}_{count} , \mathcal{A}_j and \mathcal{B}_j for the events $\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}(G)$, $\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0)$, $\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0)$, $\mathcal{E}_{count_3}(G, F_0)$, $\mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)$ respectively.

The proof of this lemma is identical to the proof of Lemma 4.6 modulo the justification of the last three lines of (13). The terms there together with the term $\sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} j^4 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j)$ account for the expected running time of $\text{FindSparse}(G - K, G_1 - K, E(G_1), W)$. In the event $\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_K \vee \{c < 400\}$ its running time is $O(n^7 2^n)$. If the event $\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_K \vee \{c < 400\}$ does not occur then $c \geq 400$, $|K| \leq \frac{10n}{c}$ and $|S_t \setminus K| \leq 0.02n$. As $|S_t \setminus K| \leq 0.02n$ we have that the event $\cup_{j=0}^{0.02n} \mathcal{A}_j$ occurs.

For $\ell \geq 400$ and $j \leq 0.02n$, in the event $\{c = \ell\} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2} \wedge \{|K| \leq \frac{10n}{\ell^2}\} \wedge \mathcal{A}_j$ the algorithm $\text{Ham}(G, F_0, 3)$ lets $K = V_{5,red}(G_1)$, $W = [n + e^{-2j}n] \setminus [n]$ and sets $G'_R, F, S = \text{FindSparse}(G - K, G_1 - K, E(G_1), W)$ and $S_0 = K \cup (S \setminus W)$. Therefore, since $|S_0 \setminus K| \leq |S_t \setminus K| = j$, at each execution of line 6 of FindSparse , FindSparse examines sets of size at most $\max\{e^{-2\ell}n, j\}$. Thus it runs in $O(n^2 \binom{n}{e^{-2\ell}n} + n^2 \binom{n}{j})$ time. Finally we use the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(n^2 \binom{n}{e^{-2\ell}n} + n^2 \binom{n}{j} \right) \Pr \left(\{c = \ell\} \wedge \left\{ |K| \leq \frac{10n}{\ell^2} \right\} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2} \wedge \mathcal{A}_j \right) \\ & \leq n^2 \binom{n}{e^{-2\ell}n} \Pr \left(\{c = \ell\} \wedge \left\{ |K| \leq \frac{10n}{\ell^2} \right\} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2} \right) + n^2 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for $\ell \geq 400$ and $j \leq 0.02n$, in the event $\{c = \ell\} \wedge \left\{ \frac{10n}{\ell^2} < |K| \leq \frac{10n}{\ell} \right\} \wedge \mathcal{A}_j$ the running time of $\text{FindSparse}(G - K, G_1 - K, E(G_1), W)$ is $O(n^2 \binom{n}{10n/\ell^2} + n^2 \binom{n}{j})$. \square

Lemma 4.10. *Let $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' \sim G(n, 0.5)$ and $F_0 = E(G) \cap E(G')$. Then, the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$ is $O(n^7)$ for $\frac{1000}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{300 \log \log n}{n}$.*

Proof. $F_0 \subseteq E(G)$ implies that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. Write $\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}$, \mathcal{E}_{exp} , $\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$, \mathcal{E}_{count} , \mathcal{A}_j and \mathcal{B}_j for the events $\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}(G)$, $\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0)$, $\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0)$, $\mathcal{E}_{count_3}(G, F_0)$, $\mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)$ respectively. In addition let $G_1 = ([n], E(G) \cap F_0)$ and $c = \frac{2|E(G_1)|}{n-1}$.

As $G_1 \sim G(n, 0.5p)$ and $pn \geq 1000$, the Chernoff bounds (2), (1) give,

$$\Pr(|c - 0.5np| > 0.05np) \leq 2e^{-0.1^2 \cdot 0.5p \binom{n}{2}/3} \leq 2e^{-5n/6} \leq 2^{-1.1n}.$$

In particular $\Pr(c < 400) = o(2^{-n})$. Thereafter, using (8), we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_K) & \leq \Pr(\mathcal{E}_K \wedge \{|c - 0.5np| \leq 0.05np\}) + \Pr(|c - 0.5np| > 0.05np) \leq \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red, \frac{10n}{0.55np}}) + 2^{-1.1n} \\ & \leq n \left(\frac{e^7 n (0.5np)^5 e^{-0.45np}}{\frac{20n}{1.1np}} \right)^{\frac{20n}{1.1np}} + 2^{-1.1n} \leq n \left(2(np)^6 e^{-0.4np} \right)^{\frac{20n}{1.1np}} e^{-0.7n} + 2^{-1.1n} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq n \left(2(1000)^6 e^{-400} \right)^{\frac{20n}{1.1np}} e^{-0.7n} + 2^{-1.1n} = o(2^{-n}).$$

Lemma 4.8, $p \geq 1000/n$ and (2) give,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{count}) &\leq \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \{c \geq 400\}) + \Pr(c < 400) \leq \Pr(\text{Bin}(0.01n^2, 500/n) < 2n) + 2^{-1.1n} \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{0.6^2 \cdot 5n}{2}} + 2^{-1.1n} = o(2^{-n}). \end{aligned}$$

Given the above, as in the proof of Lemma 4.7 one has,

$$\begin{aligned} &n^7 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{count} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} j^4 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} nj^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \vee \mathcal{B}_j) + n^5 \\ &+ n^7 2^n \Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_K \vee \{c < 400\}\right) = O(n^7). \end{aligned}$$

Now given $c = \frac{2|E(G_1)|}{n-1}$, as $G_1 \subseteq G$ we have that the graph G is distributed as $G(n, 0.5(n-1)c')$ for some $c' = \frac{2|E(G)|}{n-1} \geq c$. Thus, condition on the event $c = \ell$, Lemma 4.3 gives that $\Pr(\delta(G) \geq 2) \leq \max\left\{ne^{-(1+o(1))c'e^{-c'n}} : c' \geq \ell\right\} \leq ne^{-(1+o(1))\ell e^{-\ell n}}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\ell=400}^n n^2 \binom{n}{ne^{-2\ell}} \Pr\left(\left\{|K| \leq \frac{10n}{\ell^2}\right\} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2} \wedge \{c = \ell\}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=400}^n n^2 \binom{n}{ne^{-2\ell}} \Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2} \mid \{c = \ell\}\right) \Pr(c = \ell) \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=400}^n n^2 e^{(2\ell+1)e^{-2\ell}n} ne^{-\ell e^{-(1+o(1))\ell n}} \Pr(c = \ell) = O(n). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $400 < 0.45np$ and $\{|K| = i\} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{red,j}$ for $j \leq i$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\ell=400}^n n^2 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{\ell^2}} \Pr\left(\left\{\frac{10n}{\ell^2} < |K| \leq \frac{10n}{\ell}\right\} \wedge \{c = \ell\}\right) \leq \sum_{\ell < 0.45np} n^2 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{\ell^2}} \Pr(c < 0.45np) \\ &+ \sum_{\ell > 0.55np} n^2 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{\ell^2}} \Pr(c > 0.55np) + n^3 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{(0.45np)^2}} \Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_{red, \frac{10n}{(0.55np)^2}}\right) \\ &\leq n^3 2^n \Pr(|c - 0.5np| \geq 0.05np) + n^3 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{(0.45np)^2}} \Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_{red, \frac{10n}{(0.55np)^2}}\right) \\ &\leq n^3 2^n 2^{-1.1n} + \max\left\{n^4 \left(\frac{(0.45x)^2 e}{10}\right)^{\frac{10n}{(0.45x)^2}} \left(\frac{e^7 n (0.5x)^5 e^{-0.45x}}{\frac{10n}{(0.55x)^2}}\right)^{\frac{10n}{(0.55x)^2}} : x \geq 1000\right\} \\ &\leq 1 + n^4 \max\left\{\left(\frac{2e^9 (0.5x)^{10} e^{-0.45x}}{100}\right)^{\frac{10n}{(0.55x)^2}} : x \geq 1000\right\} \leq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.9 and the above calculations imply that the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$ is $O(n^7)$. \square

4.5 Proof of Theorem 1.5

Let $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' \sim G(n, 0.5)$ and $F_0 = E(G) \cap E(G')$. Denote by $t_1(G), t_2(G), t_3(G)$ and $t(G)$ the running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$, $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$, $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$ and $\text{CerHam2}(G, R)$ respectively. In addition let $p' = \frac{|F_0|}{\binom{n}{2}}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(t(G)) &= \mathbf{E}\left(t_1(G) \wedge \left\{p' \geq \frac{10 \log n}{n}\right\}\right) + \mathbf{E}\left(t_2(G) \wedge \left\{\frac{100 \log \log n}{n} \leq p' < \frac{10 \log n}{n}\right\}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{E}\left(t_3(G) \wedge \left\{p' < \frac{100 \log \log n}{n}\right\}\right) + O(n^7). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The $O(n^7)$ term in (14) accounts for the time needed to generate F_0 . (14) and Lemmas 3.6, 4.7 and 4.10 give,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(t(G)) &= O(n^7) + O(n^7 \cdot 2^n) \left[\mathbf{Pr}\left(\left\{p \leq \frac{10 \log n}{n}\right\} \wedge \left\{p' \geq \frac{10 \log n}{n}\right\}\right) \right. \\ &\quad + \mathbf{Pr}\left(\left\{p \geq \frac{30 \log n}{n}\right\} \wedge \left\{p' < \frac{10 \log n}{n}\right\}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{Pr}\left(\left\{p \leq \frac{100 \log \log n}{n}\right\} \wedge \left\{p' \geq \frac{100 \log \log n}{n}\right\}\right) \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbf{Pr}\left(\left\{p \geq \frac{300 \log \log n}{n}\right\} \wedge \left\{p' < \frac{100 \log \log n}{n}\right\}\right) \right] \\ &\leq O(n^7) + O(n^7 \cdot 2^n) \max_{p \geq \frac{100 \log \log n}{n}} \mathbf{Pr}(|p - 2p'| > 0.2p) \\ &= O(n^7) + O(n^7 \cdot 2^n) \max_{p \geq \frac{100 \log \log n}{n}} \mathbf{Pr}(|\text{Bin}(n, 0.5p) - 0.5np| > 0.1np) = O(n^7). \end{aligned}$$

□

5 Derandomizing $\text{CerHam2}(\cdot, R)$

The only place where $\text{CerHam2}(\cdot, R)$ uses any sort of randomness is in generating the set F_0 before executing Ham2 . There, it generates $G' \sim G(n, 0.5)$ and lets $F_0 = E(G) \cap E(G')$. To derandomize $\text{CerHam2}(\cdot, R)$ we substitute $E(G')$ with a deterministic set of edges F_0 that has the property $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$.

For that we let $F_0 = E(H_n)$ where H_n is a deterministic graph on $[n]$. It is constructed by taking a d -regular pseudorandom graph H'_n on at least n and at most $4n$ vertices, then taking the subgraph of H'_n induced by a subset of $V(H'_n)$ of size n and finally adding a number of edges incident to vertices of small degree. The construction of $\{H_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ as well as the proof of the Lemma that follows are given in Appendix A.1.

Lemma 5.1. *For n significantly large there exists a graph H_n on $[n]$ that can be constructed in $O(n^7)$ time and satisfies the following.*

- (a) *For every pair of disjoint sets $U, W \subseteq [n]$ the number of edges spanned by $U \times W$ is at least $\frac{0.1|U||W|}{n} - n^{7/4}$ and at most $\frac{0.101|U||W|}{n} + n^{7/4}$*

(b) H_n has minimum degree $0.1n$.

(c) At most $n^{2/3}$ vertices in $[n]$ have degree larger than $0.101n$ in H_n .

5.1 A deterministic algorithm for certifying Hamiltonicity

$\text{CerHam2}(G, D)$ starts by setting $G' = H_n$, $F_0 = E(H_n)$ and $G_1 = ([n], F_0 \cap E(G))$. Then it calculates $p' = |E(G_1)| / \binom{n}{2}$ and sets $S = \emptyset$. If $p' \geq \frac{10 \log n}{n}$ then it implements $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$. Else if $\frac{100 \log \log n}{n} \leq p' < \frac{10 \log n}{n}$ then it implements $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$. Otherwise it implements $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$.

Ramark 5.2. Observe that for $G \sim G(n, p)$ and $F_0 = E(H_n)$. Lemma 5.1 implies that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. Hence the algorithm Ham2 “accepts” as an input the quadruple $G, F_0, \emptyset, 1$.

The analysis of $\text{CerHam2}(G, D)$ is identical to the analysis of $\text{CerHam2}(G, R)$ modulo the calculations done for bounding the probabilities events that depend on F_0 and G .

5.2 Analysis of Ham2 in the deterministic setting - the dense regime

Lemma 5.3. Let $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' = H_n$ and $F_0 = E(H_n)$. Then, the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$ is $O(n^7)$ for $p \geq \frac{50 \log n}{n}$.

Proof. Lemma 5.1 implies that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. Thus, it suffices to verify that the expression given in (5) is $O(n^7)$. Let $G_1 = ([n], F_0 \cap E(G))$. Write $\mathcal{E}'_{exp}, \mathcal{E}'_{count}$ and \mathcal{A}'_j for the events $\mathcal{E}'_{exp}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}'_{count_1}(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{A}'_j(G, F_0)$ respectively.

In the event \mathcal{E}'_{exp} there exists a set $S \subset [n]$ with size in $[0.02n, 0.27n]$ such that $|N_{G_1}(S)| < 2|S|$. Therefore $|S| \geq 0.02n$, $|[n] \setminus (S \cup N_{G_1}(S))| \geq (1 - 0.27 \cdot 3)n = 0.19n$ and no edge from S to $[n] \setminus (S \cup N_{G_1}(S))$ belongs to G_1 . Lemma 5.1 implies that there are at least $0.1 \cdot 0.02n \cdot 0.19n - o(n^2) \geq 10^{-4}n$ edges from S to $[n] \setminus (S \cup N_{G_1}(S))$ in $E(H_n)$. Each of these edges belongs to G , hence to G_1 , independently with probability p . Thus,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}'_{exp}) \leq 2^n \cdot 2^n \cdot (1-p)^{10^{-4}n^2} \leq 4^n e^{-10^{-4}pn^2} = o(n^{-7}2^{-n}).$$

In the event $\mathcal{E}'_{count} \setminus \mathcal{E}'_{exp}$ (4) implies that $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i < n + 8 \cdot 0.02n \leq 1.2n$. For $1 \leq i \leq 0.01n^2$, $X_i = 1$ only if the corresponding edge uv belongs to G but not to G' ($e \notin F$ hence $e \notin E(H_n) \subseteq F$ due line 11 of Ham2), hence with probability p independently of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{i-1} . Thus, using (2), we have,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}'_{count} \setminus \mathcal{E}'_{exp}) \leq \Pr(\text{Bin}(0.01n^2, p) \leq 1.2n) = o(n^{-7}2^{-n}).$$

Finally, for $j \leq 0.02n$, in the event \mathcal{A}'_j one may identify sets S and W of size j and $3j$ respectively such that $S \cup N_{G_1}(S) \subset W$. H_n has minimum degree $0.1n$ and therefore if $j \leq 10^{-5}n$ then there exists at least $0.09jn$ edges from S to $[n] \setminus W$ in $E(H_n)$. On the other hand, if $j \geq 10^{-5}n$, Lemma

5.1 implies that there exist at least $0.1 \cdot j \cdot (n - 3j) - o(n^2) \geq 0.09jn$ edges from S to $[n] \setminus W$. As none of them belongs to G in the event \mathcal{A}'_j , we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \left[j^4 \binom{n}{j} + j^7 2^{3j} n \right] \Pr(\mathcal{A}'_j) &\leq 10j^4 \binom{n}{j} \binom{n}{j} \binom{n}{2j} (1-p)^{0.09jn} \\ &\leq 10j^4 \cdot n^{4j} e^{-0.09pnj} \leq 10j^4 \cdot n^{4j} e^{-4.5j \log n} = O(n^6). \end{aligned}$$

At the last inequality we used that $p \geq \frac{5000 \log n}{n}$.

(5) and the above calculation imply that the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$ is $O(n^7)$ for $p \geq \frac{100 \log n}{n}$. \square

5.3 Analysis of Ham2 in the randomized setting - the middle range

Recall, given a graph G and a set of edges F_0 such that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$ the algorithm $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$, defined at Subsection 4.3, executes the following steps. First it lets $G_1 = ([n], F_0 \cap E(G))$. Then it runs the coloring process described earlier in this section and lets $K = V_{5, \text{red}}(G_1)$. If $|K| < \frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}$ then it lets $S = K$ and $F = F_0$. Else it sets $G_R, F, S' = \text{FindSparse}(G, G_1, E(G_1), K)$ and $S = K \cup S'$. Finally it runs $\text{Ham2}(G, F, S, 1)$.

In place of Lemma 4.2 with have the following one. Its proof is located at Appendix A.3.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\frac{5000}{n} \leq p$, $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' = H_n$ and $F_0 = E(G) \cap E(G')$. Then, for $1 \leq i \leq 0.02n$, $1 \leq j \leq 0.09n$ and $\frac{n}{\log^2 n} \leq s \leq 0.01n$ the following hold.*

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, s})(G, F_0) \leq \left(\frac{e^7 (0.1np)^5 e^{-0.09npn}}{s} \right)^s, \quad \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}}(G, F_0)) \leq 2^{-n}, \quad (15)$$

$$\binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i(G, F_0)) = O(n) \quad \text{and} \quad j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)) + j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)) = O(1). \quad (16)$$

In place of Lemma 4.7 we have the following one.

Lemma 5.5. *Let $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' = H_n$ and $F_0 = E(H_n)$. Then, the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$ is $O(n^7)$ for $\frac{500 \log \log n}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{300 \log n}{n}$.*

Proof. Write $\mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}}, \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n}, \mathcal{E}_{\text{count}}, \mathcal{A}_j$ and \mathcal{B}_j for the events $\mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{\text{count}_2}(G, F_0), \mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)$ respectively. In addition let $G_1 = ([n], E(G) \cap F_0)$ and $K = V_{5, \text{red}}(G_1)$.

$F_0 \subset E(G)$ implies that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{Q}$. Thus it suffices to verify that the expression given by (12) is equal to $O(n^7)$. For the first term of (12), Lemma 5.4 implies that

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}} \vee \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n}) \leq n \left(100e^7 (0.1np)^5 e^{-0.09npn} \right)^{0.01n} + 2^{-n} = O(2^{-n}).$$

Thereafter Lemma 4.5 states that in the event $\neg \mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}} \wedge \neg \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{\text{count}}$ one has $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \leq 2n$. As $X_i = 1$ with probability p independently of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{i-1} , using (2) we get,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}} \vee \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_{\text{count}}) \leq \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}} \vee \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n}) + \Pr(\neg \mathcal{E}_{\text{exp}} \vee \neg \mathcal{E}_{\text{red}, 0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_{\text{count}})$$

$$\leq O(2^{-n}) + \Pr(\text{Bin}(0.01n^2, p) < 2n) = O(2^{-n}).$$

$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_{count}) = O(2^{-n})$ and (16) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & n^7 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_{count}) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} j^4 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j) \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n j^6 2^j \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \vee \mathcal{B}_j) + n^5 = O(n^7). \end{aligned}$$

The set $S_0 \setminus K$ generated by $\text{FindSparse}(G, G_1, E(G_1), K)$ has the property, $|N_{G_1}(S_0 \setminus K) \setminus K| < 2|S_0 \setminus K|$. Therefore,

$$|N_{G_1}(S_0)| \leq |N_{G_1}(K)| + |N_{G_1}(S_0 \setminus K)| \leq 5|K| + 2|S_0 \setminus K| \leq 5|S_0 \setminus K|.$$

Lemma 5.1 implies that for $|S_0| \leq 0.02n$ and $|T| \leq 5|S_0|$ there exists at least $0.09|S_0|(n - 6|S_0|) \geq 0.07|S_0|n$ edges from $S_0 = S \cup K$ to $[n] \setminus (S_0 \cup N_{G \cap H_n}(S_0))$ in H_n none of which belong to G . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{i} \Pr(\{|S_0| = i\}) \leq \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{i} \binom{n}{i} \binom{n}{5i} (1-p)^{0.07in} \\ & \leq n \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} \left(\frac{n^7}{i^7} e^{-0.07pn} \right)^i \leq n \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} \left((10 \log n)^7 e^{-35 \log \log n} \right)^i = O(n^2). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.6 and the above calculations imply that the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$ is $O(n^7)$. \square

5.4 Analysis of Ham2 in the deterministic setting - the sparse regime

Recall, given a graph G and a set of edges F_0 such that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$ the algorithm $\text{Ham3}(G, F_0, 2)$ executes the following steps. First it checks if the minimum degree of G is 2. If it is not then it returns that G is not Hamiltonian. Else it lets $G_1 = ([n], F_0 \cap E(G))$, $c = \frac{2|E(G_1)|}{(n-1)}$, runs the coloring process described earlier in this section and lets $K = V_{5,red}(G_1)$. Thereafter if $|K| \leq \frac{10n}{c^2}$ then it lets $W = [n + e^{-2c}n] \setminus [n]$; else it lets $W = [n + c^{-2}n] \setminus [n]$. Then it lets $G'_R, F', S = \text{FindSparse}(G - K, G_1 - K, E(G_1), W)$ and sets $S_0 = K \cup (S \setminus W)$. Finally it runs $\text{Ham2}(G, F, S, 1)$.

In place of Lemma 4.10 we have the following one.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' = E(H_n)$ and $F_0 = E(H_n)$. Then, the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$ is $O(n^7)$ for $\frac{5000}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{3000 \log \log n}{n}$.*

Proof. Lemma 5.1 implies that $(G, F_0) \in \mathcal{R}$. Write $\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}, \mathcal{E}_{exp}, \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}, \mathcal{E}_{count}, \mathcal{A}_j$ and \mathcal{B}_j for the events $\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}(G), \mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{count_3}(G, F_0), \mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)$ respectively. In addition let $G_1 = ([n], E(G) \cap F_0)$ and $c = \frac{2|E(G_1)|}{n-1}$.

First, let $c = \frac{2|E(G_1)|}{n-1}$. Lemma 5.1 implies that H_n spans at least $0.05n^2$ and at most $0.0505n^2 + o(n^2)$ edges and therefore $|E(G_1)| \sim \text{Bin}(\alpha \binom{n}{2}, p)$ for some $a \in [0.1, 0.102]$. (2), (1) give,

$$\Pr(|c - 0.1np| > 0.01np) \leq 2e^{-\frac{0.088^2 \cdot 0.1p \binom{n}{2}}{2.088}} \leq 2e^{-0.8n} \leq 2^{-1.1n}.$$

In particular $\Pr(c < 400) = o(2^{-n})$. Thereafter, using (16), we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_K) &\leq \Pr(\mathcal{E}_K \wedge \{|c - 0.1np| \leq 0.01np\}) + \Pr(|c - 0.1np| > 0.01np) \leq \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red, \frac{10n}{0.11np}}) + 2^{-1.1n} \\ &\leq n \left(\frac{e^7 n (0.1np)^5 e^{-0.09np}}{\frac{10n}{0.11np}} \right)^{\frac{10n}{0.11np}} + 2^{-1.1n} \leq n \left(e^{-9} (np)^6 e^{-0.08np} \right)^{\frac{20n}{1.1np}} e^{-0.7n} + 2^{-1.1n} \\ &\leq n \left(e^{-9} (5000)^6 e^{-450} \right)^{\frac{20n}{1.1np}} e^{-0.7n} + 2^{-1.1n} = o(2^{-n}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.8, $p \geq 5000/n$ and (2) give,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{count}) &\leq \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \{c \geq 400\}) + \Pr(c < 400) \leq \Pr(\text{Bin}(0.01n^2, 5000/n) < 2n) + 2^{-1.1n} \\ &= o(2^{-n}). \end{aligned}$$

Given the above, as in the proof of Lemma 5.5 one has,

$$\begin{aligned} &n^7 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{count} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red, 0.01n}) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} j^4 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} nj^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \vee \mathcal{B}_j) + n^5 \\ &+ n^7 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \vee \mathcal{E}_{red, 0.01n} \vee \mathcal{E}_K \vee \{c < 400\}) = O(n^7). \end{aligned}$$

Now given $c = \frac{2|E(G_1)|}{n-1}$, as $G_1 \subseteq G$ we have that the graph G is distributed as $G(n, 0.5(n-1)c')$ for some $c' = \frac{2|E(G)|}{n-1} \geq c$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\ell=400}^n n^2 \binom{n}{ne^{-2\ell}} \Pr\left(\left\{|K| \leq \frac{10n}{\ell^2}\right\} \wedge \mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2} \wedge \{c = \ell\}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=400}^n n^2 \binom{n}{ne^{-2\ell}} \Pr\left(\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2} \mid \{c = \ell\}\right) \Pr(c = \ell) \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=400}^n n^2 e^{(2\ell+1)e^{-2\ell}n} n e^{-\ell e^{-(1+o(1))\ell}n} \Pr(c = \ell) = O(n). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $400 < 0.09np$ and $\{|K| = i\} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{red, j}$ for $j \leq i$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\ell=400}^n n^2 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{\ell^2}} \Pr\left(\left\{\frac{10n}{\ell^2} < |K| \leq \frac{10n}{\ell}\right\} \wedge \{c = \ell\}\right) \leq \sum_{\ell < 0.09np} n^2 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{\ell^2}} \Pr(c < 0.09np) \\ &+ \sum_{\ell > 0.11np} n^2 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{\ell^2}} \Pr(c > 0.11np) + n^3 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{(0.09np)^2}} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red, \frac{10n}{(0.11np)^2}}) \\ &\leq n^3 2^n \Pr(|c - 0.1np| \geq 0.01np) + n^3 \binom{n}{\frac{10n}{(0.09np)^2}} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red, \frac{10n}{(0.11np)^2}}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq n^3 2^{2n-1.1n} + \max \left\{ n^4 \left(\frac{(0.09x)^2 e}{10} \right)^{\frac{10n}{(0.09x)^2}} \left(\frac{e^7 n (0.1x)^5 e^{-0.09x}}{\frac{10n}{(0.11x)^2}} \right)^{\frac{10n}{(0.11x)^2}} : x \geq 5000 \right\} \\ &\leq 1 + n^4 \max \left\{ \left(\frac{2e^9 x^{10} e^{-0.9x}}{100} \right)^{\frac{10n}{(1.1x)^2}} : x \geq 500 \right\} \leq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.6 and the above calculations imply that the expected running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$ is $O(n^7)$. \square

5.5 Proof of Theorem 1.4

Let $G \sim G(n, p)$ and $F_0 = E(H_n)$. For a graph G denote by $t_1(G)$, $t_2(G)$, $t_3(G)$ and $t(G)$ the running time of $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, \emptyset, 1)$, $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 2)$, $\text{Ham2}(G, F_0, 3)$ and $\text{CerHam2}(G, D)$ respectively. In addition let $p' = \frac{|E(G_1)|}{\binom{n}{2}}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(t(G)) &= \mathbf{E} \left(t_1(G) \wedge \left\{ p' \geq \frac{10 \log n}{n} \right\} \right) + \mathbf{E} \left(t_2(G) \wedge \left\{ \frac{100 \log \log n}{n} \leq p' < \frac{10 \log n}{n} \right\} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{E} \left(t_3(G) \wedge \left\{ p' < \frac{100 \log \log n}{n} \right\} \right) + O(n^7). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

The $O(n^7)$ term in (17) accounts for the time needed to generate H_n and F_0 (see Lemma 5.1). (17) and Lemmas 5.3, 5.5 and 5.6 give,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}(t(G)) &= O(n^7) + O(n^7 \cdot 2^n) \left[\mathbf{Pr} \left(\left\{ p \leq \frac{50 \log n}{n} \right\} \wedge \left\{ p' \geq \frac{10 \log n}{n} \right\} \right) \right. \\ &\quad + \mathbf{Pr} \left(\left\{ p \geq \frac{300 \log n}{n} \right\} \wedge \left\{ p' < \frac{10 \log n}{n} \right\} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{Pr} \left(\left\{ p \leq \frac{300 \log \log n}{n} \right\} \wedge \left\{ p' \geq \frac{100 \log \log n}{n} \right\} \right) \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbf{Pr} \left(\left\{ p \geq \frac{3000 \log \log n}{n} \right\} \wedge \left\{ p' < \frac{100 \log \log n}{n} \right\} \right) \right] \\ &\leq O(n^7) + O(n^7 \cdot 2^n) \max_{p \geq \frac{100 \log \log n}{n}} \mathbf{Pr}(|0.1p - p'| > 0.2p). \end{aligned}$$

Recall, Lemma 5.1 implies that H_n spans at least $0.05n^2$ and at most $0.0505n^2 + o(n^2)$ edges. Therefore $|F_0 \cap E(G)| \sim \text{Bin}(\alpha \binom{n}{2}, p)$ for some $a \in [0.1, 0.102]$. Thereafter, the event $\{|p' - 0.1p| \geq 0.2p\}$ occurs only if the event $\{|F_0 \cap E(G)| - \alpha p \binom{n}{2}| \geq 0.15\alpha p \binom{n}{2}\}$ occurs. Thus, (2) gives,

$$\mathbf{E}(t(G)) = O(n^7) + O(n^7 \cdot 2^n) \max_{\substack{p \geq \frac{300 \log \log n}{n} \\ \alpha \in [0.1, 0.101]}} \mathbf{Pr} \left(\text{Bin} \left(\alpha \binom{n}{2}, p \right) - \alpha \binom{n}{2}, p \right) \Big| \alpha \binom{n}{2} p = O(n^7).$$

\square

6 Conclusion

We have introduced and analysed CertifyHAM, an algorithm that solves HAM in $O\left(\frac{n}{p}\right)$ expected running time over the input distribution $G \sim G(n, p)$ for $p \geq \frac{5000}{n}$. The value $p = \frac{5000}{n}$ is not optimised; however we believe that new ideas are needed to extend it pass the value $\frac{100}{n}$.

At the setup of Theorem 1.1 we assumed that we are given the adjacency matrix of G . In another line of research the Hamilton cycle problem with input $G \sim G(n, p)$ is consider at the setup where G is given in the form of randomly ordered adjacency lists. That is, instead of the adjacency matrix of A , for every vertex $v \in [n]$ we are given a random permutation of its neighbors via a list $L(v)$ (see [2], [4], [16]). In [2] CerHam1* is presented, an algorithm that with probability $1 - o(n^{-7})$ solves HAM with input $G \sim G(n, p)$, in this model, in $O(n)$ time, $p \geq 0$. As it takes $O(n^2)$ time to construct the adjacency matrix of a graph from its adjacency lists, by first applying CerHam1*, then constructing the adjacent matrix of G in the event that CerHam1* fails and then executing CerHam2 we get a linear expected running time algorithm that solves HAM over input $G \sim G(n, p)$ when G is given in the form of randomly ordered adjacency lists for $p \geq \frac{5000}{n}$.

References

- [1] Yahav Alon and Michael Krivelevich. Finding a hamilton cycle fast on average using rotations and extensions. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 57(1):32–46, 2020.
- [2] Michael Anastos. Fast algorithms for solving the hamilton cycle problem with high probability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.14759*, 2021.
- [3] Michael Anastos and Alan Frieze. Hamilton cycles in random graphs with minimum degree at least 3: an improved analysis. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 57(4):865–878, 2020.
- [4] Dana Angluin and Leslie G Valiant. Fast probabilistic algorithms for hamiltonian circuits and matchings. *Journal of Computer and system Sciences*, 18(2):155–193, 1979.
- [5] Richard Bellman. Dynamic programming treatment of the travelling salesman problem. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 9(1):61–63, 1962.
- [6] Andrej Bogdanov and Luca Trevisan. Average-case complexity. *arXiv preprint cs/0606037*, 2006.
- [7] Béla Bollobás. The evolution of sparse graphs, graph theory and combinatorics, 1984. *MR*, 777163(2):35–57, 1984.
- [8] Alan Frieze. Hamilton cycles in random graphs: a bibliography. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.07139*, 2019.
- [9] Alan Frieze and Michal Karoński. *Introduction to random graphs*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [10] Yuri Gurevich and Saharon Shelah. Expected computation time for hamiltonian path problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 16(3):486–502, 1987.

- [11] Michael Held and Richard M Karp. A dynamic programming approach to sequencing problems. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied mathematics*, 10(1):196–210, 1962.
- [12] Richard M Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In *Complexity of computer computations*, pages 85–103. Springer, 1972.
- [13] Richard M Karp. Dynamic programming meets the principle of inclusion and exclusion. *Operations Research Letters*, 1(2):49–51, 1982.
- [14] János Komlós and Endre Szemerédi. Limit distribution for the existence of hamiltonian cycles in a random graph. *Discrete mathematics*, 43(1):55–63, 1983.
- [15] Michael Krivelevich and Benny Sudakov. Pseudo-random graphs. In *More sets, graphs and numbers*, pages 199–262. Springer, 2006.
- [16] Rajko Nenadov, Angelika Steger, and Pascal Su. An $o(n)$ time algorithm for finding hamilton cycles with high probability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.02551*, 2020.
- [17] JJ Seidel. A survey of two-graphs, intern. coll. teorie combinatorie (roma, 1973), i. *Accad. Naz. Lincei, Rome*, 1976.
- [18] Andrew Thomason. A simple linear expected time algorithm for finding a hamilton path. *Discrete Mathematics*, 75(1-3):373–379, 1989.

A Proofs of auxiliary Lemmas

A.1 A Family of Pseudorandom Graphs

A graph G is a strongly regular graph with parameters (n, d, η, μ) if (i) G is a d -regular graph on n vertices, (ii) for every $x, y \in V(G)$ if $xy \in E(G)$ then x and y have exactly η common neighbors and (iii) for every $x, y \in V(G), x \neq y$ if $xy \notin E(G)$ then x and y have exactly μ common neighbors. For the proofs of the following Lemmas and some further reading on pseudorandom and strongly regular graphs see [15].

Lemma A.1. *Let G be a connected strongly regular graph with parameters (n, d, η, μ) . Then G has only 3 distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ which are given by,*

- $\lambda_1 = d,$
- $\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\eta - \mu + \sqrt{(\eta - \mu)^2 + 4(d - \mu)} \right)$ and
- $\lambda_3 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\eta - \mu - \sqrt{(\eta - \mu)^2 + 4(d - \mu)} \right).$

For a graph G and disjoint sets $U, W \subset V(G)$ we let $e(U, W)$ be the number of edges with an endpoint in each U, W .

Lemma A.2. *Let G be a d -regular graph on n vertices. Let $d = \lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of G . Let $\lambda = \max_{2 \leq i \leq n} |\lambda_i|$. Then for every two disjoint subsets $U, W \subseteq V(G)$,*

$$\left| e(U, W) - \frac{d|U||W|}{n} \right| \leq \lambda \sqrt{|U||W| \left(1 - \frac{|U|}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{|W|}{n}\right)}. \quad (18)$$

We now introduce a family of strongly regular graphs $H_{q,k}$ where $1 \leq k \leq q$ and q is a prime power which we later use to construct $\{H_n\}_{n \geq 1}$. This family is due to Delsarte and Goethals and to Turyn (see [15], [17]). Let V_q be the elements of the two dimensional vector space over $GF(q)$. Let L be the set of $q+1$ lines that pass through the origin and L_k be a subset of L of size k . We define $H_{q,k}$ to be the graph on V_q where two elements $x, y \in V_q$ form an edge iff the line that passes through both x and y is parallel to a line in L_k . It is easy to check that $H_{q,k}$ is a $k(q-1)$ -regular graph on q^2 vertices. Every pair of neighbors shares exactly $(k-1)(k-2) + q - 1$ neighbors and every pair of non-adjacent vertices shares exactly $k(k-1)$ neighbors. Thus $H_{q,k}$ is strongly regular with parameters $(q^2, k(q-1), (k-1)(k-2) + q - 2, k(k-1))$.

Now, for n sufficiently large we construct the graph H_n as follows: Let q be the smallest prime between \sqrt{n} and $2\sqrt{n}$. Let k be the smallest integer larger than $0.1001q$ and let $H'_n = H_{q,k}$. Now let H''_n be the subgraph of H'_n spanned by the first n vertices of H'_n which we identify with $[n]$. Join every vertex of degree less than $0.1n$ in H''_n to every vertex in $[0.1n+1]$ and let H_n be the resultant graph.

Lemma A.3. *For n significantly large there exists a graph H_n on $[n]$ that can be constructed in $O(n^7)$ time and satisfies the following.*

- (a) *For every pair of disjoint sets $U, W \subseteq [n]$ the number of edges spanned by $U \times W$ is at least $\frac{0.1|U||W|}{n} - n^{7/4}$ and at most $\frac{0.101|U||W|}{n} + n^{7/4}$*
- (b) *H_n has minimum degree $0.1n$.*
- (c) *At most $n^{2/3}$ vertices in $[n]$ have degree larger than $0.101n$ in H_n .*

Proof. Determining the primes smaller or equal to $4\sqrt{n}$ can be done in $O(n^7)$ time, hence H_n can be constructed in $O(n^7)$ time.

Part (b) follows from the construction of H_n . Let S_n and L_n respectively be the set of vertices of degree at most $0.1n$ and at least $0.1005n$ respectively in H''_n .

$H_{q,k}$ is strongly regular with parameters $(q^2, k(q-1), (k-1)(k-2) + q - 2, k(k-1))$, for some $k \in [0.1001q, 0.1002q]$. Thus, as $|(k-1)(k-2) + q - 2 - k(k-1)| \leq q$, Lemma A.1 implies that $H_{q,k}$ has only 3 distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ with $\lambda_1 = k(q-1)$ and $|\lambda_2|, |\lambda_3| = O(q) = O(\sqrt{n})$. Hence (18) implies that for every pair of disjoint subsets U, W of $V(H''_n) \subseteq V(H_{q,k})$

$$\left| e_{H''_n}(U, W) - \frac{k(q-1)|U||W|}{q^2} \right| = O(n^{3/2}). \quad (19)$$

As k is the smallest integer larger than $0.1001q$ for significantly large n we have that $0.1 \leq \frac{k(q-1)}{q^2} \leq 0.1002q$. Taking $U = S_n$ and $W = [n] \setminus U$ in (19) we get that $|S_n| = O(n^{1/2})$ and $O(n^{3/2})$ edges

are added to H_n'' to form H_n , hence (a) follows. Similarly, $|L_n| = O(n^{1/2})$. Finally as every vertex of H_n of degree at least $0.101n$ either belongs to L_n or is incident to at least $0.005n$ of the $O(n^{3/2})$ edges added to H_n'' , we have that there exists $O(n^{1/2})$ such vertices. \square

A.2 A coloring process - Randomized setting

Here we prove the following Lemma stated earlier at Subsection 4.1.

Lemma A.4. *Let $\frac{1000}{n} \leq p$, $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' \sim G(n, 0.5)$ and $F_0 = E(G) \cap E(G')$. Then, for $1 \leq i \leq 0.02n$, $1 \leq j \leq 0.02n$ and $\frac{n}{\log^2 n} \leq s \leq 0.01n$ the following hold.*

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,s}(G, F_0)) \leq n \left(\frac{e^7 n (0.5np)^5 e^{-0.45np}}{s} \right)^s, \quad \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0)) \leq 2^{-n}, \quad (20)$$

$$\binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i(G, F_0)) = O(n) \quad \text{and} \quad j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j) + j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)) = O(n). \quad (21)$$

Proof. Write $\mathcal{E}_{exp}, \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}, \mathcal{A}_j$ and \mathcal{B}_j for the events $\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0), \mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)$ respectively. In addition let $G_1 = ([n], E(G) \cap E(G'))$. Let $\frac{n}{\log^2 n} \leq s \leq 0.01n$. Observe that at each step of the coloring process at Subsection 4.1 each time a vertex is colored red at most 5 vertices are colored blue. As a single vertex is colored red at a time if $\mathcal{E}_{red,s}$ occurs then there exists a moment where exactly s vertices have color red. In addition these s vertices are adjacent to a set of $i \leq 5s$ blue vertices and not adjacent to the rest of the vertices in G_1 . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,s}) &\leq \Pr(\exists S, T \subseteq [n] : |S| = s, |T| \leq 5s \text{ and } T = N_{G_1}(S)) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{5s} \binom{n}{s+i} \binom{s+i}{s} s^i (0.5p)^i (1-0.5p)^{s(n-s-i)} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{5s} \left(\frac{en}{s+i} \right)^{s+i} \left(\frac{e(s+i)}{s} \right)^s s^i (0.5p)^i e^{-0.45nps} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{5s} \left(\frac{e^2 n}{s} \right)^s e^i (0.5np)^i e^{-0.45nps} \\ &\leq n \left(\frac{e^7 n}{s} \right)^s (0.5np)^{5s} e^{-0.45nps} \leq n \left(\frac{e^7 (0.5np)^5 e^{-0.45npn}}{s} \right)^s. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Thereafter,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}) &\leq \Pr(\exists S, T \subseteq [n] : |S| \in [0.02n, 0.27n], |T| = 0.05n + 2|S| \text{ and } N_{G_1}(S) \subseteq T) \\ &\leq \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \binom{n}{s+2s+0.05n} \binom{s+2s+0.05n}{2s} \binom{s+0.05n}{s} (1-0.5p)^{s(0.95n-3s)} \\ &\leq \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \left(\frac{en}{s+2s+0.05n} \right)^{s+2s+0.05n} 3^{s+2s+0.05n} e^{-0.5sp(0.95n-3s)} \\ &\leq \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \left(\frac{en}{s} \right)^{s+2s+0.05n} e^{-0.5sp(0.95n-3s)} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$= \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \exp \left\{ n \left[\left(\frac{3s}{n} + 0.05 \right) \left(1 + \log \left(\frac{n}{s} \right) \right) - 500 \left(\frac{s}{n} \right) \left(0.95 - \frac{3s}{n} \right) \right] \right\}.$$

Let $f(x) = (3x + 0.05)(1 - \log(x)) - 500x(0.95 - 3x)$. Then $f''(x) > 0$. Thus $f(x)$ has a unique minimum which implies that $\max\{f(x) : x \in [0.02, 0.27]\} = \max\{f(0.02), f(0.27)\} \leq -1$. Therefore,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}) \leq ne^{-n} \leq 2^{-n}.$$

Now let $i \leq 0.02n$. In the event \mathcal{A}_i there exists a set $S \subset [n] \setminus V_{5,red}(G_1)$ of size i such that $j = |N_{G_1}(S) \setminus V_{5,red}(G_1)| < 2|S|$. In addition each vertex of S has at least 6 neighbors in $[n] \setminus V_{5,red}(G_1)$ and therefore $S \cup N_{G_1}(S)$ spans at least $3|S| + |N_{G_1}(S)|/2 \geq 2|S| + |N_{G_1}(S)|$ edges. Thereafter if we let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_ℓ be the components of the subgraph of G_1 induced by $V_{red}(G_1)$ then a number of them is connected to $S \cup N_{G_1}(S)$ and these components span in total a set C_S of r vertices. Finally, as each of these r vertices has at most 5 neighbors not in C_r , we have that $r' = |N_{G_1}(C_r) \setminus S| \leq 5r$. In the event $\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$ we have that $r \leq 0.01n$. All the above, in the event $\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$, yield a set of vertices W of size $i + j + r + r'$ (with $j \leq 2i, r \leq 0.01n$) that spans $2i + j + r + r'$ edges in G and contains a set Z of $i + r$ vertices with no neighbors outside this set in G_1 . The number of ways to determine such a quadruple of sets, with $j \leq 2i$, is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{n}{i+j+r+r'} \binom{i+j+r+r'}{i+r} \binom{i+j+r+r'}{i+j+r+r'} \binom{i+j}{i} \\ & \leq \left(\frac{en}{i+j+r+r'} \right)^{i+j+r+r'} 2^{i+j+r+r'} \left(\frac{e(i+j+r+r')}{2} \right)^{i+j+r+r'} \left(\frac{e(i+j)^2}{2i} \right)^i \\ & \leq (e^2n)^{i+j+r+r'} \left(\frac{e \cdot 9i^2}{2i} \right)^i \leq (e^2n)^{i+j+r+r'} (13i)^i. \end{aligned}$$

(20) implies that $\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \leq 2^{-n}$. Let S be a set of $2i + j + r + r'$ edges spanned by $[i + j + r + r']$ and $\mathcal{E}_{i,j,r,r'}$ be the event that $S \subset E(G)$ and $N_{G_1}([i + r]) \subseteq [i + j + r + r']$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{10i} \binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) & \leq 2^{10i} \binom{n}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{2i} \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} \sum_{r'=0}^{5r} (e^2n)^{i+j+r+r'} (13i)^i \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{i,j,r,r'}) + 2^{10i} \binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \\ & \leq 2^{10i} \left(\frac{en}{i} \right)^i \sum_{j=0}^{2i} \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} \sum_{r'=0}^{5r} (e^2n)^{i+j+r+r'} (13i)^i p^{2i+j+r+r'} (1 - 0.5p)^{(i+r)(n-i-r)} + 2^{0.20n} \binom{n}{0.02n} 2^{-n} \\ & \leq 2^{10i+1} \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} (e^2np)^{2i+6r} (13enp)^i e^{-0.45(i+r)pn} + 1 \leq 2 \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} \left[(120e^2np)^6 e^{-0.45pn} \right]^{i+r} + 1 \leq 2. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

At the lat inequality we used that $p \geq \frac{1000}{n}$. Thus $\binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) = O(1)$ and $i^6 2^i \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) = O(1)$ for $i \leq 0.02n$.

Finally, if \mathcal{B}_j occurs then there exist set $W_1, W_2 \subset [n]$ such that $|W_2| \leq j \leq |W_1| \leq 2j, |N_{G_1}(W_1)| \leq 5|W_1|$. In addition, since the edges incident to $W = W_1 \cup W_2$ span a connected graph in G there exists a set $W_3 \subseteq [n] \setminus W$ of size at most $|W|$ with the property that $W_1 \cup W_2 \cup W_3 \cup N_{G_1}(W_1)$ is

connected in G . Thus, for $j \leq 0.02n$ (by letting $W'_2 = W_2 \cup W_3$) we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j) &\leq j^6 2^{6j} \sum_{i=j}^{2j} \sum_{\ell=0}^{5i} \sum_{k=0}^{2j} \Pr \left(\exists W_1, W'_2 \subset [n] : |W_1| = i, N_{G_1}(W_1) = \ell, |W'_2| = k, \right. \\
&\quad \left. \text{and } W_1 \cup W'_2 \cup N_{G_1}(W_1) \text{ is connected in } G \right) \\
&\leq j^6 2^{6j} \sum_{i=j}^{2j} \sum_{\ell=0}^{5i} \sum_{k=0}^{3i} \binom{n}{i+\ell+k} \binom{i+\ell+k}{i, \ell, k} (i+\ell+k)^{i+\ell+k-2} p^{i+\ell+k-1} (1-0.5p)^{i(n-i-\ell)} \\
&\leq j^6 2^{6j} \sum_{i=j}^{2j} \sum_{\ell=0}^{5i} \sum_{k=0}^{3i} p^{-1} \left(\frac{enp}{i+\ell+k} \right)^{i+\ell+k} 3^{i+\ell+k} (i+\ell+k)^{i+\ell+k-2} e^{-0.5pi(n-12j)} \\
&\leq j^6 2^{6j} \sum_{i=j}^{2j} \sum_{\ell=0}^{5i} \sum_{k=0}^{3i} p^{-1} (3enp)^{9i} e^{-0.38pi} \\
&\leq 120j^9 2^{6j} p^{-1} \left((3enp)^9 e^{-0.038np} \right)^j \leq 120j^9 2^{6j} p^{-1} \left((3000e)^9 e^{-380} \right)^j = O(p^{-1}) = O(n).
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

□

A.3 A coloring process - Deterministic setting

Here we prove the following Lemma stated at Subsection 5.3.

Lemma A.5. *Let $\frac{5000}{n} \leq p$, $G \sim G(n, p)$, $G' = H_n$ and $F_0 = E(G) \cap E(G')$. Then, for $1 \leq i \leq 0.02n$, $1 \leq j \leq 0.09n$ and $\frac{n}{\log^2 n} \leq s \leq 0.01n$ the following hold.*

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,s})(G, F_0) \leq \left(\frac{e^7 (0.1np)^5 e^{-0.09npn}}{s} \right)^s, \quad \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0)) \leq 2^{-n}, \tag{26}$$

$$\binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i(G, F_0)) = O(n) \quad \text{and} \quad j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)) + j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)) = O(1). \tag{27}$$

Proof. Write $\mathcal{E}_{exp}, \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}, \mathcal{A}_j$ and \mathcal{B}_j for the events $\mathcal{E}_{exp}(G, F_0), \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}(G, F_0), \mathcal{A}_j(G, F_0)$ and $\mathcal{B}_j(G, F_0)$ respectively. In addition let $G_1 = ([n], E(G) \cap F_0)$. Let $\frac{n}{\log^2 n} \leq s \leq 0.01n$. The proof of this Lemma is almost identical to the proof of Lemma 4.2 modulo the following. Lemma 5.1 implies that for every pair of disjoint sets $W_1, W_2 \subset [n]$ there exists at least $\max\{0.1|W_1||W_2| - n^{7/4}, 0.1n|W_1| - |W_1|(n - |W_2|)\}$ edges from W_1 to W_2 in H_n each appearing independently in G with probability p . The bound $0.1n|W_1| - |W_1|(n - |W_2|)$ arises from the fact that H_n has minimum degree at least $0.1n$.

Similarly to (22) we get,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,s}) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{5s} \binom{n}{s+i} \binom{s+i}{s} s^i p^i (1-p)^{\max\{0.1s(n-6s) - n^{7/4}, 0.1ns - s(n-(n-6s))\}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{5s} \left(\frac{en}{s+i} \right)^{s+i} \left(\frac{e(s+i)}{s} \right)^s s^i p^i e^{-0.093nps} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{5s} \left(\frac{e^2 n}{s} \right)^s e^i (np)^i e^{-0.093nps} \\
&\leq n \left(\frac{e^7 n}{s} \right)^s (np)^{5s} e^{-0.09nps} \leq n \left(\frac{e^7 (np)^5 e^{-0.09npn}}{s} \right)^s.
\end{aligned}$$

Thereafter, as in (23) we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}) &\leq \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \binom{n}{s+2s+0.05n} \binom{s+2s+0.05n}{2s} \binom{s+0.05n}{s} (1-p)^{0.1s(0.95n-3s)-n^{7/4}} \\
&\leq \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \left(\frac{en}{s} \right)^{s+2s+0.05n} e^{-(0.1+o(1))sp(0.95n-3s)} \\
&= \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \exp \left\{ n \left[\left(\frac{3s}{n} + 0.05 \right) \left(1 + \log \left(\frac{n}{s} \right) \right) - 500 \left(\frac{s}{n} \right) \left(0.95 - \frac{3s}{n} \right) \right] \right\} \leq 2^{-n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now let $i \leq 0.02n$. (26) implies that $\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \leq 2^{-n}$. As in (24) we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
2^{10i} \binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) &\leq 2^{10i} \binom{n}{i} \sum_{j=0}^{2i} \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} \sum_{r'=0}^{5r} (e^2 n)^{i+j+r+r'} (13i)^i \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{i,j,r,r'}) + 2^{10i} \binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \\
&\leq 2^{10i} \left(\frac{en}{i} \right)^i \sum_{j=0}^{2i} \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} \sum_{r'=0}^{5r} (e^2 np)^{i+j+r+r'} (13ip)^i (1-p)^{\max\{0.1(i+r)(n-i-r)-n^{7/4}, 0.1ni-i(i+r)\}} + 1 \\
&\leq 2^{10i+1} \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} (e^2 np)^{2i+6r} (13enp)^i e^{-0.093(i+r)pn} + 1 \leq 2 \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} \left[(120e^2 np)^6 e^{-0.093pn} \right]^{i+r} + 1 \leq 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) = O(1)$ and $i^6 2^i \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) = O(1)$ for $i \leq 0.02n$.

Finally, similarly to (25), we get,

$$\begin{aligned}
j^6 2^{6j} \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j) &\leq j^6 2^{6j} \sum_{i=j}^{2j} \sum_{\ell=0}^{5i} \sum_{k=0}^{3i} \binom{n}{i+\ell+k} \binom{i+\ell+k}{i,\ell,k} (i+\ell+k)^{i+\ell+k-2} p^{i+\ell+k-1} \\
&\quad \times (1-p)^{\max\{0.1i(n-6i)-n^{7/4}, 0.1i(n-6i)-o(n^2)\}} \\
&\leq j^6 2^{6j} \sum_{i=j}^{2j} \sum_{\ell=0}^{5i} \sum_{k=0}^{3i} p^{-1} \left(\frac{enp}{i+\ell+k} \right)^{i+\ell+k} 3^{i+\ell+k} (i+\ell+k)^{i+\ell+k-2} e^{-0.07npi} \\
&\leq j^6 2^{6j} \sum_{i=j}^{2j} \sum_{\ell=0}^{5i} \sum_{k=0}^{3i} p^{-1} (3enp)^{9i} e^{-0.07npi} \\
&\leq 120j^9 2^{6j} p^{-1} \left((3enp)^9 e^{-0.07np} \right)^j \leq 120j^9 2^{6j} p^{-1} \left((15000e)^9 e^{-350} \right)^j = O(p^{-1}) = O(n).
\end{aligned}$$

□

A.4 Minimum degree 2

Let $G(n, m)$ be the uniform random graph model i.e. if $G \sim G(n, m)$ then G is a graph chosen uniformly at random from all graphs on $[n]$ with m edges. For $m = O(n \log \log n)$ one can generate $G_{n,m}$ via the following process (see [3]). Let X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n be i.i.d random variables $Poisson(\lambda)$ and M a multiset that contains X_i copies of v_i . Let $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ and $A = a_1, a_2, \dots, a_X$ be a random permutation of the elements in M . In the event that X is even let G_A be the multi-graph on $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$ where the edge set is given by $\{a_{2i-1}a_{2i} : 1 \leq i \leq X/2\}$. In the event that $X = 2m$ and G_A is simple we have that G_A has the same distribution as $G_{n,m}$. The probability of X being even, $X = 2m$ and A being simple is larger than $\frac{1}{n}$ when $\lambda = \frac{2m}{n}$ and $m = O(n \log \log n)$ (see [9], Chapter 11). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\delta(G_{n,m}) \geq 2) &= \Pr(\delta(G_A) \geq 2 | G_A \text{ is simple}, X = 2m) \\ &= \Pr(\min\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\} \geq 2 | G_A \text{ is simple}, X = 2m) \\ &\leq n \Pr(\min\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\} \geq 2) \leq n \left(1 - \frac{2m}{n} e^{-\frac{2m}{n}}\right)^n \leq n e^{-2m e^{-\frac{2m}{n}}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4.3.