

The global resilience of Hamiltonicity in $G(n, p)$

Yahav Alon *

August 4, 2022

Abstract

Denote by $r_g(G, \mathcal{H})$ the *global resilience* of a graph G with respect to Hamiltonicity. That is, $r_g(G, \mathcal{H})$ is the minimal r for which there exists a subgraph $H \subseteq G$ with r edges, such that $G \setminus H$ is not Hamiltonian. We show that if p is above the Hamiltonicity threshold and $G \sim G(n, p)$ then, with high probability, $r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) = \delta(G) - 1$. This is easily extended to the full interval: for every $p(n) \in [0, 1]$, if $G \sim G(n, p)$ then, with high probability, $r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) = \max\{0, \delta(G) - 1\}$.

1 Introduction

Let \mathcal{P} be a monotone increasing graph property. For a graph G , we define the *global resilience* of G with respect to \mathcal{P} , denoted $r_g(G, \mathcal{P})$, as follows.

$$r_g(G, \mathcal{P}) := \min \{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists H \subseteq G : e(H) = m, G \setminus H \text{ is not in } \mathcal{P}\}.$$

That is, $r_g(G, \mathcal{P})$ is the minimal number of edge removals from G such that the resulting graph does not satisfy \mathcal{P} . This notion serves as a measure of how “strongly” G satisfies the property \mathcal{P} , by its distance from the closest graph outside of \mathcal{P} . It is by no means a new notion, and many long standing results in extremal graph theory can be expressed by it. For example, the extremal number $\text{ex}(n, G)$ can be expressed as $\binom{n}{2} - r_g(K_n, \mathcal{P}_G)$, where \mathcal{P}_G denotes the property of containing a copy of G as a subgraph. Turán’s theorem can now be stated as: for every $n \geq r \geq 3$ integers, $r_g(K_n, \mathcal{P}_{K_r}) = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \frac{n^2}{2(r-1)}$.

We denote by \mathcal{H} the property of Hamiltonicity. It is trivial to see that, for every graph G with $\delta(G) \geq 1$, one has $r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) \leq \delta(G) - 1$. Indeed, one can ensure that $G \setminus H$ contains no Hamilton cycle by having H contain all the edges incident in G to some vertex $v \in V(G)$ but one. By choosing v to be a vertex with minimum degree, this trivial bound is achieved.

In this paper we show that this trivial upper bound is, in fact, the typical exact value of $r_g(G, \mathcal{H})$ when G is a random graph, by proving the following theorem.¹

Theorem 1. *Let $G \sim G(n, p)$, where $p = p(n)$ satisfies $np - \log n - \log \log n \rightarrow \infty$. Then with high probability $r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) = \delta(G) - 1$.*

Ore [9] proved that every n -vertex graph with at least $\binom{n-1}{2} + 2$ edges is Hamiltonian. Restated in terms of the global resilience, this implies that $r_g(K_n, \mathcal{H}) = n - 2$, and thus the theorem holds for $p = 1$.

To cover the complete range of p , the following corollary is easily derived from Theorem 1.

*School of Mathematical Sciences, Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 6997801, Israel. Email: yahavalo@tauex.tau.ac.il.

¹Here and later the logarithms have natural base.

Corollary 1. *Let $p(n) \in [0, 1]$ and $G \sim G(n, p)$. Then with high probability $r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) = \max\{0, \delta(G) - 1\}$.*

Proof. Consider separately three ranges of p :

Sub-critical: if $np - \log n - \log \log n \rightarrow -\infty$, then with high probability $\delta(G) = 0$ and G is not Hamiltonian, and therefore $r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) = 0 = \max\{0, \delta(G) - 1\}$.

Critical: if $np - \log n - \log \log n \rightarrow c$, then with high probability either $\delta(G) \leq 1$, or $\delta(G) = 2$ and G is Hamiltonian (a consequence of Ajtai, Komlós, Szemerédi [1], Bollobás [4]). In the first case indeed $r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) = 0 = \max\{0, \delta(G) - 1\}$. In the second case, because G is Hamiltonian, $1 \leq r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) \leq \delta(G) - 1$, as this is true for every Hamiltonian graph. But in this case $\max\{0, \delta(G) - 1\} = 1$ and therefore indeed $r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) = \max\{0, \delta(G) - 1\}$.

Super-critical: the case $np - \log n - \log \log n \rightarrow \infty$ is covered by Theorem 1, since in the super-critical regime, with high probability, $\max\{0, \delta(G) - 1\} = \delta(G) - 1$.

□

Related work

The *local resilience* of a property is a similar notion of resilience, that, with respect to Hamiltonicity in random graphs, has been more thoroughly studied. Denote by $r_\ell(G, \mathcal{P})$ the local resilience of G with respect to \mathcal{P} , defined as the minimal value of m such that there is a graph H with $\Delta(H) \leq m$, and $G \setminus H$ does not satisfy \mathcal{P} . Sudakov and Vu [12] showed that there is $C > 0$ such that, for every $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$, if $p \geq \frac{C \log^{2+\delta} n}{n}$ then with high probability $r_\ell(G(n, p), \mathcal{H}) \geq (1/2 - \varepsilon)np$. Closer to the Hamiltonicity threshold, Ben-Shimon, Krivelevich and Sudakov [3] showed that if $p \leq \frac{1.02 \log n}{n}$ is above the Hamiltonicity threshold then, with high probability, $r_\ell(G(n, p), \mathcal{H}) = \delta(G) - 1$. Since it is always true that $r_\ell(G, \mathcal{P}) \leq r_g(G, \mathcal{P})$, an immediate consequence of this is that Theorem 1 holds when $p \leq \frac{1.02 \log n}{n}$.

One can also consider measures of resilience where the limitations on the degrees of the subtracted subgraph H depend on the degrees of G . Lee and Sudakov [6] showed that for every $\varepsilon > 0$, if $C > 0$ is large enough with respect to ε , $p \geq \frac{C \log n}{n}$ and $G \sim G(n, p)$ then, with high probability, $G \setminus H$ is Hamiltonian for every $H \subseteq G$ such that $\delta(G \setminus H) \geq (1/2 + \varepsilon)np$. Another notion of local resilience one can consider is α -resilience. We say that G is α -resilient with respect to \mathcal{P} if $G \setminus H$ has \mathcal{P} for every $H \subseteq G$ such that $d_H(v) \leq \alpha \cdot d_G(v)$ for every $v \in V(G)$. Montgomery [7], and independently Nenadov, Steger and Trujić [8] showed that in the *random graph process* model $\{G_m\}_{m \geq 0}$, if m is past the hitting time of Hamiltonicity then, with high probability, G_m is $(1/2 - \varepsilon)$ -resilient. Nenadov et al. additionally extended this result below the hitting time, and showed that the 2-core of G_m is also $(1/2 - \varepsilon)$ -resilient with respect to Hamiltonicity with high probability, given that $m \geq (1/6 + \varepsilon)n \log n$.

For further reading on various measures of resilience of graph properties we refer to Sudakov's survey on the subject [11].

Alon and Krivelevich [2] proved that for $G \sim G(n, p)$, p above the Hamiltonicity threshold, one has $\mathbb{P}(G \notin \mathcal{H}) = (1 + o(1)) \cdot \mathbb{P}(\delta(G) < 2)$. Informally, this result suggests that the greatest obstacle (probability-wise) for a random graph to be Hamiltonian is the minimum degree. In a sense, Theorem 1 shows something similar, by showing that, with high probability, the nearest non-Hamiltonian graph to G indeed has minimum degree less than 2.

2 Preliminaries

The following graph theoretic notation is used. For a graph $G = (V, E)$ and two disjoint vertex subsets $U, W \subseteq V$, we let $E_G(U, W)$ denote the set of edges of G adjacent to exactly one vertex from U and one vertex from W , and let $e_G(U, W) = |E_G(U, W)|$. Similarly, $E_G(U)$ denotes the set of edges spanned by a subset U of V , and $e_G(U)$ stands for $|E_G(U)|$, and $E_G(v)$ denotes $E_G(\{v\}, V \setminus \{v\})$. The (external) neighbourhood of a vertex subset U , denoted by $N_G(U)$, is the set of vertices in $V \setminus U$ adjacent to a vertex of U , and for a vertex $v \in V$ we set $N_G(v) = N_G(\{v\})$. The degree of a vertex $v \in V$, denoted by $d_G(v)$, is its number of incident edges.

We suppress the rounding notation occasionally to simplify the presentation.

Auxiliary results

Definition 2.1. Let $\alpha > 0$ and k a positive integer. A graph G is a (k, α) -expander if $|N_G(U)| \geq \alpha|U|$ for every vertex subset $U \subset V(G)$, $|U| \leq k$.

Definition 2.2. Let G be a graph. A non-edge $(u, v) \in E(G)$ is called a booster if the graph G' with edge set $E(G') = E(G) \cup \{(u, v)\}$ is either Hamiltonian or has a path longer than a longest path of G .

Lemma 2.1. (Pósa 1976 [10]) Let G be a connected non-Hamiltonian graph, and assume that G is a $(k, 2)$ -expander. Then G has at least $\frac{(k+1)^2}{2}$ boosters.

Definition 2.3. A graph G is Hamilton-connected if for every two vertices $u, v \in V(G)$, G contains a Hamilton path with u, v as its two endpoints.

Theorem 2. (Chvátal–Erdős Theorem [5]) Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph such that $\alpha(G) < \kappa(G)$. Then G is Hamilton-connected.

Useful inequalities

Lemma 2.2. Let $1 \leq l \leq k \leq n$ be integers. Then the following inequalities hold:

1. $\binom{n}{k} \leq \left(\frac{en}{k}\right)^k$;
2. $\frac{\binom{n-l}{k}}{\binom{n}{k}} \leq e^{-\frac{l \cdot k}{n}}$.

Lemma 2.3. Let $1 \leq k \leq n$ be integers, $0 < p < 1$, and let $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$. Then the following inequalities hold:

1. $\mathbb{P}(X \geq k) \leq \left(\frac{enp}{k}\right)^k$;
2. $\mathbb{P}(X = k) \leq \left(\frac{enp}{k(1-p)}\right)^k \cdot e^{-np}$.

If, additionally, $k \leq np$, then

3. $\mathbb{P}(X \leq k) \leq (k+1) \cdot \left(\frac{enp}{k(1-p)}\right)^k \cdot e^{-np}$.

3 Proof of Theorem 1

In this section we present a proof of Theorem 1. We prove separately for two different ranges of the probability p , as the typical properties of the random graph in these two regimes is fairly different. In Section 3.1 we prove the claim in the sparse regime $p \leq n^{-0.4}$, and in Section 3.2 we prove it the the dense regime $n^{-0.4} \leq p \leq 1$.

3.1 Sparse case

Theorem 3. *Let $G \sim G(n, p)$ where $np - \log n - \log \log n \rightarrow \infty$ and $p \leq n^{-0.4}$. Then with high probability $r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) = \delta(G) - 1$.*

Proof. Let $d_0 = 0.001np$ and $\text{SMALL}(G) = \{v \in V(G) \mid d_G(v) < d_0\}$.

Lemma 3.1. *With high probability G has the following properties*

(P1) $\delta(G) \geq 2$ and $\Delta(G) \leq 5np$;

(P2) $|\text{SMALL}(G)| \leq n^{0.1}$;

(P3) G does not contain a path of length at most 4 with both its endpoints in $\text{SMALL}(G)$;

(P4) every $U \subseteq V(G)$ with $\frac{1}{2}d_0 \leq |U| \leq \frac{5n}{\sqrt{np}}$ spans at most $\frac{1}{10}d_0|U|$ edges;

(P5) if $U, W \subseteq V(G)$ and $|U| = |W| = \frac{n}{\sqrt{np}}$ then $e(U, W) \geq n/2$.

Proof. For each of the given properties, we bound the probability that $G \sim G(n, p)$ fails to uphold it.

(P1). Since p is above the Hamiltonicity threshold, which is equal to the threshold of the property $\delta(G) \geq 2$, the first part is obvious. For the second part, by the union bound we get

$$\mathbb{P}(\Delta(G) \geq 5np) \leq n \cdot \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(n-1, p) \geq 5np) \leq n \cdot \left(\frac{e(n-1)p}{5np}\right)^{5np} \leq n^{-2}.$$

(P2). The probability that $|\text{SMALL}(G)| \geq n^{0.1}$ is at most the probability that there is a set of size $s := n^{0.1}$ with less than $d_0 \cdot s$ outgoing edges. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|\text{SMALL}(G)| \geq n^{0.1}) &\leq \binom{n}{s} \cdot \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(s(n-s), p) < d_0 \cdot s) \\ &\leq \binom{n}{s} \cdot d_0 s \cdot \mathbb{P}(\text{Bin}(s(n-s), p) = d_0 \cdot s) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{en}{s}\right)^s \cdot d_0 s \cdot \left(\frac{es(n-s)p}{d_0 s(1-p)}\right)^{d_0 s} \cdot e^{-s(n-s)p} \\ &\leq n^{0.9s} \cdot d_0 s \cdot 3000^{d_0 s} \cdot e^{-0.95 \cdot snp} \\ &\leq \exp(-s \cdot \log n \cdot (o(1) + 0.9 + 0.001 \cdot \log 3000 - 0.95)) \\ &= o(1). \end{aligned}$$

(P3). Given $u, v \in V(G)$ and a path P of length ℓ between them, the probability that $u, v \in \text{SMALL}(G)$ and $P \subseteq G$ is at most the probability that $P \subseteq G$ and $\{u, v\}$ has less than $2d_0$ outgoing edges that are not part of P , which is at most

$$p^\ell \cdot 2d_0 \cdot \left(\frac{2enp}{2d_0(1-p)} \right)^{2d_0} \cdot e^{-2(n-3)p} \leq p^\ell \cdot e^{-1.9np}.$$

By the union bound, the probability that there is a path $P \subseteq G$ of length at most 4 with both endpoints in $\text{SMALL}(G)$ is at most

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^4 \binom{n}{\ell+1} p^\ell \cdot e^{-1.9np} = o(1).$$

(P4). The probability that there is a set $U \subseteq V(G)$ of size $k \geq \frac{1}{2}d_0$ that contradicts **(P4)** is at most

$$\binom{n}{k} \cdot \mathbb{P} \left(\text{Bin} \left(\binom{k}{2}, p \right) \geq \frac{1}{10}d_0k \right) \leq \left(\frac{en}{k} \right)^k \cdot \left(\frac{10ek^2p}{2d_0k} \right)^{0.1d_0k} \leq p^{0.08d_0k},$$

and therefore the probability that G does not have **(P4)** is at most

$$\sum_{k=d_0/2}^{5n/\sqrt{np}} p^{0.08d_0k} = (1 + o(1))p^{0.04d_0^2} = o(1).$$

(P5). By the union bound, the probability that there are $U, W \subseteq V(G)$ of size $\frac{n}{\sqrt{np}}$ with less than $\frac{1}{2}n$ edges between them is at most

$$\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{np}} \right)^2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}n \cdot \mathbb{P} \left(\text{Bin} \left(\frac{n}{p}, p \right) = \frac{1}{2}n \right) \leq n \cdot (enp)^{\frac{2n}{\sqrt{np}}} \cdot \left(\frac{2en}{(1-p)n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}n} \cdot e^{-n} = o(1).$$

□

Lemma 3.2. *With high probability, for every subgraph $H \subseteq G$ with $e(H) = \delta(G) - 2$, the graph $G \setminus H$ contains a subgraph Γ_0 that is an $(\frac{n}{4}, 2)$ -expander with at most d_0n edges.*

Proof. We prove this by showing that if G satisfies properties **(P1)**-**(P5)** then, for every $H \subseteq G$ with $\delta(G) - 2$ edges, $G \setminus H$ contains a subgraph Γ_0 as required. To this end we consider a random subgraph of $G \setminus H$ with at most d_0n edges and show that it is an $(\frac{n}{4}, 2)$ -expander with positive probability, which implies existence.

Construct a random subgraph of $G \setminus H$ as follows. For every $v \in V$ set E_v to be $E_{G \setminus H}(v)$ in the case $d_{G \setminus H}(v) \leq d_0$, and otherwise set E_v to be a subset of $E_{G \setminus H}(v)$ of size d_0 , chosen uniformly at random. The random subgraph Γ is the $G \setminus H$ -subgraph with edge set $\bigcup_{v \in V(G)} E_v$. Observe that the minimum degree of a graph Γ drawn this way is at least $\min\{\delta(G \setminus H), d_0\} \geq 2$, that $d_\Gamma(v) = d_{G \setminus H}(v)$ for every $v \in \text{SMALL}(G)$, and that $e(\Gamma) \leq d_0n$.

We bound from above the probability that Γ contains a subset U with at most $n/4$ vertices with less than $2|U|$ neighbours. Let $|U| = k \leq \frac{n}{4}$ and denote $U_1 = U \cap \text{SMALL}(G)$, $U_2 = U \setminus U_1$ and k_1, k_2 the sizes of U_1, U_2 respectively. Observe that **(P3)** implies that (i) every vertex in U_2 has at most one neighbour

in $U_1 \cup N_G(U_1)$, and therefore $|N_\Gamma(U_2) \cap (U_1 \cup N_\Gamma(U_1))| \leq k_2$; and (ii) distinct vertices in $\text{SMALL}(G)$ have non-intersecting neighbourhoods, and therefore $|N_\Gamma(U_1)| \geq \delta(G) \cdot k_1 \geq 2k_1$.

First we show that if $k_2 \leq \frac{n}{\sqrt{np}}$ then $|N_\Gamma(U)| \geq 2|U|$ with probability 1. We separate the proof into different cases according to the value of k_2 .

1. $k_2 = 1$. If $k_1 = 0$ then U is a singleton, and $N_\Gamma(U)$ contains at least two vertices since $\delta(G) \geq 2$.

Otherwise, $k_1 > 0$ and in particular $\text{SMALL}(G)$ is not empty, so $\delta(G) < d_0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} |N_\Gamma(U)| &\geq |N_\Gamma(U_1) \setminus U_2| + |N_\Gamma(U_2) \setminus (N_\Gamma(U_1) \cup U_1)| \\ &\geq \delta(G) \cdot k_1 - 1 + d_0 - (\delta(G) - 2) - 1 \\ &\geq 2k_1 + 2 = 2|U|. \end{aligned}$$

2. $2 \leq k_2 \leq \frac{1}{10}d_0$. Since there are at least two vertices, there is a vertex $v \in U_2$ such that

$$d_{G \setminus H}(v) \geq d_G(v) - \frac{1}{2}(\delta(G) - 2) - 1 \geq \frac{1}{2}d_G(v) \geq \frac{1}{2}d_0,$$

and therefore also $d_\Gamma(v) \geq \frac{1}{2}d_0$, and $e_\Gamma(v, V(G) \setminus U_2) \geq \frac{1}{2}d_0 - k_2 \geq \frac{2}{5}d_0$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} |N_\Gamma(U)| &\geq |N_\Gamma(U_1) \setminus U_2| + |N_\Gamma(U_2) \setminus (N_\Gamma(U_1) \cup U_1)| \\ &\geq 2k_1 - k_2 + \frac{2}{5}d_0 - k_2 \\ &\geq 2k_1 + 2k_2 = 2|U|. \end{aligned}$$

3. $\frac{1}{10}d_0 \leq k_2 \leq \frac{n}{\sqrt{np}}$. In this case $|N_\Gamma(U_2)| \geq 4k_2$. Indeed, if $|N_\Gamma(U_2)| \leq 4k_2$ then $U_2 \cup N_\Gamma(U_2)$ is contained in a set of size $5k_2$, which is between $\frac{1}{2}d_0$ and $\frac{5n}{\sqrt{np}}$, that spans at least $\frac{1}{2}d_0k_2$ edges, a contradiction to **(P4)**. We get

$$\begin{aligned} |N_\Gamma(U)| &\geq |N_\Gamma(U_1) \setminus U_2| + |N_\Gamma(U_2) \setminus (N_\Gamma(U_1) \cup U_1)| \\ &\geq 2k_1 - k_2 + 4k_2 - k_2 \\ &\geq 2k_1 + 2k_2 = 2|U|. \end{aligned}$$

For the remaining case $\frac{n}{\sqrt{np}} \leq k_2 \leq \frac{n}{4}$ we show that $|N_\Gamma(U)| \geq 2|U|$ with positive probability. Suppose otherwise, then $|V(G) \setminus (U \cap N_\Gamma(U))| \geq \frac{1}{3}n$. In particular, there are disjoint sets $U' \subseteq U$ and $W \subseteq V(G) \setminus (U \cap N_\Gamma(U))$, each of size $\frac{n}{\sqrt{np}}$, such that $e_\Gamma(U', W) = 0$. Observe that by **(P5)**, $e_{G \setminus H}(U', W) \geq \frac{1}{2}n - \delta(G) \geq \frac{1}{3}n$. For a given pair of subsets U', W , the probability for this is at most

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{u \in U'} \mathbb{P}(e_\Gamma(u, W) = 0) &\leq \prod_{u \in U'} \frac{\binom{d_{G \setminus H}(u) - e_{G \setminus H}(u, W)}{d_0}}{\binom{d_{G \setminus H}(u)}{d_0}} \\ &\leq \prod_{u \in U'} e^{-\frac{d_0 \cdot e_{G \setminus H}(u, W)}{d_{G \setminus H}(u)}} \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{d_0}{\Delta(G)} \cdot e_{G \setminus H}(U, W)\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{15000}n\right) \end{aligned}$$

Since there are $\exp(o(n))$ pairs of subsets U', W of size $\frac{n}{\sqrt{np}}$, by the union bound the probability that two subsets of this size with no edges between them in Γ exist is of order $o(1)$. Consequently, the random subgraph Γ is an $(\frac{n}{4}, 2)$ -expander with probability $1 - o(1)$, implying that $G \setminus H$ contains a sparse expander, as claimed. □

Lemma 3.3. *With high probability, for every subgraph $H \subseteq G$ with $e(H) = \delta(G) - 2$ and every non-Hamiltonian $(\frac{n}{4}, 2)$ -expander $\Gamma \subseteq G$ with $e(\Gamma) \leq 2d_0n$, the graph $G \setminus (H \cup \Gamma)$ contains a booster with respect to Γ .*

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, a non-Hamiltonian $(\frac{n}{4}, 2)$ -expander has at least $\frac{n^2}{32}$ boosters. For a given subgraph H with $\delta(G) - 2$ edges and a given expander Γ , the probability that none of the many boosters are in $G \setminus H$ is at most

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\text{Bin}\left(\frac{n^2}{32}, p\right) \leq e(H)\right) \leq \delta(G) \cdot \left(\frac{en^2p}{32 \cdot \delta(G) \cdot (1-p)}\right)^{\delta(G)} \cdot e^{-\frac{n^2p}{32}} \leq e^{-\frac{n^2p}{33}}.$$

By the union bound, the probability that there is an expander subgraph $\Gamma \subseteq G$ with at most $2d_0n$ edges, and no boosters in G , is at most

$$\sum_{k=1}^{2d_0n} \binom{\binom{n}{2}}{k} \cdot p^k \cdot e^{-\frac{n^2p}{33}} \leq 2d_0n \cdot \left(\frac{enp}{4d_0}\right)^{2d_0n} \cdot e^{-\frac{n^2p}{33}} = \exp\left(-n^2p \cdot \left(o(1) + \frac{\log(250e)}{500} - \frac{1}{33}\right)\right) = o(1).$$

□

Corollary 3.1. *With high probability, for every subgraph $H \subseteq G$ with $e(H) = \delta(G) - 2$ the graph $G \setminus H$ is Hamiltonian.* □

□

3.2 Dense case

Theorem 4. *Let $G \sim G(n, p)$ where $n^{-0.4} \leq p \leq 1$. Then with high probability $r_g(G, \mathcal{H}) = \delta(G) - 1$.*

Proof.

Lemma 3.4. *With high probability G has the following properties*

(Q1) $\delta(G) \geq \frac{1}{2}np$;

(Q2) if $U \subseteq V(G)$ and $|U| = \frac{1}{8}np$ then $e(U) \geq n$;

(Q3) if $U, W \subseteq V(G)$ and $|U| = |W| = \frac{1}{8}np$ then $e(U, W) \geq n$.

Proof. An upper bound of order $o(1)$ on the probability that $G \sim G(n, p)$ fails to uphold any of the three properties follows from applying the union bound and standard bounds on binomial distributions. □

The proof of Theorem 3.2 now follows from Lemma 3.4. We prove that if G has properties **(Q1)**-**(Q3)** then $G \setminus H$ is Hamiltonian for every such H with $e(H) = \delta(G) - 2$.

Let $v_0 \in V(G)$ be a vertex with $d_{G \setminus H}(v_0) = \delta(G \setminus H)$ and denote $G' := (G \setminus H) - v_0$. Then $\delta(G') \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta(G)$. We now claim that $\kappa(G') > \alpha(G')$, and therefore by Theorem 2 we conclude that G' is Hamilton-connected. Since $d_{G \setminus H}(v_0) \geq 2$ this implies that $G \setminus H$ is Hamiltonian.

Indeed, by **(Q2)**, every vertex subset with $\frac{1}{8}np$ vertices spans at least $n - \delta(G) > 0$ edges in G' , and therefore $\alpha(G') < \frac{1}{8}np$.

On the other hand, let $V(G') = U \cup X \cup W$ be a partition of $V(G')$ such that U, W are non-empty and $e_{G'}(U, W) = 0$. Assume without loss of generality that $|U| \leq |W|$, Then $|U| < \frac{1}{8}np$, since otherwise by **(Q3)** we have $e_{G'}(U, W) \geq n - \delta(G) > 0$. Additionally, by **(Q1)** we have $\delta(G') \geq \frac{1}{2}\delta(G) \geq \frac{1}{4}np$. Since $U \cup X$ contains all of the neighbours of a vertex $u \in U$ we get $|X| \geq d_{G'}(u) - |U| \geq \frac{1}{4}np - \frac{1}{8}np = \frac{1}{8}np$. Therefore $\kappa(G') \geq \frac{1}{8}np$. □

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank Professor Michael Krivelevich for his support and valuable advice during the writing of this paper.

References

- [1] M. Ajtai, J. Komlós and E. Szemerédi, *First occurrence of Hamilton cycles in random graphs*, Cycles in graphs '82, North Holland Mathematical Studies 115, North Holland, Amsterdam (1985), 173–178.
- [2] Y. Alon and M. Krivelevich, *Random graph's Hamiltonicity is strongly tied to its minimum degree*, Electronic Journal of Combinatorics 27 (2020) Paper No. 1.30.
- [3] S. Ben-Shimon, M. Krivelevich and B. Sudakov, *On the resilience of Hamiltonicity and optimal packing of Hamilton cycles in random graphs*, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics 25 (2011), 1176–1193.
- [4] B. Bollobás, *The evolution of sparse graphs*, Graph Theory and Combinatorics, Academic Press, London (1984), 35–57.
- [5] V. Chvátal and P. Erdős, *A note on Hamiltonian circuits*, Discrete Mathematics 2 (1972), 111–113.
- [6] C. Lee and B. Sudakov, *Dirac's theorem for random graphs*, Random Structures & Algorithms, 41 (2012), 293–305.
- [7] R. Montgomery, *Hamiltonicity in random graphs is born resilient*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, 139 (2019), 316–341.
- [8] R. Nenadov, A. Steger and M. Trujić, *Resilience of perfect matchings and Hamiltonicity in random graph processes*, Random Structures & Algorithms 54 (2019), 797–819.
- [9] O. Ore, *Arc coverings of graphs*, Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata 55 (1961), 315–321.
- [10] L. Pósa, *Hamiltonian circuits in random graphs*, Discrete Mathematics 14 (1976), 359–364.

- [11] B. Sudakov, *Robustness of graph properties*, BCC (2017), 372–408.
- [12] B. Sudakov and V. H. Vu, *The local resilience of random graphs*, Random Structures & Algorithms 33 (2008), 409–433.