

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 $p \geq \frac{2000}{n}$ 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 [13] 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 [6],[12]; it is a dynamic programming algorithm with worst-case time complexity $\Theta(n^2 2^n)$ time and worst-case space complexity $\Theta(\sqrt{n} 2^n)$.

In [11], 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 graphs on n vertices, the expected running time of their algorithm over the input distribution $G \sim G(n, p)$ is polynomial in n when $p = 1/2$. The last statement raises the question for which values of p there exists an algorithm that solves HAM in polynomial expected running time over the input distribution $G \sim G(n, p)$. Gurevich and Shelah [11], 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 $p \geq \frac{2000}{n}$.*

In the above Theorem 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 A_G . Thus the expected running time of CertifyHAM is optimal.

One of the most interesting figures of Theorem 1.1 is that it can also deal with $G(n, p)$ below the Hamiltonicity threshold. A celebrated result of Bollobás [8] and of Komlós and Szemerédi [14] state 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 the Hamilton Cycles in random graphs see [9].

Theorem 1.1 falls into the area of average-case analysis of algorithms. For a complete survey on this area see [7]. 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 $p(\cdot)$ 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 2.9, give the following.

Corollary 1.2. *(HAM, \mathcal{P}_p) belongs to AvgP for all $p \geq 0$.*

1.1 Description of CertifyHAM

CertifyHAM implements 2 algorithms. First it implements CerHam1. CerHam1 solves *HAM* with input $G \sim G(n, p)$ in $O\left(\frac{n}{p}\right)$ time with probability $1 - o(n^{-7})$. In addition, if $\delta(G) < 2$ then CerHam1 returns “ G in not Hamiltonian”. If CerHam1 fails to solve *HAM* for a given instance G then CertifyHAM implements CerHam2 whose expected run time of CerHam2 is $O(n^7)$. For an instance x denote by $t_1(x), t_2(x)$ and $t(x)$ the running time with input x of CerHam1, CerHam2 and CertifyHam respectively. Then, for $p \geq \frac{2000}{n}$,

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

The description of CerHam1 is given in [2]. In this paper we introduce and analyse CerHam2.

CerHam2 takes as an input a graph G and starts by querying a number of edges of G . By querying an edge of G we refer to reading the corresponding entry of A_G the adjacency matrix of G . When $G \sim G(n, p)$ we consider that initially all of the entries of 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

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

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.

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 size 1 less or 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 adjust \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 taken place. In the unlikely event that the CerHam2 exits its while loop it implements the Held-Karp algorithm.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we present the tools needed for the presentation and analysis of CerHam2. We then present and analyse CerHam2 in Section 3. Its analysis is split into 3 cases corresponding to the regimes $\frac{2000 \log n}{n} \leq p, \frac{1000 \log \log n}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{1000 \log n}{n}$ and $\frac{2000}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{1000 \log \log n}{n}$ respectively. For ease of the presentation of the paper we have moved the proofs of technical results to the Appendix.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 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 $v_n v_i$ and $v_i v_{i+1}$ the inserted and the deleted edge respectively. We will not perform all Pósa rotations possible. Instead we will only perform Pósa rotations for which the pivot vertex does not belong to some prescribed set S . The exact procedure which we call *RPR* 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 $RPR(G, P, u, v, S)$

- 1: Let $Q = u$, $\mathcal{P} = \{P\}$, $End = \{u\}$.
 - 2: **while** $Q \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 - 3: Let w be the first vertex in Q and P_w be the unique Hamilton path in \mathcal{P} from v to w .
 - 4: For $z \in N(w) \setminus S$ perform the Pósa rotation starting from P_w that fixes v and the inserted edge is wz only if the new endpoint does not belong to End . If the Pósa rotation is performed then add the new endpoint to End and to the end of Q and the corresponding path to \mathcal{P} .
 - 5: Remove z from Q .
 - 6: **end while**
 - 7: 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 first part of 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 $End, \mathcal{P} = RPR(G, P, v, u, S)$. 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 in 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 $1 \leq i \leq \ell$.

Now let $k \leq \ell$ and $w \in N(u_k) \setminus S$. If a Pósa rotation occurs with $u_k w$ being the deleted edge then $w \in T_{k'}$ for some $k' > k$. Else the vertex that succeeds w on P_{u_k} is $u_{k'}$ for some $k' < k$. In this case let $Q_0 = P_{u_{k'}}, Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_t = P_{u_k}$ be the sequence of paths in $P_{u_1}, P_{u_2}, \dots, P_{u_\ell}$ that correspond to the t Pósa rotations that transform $P_{u_{k'}}$ to P_{u_k} . Then at every path P of this sequence an edge e incident to $u_{k'}$ is either equal to $u_{k'} r_{k',1}$ or is an inserting edge. In both cases, both of the endpoints of e belong to $\cup_{i \leq k} T_i$ hence $w \in \cup_{i \leq k} T_i$. Therefore $N_G(End) \setminus S \subset \cup_{i \leq \ell} T_i$ 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 $End, \mathcal{P} = RPR(G, P, v, u, S)$ then End and W are disjoint. Indeed $u \notin S$. 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 .*

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

We use *RPR* as a subroutine in 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 $\mathcal{P}_{u,w}$ creates a Hamilton cycle if $|\mathcal{P}_{u,w}| = 1$ or joints 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: $End, \mathcal{P} = RPR(G \cup R, P, v_1, v_k, S)$
 - 4: **for** $u \in End$ **do**
 - 5: Let P_u be the Hamilton path from v to u in \mathcal{P} .
 - 6: $End_u, \mathcal{P}_u = RPR(G \cup R, P_u, v_1, v_k, S)$.
 - 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 $\mathcal{U} = \{\mathcal{P}_{u,w} : u \in End, w \in End_u\}$
 - 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 $O(n^3)$.

2.2 Covering non-expanding sets

In this subsection we introduce *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 outputted by *ReducePaths*. *CoverAndAdjust* takes as an input a graph G' , a set S of size less than $n/2$ 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 starts by implementing the Held-Karp algorithm to find a path packing \mathcal{P}' that covers S . 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' induced by $S \cup N(S)$.
 - 2: **for** every component C of G'_S **do**
 - 3: Add to C every edge spanned by $V(C) \cap N(S)$ and let G'_C be the obtained graph.
 - 4: Implement Held-Karp to find a Hamilton cycle H of G''_C . If no such a cycle exists output “ G' is not Hamiltonian”.
 - 5: Remove from H all the edges not incident to S let \mathcal{P}' be the set of paths left of length at least 1.
 - 6: Remove from the paths in \mathcal{P} the vertices that are covered by \mathcal{P}' and add \mathcal{P}' to \mathcal{P} .
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: Output \mathcal{P} .
-

The correctness of line 4 of the above algorithm is given by the following Lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $G' \subseteq G$ and $S \subset V(G)$ be such that $|S| < |V(G)|/2$ and each vertex in S has the same neighborhood in both G and G' . Then if $\text{CoverAndAdjust}(G, S, \mathcal{P})$ 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, as $|S| < |V(G)|/2$ the edges of H incident to $V(C) \cap S$ induce a path packing $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k\}$ that cover $S \cap V(C)$ such that the endpoints of P_i lie in $N(S) \cap V(C)$ for $i \in [k]$. As each vertex in S has the same neighborhood in both G and G' these paths are present in G'_S , hence in G''_C . Finally as every pair of vertices in $N(S) \cap V(C)$ forms an edge in G''_C the paths P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k can be used to form a Hamilton cycle in G''_C . Thus $\text{CoverAndAdjust}(G', S, \mathcal{P})$ does not outputs “ G' is not Hamiltonian”. \square

Observation 2.5. *After the execution of $\text{CoverAndAdjust}(G', S, \mathcal{P})$ $|\mathcal{P}|$ may increase by at most $6|S|$. This is because the “new” paths cover at most $3|S|$ vertices and for each vertex covered by a new path at most 2 edges may be deleted at line 6.*

The running time of $\text{CoverAndAdjust}(G', S, \mathcal{P})$ is dominated by the application of Held-Karp algorithm and it is $O(ns^22^s) + O(n^2)$ where s is the size of the largest component of the subgraph of G' induced by $S \cup N(S)$.

2.3 A Family of Pseudorandom Graphs

Initially CerHam2 queries the edges of G that belong to some graph H_n . H_n 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 is given in Appendix A.

Lemma 2.6. *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 .*

2.4 A coloring process

For a graph G we let $G \cap H_n$ be the graph on $[n]$ with edge set $E(G) \cap E(H_n)$. At the regimes where $p \leq \frac{1000 \log n}{n}$ we first implement the following red/blue/black coloring procedure: Initially all the vertices of $G \cap H_n$ are coloured black. While there exists a blue or black vertex v with at most 5 black neighbors in $G \cap H_n$ 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 is red, blue and black respectively. A standard argument shows that $V_{5,red}(G)$, $V_{5,blue}(G)$ and $V_{5,black}(G)$ do not depend on the order in which the vertices are being processed (see [4]). Observe that every vertex in both $V_{5,blue}(G)$ and $V_{5,black}(G)$ has at least 6 neighbors in $V_{5,black}(G)$. 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. For the proof of Lemma 2.8 see Appendix A.

Observation 2.7. *During the above coloring process every time a vertex is colored red at most 5 other vertices 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 $|V_{5,blue}(G) \cap C| \leq 5|V_{5,red}(G) \cap C|$.*

Lemma 2.8. *Let $\frac{2000}{n} \leq p$ and $G \sim G(n, p)$. For $i, j, s \in \mathbb{N}$ define the following events,*

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

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

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

and

$$\mathcal{B}_j := \{ \text{there exists a set } W \subset [n] \text{ of size at most } 0.02n \text{ and a subgraph } G_R \text{ of } G \text{ with the property that } |N_{G \cap H_n}(W) \setminus V_{5,red}| < 2|W| \text{ and } W \cup V_{5,red}(G) \cup N_G(V_{5,red}(G) \cup W) \text{ spans a component of size } j \text{ in } G_R \}.$$

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.

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,s}) \leq \left(\frac{e^7(0.1np)^5 e^{-0.09np}}{s} \right)^s, \quad \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}) \leq 2^{-n}, \quad (1)$$

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

2.5 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 initiate CerHam2 by 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 is done in the following Lemma. Its proof can be found at Appendix A.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\frac{2000}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{1000 \log \log n}{n}$ and $G \sim G(n, p)$. Then,*

$$\Pr(\delta(G(n, p)) \geq 2) \leq ne^{-1.1n^2 p e^{-1.1np}} + 2^{-n}. \quad (3)$$

3 Certifying Hamiltonicity

CerHam2 takes as input a graph G on $[n]$ and two sets $K, S \subseteq [n]$. It also utilizes the graph H_n whose construction is given in Appendix A. Throughout its execution H 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 H that belong to G .

Algorithm 4 CerHam2(G, K, S)

```

1: Set  $count = 0$ ,  $i = 1$ ,  $S_0 = K \cup S$ ,  $\mathcal{P} = [n]$  and  $H = E(H_n)$ .
2: Query the edges in  $H$  and set  $G_R = ([n], E(G) \cap H)$ .
3: while  $|S_{i-1}| < 0.25n$  and  $count < 0.01n^2$  do
4:    $End, \{End_u\}_{u \in End}, \mathcal{U} = ReducePaths(G, \mathcal{P}, S_i \cup N(S_i))$ .
5:   if there exists  $S'_i \in \{End_u : u \in End\} \cup \{End\}$  such that  $|S'_i| < 0.25n$  then
6:     Let  $S_i = S_{i-1} \cup S'_i$ .
7:     While there exists  $W \subset [n] \setminus S_i$  s.t.  $|W| \leq |S_i \setminus S_0|$  and  $|N_{G_R}(W) \setminus S_i| < 2|W|$  and  $W \cup (N_{G_R}(W) \setminus S_i)$  is connected in  $G_R$ , add  $W$  to  $S_i$ .
8:     Add to  $H$  all the edges incident to  $S_i$  and query the edges of  $G$  that have just been added to  $H$ . Add any edges of  $G$  that have just been revealed to  $G_R$ .
9:     Execute  $CoverAndAdjust(G_R, S_i, \mathcal{P})$ . If it outputs “ $G_R$  is not Hamiltonian” then output “ $G$  is not Hamiltonian”. Else let  $\mathcal{P} = CoverAndAdjust(G_R, S_i, \mathcal{P})$ .
10:    Set  $i = i + 1$ .
11:   else
12:     Let  $u \in End$  and  $w \in End_u$  be such that  $uw \notin H$ .
13:     Add  $uw$  to  $H$  and query whether  $uw \in E(G)$ .
14:     Set  $count = count + 1$ .
15:     if  $uw \in E(G)$  then let  $\mathcal{P}_{u,w}$  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. Add  $uw$  to  $G_R$ .
16:     end if
17:   end if
18: end while
19: Set  $t = i - 1$ .
20: Reveal  $G$ .
21: Execute the Held-Harp algorithm with input the graph  $G$ .

```

For the correctness of CerHam2 one has to verify the correctness of lines 9 and 12. If CerHam2 outputs “ G is not Hamiltonian” at line 9 then this statement is indeed true due to Lemma 2.4; here we are using that we reveal all the edges in G incident to S_i at line 8 and hence the edge sets incident to S_i in G_R and G are identical. For line 12 recall that Observation 2.2 implies that at every iteration of the while-loop the sets $End, \{End_u\}_{u \in End}$ and disjoint from S_i . In addition observe that $count$ is an upper bound on the number of edges in $H \setminus E(H_n)$ not incident to S_i . Furthermore Lemma 2.6 states that at most $n^{2/3}$ vertices have degree larger than 0.101 in H_n . Therefore if the algorithm proceeds to line 12 then the set $\{uw : u \in End, w \in End_u \text{ and } uw \notin E(H)\}$ contains at least $[(0.25 - 0.101)n]^2/2 - 0.01n^2 - o(n^2) \geq 1$ edges and the corresponding choice of u and w is possible.

Let $s_i = |S_i|$ for $0 \leq i \leq t$. The following lemma upper bounds the number of edges in G we need to identify at line 13. We later use Lemma 3.1 to upper bound the probability that $\text{count} \geq 0.01n^2$ at the end of the while-loop. For $i \leq 0.01n^2$ let $X_i = 1$ if the i^{th} time line 13 is executed an edge wu in G is identified.

Lemma 3.1. *For $i \in [t]$ we have,*

$$|N_{G \cap H_n}(S_i \setminus S_0)| < 2|S_i \setminus S_0|. \quad (4)$$

Furthermore,

$$t \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{s_t - s_0}{s_1 - s_0} \right). \quad (5)$$

In addition, if $|N_{G \cap H_n}(S \setminus K)| < 2|S \setminus K|$ then for $i \in [t]$,

$$|N_{G \cap H_n}(S_i \setminus K)| < 2|S_i \setminus K|. \quad (6)$$

Finally, if CerHam2 exits the while-loop and $|S| < 0.25n$ then,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i < 6s_0t + 12s_t + n. \quad (7)$$

Proof. Let $1 \leq i \leq t$ and let Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_r be the sets added to S_0 , due to lines 6 and 7, in the order that they were added, to form S_i . As throughout the algorithm G_R is a supergraph of $G \cap H_n$, with $W_j = S_0 \cup (\cup_{\ell=1}^{j-1} Q_\ell)$, we have,

$$|N_{G \cap H_n}(S_i \setminus S_0)| = \sum_{j=1}^r |N_{G \cap H_n}(Q_j \setminus W_j)| < \sum_{j=1}^r 2|Q_j| = 2|S_i \setminus S_0|.$$

For the proof of (6) we repeat the above argument with $Q_0 (= S), Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_r$ being the sets added to K to form S_i .

Now observe that due to line 7 of the algorithm we have that $|S'_{i+1}| > |S_i \setminus S_0|$. Therefore,

$$s_{i+1} - s_0 = |S_{i+1} \setminus S_0| \geq |S'_{i+1}| > 2|S_i \setminus S_0| = 2(s_i - s_0)$$

for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, t-1\}$. Hence $t \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{s_t - s_0}{s_1 - s_0} \right)$.

If CerHam2 exits the while-loop and $|S| < 0.25n$ then the line 14 has been executed $0.01n^2$ times. Say $|\mathcal{P}| = 0$ if a Hamilton cycle has been constructed. The i^{th} time line 9 is executed the number of paths in \mathcal{P} may be increased by at most $6|S_i|$ (see Observation 2.5). On the other hand $X_j = 1$ implies a decrease in $|\mathcal{P}|$ the j^{th} time line 13 is executed. If CerHam2 exits the while-loop then $|\mathcal{P}| > 0$ throughout the algorithm and as initially $|\mathcal{P}| = n$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< n + \sum_{i=1}^t 6s_i - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i = n + 6s_0t + 6 \sum_{i=1}^t (s_i - s_0) - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \\ &\leq n + 6s_0t + 6 \sum_{i=1}^t 2^{-i+t} (s_t - s_0) - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i \leq n + 6s_0t + 12s_t - \sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i. \end{aligned}$$

□

3.1 The upper range

Let $p \geq \frac{1000 \log n}{n}$ and $G \sim G(n, p)$. We execute $\text{CerHam2}(G, K, S)$ with $K = S = \emptyset$. For the analysis of this regime we define the following events.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}'_{exp} &= \{\exists S \subset [n] \text{ with size in } [0.02n, 0.27n] \text{ such that } |N_{G \cap H_n}(S)| < 2|S|\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_{count} &= \{\text{count reaches the value of } 0.01n^2\} \end{aligned}$$

and

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

Lemma 3.2. *If*

$$O\left(n^3 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}) + n^5\right) = O(n^7) \quad (8)$$

then the expected running time of CerHam2 is $O(n^7)$.

Proof. Lemma 3.1 implies that $t \leq \log n$ and therefore CerHam2 may execute at most $\log n + 0.01n^2$ times line 4. 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 CerHam2 in the event that it never proceeds to line 6 and it does not exit the while-loop.

In the event $\mathcal{E}'_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}$ the algorithm may exit the while loop. Before exiting the while loop it may reach line 5 at most n times, each time spending at most $O(n^2 2^n)$ time at lines 5 to 9. After exiting the while-loop it executes Held-Karp whose complexity is $O(n^2 2^n)$. Thus, in the event $\mathcal{E}'_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}$ CerHam2 runs in $O(n^3 2^n)$ time.

On the other hand, if none of \mathcal{E}'_{count} , \mathcal{E}_{exp} occurs then $|S_i| \leq 0.02n$ for $0 \leq i \leq t$ and $\text{count} \leq 0.01n^2$. The inequality $|S_i| \leq 0.02n$ follows from the fact that while $|S_i| \leq 0.02n$ the algorithm will not search for larger sets to add to S_i at line 7 and it will never add to it a set of size larger than $0.25n$ at line 6. Thus if a set W is added by CerHam to S_i then $|W| \leq 0.25n$ and $|N_{G \cap H_n}(W) \setminus S_i| \leq |N_{G_R}(W) \setminus S_i| < 2|W|$. In addition, by Lemma 3.1, $|N_{G \cap H_n}(S_i)| < 2|S_i|$ and hence $|N_{G \cap H_n}(S_i \cup W)| \leq 2|S_i \cup W|$ and $|S_i \cup W| \leq 0.02n + 0.25n \leq 0.27n$ and as \mathcal{E}'_{exp} does not occur we have that $|S_i \cup W| \leq 0.02n$.

Thus, if none of \mathcal{E}'_{count} , \mathcal{E}_{exp} occurs and we let $j = |S_t|$ then $0 \leq j \leq 0.02n$ and the event $\mathcal{A}'_j \setminus (\mathcal{E}'_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count})$ occurs. In the event $\mathcal{A}'_j \setminus (\mathcal{E}'_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count})$ CerHam2 may execute lines 6-10 at most n times each running in $O(\sum_{\ell=1}^j \binom{n}{\ell}) = O(n \binom{n}{j})$ time yielding a total running time for lines 6-10 of $O(n^2 \binom{n}{j})$.

Equation (8) follows from the fact that at least one of the events $\mathcal{E}'_{exp}, \mathcal{E}_{count}, \{\mathcal{A}'_j\}_{j=0}^{0.02n}$ occurs. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Equation (8) holds.*

Proof. In the event \mathcal{E}'_{exp} we can find disjoint sets $A, B \subset [n]$ of size $0.02n$ and $(1 - 0.27 \cdot 3)n = 0.19n$ such that no edge from A to B belongs to G . Thus,

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

In the event $\mathcal{E}_{count} \setminus \mathcal{E}'_{exp}$ (7) implies that $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n^2} X_i < n + 12 \cdot 0.02n \leq 1.3n$. For $1 \leq i \leq 0.01n^2$, $X_i = 1$ with probability p independently of X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{i-1} . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{count} \setminus \mathcal{E}'_{exp}) &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{1.3n} \binom{0.01n^2}{j} p^j (1-p)^{0.01n^2-j} \leq n \left(\frac{0.01n^2 p e}{1.3n} \right)^{1.3n} e^{-0.009pn^2} \\ &\leq n \left(n p e^{-0.006pn} \right)^{1.3n} \leq n \left(1000 \log n e^{-6 \log n} \right)^{1.3n} < 2^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $j \leq 0.02n$, in the event $\mathcal{A}'_j \setminus (\mathcal{E}'_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count})$ one may identify sets S and W of size j and $2j$ respectively such that $N_{G \cap H_n}(S) \subset W$. As H_n has minimum degree $0.1n$, there are at least $(0.1n - 0.06n) \cdot j$ edges from S to $[n] \setminus (S \cup W)$ in H_n none of which belongs to G . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} n^2 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}'_j \setminus (\mathcal{E}'_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count})) &\leq n^2 \binom{n}{j} \binom{n}{j} \binom{n}{2j} (1-p)^{0.04jn} \leq n^2 \left(\frac{en}{j} \right)^{4j} e^{-0.04jpn} \\ &\leq n^2 (en^4 e^{-0.04np})^j \leq n^2 (en^4 e^{-40 \log n})^j = O(n^2). \end{aligned}$$

(8) follows. \square

3.2 The middle range

We now let $\frac{1000 \log \log n}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{1000 \log n}{n}$. We run the coloring process described at Subsection 2.4 and let $K = V_{5,red}(G \cap H_n)$. Let $S = \emptyset$. If $|K| \geq \frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}$ then while there exists a set $W \subset [n]$ of size at most $|K \cup S|$ such that $|N_{G \cap H_n}(W) \setminus (K \cup S)| < 2|W|$ and $W \cup (N_{G \cap H_n}(W) \setminus (K \cup S))$ is connected add W to S . We then execute CerHam2(G, K, S).

For the the analysis of CerHam2 in the regime $\frac{2000}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{1000 \log \log n}{n}$ we use the events $\mathcal{E}_{red,s}, \mathcal{E}_{exp}, \mathcal{A}_i$ and \mathcal{B}_i , defined in Lemma 2.8. We also use the event \mathcal{E}_{count} defined in the previous subsection.

In place of Lemma 3.2 we have the following one.

Lemma 3.4. *If*

$$\begin{aligned} O \left(n^3 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count} \cup \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} 2^j n^3 \log n \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j \setminus \mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}) \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{i} \Pr(|S \cup K| = i \setminus \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) + n^5 \right) = O(n^7) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

then the expected running time of CerHam2 is $O(n^7)$.

Proof. Similarly to the proof of (4) we have that $|N_{G \cap H_n}(S \setminus K)| < 2|S \setminus K|$. Thus (6) implies that $|N_{G \cap H_n}(S_t \setminus K)| < 2|S_t \setminus K|$ and the event $\mathcal{A}_{|S_t|}$ occurs.

The term $O\left(\sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}) + \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{i} \Pr(|S \cup K| = i \setminus \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) + n^5\right)$ accounts for the expected time complexity of constructing the set S in the event that none of \mathcal{E}_{exp} and $\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$ occurs. If one of $\mathcal{E}_{exp}, \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$ occurs then the complexity of the corresponding step is $O(n^3 2^n)$. The term $O(2^j n^3 \log n \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j \setminus \mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}))$ is a sharper upper bound on the total complexity of line 9 (recall line 9 is executed at most $t \leq \log n$ times). The rest of the terms in (9) are justified as in the proof of Lemma 3.2. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Equation (9) holds.*

Proof. Lemma 2.8 states that for $s \leq 0.01n, i \leq 0.02n$ and $j \leq 0.09n$,

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

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

Therefore,

$$O\left(n^3 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} 2^j n^3 \log n \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j) + n^5\right) = O(n^7).$$

If $\mathcal{E}_{exp}, \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$ do not occur and $|S \cup K| \geq \frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}$ then

$$|N_{G \cap H_n}(K \cup S)| \leq |N_{G \cap H_n}(K)| + |N_{G \cap H_n}(S) \setminus K| \leq 5|K| + 2|S| \leq 5|K \cup S|.$$

In addition Lemma 2.6 implies that 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,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} n \binom{n}{i} \Pr(|S \cup K| = i \setminus \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) &\leq \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} n \binom{n}{i} \binom{n}{i} \binom{n}{5i} (1-p)^{0.07in} \\ &\leq n \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} \left(\frac{n^7}{i^7} e^{-0.07pn} \right)^i \leq n \sum_{i=\frac{n}{10 \log_2 n}}^{0.02n} \left((10 \log n)^7 e^{-70 \log \log n} \right)^i = O(n^2). \end{aligned}$$

Now if the event $(\neg \mathcal{E}_{exp}) \wedge (\neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \left\{ |S \cup K| < \frac{n}{10 \log_2 n} \right\}$ occurs then the equations $t \leq \log_2 n$ and (7) imply that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n} X^i < 1.3n + 6 \log_2 n \cdot \frac{n}{10 \log_2 n} < 2n.$$

Else if the event $(\neg \mathcal{E}_{exp}) \wedge (\neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \left\{ |S \cup K| \geq \frac{n}{10 \log_2 n} \right\}$ occurs then due the construction of S we have that $S_1 \geq \max\{|K|, |S|\} \geq 0.5|S_0|$; hence by Lemma 3.1

$$t \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{|S_t|}{0.5|S_0|} \right) \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{0.02n}{0.5|S_0|} \right)$$

and once again from (7) it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n} X^i < 1.3n + 6n \cdot \max \left\{ x \log_2 \left(\frac{0.1}{x} \right) : 0 \leq x \leq 0.02 \right\} < 2n.$$

Hence,

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

(9) follows. \square

3.3 The lower range

Let $\frac{2000}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{1000 \log \log n}{n}$ and $c = c(p, n) = np \geq 2000$. We run the coloring process described at Subsection 2.4 and let $K = V_{5,red}(G \cap H_n)$. Let $S = \emptyset$. If $|K| \leq \frac{n}{c^2}$ then while there exists a set $W \subset [n]$ of size at most $\max\{|S|, e^{-2c}n\}$ such that $|N_{G \cap H_n}(W) \setminus (K \cup S)| < 2|W|$ and $W \cup (N_{G \cap H_n}(W) \setminus (K \cup S))$ is connected add W to S . Else if $|K| > \frac{n}{c^2}$ then while there exists a set $W \subset [n]$ of size at most $\max\{|S|, \frac{n}{c^2}\}$ such that $|N_{G \cap H_n}(W) \setminus (K \cup S)| < 2|W|$ and $W \cup (N_{G \cap H_n}(W) \setminus (K \cup S))$ is connected add W to S . We then execute $\text{CerHam2}(G, K, S)$.

In addition to the events that we defined in the previous subsection we define the events

$$\mathcal{E}_1 = \left\{ |K| \leq \frac{n}{c^2} \right\}, \mathcal{E}_2 = \left\{ \frac{n}{c^2} < |K| \leq \frac{20n}{c} \right\}, \mathcal{E}_3 = \left\{ \frac{20n}{c} < |K| \right\} \text{ and } \mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2} = \{\delta(G) \geq 2\}.$$

Recall that if $\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}$ does not occur then CertifyHAM does not run CerHam2 while Lemma 2.9 states that $\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}) \leq ne^{-1.1n^2pe^{-1.1np}} + 2^{-n}$.

In place of Lemma 3.4 we have the following one.

Lemma 3.6. *If*

$$\begin{aligned} & O \left(n^3 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count} \cup \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n} \cup \mathcal{E}_3) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}) \right. \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} 2^j n^3 \log n \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j \setminus \mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}) + \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{n}{c^2}} n^2 \binom{n}{ne^{-2c}} \Pr(|K| = i, \mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}) \\ & \left. + \sum_{i=\frac{n}{c^2}+1}^{\frac{20n}{c}} n^2 \binom{n}{\frac{n}{c^2}} \Pr(|K| = i) + n^5 \right) = O(n^7), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

then the expected running time of CerHam2 is $O(n^7)$.

Proof. The terms in (10) that do not appear in (9) together with the term $O(\sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}))$ account for the expected time complexity of constructing the sets K and S in the event \mathcal{E}_{exp} and $\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}$ do not occur. The rest of the terms in (10) are justified as in the proof of Lemma 3.4. \square

Lemma 3.7. *Equation (10) holds.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 3.5 we have that,

$$O\left(n^3 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} n^2 \binom{n}{j} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_j \setminus \mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count}) + \sum_{j=0}^{0.02n} 2^j n^3 \log n \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j \setminus \mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{count})\right) = O(n^7).$$

In the event that $|K| \geq i$ the event $\mathcal{E}_{red,i}$ occurs. Therefore Lemma 2.8 implies,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=\frac{n}{c^2}+1}^{\frac{20n}{c}} n^2 \binom{n}{\frac{n}{c^2}} \Pr(|K| = i) + n^3 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_3) \\ & \leq n^2 (ec^2)^{\frac{n}{c^2}} (0.1^5 e^7 c^7 e^{-0.09c})^{\frac{n}{c^2}} + n^3 2^n (20^{-1} 0.1^5 e^7 c^6 e^{-0.09c})^{\frac{20n}{c}} \\ & \leq n^2 (c^9 e^{-0.09c})^{\frac{n}{c^2}} + n^3 2^n (c^6 e^{-0.05c})^{\frac{20n}{c}} \cdot e^{-0.8n} \leq n^2 (2000^9 e^{-180})^{\frac{n}{c^2}} + (2000^6 e^{-100})^{\frac{20n}{c}} = O(n^2). \end{aligned}$$

Thereafter,

$$\begin{aligned} n^2 \binom{n}{ne^{-2c}} \Pr(|K| = i, \mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}) & \leq n^2 e^{(2c+1)e^{-2c}n} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{\delta \geq 2}) \leq n^2 e^{(2c+1)e^{-2c}n} \left(ne^{-1.1ce^{-1.1c}n} + 2^{-n} \right) \\ & \leq n^3 e^{ce^{-1.1c}n} e^{-1.1ce^{-1.1c}n} + O(1) = O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Now in the event $(\neg \mathcal{E}_{exp}) \wedge (\neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \{|K| \leq \frac{n}{c^2}\} \wedge \{|S| < |K|\}$, due the construction of S , we have that $|S_1 \setminus S_0| \geq e^{-2c}n$ and $|S_0| \leq 2|K| \leq \frac{2n}{c^2}$. Hence $t \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{0.02n}{e^{-2c}n} \right) \leq 2c \log^{-1} 2$, which implies that $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n} X^i < 1.3n + 12t \cdot 2|K| < 2n$.

On the other hand in the event $(\neg \mathcal{E}_{exp}) \wedge (\neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \{\frac{n}{c^2} < |K| \leq \frac{20n}{c}\} \wedge \{|S| < |K|\}$, we have that $|S_1 \setminus S_0| \geq \frac{n}{c^2}$ and $t \leq \log_2(0.02c^2) \leq 3 \log c$, which once again implies that $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n} X^i < 1.3n + 12t|K| < 2n$.

Finally in the event $(\neg \mathcal{E}_{exp}) \wedge (\neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \wedge \mathcal{E}_{count} \wedge \{\frac{20n}{c} < |K|\} \wedge \{|S| \geq |K|\}$ we have that, due the construction of S , $|S_1 \setminus S_0| \geq |S| \geq 0.5|S_0|$. Hence $t \leq \log_2 \left(\frac{0.02n}{0.5|S_0|} \right)$ and $|S| \leq 2|S_0|$ implying that $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n} X^i < 1.3n + 24t|S_0| < 1.3n + 12t|S| < 2n$.

In all 3 cases we have $\sum_{i=1}^{0.01n} X^i < 2n$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{count} \setminus (\mathcal{E}_{exp} \cup \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n})) & \leq \Pr(\text{Bin}(0.01n^2, p) < 2n) \leq \Pr\left(\text{Bin}\left(0.01n^2, \frac{2000}{n}\right) < 2n\right) \\ & \leq 2n \binom{0.01n^2}{2n} \left(\frac{2000}{n}\right)^{2n} \left(1 - \frac{2000}{n}\right)^{0.01n^2 - \frac{2000}{n}} \leq 2n(100e)^{2n} e^{-19n} \leq e^{-5n} \leq 2^{-n}. \end{aligned}$$

(10) follows. □

4 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 $p \geq \frac{2000}{n}$. The value $p = \frac{2000}{n}$ is not

optimised; however we believe that new ideas are needed to extend it pass the value $\frac{100}{n}$. The space complexity of CeritfyHAM is $O(\sqrt{n}2^n)$ as it implements the Held-Karp algorithm as a subroutine. In the range $p \geq \frac{2000}{n}$ one may substitute Held-Karp with the algorithm given by Gurevich and Shelah in [11] that solves HAM and has $O(n^2 2^{2n})$ and $O(n)$ time and space complexity respectively. This will yield an algorithm that solve HAM in $O(\frac{n}{p})$ expected time whose space complexity is $O(n^2)$. This last statement can be proven using the proof of Theorem 1.1 with minor modifications.

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 for every vertex $v \in [n]$ we are given a random permutation of its neighbors via a list $L(v)$ (see [2], [5], [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 that is given in the form of randomly ordered adjacency lists for $p \geq \frac{2000}{n}$.

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*, 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] Michael Anastos and Alan Frieze. A scaling limit for the length of the longest cycle in a sparse random graph. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 148:184–208, 2021.
- [5] 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.
- [6] Richard Bellman. Dynamic programming treatment of the travelling salesman problem. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 9(1):61–63, 1962.
- [7] Andrej Bogdanov and Luca Trevisan. Average-case complexity. *arXiv preprint cs/0606037*, 2006.
- [8] Béla Bollobás. The evolution of sparse graphs, graph theory and combinatorics, 1984. *MR*, 777163(2):35–57, 1984.
- [9] Alan Frieze. Hamilton cycles in random graphs: a bibliography. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.07139*, 2019.
- [10] Alan Frieze and Michal Karoński. *Introduction to random graphs*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.

- [11] Yuri Gurevich and Saharon Shelah. Expected computation time for hamiltonian path problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 16(3):486–502, 1987.
- [12] 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.
- [13] Richard M Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In *Complexity of computer computations*, pages 85–103. Springer, 1972.
- [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 pseudo-random 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 $U, W \subseteq V(G)$,*

$$\left| e(U, W) - \frac{d|U||W|}{n} \right| \leq \lambda \sqrt{|U||W| \left(1 - \frac{|U|}{n}\right) \left(1 - \frac{|W|}{n}\right)}. \quad (11)$$

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 [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 a 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 the graph H_n 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. 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 $(q^2, kq, (k - 1)(k - 2) + q - 2, k(k - 1))$, for some $k \in [0.1q, 0.1002q]$. Thus, as $|(k - 1)(k - 2) + q - 2 - k(k - 1)| \leq q$, Lemma A.1 implies that H''_n has only 3 distinct eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$ with $\lambda_1 = kq$ and $|\lambda_2|, |\lambda_3| = O(q) = O(\sqrt{n})$. Hence (11) implies that for every pair of disjoint subsets U, W of $[n]$

$$\left| e_{H''_n}(U, W) - \frac{k|U||W|}{n} \right| = O(n^{3/2}). \quad (12)$$

As k is the smallest integer larger than $0.1001q$ for significantly large n we have that $k \leq 0.1002q$. Taking $U = S_n$ and $W = V(H''_n) \setminus U$ in (12) we get that $|S_n|$ 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 $O(n^{3/2})$ added edges we have that there exists $O(n^{1/2})$ such vertices. \square

A.2 A coloring process

Here we prove the following Lemma stated earlier at Subsection 2.4.

Lemma A.4. *Let $\frac{2000}{n} \leq p$ and $G \sim G(n, p)$. For $i, j, s \in \mathbb{N}$ define the following events,*

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

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

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

and

$$\mathcal{B}_j := \{ \text{there exists a set } W \subset [n] \text{ of size at most } 0.02n \text{ and a subgraph } G_R \text{ of } G \\ \text{with the property that } |N_{G \cap H_n}(W) \setminus V_{5,red}| < 2|W| \text{ and} \\ W \cup V_{5,red}(G) \cup N_G(V_{5,red}(G) \cup W) \text{ spans a component of size } j \text{ in } G_R\}.$$

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.

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,s}) \leq \left(\frac{e^7(0.1np)^5 e^{-0.09npn}}{s} \right)^s, \quad \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}) \leq 2^{-n}, \quad (13)$$

$$\binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) = O(n) \quad \text{and} \quad 2^j \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j) = O(n). \quad (14)$$

Proof. Let $\frac{n}{\log^2 n} \leq s \leq 0.01n$. Observe that at each step of the coloring process at Subsection 2.4 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 set of black vertices. If $\frac{n}{\log^2 n} \leq s \leq 0.01n$ then Lemma 2.6 implies that there exists at least $0.1s(n-6s) - n^{7/4} \geq 0.093sn$ edges from the red to the black vertices in H_n , none of which belongs to G . Thereafter either $i \leq n^{4/5}$ or there exists at most $0.102is$ edges between the red and blue vertices in H_n out of which at least i belong to G . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,s}) &\leq \sum_{i=n^{4/5}}^{5s} \binom{n}{s+i} \binom{s+i}{s} s^i (0.102p)^i (1-p)^{0.093sn} + \binom{n}{s} \binom{n}{n^{4/5}} (1-p)^{0.093sn} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=n^{4/5}}^{5s} \left(\frac{en}{s+i} \right)^{s+i} \left(\frac{e(s+i)}{s} \right)^s s^i (0.102p)^i e^{-0.093nps} + \left(\frac{en}{s} \right)^s e^{-0.092nps} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=n^{4/5}}^{5s} \left(\frac{e^2 n}{s} \right)^s e^i (0.102np)^i e^{-0.093nps} + \left(\frac{en}{s} \right)^s e^{-0.092nps} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq n \left(\frac{e^7 n}{s} \right)^s (0.1np)^{5s} e^{-0.091nps} + \left(\frac{en}{s} \right)^s e^{-0.092nps} \leq \left(\frac{e^7 (0.1np)^5 e^{-0.09npn}}{s} \right)^s.$$

Lemma 2.6 implies that between any pair of two disjoint sets $A, B \subset [n]$ of linear size there exists at least $(0.1 + o(1))|A||B|$ edges in H_n . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}) &\leq \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \binom{n}{s+2s+0.05n} \binom{s+2s+0.05n}{2s} \binom{s+0.05n}{s} (1-p)^{(0.1+o(1))s(n-3s-0.05n)} \\ &\leq \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \left(\frac{en}{s+2s+0.05n} \right)^{s+2s+0.05n} 3^{s+2s+0.05n} e^{-(0.1+o(1))sp(n-3s-0.05n)} \\ &\leq \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \left(\frac{en}{s} \right)^{s+2s+0.05n} e^{-(0.1+o(1))sp(n-3s-0.05n)} \\ &= \sum_{s=0.02n}^{0.27n} \exp \left\{ n \left[\left(\frac{3s}{n} + 0.05 \right) \left(1 + \log \left(\frac{n}{s} \right) \right) - (200 + o(1)) \left(\frac{s}{n} \right) \left(1 - \frac{3s}{n} - 0.05 \right) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $f(x) = (3x + 0.05)(1 - \log(x)) - 200x(1 - 3x - 0.05)$. Then $f''(x) > 0$. Thus $f(x)$ has a unique minimum which implies that $\max\{f(x) : x \in [0.02, 0.27]\} = \max\{f(0.02), f(0.27)\} \leq -3$. Therefore,

$$\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{exp}) \leq ne^{-3n} \leq 2^{-n}.$$

Now let $i \leq 0.02n$. In the event \mathcal{A}_i there exists a set $S \subset [n] \setminus V_{5,red}$ of size i such that $|N_{G \cup H_n}(S) \setminus V_{5,red}| < 2|S|$. In addition each vertex of S has at least 6 neighbors in $[n] \setminus V_{5,red}(G \cap H_n)$ and therefore $S \cup N_{G \cap H_n}(S)$ spans at least $3|S| + |N_{G \cup H_n}(S)|/2 \geq 2|S| + |N_{G \cap H_n}(S)|$ edges. Thereafter if we let C_1, C_2, \dots, C_ℓ be the components of the subgraph of $G \cap H_n$ induced by V_{red} then a number of them is connected to S in $N_{G \cap H_n}(S)$ 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 $r' = |N_{G \cap H_n}(C_r) \setminus S| \leq 5r$. All the above yield a set of vertices W of size $i + j + r + r'$ 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 $G \cap H_n$. Lemma 2.6 implies that if $i + r \leq 0.03n$ then there exists at least $0.09(i + r)n$ edges from Z to $[n] \setminus W$ in $G \cap H_n$. The number of ways to determine such a pair of sets, with $j \leq 2i$, is at most

$$\begin{aligned} &\binom{n}{i+j+r+r'} \binom{i+j+r+r'}{i+r} \binom{\binom{i+j+r+r'}{2}}{i+j+r+r'} \binom{\binom{i+j}{2}}{i} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{en}{i+j+r+r'} \right)^{i+j+r+r'} 2^{i+j+r+r'} \left(\frac{e(i+j+r+r')}{2} \right)^{i+j+r+r'} \left(\frac{e(i+j)}{2} \right)^i \\ &\leq (e^2 n)^{i+j+r+r'} (5i)^i \end{aligned}$$

(13) implies that $\Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \leq 2^{-n}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) &\leq \binom{n}{i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i \setminus \mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) + 2^n \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,0.01n}) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{en}{i} \right)^i \sum_{j=0}^{2i} \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} \sum_{r'=0}^{5r} (e^2 n)^{i+j+r+r'} (2i)^i p^{2i+j+r+r'} (1-p)^{0.09(i+r)n} + 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 2 \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} (e^2 np)^{2i+6r} (2enp)^i e^{-0.09(i+r)pn} + 1 \leq 2 \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} (e^2 np)^{6(i+r)} e^{-0.09(i+r)pn} + 1 \leq 2.$$

Finally let $1 \leq j \leq 0.09n$. Let \mathcal{F}_j be the event that some \mathcal{A}_i occurs with $0.1j \leq i \leq j$. The above calculations imply,

$$2^j \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j \wedge \mathcal{F}_j \wedge (\neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0,01n})) \leq \sum_{i=0.1j}^j 2^{10i} \Pr(\mathcal{A}_i) \leq \sum_{i=0.1j}^j \sum_{r=0}^{0.01n} 2^{10i} (e^2 np)^{6(i+r)} e^{-0.09(i+r)pn} = O(n).$$

On the other hand in the event $\mathcal{B}_j \wedge (\neg \mathcal{F}_j) \wedge (\neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0,01n})$ at least a 0.1 portion of the component in question belongs to $V_{5,red}$. Let S be the set of these vertices. Then there exists a set $T \supseteq S$ such that T is connected in G and no vertex in S has a neighbor outside T in $G \cap H_n$. Parts (a) and (b) of Lemma 2.6 imply that there exists at least $(0.1 + o(1))|S|(n - |T|) \geq 0.009jn$ edges from S to $[n] \setminus T$ in H_n none of which belongs to G . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 2^j \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j \wedge (\neg \mathcal{F}_j) \wedge (\neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0,01n})) &\leq 2^j \sum_{i=0.1j}^j \binom{n}{j} j^{j-2} p^{j-1} (1-p)^{0.009jn} \\ &\leq j 2^j \left(\frac{en}{j}\right)^j p^{j-1} e^{-0.009jpn} \leq n(enp)^j e^{-0.009jpn} = O(n) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$2^j \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j) \leq 2^j \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j \wedge \mathcal{F}_j \wedge (\neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0,01n})) + 2^j \Pr(\mathcal{B}_j \wedge (\neg \mathcal{F}_j) \wedge (\neg \mathcal{E}_{red,0,01n})) + 2^j \Pr(\mathcal{E}_{red,0,01n}) = O(n).$$

□

A.3 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 [10], Chapter 11). Therefore,

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

Lemma A.5. Let $\frac{2000}{n} \leq p \leq \frac{1000 \log \log n}{n}$ and $G \sim G(n, p)$. Then,

$$\Pr(\delta(G(n, p)) \geq 2) \leq n e^{-1.1n^2 p e^{-1.1np}} + 2^{-n}. \quad (15)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(\delta(G(n, p)) \geq 2) &\leq \Pr(|E(G(n, p))| \geq 0.55n^2p) + \sum_{i=0}^{0.55n^2p} \Pr(\delta(G(n, p)) \geq 2 | |E(G(n, p))| = i) \\
&\leq \Pr(\text{Bin}(0.5n(n-1), p) \geq 0.55n^2p) + \sum_{i=0}^{0.55n^2p} \Pr(\delta(G(n, i)) \geq 2) \\
&\leq 2^{-n} + n^2 \Pr(\delta(G(n, 0.55n^2p)) \geq 2) \leq 2^{-n} + n^2 e^{-1.1n^2pe^{-1.1np}}.
\end{aligned}$$

At the third line we used the Chernoff bound to deduce that

$$\Pr(\text{Bin}(0.5n(n-1), p) \geq 0.55n^2p) \leq e^{-\frac{0.1^2 \cdot 0.5n(n-1)p}{3}} \leq e^{-n}$$

and the fact that $\Pr(\delta(G(n, i)) \geq 2)$ is decreasing with respect to i . □