

# Local Resilience of Graphs\*

Benny Sudakov,<sup>1,2</sup> V. H. Vu<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, UCLA, Los Angeles, California 90095

<sup>2</sup>Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey;

e-mail: bsudakov@math.ucla.edu

<sup>3</sup>Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854;

e-mail: vanvu@math.rutgers.edu

Received 15 May 2006; accepted 22 July 2007

Published online 29 August 2008 in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com).

DOI 10.1002/rsa.20235

**ABSTRACT:** In this article, we initiate a systematic study of graph resilience. The (local) resilience of a graph  $G$  with respect to a property  $\mathcal{P}$  measures how much one has to change  $G$  (locally) to destroy  $\mathcal{P}$ . Estimating the resilience leads to many new and challenging problems. Here we focus on random and pseudorandom graphs and prove several sharp results. © 2008 Wiley Periodicals, Inc. *Random Struct. Alg.*, 33, 409–433, 2008

*Keywords:* random graphs; hamiltonicity; chromatic number; extremal problems

## 1. THE NOTION OF RESILIENCE

A typical result in graph theory is of the following form:

*A graph  $G$  (from certain class) possesses a property  $\mathcal{P}$ .*

In this article, we would like to investigate the following general problem:

*How strongly does  $G$  possess  $\mathcal{P}$ ?*

To study this question, we define *the resilience of  $G$  with respect to  $\mathcal{P}$* , which measures how much one should change  $G$  to destroy  $\mathcal{P}$ . There are two natural kinds of resilience: global and local. It is more convenient to first define these quantities with respect to monotone increasing properties ( $\mathcal{P}$  is monotone increasing if it is preserved under edge addition).

---

Correspondence to: Benny Sudakov

\*Supported by NSF Career Awards; USA-Israeli BSF Grant; Alfred P. Sloan Fellowship; the State of New Jersey.

© 2008 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

**Definition 1.1.** (Global resilience). Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be an increasing monotone property. The global resilience of  $G$  with respect to  $\mathcal{P}$  is the minimum number  $r$  such that by deleting  $r$  edges from  $G$  one can obtain a graph not having  $\mathcal{P}$ .

The notion of global resilience is not new. In fact, problems about global resilience are popular in extremal graph theory. For example, the celebrated theorem of Turán [17] gives the answer to the following question:

*How many edges should one delete from the complete graph  $K_n$  to make it  $K_k$ -free?*

The main focus of this article is on the *local resilience*, which eventually leads to a host of intriguing new questions. To start, let us notice that one can destroy many properties by simple local changes. For instance, to destroy the hamiltonicity, it suffices to delete all edges adjacent to one vertex. This motivates the following notion.

**Definition 1.2.** (Local resilience). Given a monotone increasing property  $\mathcal{P}$ . The local resilience of a graph  $G$  with respect to  $\mathcal{P}$  is the minimum number  $r$  such that by deleting at each vertex of  $G$  at most  $r$  edges one can obtain a graph not having  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Note that a classical theorem of Dirac (see, e.g., [6]) can be formulated in this language as follows:

*The local resilience of  $K_n$  with respect to hamiltonicity is  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ .*

If  $\mathcal{P}$  is not monotone (for instance, having a nontrivial automorphism is such a property), then we may have to both delete and add edges. This leads to the general definition.

**Definition 1.3.** Given a property  $\mathcal{P}$ . The local resilience of  $G$  with respect to  $\mathcal{P}$  is the minimum number  $r$  so that there is a graph  $H$  on  $V(G)$  with maximum degree at most  $r$  such that the graph  $G \Delta H$  does not have  $\mathcal{P}$ .

One can observe that there is a certain duality between properties and resilience. If the property is local (such as containing a triangle), then it makes more sense to talk about the global resilience. If the property is global (such as being hamiltonian), then the local resilience seems to be the right parameter to consider.

The notion of local resilience was first introduced few years ago in a paper of Kim and Vu [9] for a purpose which we will discuss in concluding remarks. It was also used implicitly by Kim, Sudakov, and Vu in [8] to prove a conjecture of Wormald (see the subsection on Symmetry in the next section). We are now convinced that this notion is of independent interest, and, with this paper, aim to initiate a systematic investigation.

To generate new questions, one can match any interesting graph with any natural property and ask for the corresponding resilience. Here is a random example:

*What is the local resilience of the hypercube with respect to containing a perfect matching?*

In other words, what is the minimum degree of a subgraph of the hypercube containing an edge from every perfect matching?

The notion of resilience is not restricted to graphs. In fact, one can define it for virtually any structure. For instance, one can consider the resilience of matrices. The resilience, in this case, tells us how many entries need to be change to destroy a certain property. Here is an example, suggested by Kahn (private communication):

*What is the global resilience of the Hadamard matrix with respect to being nonsingular?*

In other words, how many entries of a Hadamard matrix needs to be changed in order to make the matrix singular? The problem seems even more interesting if we restrict the changes to a small set of values (e.g., a new entry can only take values in  $\{-1, 1\}$  or  $\{0, -1, 1\}$ ).

Instead of producing a long list of problems here (we leave this task to the interested readers), we would like to mention that the notion of resilience not only generates new questions, but also serves as a useful tool for proving new results. We will discuss an example in Section 2.4 and another in Section 6.1. As a matter of fact, these applications were the original motivation for developing this notion.

To conclude this section, let us point out that the notion of resilience may have a relation to the theory of communication. A basic scenario in this theory involves three parties. A sender (Alice), a receiver (Bob), and an eavesdropper (Charles). Alice wants to send a message to Bob. On the other hand, Charles (usually an adversary) can (and want to) intercept and change the message.

Now imagine that the message has a form of a binary matrix, which is the adjacency matrix of a graph. The information Bob wants to learn from the message is hidden in a property of the graph. Can Charles destroy this information?

The answer depends on how much power Charles possesses. If his power was unlimited, then he could simply turn all bits to zero and perhaps destroy any interesting information the message may contain. But what if his power is limited? In fact, it is a common assumption that the matrix is sent row by row and Charles could only change a few bits in each row. It is now clear that if the original graph has high local resilience (with respect to the particular property Bob is interested in), then Charles cannot do anything to prevent Bob from learning the truth.

## 2. THE RESILIENCE OF RANDOM GRAPHS

Fix a property  $\mathcal{P}$  and consider the set of all (labeled) graphs on the same large vertex set. The local resilience is viewed as a graph function  $f_{\mathcal{P}}(G)$ . The value of this function can change significantly from graph to graph, and for some graphs could be very hard to determine. Thus, a natural thing to do is to study the typical behavior of this function in a large set of graphs. This, as one may expect, leads immediately to the consideration of the local resilience of random graph.

The most commonly used model of random graphs, sometimes synonymous with the term “random graph,” is the so called binomial random graph  $G(n, p)$  introduced by Erdős and Rényi. The random graph  $G(n, p)$  denotes the probability space whose points are graphs on a fixed vertex set  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$  where each pair of vertices forms an edge, randomly and independently, with probability  $p$ . Here  $p$  is a positive number at most one and can depend on  $n$ . The above operation generates a distribution on the set of all (labeled) graphs on  $n$  vertices. Abusing the notation slightly, we call this distribution the  $G(n, p)$  distribution. It is well known, and easy to prove, that this distribution concentrates on the graphs with roughly  $\binom{n}{2}p$  edges. We say that the random graph  $G(n, p)$  possesses a graph property  $\mathcal{P}$  *almost surely*, or a.s. for short, if the probability that  $G(n, p)$  satisfies  $\mathcal{P}$  tends to 1 as the number of vertices  $n$  tends to infinity.

**Definition 2.1.** Consider random graph  $G(n, p)$  and a fixed property  $\mathcal{P}$ . The local resilience of  $G(n, p)$  with respect to  $\mathcal{P}$  is the minimum number  $r$  so that almost surely there is a graph  $H$  on  $[n]$  with maximum degree at most  $r$  such that the graph  $G(n, p) \Delta H$  does not have  $\mathcal{P}$ .

*Remark.* It is important to notice that after one has sampled a graph from the distribution  $G(n, p)$ , the adversary is allowed to find graph  $H$  with the smallest possible maximum degree in order to destroy the property  $\mathcal{P}$ . The graph  $H$  can change from sample to sample.

*Remark.* Instead of considering the distribution  $G(n, p)$ , one can consider the set of all graphs on  $n$  vertices with  $\binom{n}{2}p$  edges, equipped with the uniform distribution. All results we prove for  $G(n, p)$  will hold with respect to this distribution as well.

Next, we will describe several estimates which we obtained for the local resilience of random and pseudorandom graphs with respect to various graph properties. Some of these results are asymptotically best possible. Throughout this article,  $\log$  denotes logarithm in the natural base  $e$ . For two functions  $f(n)$  and  $g(n)$  the notation  $f \gg g$  means that  $f/g \rightarrow \infty$  together with  $n$ .

## 2.1. Perfect Matching

Let  $G$  be a graph on  $n$  vertices, where  $n$  is even. A perfect matching of  $G$  is a set of disjoint edges which together cover all  $n$  vertices. A classical theorem of Erdős and Rényi [5] shows that for any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$  if  $p > (1 + \epsilon) \log n/n$ , then almost surely  $G(n, p)$  has a perfect matching.

Let us now give a lower bound for the local resilience of the property of having a perfect matching. One natural way to destroy all perfect matchings is the following. Split the vertex set of  $G$  into two parts  $X$  and  $Y$  of size  $n/2 + 1$  and  $n/2 - 1$ , respectively. Then delete all edges inside the set  $X$ . Thus  $X$  becomes an independent set and it is impossible to match all of its vertices with vertices of  $Y$ , since  $|Y| < |X|$ . In other words, if we define  $f_1(G)$  to be the minimum of the maximum degree of the subgraph of  $G$  induced by a subset of size  $n/2 + 1$  then

**Fact 2.2.** *The local resilience of  $G$  with respect to having a perfect matching is at most  $f_1(G)$ .*

In  $G(n, p)$  (with  $p$  sufficiently large), with high probability all vertices have degree  $(1 + o(1))np$ . Thus, one would expect that almost surely random graph has an induced subgraph on  $n/2 + 1$  vertices whose maximum degree is  $(1/2 + o(1))np$ . So, the local resilience of  $G(n, p)$  with respect to having a perfect matching is at most  $(1/2 + o(1))np$ . Our first theorem shows that this trivial upper bound is actually the truth.

**Theorem 2.3.** *For even  $n$  and  $p \gg \log n/n$ , the local resilience of  $G(n, p)$  with respect to having a perfect matching is  $(1/2 + o(1))np$ .*

Roughly speaking, this theorem tells us that for most graphs on  $n$  vertices with approximately  $\binom{n}{2}p$  edges, there is no essentially better way to remove all perfect matchings than the

one considered above. We will present a more precise statement of Theorem 2.3 together with its proof in Section 3.

For  $n$  odd, one can talk about nearly perfect matchings (which leave one vertex unmatched). Theorem 2.3 also holds in this case with essentially the same proof.

## 2.2. Hamiltonicity

A graph  $G$  is hamiltonian if it contains a cycle going through all vertices. Another classical theorem in random graph theory which was proved by Komlós and Szemerédi [10] and by Korshunov [11] (extending earlier result of Pósa [16]) shows that if  $p > (1 + \epsilon) \log n/n$ , then almost surely  $G(n, p)$  is hamiltonian.

Following the ideas in the previous section, we can remove all hamiltonian cycles of  $G$  by splitting the vertex set of  $G$  into two parts whose sizes differ by at most two and deleting all the edges inside the larger part. Then, similarly to the previous section we have that

**Fact 2.4.** *The local resilience of  $G$  with respect to having a Hamilton cycle is at most  $f_1(G)$ .*

Another construction is to split the vertex set into two parts whose sizes differ by at most one and delete all edges between them. This, however, does not change the asymptotic of the lower bound with respect to a random graph. Therefore for sufficiently large  $p$ , we can again conclude that the local resilience of  $G(n, p)$  with respect to being hamiltonian is at most  $(1/2 + o(1))np$ . Here we prove the matching lower bound.

**Theorem 2.5.** *For all  $p > \log^4 n/n$ , the local resilience of  $G(n, p)$  with respect to being hamiltonian is  $(1/2 + o(1))np$ .*

A more accurate version of this theorem and its proof will be presented in Section 4. Our proof relies only on properties of the edge distribution of  $G(n, p)$  and therefore can be extended to pseudorandom graphs.

Consider a graph  $G$ . Let  $\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n(G)$  be the eigenvalues of its adjacency matrix. The quantity  $\lambda(G) = \max_{i \geq 2} |\lambda_i(G)|$  is called the *second eigenvalue* of  $G$  and plays an important role. We say that  $G$  is an  $(n, D, \lambda)$ -graph if it is  $D$ -regular, has  $n$  vertices and  $\lambda(G)$  is at most  $\lambda$ . It is well known (see, e.g., [1] for more details) that if  $\lambda$  is much smaller than the degree  $D$ , then  $G$  has strong pseudorandom properties, i.e., the edges of  $G$  are distributed like in random graph  $G(n, D/n)$ . In Section 4 we will show that if  $D/\lambda > \log^2 n$  then the local resilience of any  $(n, D, \lambda)$ -graph with respect to being hamiltonian is  $(1/2 + o(1))D$ .

## 2.3. Chromatic Number

A graph  $G$  is  $k$ -colorable if one can assign  $k$  different colors to the vertices of  $G$  so that the colors of adjacent vertices are different. The *chromatic number* of  $G$  is the smallest  $k$  such that  $G$  is  $k$ -colorable. We use the standard notation  $\chi(G)$  for the chromatic number of  $G$ . It was proved by Bollobás [2] for large  $p$  and by Łuczak [15] for small  $p$  that almost surely  $\chi(G(n, p)) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{n}{2 \log_b(np)}$ , where  $b = 1/(1 - p)$ .

In Section 5, we consider the local resilience of  $G(n, p)$  with respect to the colorability property. The task is to determine the largest  $r$  such that for almost all samples  $G$  from

$G(n, p)$ , the following holds. By adding at most  $r$  edges to each vertex of  $G$ , one cannot increase the chromatic number of  $G(n, p)$  by more than  $o(\chi(G(n, p)))$ . Trivially  $r \leq (1 + \epsilon)\chi(G(n, p))$  for any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ , because we can add a clique of that size and the chromatic number of the graph will grow by factor at least  $1 + \epsilon$ . We have the following lower bound.

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $p$  be a fixed, small positive number. Assume that  $n^{-1/3+\epsilon} \leq p \leq 3/4$ . The local resilience of  $G(n, p)$  with respect to being  $(1 + o(1))\frac{n}{2\log_b(np)}$ -colorable is at least  $np^2 / \log^5 n$ .*

Note that for the uniform case when  $p = 1/2$ , this lower bound is off by only polylogarithmic factor. For  $p$  below  $n^{-1/3+\epsilon}$ , we have the following weaker result.

**Theorem 2.7.** *For every positive integer  $d$  and for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a constant  $c = c(d, \epsilon)$  such that the following hold. For any  $p > c/n$ , almost surely*

$$\max_{H, \Delta(H) \leq d} \chi((G(n, p) \cup H)) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\chi(G(n, p)).$$

Informally, this result says that for any given  $d$  and for most graphs on  $n$  vertices with average degree at least  $c$  (which is sufficiently large compared to  $d$ ), adding any graph of maximum degree  $d$  has very little impact on the chromatic number. It is best to compare this theorem against the following folklore result (see, e.g., [14] Chapter 9).

**Fact 2.8.** *Let  $G$  and  $H$  be two graphs on the same set of points. Then*

$$\chi(G \cup H) \leq \chi(G)\chi(H),$$

*and there are pairs of  $G$  and  $H$  such that the equality holds.*

## 2.4. Symmetry

Another classical theorem of Erdős and Rényi [4] states that for  $p \geq (1 + \epsilon) \log n/n$ ,  $G(n, p)$  is almost surely nonsymmetric, i.e., has no nontrivial automorphisms. The question here is how much should one change the graph to make it symmetric. The global resilience with respect to being non-symmetric was determined in [4].

**Theorem 2.9.** *If both  $1 - p, p \gg \log n/n$ , then the global resilience of  $G(n, p)$  with respect to being non-symmetric is  $(2 + o(1))np(1 - p)$ .*

To explain the quantity  $(2 + o(1))np(1 - p)$ , notice that this is the number of edges one needs to delete to obtain two vertices with the same neighborhoods. The transposition of such two vertices is a nontrivial automorphism of the (modified) graph. Notice that in this case, one needs to delete  $(1 + o(1))np(1 - p)$  edges from each vertex. In [8], the authors, together with Kim, proved a strengthening of Theorem 2.9 which implies the following result.

**Theorem 2.10.** *If both  $1 - p, p \gg \log n/n$ , then the local resilience of  $G(n, p)$  with respect to being non-symmetric is  $(1 + o(1))np(1 - p)$ .*

As a corollary, we proved in [8] that random regular graphs (with large degrees) are almost surely nonsymmetric, confirming a conjecture of Wormald. The interesting point here is that local resilience was not the main object under study in [8], but it was used as a tool to prove a new result. The main idea in [8] is as follows. Consider the indicator graph function  $I(G)$ , where  $I(G) = 1$  if  $G$  is nonsymmetric and 0 otherwise. We want to show that with high probability  $I(G) = 1$  where  $G$  is a random regular graph. One may want to view this statement as a sharp concentration result, namely,  $I(G)$  is a.s. close to its mean. However, it is impossible to prove a sharp concentration result for a random variable having only two values close to each other. The idea here is to “blow up”  $I(G)$  using the notion of local resilience. Instead of  $I(G)$  we used a function  $D(G)$  which (roughly speaking) equals the local resilience of  $G$  with respect to being nonsymmetric. This function is zero if  $G$  is symmetric and rather large otherwise. This gives us room to show that  $D(G)$  is strongly concentrated around a large positive value, and from this we can conclude that almost surely the random regular graph is nonsymmetric.

**Notation.** We usually write  $G = (V, E)$  for a graph  $G$  with vertex set  $V = V(G)$  and edge set  $E = E(G)$ , setting  $n = |V|$  and  $e(G) = |E(G)|$ . If  $X \subset V$  is a subset of the vertex set then  $e_G(X)$  denotes the number of those edges of  $G$  with both endpoints in  $X$ . Similarly, we write  $e_G(X, Y)$  for the number of edges with one endpoint in  $X$  and the other in  $Y$ . We denote by  $N_G(v)$  the set of vertices adjacent to a vertex  $v$  and by  $d_G(v) = |N(v)|$  the degree of  $v$ . More generally, for a subset  $X \subset V$ ,  $N_G(X)$  is the set of all neighbors of vertices of  $X$  in  $G$ . Note that  $N_G(X)$  is not necessarily disjoint from  $X$ .

To simplify the presentation, we often omit floor and ceiling signs whenever these are not crucial and make no attempts to optimize the absolute constants.

### 3. PERFECT MATCHINGS

The following is a more precise version of Theorem 2.3. To deduce Theorem 2.3 from it, simply notice that if  $p \gg \log n/n$ , then the error term  $8\sqrt{np \log n} = o(np)$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *For even  $n$  and  $p \geq 400 \log n/n$  the random graph  $G(n, p)$  almost surely has the following properties:*

- (i) *If  $H$  is a subgraph of  $G = G(n, p)$  with maximum degree*

$$\Delta(H) \leq np/2 - 8\sqrt{np \log n},$$

*then  $G' = G - H$  has a perfect matching.*

- (ii) *There exist a subgraph  $H$  of  $G = G(n, p)$  with maximum degree*

$$\Delta(H) \leq np/2 + 2\sqrt{np \log n}$$

*such that  $G' = G - H$  has no perfect matching.*

To prove the theorem we need the following simple lemma about properties of random graphs.

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $p \geq 400 \log n/n$  then almost surely,*

- (i) *The minimum degree of  $G(n, p)$  is at least  $np - 2\sqrt{np \log n}$ ,*
- (ii) *The maximum degree of  $G(n/2 + 1, p)$  is at most  $np/2 + 2\sqrt{np \log n}$ ,*
- (iii) *The number of edges between any two disjoint subsets  $A, B$  of  $G(n, p)$  of size  $|A| = |B| = s \leq n/4$  is at most*

$$e(A, B) \leq s \left( \frac{np}{4} + \sqrt{2np \log n} \right).$$

*Proof.* (i) Because the degree of every vertex  $v$  of  $G(n, p)$  is binomially distributed random variable with parameters  $n - 1$  and  $p$ , it follows by the standard Chernoff-type estimates (see, e.g., Chapter 2.1 in [7]) that

$$\mathbb{P}[d(v) - (n - 1)p \leq -\sqrt{3np \log n} = -t] \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2np}} = n^{-3/2}.$$

Therefore, the probability that  $G(n, p)$  has a vertex of degree less than  $np - 2\sqrt{np \log n} < (n - 1)p - \sqrt{3np \log n}$  is at most  $n^{-1/2} = o(1)$ .

(ii) Let  $v$  be a vertex of  $G(n/2 + 1, p)$  and let  $t = 2\sqrt{np \log n}$ . Because  $2\sqrt{np \log n} < np$ , by Chernoff-type estimate we have that

$$\mathbb{P}[d(v) - np/2 \geq t] \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2(np/2+t/3)}} \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2np}} = n^{-2}.$$

Thus, the probability that  $G(n/2 + 1, p)$  has a vertex of degree larger than  $np/2 + 2\sqrt{np \log n}$  is  $o(1)$ .

(iii) The number of edges between two disjoint sets  $A, B$  of size  $s$  is binomially distributed and has expectation  $\lambda = s^2p$ . Set  $t = s\sqrt{2np \log n}$ . Since  $s \leq n/4$ , by Chernoff-type estimates, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[e(A, B) \geq s(np/4 + \sqrt{2np \log n})\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[e(A, B) \geq s^2p + s\sqrt{2np \log n} = \lambda + t\right] \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2(\lambda+t/3)}}.$$

As  $p \geq 400 \log n/n$  and  $s \leq n/4$ , we have that  $\sqrt{2np \log n} < np/10$  and  $2sp \leq np/2$ . Therefore

$$\frac{t^2}{2(\lambda + t/3)} > s \cdot \frac{2np \log n}{2sp + \sqrt{2np \log n}} \geq s \cdot \frac{2np \log n}{np/2 + np/10} > 3s \log n.$$

This implies that the probability that there are two disjoint sets which violates the assertion of the lemma is at most

$$\sum_{s \leq n/4} \binom{n}{s} \binom{n}{s} e^{-3s \log n} \leq \sum_{s \leq n/4} n^{2s} n^{-3s} = \sum_{s \leq n/4} n^{-s} = o(1).$$

This completes the proof. ■

**Proof of Theorem 3.1.** (i) Let  $G$  be a graph of order  $n$  with minimum degree at least  $np - 2\sqrt{np \log n}$  such that the number of edges between any two disjoint subsets of  $G$  of size  $s \leq n/4$  is bounded by  $s(np/4 + \sqrt{2np \log n})$ . Let  $H$  be a subgraph of  $G$  with maximum degree at most  $np/2 - 8\sqrt{np \log n}$  and let  $G' = G - H$ . We will show that  $G'$  has a perfect matching. This together with the previous lemma immediately implies the assertion (i) of Theorem 3.1.



By our assumptions on  $G$  and  $H$  the minimum degree of  $G'$  is at least  $np/2 + 6\sqrt{np \log n}$ . Consider a random partition of the set of vertices into two equal parts of size  $n/2$  each and let  $G''$  be the bipartite graph consisting of all edges of  $G'$  intersecting both parts. For every vertex  $v$  its degree in  $G''$  is a random variable which has *hypergeometric distribution* with expectation  $d_{G'}(v)/2 \geq np/4 + 3\sqrt{np \log n} = \lambda$ . As  $p \geq 400 \log n/n$  we have that  $\lambda < 5np/12$ . Set  $t = \sqrt{np \log n}$ . Using Chernoff-type estimates (which are valid also for hypergeometric distributions, see Theorem 2.10 in [7]) we obtain that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ d_{G''}(v) \leq np/4 + 2\sqrt{np \log n} = \lambda - t \right] \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2\lambda}} < n^{-6/5} \ll n^{-1}.$$

Therefore, there exist a partition  $(V_1, V_2)$  such that the degree of every vertex of the corresponding bipartite graph  $G''$  is at least  $np/4 + 2\sqrt{np \log n}$ . Fix such a partition. We claim that  $G'' \subset G'$  satisfies Hall's condition and therefore has a perfect matching.

We need to check that  $|N_{G''}(S)| \geq |S|$  for all  $S \subset V_i, i = 1, 2$ . Let  $S' \subset V_i, |S'| > n/4$  with  $|N_{G''}(S')| < |S'|$ . If  $|N_{G''}(S')| \geq n/4$  let  $S = V_{3-i} - N_{G''}(S')$ , otherwise let  $S$  be any subset of  $V_{3-i} - N_{G''}(S')$  of size  $n/4$ . Note that in both cases  $|S| \leq n/4$ . Since  $N_{G''}(S) \subseteq V_i - S'$ , we have

$$|N_{G''}(S)| \leq |V_i| - |S'| < \min(n/4, |V_{3-i}| - |N_{G''}(S')|) = |S|.$$

This shows that it is enough to verify inequality  $|N_{G''}(S)| \geq |S|$  only for subsets  $S$  of size at most  $n/4$ . Let  $S \subset V_i$  of size  $s \leq n/4$ . Note that, by our assumptions there are at most  $s(np/4 + \sqrt{2np \log n})$  edges of  $G$  between any two disjoint sets of size  $s$ . On the other hand, it follows from the minimum degree estimate that there are at least  $s(np/4 + 2\sqrt{np \log n})$  edges of  $G'' \subset G$  between  $S$  and  $N_{G''}(S)$ . This implies that  $|N_{G''}(S)| \geq s$  and completes the proof of the first part.

(ii) Partition the vertices of  $G = G(n, p)$  into two parts  $X$  and  $Y$  with sizes  $n/2 + 1$  and  $n/2 - 1$  respectively. Let  $H$  be a subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $X$ . By part (ii) of Lemma 3.2 we have that a.s. the maximum degree of  $H$  is at most  $np/2 + 2\sqrt{np \log n}$ . Thus it is enough to show that  $G' = G - H$  has no perfect matching. Note that the vertices of  $X$  form an independent set in  $G'$  and therefore should be matched with vertices in  $Y$ . On the other hand this is impossible as  $|Y| < |X|$ . ■

#### 4. HAMILTON CYCLES

In this section we study the local resilience of random and pseudo-random graphs with respect to hamiltonicity. For illustrative purposes we start by focusing on the case of dense pseudorandom graphs, because in this case the treatment is considerably less technical.

##### 4.1. $\epsilon$ -Regular Graphs

A graph  $G = (V, E)$  on  $n$  vertices is called  $(d, \epsilon)$ -regular if its minimum degree is at least  $dn$ , and for every pair of disjoint subsets  $S, T \subset V$  of cardinalities at least  $\epsilon n$ , the number of edges between  $S$  and  $T$  satisfies

$$\left| \frac{e(S, T)}{|S||T|} - d \right| \leq \epsilon.$$

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $G$  be a  $(d, \epsilon)$ -regular graph on  $n$  vertices, where  $0 < \epsilon \ll d \leq 1$  are constants and  $n$  is sufficiently large and let  $c_d = 8/d$ . Then for every subgraph  $H$  of  $G$  with maximum degree  $\Delta(H) \leq (d/2 - c_d\epsilon)n$  the graph  $G' = G - H$  contains a Hamilton cycle.*

Using Chernoff-type estimates one can easily check that for every constant  $0 < p < 1$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  the random graph  $G(n, p)$  is almost surely  $(p, \epsilon)$ -regular. In particular, we obtain that by deleting at most  $(1/2 - \epsilon)np$  edges at every vertex of  $G(n, p)$  we cannot destroy all Hamilton cycles in this graph. On the other hand, the construction in part (ii) of Theorem 3.1 shows that the constant  $1/2$  cannot be improved.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $G$  be a  $(d, \epsilon)$ -regular graph on  $n$  vertices with  $0 < 2\epsilon < d \leq 1$  and let  $H$  be a subgraph of  $G$  with maximum degree  $\Delta(H) \leq (d/2 - c\epsilon)n$  and  $c > 2$ . Then the graph  $G' = G - H$  is connected and for every  $X \subseteq V(G')$  of size at least  $\epsilon n$  we have that  $|N_{G'}(X)| \geq (1/2 + (c - 2)\epsilon)n$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a subset of  $V(G')$  of size at least  $\epsilon n$  and let  $Z$  contains precisely  $\epsilon n$  vertices of  $X$ . Consider the set  $Y$  of all vertices of  $G' - Z$  which have no neighbors in  $Z$ . Then  $|N_{G'}(X)| \geq |N_{G'}(Z)| \geq n - |Y| - |Z|$ . Since  $G$  is a  $(d, \epsilon)$ -regular graph, by definition, we have  $e_G(Z, Y) \geq (d - \epsilon)|Z||Y|$ . On the other hand we know that  $e_{G'}(Z, Y) = 0$ . This implies that all the edges of  $G$  between  $Z$  and  $Y$  were deleted when we removed  $H$ . Because the maximum degree of  $H$  is at most  $(d/2 - c\epsilon)n$ , there are at most  $(d/2 - c\epsilon)n|Z|$  edges of  $H$  incident with vertices in  $Z$ . Combining these facts we obtain that

$$(d/2 - c\epsilon)n|Z| \geq e_G(Z, Y) \geq (d - \epsilon)|Z||Y|.$$

This implies that

$$|Y| \leq \frac{d/2 - c\epsilon}{d - \epsilon}n \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - (c - 1)\epsilon\right)n,$$

and hence  $|N_{G'}(X)| \geq n - |Y| - |Z| \geq (1/2 + (c - 2)\epsilon)n$ .

Next we use this inequality to show that  $G' = G - H$  is connected. Suppose that this is not true and let  $X$  be the vertex set of the smallest connected component of  $G'$ . Then  $|X| \leq n/2$  and  $N_{G'}(X) = X$ . Since the minimum degree of  $G'$  is at least  $dn - \Delta(H) \geq dn/2$ , we have that  $|X| \geq dn/2 \geq \epsilon n$  and therefore  $|N_{G'}(X)| > n/2 \geq |X|$ . This contradiction implies that  $G'$  is connected and completes the proof. ■

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Let  $c_d = 8/d$  and let  $G'$  be the graph obtained from  $(d, \epsilon)$ -regular graph  $G$  of order  $n$  by deleting a subgraph  $H$  with maximum degree  $\Delta(H) \leq (d/2 - c_d\epsilon)n$ . To prove the theorem we show that some path  $P$  of a maximal length in  $G'$  can be closed to a cycle. As  $G'$  is connected by Lemma 4.2, any non-Hamilton cycle can be extended to a path covering some additional vertices. Therefore the assumption about the maximality of  $P$  implies that  $P$  is a Hamilton path, and thus the above created cycle is Hamilton as well. Our approach relies on a variant of the so called rotation–extension technique, invented by Pósa in [16] and applied in several subsequent papers on hamiltonicity of random and pseudo-random graphs (see, e.g., [10], [3], [12]).

Let  $P = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_l)$  be a longest path in  $G'$ . If  $1 \leq i < l$  and  $(v_i, v_l) \in E(G')$ , then the path  $P' = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i, v_l, v_{l-1}, \dots, v_{i+1})$  is also of maximal length. We say that  $P'$  is a *rotation* of  $P$  with *fixed endpoint*  $v_1$ , *pivot*  $v_i$ , and *broken edge*  $(v_i, v_{i+1})$  (the reason for the last term being the fact that  $(v_i, v_{i+1})$  is deleted from the edge set of  $P$  to get  $P'$ ). We can

then rotate  $P'$  in a similar fashion to get a new path  $P''$  of the same length, and so on. A subset  $I$  of consecutive points of  $P$  is called a *segment*. Given set a  $S \subseteq P$ , a vertex  $v \in S$  is an *interior point* of  $S$  with respect to  $P$  if both neighbors of  $v$  along  $P$  lie in  $S$ . The set of all interior points of  $S$  will be denoted by  $int(S)$ .

Let  $t = d/(5\epsilon)$  and let  $I_1, I_2, \dots, I_t$  be a partition of path  $P$  into  $t$  segments of length  $|P|/t \leq n/t = (5/d)\epsilon n$ . By definition, all the neighbors of  $v_1$  and  $v_t$  in  $G'$  belong to  $P$ . Because the minimum degree of  $G'$  is at least  $dn - \Delta(H) \geq dn/2$ , there exist a segment  $I_p$  which contains at least  $(dn/2)/t \geq 5\epsilon n/2$  neighbors of  $v_1$ . Similarly there exist a segment  $I_q$  which contains at least  $5\epsilon n/2$  neighbors of  $v_t$ . If  $p = q$  divide  $I_p$  into two segments  $J_1, J_2$  such that both contains exactly  $5\epsilon n/4$  neighbors of  $v_1$ . Clearly, one of the segments  $J_i$  contains at least  $5\epsilon n/4$  neighbors of  $v_t$ . Without loss of generality suppose that it is  $J_2$ . Hence we obtain two disjoint segments of  $P$  such that  $|J_1|, |J_2| \leq (5/d)\epsilon n$ ,  $int(J_1)$  contains at least  $5\epsilon n/4 - 2 > \epsilon n$  neighbors of  $v_1$  and  $int(J_2)$  contains at least  $\epsilon n$  neighbors of  $v_t$ . In case  $p \neq q$  simply take  $J_1 = I_p$  and  $J_2 = I_q$ .

For every neighbor  $u$  of  $v_1$  in  $int(J_1)$  rotate  $P$  using  $u$  as pivot and keeping  $v_t$  fixed. Let  $A$  be the set of endpoints of paths obtained by such rotations. For every  $a \in A$  let  $P(a, v_t)$  be the corresponding new maximum length path with endpoints  $a$  and  $v_t$  directed from  $a$  to  $v_t$ . By the above discussion,  $A$  is subset of  $J_1$  of size at least  $\epsilon n$  and all the edges of  $P$  outside  $J_1$  are unbroken and belong to every path  $P(a, v_t)$ . Moreover, each  $P(a, v_t)$  traverse the segments of  $P$  outside  $J_1$  in exactly the same direction.

Now for every  $a \in A$  and for every neighbor  $w$  of  $v_t$  in  $int(J_2)$  rotate  $P(a, v_t)$  using  $w$  as pivot and keeping  $a$  fixed. For every  $a \in A$ , let  $B(a)$  be the set of endpoints of paths obtained by such rotations. Note that, since  $J_2$  is disjoint from  $J_1$ , all the paths  $P(a, v_t)$  traverse the segment  $J_2$  in the same direction. This implies that the set  $B(a)$  does not depend on  $a$ . Call this set  $B$ . The size of  $B$  is at least  $\epsilon n$ . Furthermore,  $B$  is completely contained in  $J_2$ . For every  $a \in A$  and  $b \in B$ , let  $P(a, b)$  be the corresponding new maximum length path with endpoints  $a$  and  $b$ , directed from  $a$  to  $b$ . Again it is easy to see that in all the paths  $P(a, b)$  the edges outside  $J_1 \cup J_2$  are unbroken and these paths traverse the segments of  $P$  outside  $J_1 \cup J_2$  in exactly the same direction.

Consider a point  $v$  in the interior of  $P - (J_1 \cup J_2)$  adjacent to some  $b \in B$ . For every  $a \in A$  and for every such  $v$  we can rotate  $P(a, b)$  using  $v$  as pivot and keeping  $a$  fixed. Because all the paths  $P(a, b)$  traverse the edges of  $P - (J_1 \cup J_2)$  in the same direction, we conclude that the set of endpoints of paths obtained by such rotations does not depend on  $a$ . Denote this set by  $C$ . Then for every  $a \in A$  and  $c \in C$  there exists a maximum length path with endpoints  $a$  and  $c$ . Note that the size of  $C$  is at least  $|N_{G'}(B)| - |J_1| - |J_2| - O(1)$ . Furthermore  $|B| \geq \epsilon n$ . Therefore, by Lemma 4.2 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |C| &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + (c_d - 2)\epsilon\right)n - 2(5/d)\epsilon n - O(1) \\ &> \left(\frac{1}{2} + (8/d - 2)\epsilon\right)n - (11/d)\epsilon n \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - (5/d)\epsilon\right)n. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since also  $|A| \geq \epsilon n$  the same lemma implies that

$$|N_{G'}(A)| \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + (c_d - 2)\epsilon\right)n \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} + (6/d)\epsilon\right)n > n - |C|.$$

Thus we conclude that  $C \cap N_{G'}(A)$  is nonempty, i.e., there is an edge connecting  $A$  and  $C$  and hence closing a maximal path to a cycle. This completes the proof. ■

### 4.2. Sparse Random Graphs

Now we are going to consider the general case when  $p$  can be as small as  $\log^4 n/n$ .

**Theorem 4.3.** *For every fixed  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $p \geq \log^4 n/n$  the random graph  $G(n, p)$  almost surely has the following property. If  $H$  is a subgraph of  $G = G(n, p)$  with maximum degree  $\Delta(H) \leq (1/2 - \epsilon)np$  then  $G' = G - H$  contains a Hamilton cycle.*

The proof of this theorem is much more technical than the previous one. Let us start with two (rather routine) lemmas about the edge distribution of  $G(n, p)$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *If  $p \geq \log^4 n/n$  then almost surely*

- (i) *For every subset  $A, |A| = a$  of  $G(n, p)$  the number of edges between  $A$  and its complement  $V(G) - A$  is  $(1 + o(1))a(n - a)p$ .*
- (ii) *The number of edges between any two disjoint subsets  $A, B$  of  $G(n, p)$  of size  $|A| = a$  and  $|B| = b \leq \min(\frac{anp}{15}, \frac{n}{15})$  is less than  $anp/2$ .*
- (iii) *The number of edges between any two disjoint subsets  $A, B$  of  $G(n, p)$  of size  $|A| = a \geq n/\log^3 n$  and  $|B| = b \geq n/\log^{1/4} n$  is at least  $(1 + o(1))abp$ .*

*Proof.* (i) By symmetry it is enough to prove the claim for  $a \leq n/2$ . In this case, using Chernoff-type estimates, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left[ |e(A, V(G) - A) - a(n - a)p| \geq t = \frac{a(n - a)p}{\log n} \right] \\ \leq e^{-\Omega\left(\frac{t^2}{2a(n-a)p}\right)} \leq e^{-\Omega\left(\frac{a(n-a)p}{\log^2 n}\right)} \ll e^{-2a \log n}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the probability that there is set  $A, |A| \leq n/2$  which violates condition (i) is at most

$$\sum_{a \leq n/2} \binom{n}{a} e^{-2a \log n} \leq \sum_{a \leq n/2} n^a e^{-2a \log n} = \sum_{a \leq n/2} e^{-a \log n} = o(1).$$

(ii) The probability that there is a pair of sets  $A, B$  that violates this claim is at most

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} &\leq \sum_{a,b} \binom{n}{a} \binom{n}{b} \binom{ab}{anp/2} p^{anp/2} \leq \sum_{a,b} \binom{n}{a} \left(\frac{en}{b}\right)^b \left(\frac{eab}{anp/2}\right)^{anp/2} p^{anp/2} \\ &\leq \sum_{a,b} \binom{n}{a} \left(\frac{en}{b}\right)^{anp/15} \left(\frac{2eb}{n}\right)^{anp/2} \leq \sum_{a,b} n^a (2^{1/2} e^{3/5} (b/n)^{2/5})^{anp} \\ &\leq \sum_{a,b} n^a \left(\frac{2^3 e^3}{15^2}\right)^{anp/5} \leq n \sum_a e^{a \log n} 0.8^{a \log^4 n/5} = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) The number of choices for sets  $A, B$  is at most  $2^{2n}$ . On the other hand, using again Chernoff-type estimates, we have that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ e(A, B) - abp \leq -t = -\frac{abp}{\log^{1/4} n} \right] \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2abp}} \leq e^{-\frac{abp}{2 \log^{1/2} n}} \leq e^{-n \log^{1/4} n/2} \ll 2^{-2n}.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. ■

**Lemma 4.5.** For  $p \geq \log^4 n/n$  and fixed  $\epsilon > 0$  let  $H$  be a subgraph of  $G = G(n, p)$  with maximum degree  $\Delta(H) \leq (1/2 - \epsilon)np$ . Then a.s. the graph  $G' = G - H$  is connected, every subset  $A$  of  $G'$  of size  $a \leq n/\log^4 n$  satisfies that  $|N_{G'}(A)| \geq a \log^4 n/15$  and every subset  $B$  of size  $b \geq n/\log^3 n$  has  $|N_{G'}(B)| \geq \frac{1+\epsilon}{2}n$ .

*Proof.* Let  $H$  be a subgraph of  $G = G(n, p)$  with maximum degree  $\Delta(H) \leq (1/2 - \epsilon)np$ . Consider a subset  $A$  of  $G' = G - H$  of size  $a \leq n/\log^4 n$ . By part (i) of the previous lemma we know that there are  $(1 + o(1))a(n - a)p = (1 + o(1))anp$  edges of  $G(n, p)$  between  $A$  and its complement  $V(G) - A$ . On the other hand there are at most  $(1/2 - \epsilon)anp$  edges of  $H$  incident with vertices in  $A$ . Combining these facts we obtain that

$$e_{G'}(A, V - A) \geq (1 + o(1))anp - (1/2 - \epsilon)anp \geq anp/2.$$

Let  $Y$  be the set of all vertices from  $V - A$  which are adjacent in  $G'$  to some vertex in  $A$ . Then  $e_G(A, Y) \geq e_{G'}(A, Y) \geq anp/2$ . Hence, by part (ii) of Lemma 4.4 we have that

$$|N_{G'}(A)| \geq |Y| \geq \min\left(\frac{anp}{15}, \frac{n}{15}\right) \geq \frac{\log^4 n}{15}a.$$

Let  $B$  be a subset of  $G'$  of size at least  $n/\log^3 n$  and let  $D \subseteq B$  contains precisely  $|D| = d = n/\log^3 n$  vertices from  $B$ . Consider the set  $Z$  of all vertices of  $G' - D$  which have no neighbors in  $D$ . Then  $|N_{G'}(B)| \geq |N_{G'}(D)| \geq n - |D| - |Z|$ . Note that, by definition of  $Z$ , all the edges of  $G(n, p)$  between  $D$  and  $Z$  were deleted when we removed  $H$ . Since the maximum degree of  $H$  is at most  $(1/2 - \epsilon)np$ , there are at most  $(1/2 - \epsilon)ndp$  edges of  $H$  incident with vertices in  $D$ . Using this fact together with part (iii) of Lemma 4.4, we obtain

$$(1 + o(1))d|Z|p \leq e_G(D, Z) \leq (1/2 - \epsilon)ndp,$$

and therefore  $|Z| \leq (1/2 - \epsilon - o(1))n$ . This implies that

$$|N_{G'}(B)| \geq n - |Z| - |D| \geq (1/2 + \epsilon - o(1))n - n/\log^3 n > \frac{1 + \epsilon}{2}n.$$

By the above mentioned discussion we have that  $|N_{G'}(C)| > |C|$  for every subset  $C$ ,  $|C| \leq n/2$ . Thus every connected component of  $G'$  has size larger than  $n/2$  and therefore  $G'$  is connected. ■

With these lemmas in hand, Theorem 4.3 is a corollary of the following deterministic result, which ensures the existence of a hamiltonian cycle in a graph provided some information about edge expansion.

**Theorem 4.6.** For every fixed  $\epsilon > 0$  and sufficiently large  $n$ , the following holds. Let  $G$  be a connected graph of order  $n$  such that every subset  $U$  of  $G$  of size at most  $n/\log^4 n$  satisfies  $|N_G(U)| \geq |U| \log^4 n/15$  and every subset  $W$  of size at least  $n/\log^3 n$  has  $|N_G(W)| \geq \frac{1+\epsilon}{2}n$ . Then  $G$  contains a Hamilton cycle.

The proof of Theorem 4.6 uses roughly the same approach as described in the previous subsection but is much more involved. It is enough to show that some longest path in  $G$  can

be closed to a cycle. Since  $G$  is connected this cycle must be hamiltonian. We start with some fixed longest path  $P$  and use the rotation–extension technique to construct two sets of vertices  $A$  and  $B$  of nearly linear size such that for every vertex  $a \in A$  and every vertex  $b \in B$  there is a path  $P(a, b)$  from  $a$  to  $b$  of maximum length. Also, we have a collection of segments of the original path  $P$  with total length  $|P| - o(n)$  such that all paths  $P(a, b)$  contain these segments untouched. Moreover, each of these segments is traversed by all paths  $P(a, b)$  in the same direction. Once we have such a collection of maximum paths  $P(a, b)$ , we perform one additional round of rotations to find a maximum path which can be closed to a cycle. This part of the argument is exactly the same as in the proof of Theorem 4.1.

To construct sets  $A, B$  as above in the case of dense graphs, it was enough to rotate each endpoint of the original path  $P$  once. Unfortunately, in the case of sparse graphs, after one round of rotations one can only obtain sets  $A, B$  of polylogarithmic size. The goal of the proof is to amplify the size of  $A$  and  $B$  to be close to linear. This is achieved in roughly  $\frac{\log n}{\log \log n}$  rounds of rotations, where in each round we first rotate the left endpoint of all maximum paths  $P(a, b)$  and then the right endpoint. At the end of each round, we obtain new sets  $A$  and  $B$ , which are larger than the previous ones by a factor of  $\log n$ .

*Proof.* We use the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 4.1. Let  $P = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k)$  be the longest path in  $G$ . We fix a canonical direction on the path  $P$  from  $v_1$  to  $v_k$ , and call  $v_1$  the left end and  $v_k$  the right end. If  $1 \leq i < k$  and  $(v_i, v_k) \in E(G)$ , then the path  $P' = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i, v_k, v_{k-1}, \dots, v_{i+1})$  is also of maximal length. We say that  $P'$  is a *rotation* of  $P$  with *fixed endpoint*  $v_k$ , *pivot*  $v_i$  and *broken edge*  $(v_i, v_{i+1})$  (the reason for the last term being the fact that  $(v_i, v_{i+1})$  is deleted from the edge set of  $P$  to get  $P'$ ). We can then rotate  $P'$  in a similar fashion to get a new path  $P''$  of the same length, and so on. We only perform rotations whose broken edges are the edges of the original path  $P$ . For example, if we perform a rotation with pivot  $v_i$  we will not use vertices  $v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}$  as pivots for future rotations. A subset  $I$  of consecutive points of  $P$  is called a *segment*. Given a set  $S \subseteq P$ , a vertex  $v \in S$  is an *interior point* of  $S$  with respect to  $P$  if both neighbors of  $v$  along  $P$  lie in  $S$ . The set of all interior points of  $S$  will be denoted by  $\text{int}(S)$ .

The proof consists of two parts. First, for every  $1 \leq t \leq r = \frac{\log n}{\log \log n} - 5$ , we use induction to construct segments  $I_1, \dots, I_t$  and  $J_1, \dots, J_t$  of the original path  $P$  and two subsets  $A_t, B_t$  of size  $\log^{t+2} n$  with the following properties.

### Properties:

1. All segments  $I_\ell, J_{\ell'}$  have length at most  $O(n/\log n)$  for every  $1 \leq \ell, \ell' \leq t$ . Segments  $I_\ell$  are disjoint from all segments  $J_{\ell'}$ . For every two indices  $\ell \neq \ell'$ , the corresponding segments  $I_\ell$  and  $I_{\ell'}$  are either disjoint or the same. Similar conditions hold for segments  $J_\ell, J_{\ell'}$ . Also,  $A_t \subset I_t$  and  $B_t \subset J_t$ .
2. For every  $a \in A_t$  and  $b \in B_t$ , we have a path of maximum length going from  $a$  to  $b$ . This path was obtained from  $P$  by  $t$  iterations of rotations, where in each iteration we first rotate the left end point and then the right end point of a path obtained in the previous iteration. Therefore, this path has  $2t$  broken edges. The edge which gets broken in the  $i$ -th iteration when we rotate the left end point is denoted by  $e_i(a)$ . Similarly,  $e_i(b)$  is the edge which gets broken in the  $i$ -th iteration when we rotate the right end point. These  $2t$  edges partition  $P$  into  $2t + 1$  segments  $Q_1(a, b), \dots, Q_{2t+1}(a, b)$ , where the indices  $1, 2, \dots, 2t + 1$  correspond to the order in which the segments appear on the path  $P(a, b)$  when we go from  $a$  to  $b$ .

3. For any  $a \in A_t$ , the corresponding edges  $e_1(a), \dots, e_t(a)$  depend only on  $a$ , regardless of the right end point  $b \in B_t$ . Also, the edge  $e_\ell(a)$  belongs to  $I_\ell$  for all  $a \in A_t$ , and  $1 \leq \ell \leq t$ . Similarly, the edges  $e_1(b), \dots, e_t(b)$  depend only on  $b$ , and  $e_\ell(b)$  belongs to  $J_\ell$  for all  $b \in B_t$  and  $1 \leq \ell \leq t$ . Moreover, the order in which the  $2t$  edges  $\{e_\ell(a)\} \cup \{e_\ell(b)\}$  appear on the path  $P$  is universal (i.e., it does not depend on the pair  $(a, b)$ ).
4. There is a universal pair  $(\pi, z)$  (i.e., it does not depend on the endpoints  $a, b$ ), where  $\pi$  is a permutation in  $S_{2t+1}$  and  $z$  is a binary vector of length  $2t + 1$ . Permutation  $\pi$  records the order in which the segments  $Q_i(a, b)$  appear on the path  $P$ . For example  $\pi(i) = j$  means that  $Q_i(a, b)$  is the  $j$ -th segment from the left on  $P$ . The vector  $z$  records the direction in which these segments are traversed by  $P(a, b)$ :  $z_i = 0$  if  $P(a, b)$  traverses  $Q_i(a, b)$  from left to right (in the direction of  $P$ ) and  $z_i = 1$  otherwise. Therefore, although segments  $Q_i(a, b)$  do depend on the endpoints  $a, b$ , we have that these segments appear on paths  $P$  in exactly the same order, and also the direction in which each segment  $Q_i(a, b)$  is traversed is the same for all paths  $P(a, b)$ .

Suppose that we have constructed sets  $A_r, B_r$  of size  $\log^{r+2} n$  and segments  $I_1, \dots, I_r$  and  $J_1, \dots, J_r$  which satisfy properties 1–4 for  $r = \frac{\log n}{\log \log n} - 5$ . Then we can complete the proof of the theorem as follows. Note that both  $A_r$  and  $B_r$  have size  $\log^{r+2} n = n / \log^3 n$ , and all paths  $P(a, b)$  have the same vertex set as path  $P$ . Also by maximality of path  $P(a, b)$ , all neighbors of  $a$  also belong to this path. Thus the neighbors of all vertices in  $A_r$  belong to path  $P$ . Let  $I = \cup_{\ell=1}^r I_\ell, J = \cup_{\ell=1}^r J_\ell$ , and let  $v$  be a point in the interior of  $P - (I \cup J)$  adjacent to some  $a \in A_r$ . By the above discussion, the number of such vertices  $v$  is at least  $|N_G(A_r)| - |I| - |J| - O(r)$ . For every  $b \in B_r$  and for every such  $v$ , we can rotate  $P(a, b)$  using  $v$  as pivot and keeping  $b$  fixed. From properties 1–4, it is easy to check that for every edge of  $P - (I \cup J)$ , there is an index  $1 \leq i \leq 2r + 1$  such that for all paths  $P(a, b)$  this edge belongs to the segment  $Q_i(a, b)$ . Therefore, every edge of  $P - (I \cup J)$  is traversed in the same direction by all paths  $P(a, b)$ . Thus, the set of endpoints of new paths obtained by such rotations does not depend on  $b$ . Denote this set by  $C$ . For every  $b \in B_r$  and  $c \in C$  there exists a maximum length path with endpoints  $c$  and  $b$ . As we already mentioned, the size of  $C$  is at least  $|N_G(A_r)| - |I| - |J| - O(r)$  and  $|A_r| = n / \log^3 n$ . By our assumptions, we have that

$$|C| \geq \frac{1 + \epsilon}{2} n - 2r \frac{n}{\log n} - O(r) > \frac{1 + \epsilon}{2} n - o(n) > n/2.$$

On the other hand, since  $|B_r| = n / \log^3 n$ , the expansion assumption yields

$$|N_G(B_r)| \geq \frac{1 + \epsilon}{2} n > n - |C|.$$

This implies that  $C \cap N_G(B_r)$  is not empty. So, there is an edge connecting  $B_r$  and  $C$  which closes a maximal path to a cycle. The proof is complete. ■

Next we show, using induction, how to construct segments  $I_1, \dots, I_t$  and  $J_1, \dots, J_t$ , and sets  $A_t, B_t$  of size  $\log^{t+2} n$ , satisfying properties 1–4. We start with a detailed description of the basis case when  $t = 1$ .

**Construction for  $t = 1$ .** By our assumption, the minimum degree  $\delta(G)$  (of  $G$ ) is at least  $\log^4 n / 15$ . Because of the maximality of path  $P$ , all the neighbors of  $v_1$  and  $v_k$  belong to

$P$ . Set  $s = \log n/40$  and partition  $P$  into  $s$  segments of length  $|P|/s \leq n/s = O(n/\log n)$ . By the pigeonhole principle, there are two segments  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  containing at least  $\delta(G)/s \geq 8 \log^3 n/3$  neighbors of  $v_1$  and  $v_k$ , respectively. If  $S_1 \neq S_2$ , let  $I_1 = S_1$  and  $J_1 = S_2$ . Otherwise, divide  $S_1$  into two segments, each containing at least  $4 \log^3 n/3$  neighbors of  $v_1$ . One of these segments must contain at least  $4 \log^3 n/3$  neighbors of  $v_k$ . Call this segment  $J_1$  and the other one  $I_1$ . In both cases, we obtain two disjoint segments  $I_1, J_1$  of length  $O(n/\log n)$  such that  $\text{int}(I_1)$  contains at least  $\log^3 n$  neighbors of  $v_1$  and  $\text{int}(J_1)$  contains at least  $\log^3 n$  neighbors of  $v_k$ .

For every neighbor  $u$  of  $v_1$  in  $\text{int}(I_1)$ , rotate  $P$  using  $u$  as pivot and keeping  $v_k$  fixed. Let  $A_1$  be the set of endpoints of paths obtained by such rotations. For  $a \in A_1$ , let  $P(a, v_k)$  be the corresponding new maximum path with endpoints  $a$  and  $v_k$ , directed from  $a$  to  $v_k$ . Also, for every  $a \in A_1$  and for every neighbor  $w$  of  $v_k$  in  $\text{int}(J_1)$ , rotate  $P(a, v_k)$  using  $w$  as pivot and keeping  $a$  fixed. Let  $B_1$  be the set of endpoints of paths obtained by such rotations. Since  $J_1$  is disjoint from  $I_1$ , all paths  $P(a, v_k)$  traverse the segment  $J_1$  in the same direction. This implies that the set  $B_1$  does not depend on  $a$ . Both  $A_1$  and  $B_1$  are of size at least  $\log^3 n$ . By deleting some vertices, we can assume that  $|A_1| = |B_1| = \log^3 n$  for convenience. We also know that  $A_1 \subset I_1$ ,  $B_1 \subset J_1$ , and for every  $a \in A_1$  and  $b \in B_1$  we have a maximum length path  $P(a, b)$  with endpoints  $a$  and  $b$ .

Each path  $P(a, b)$  was obtained by two rotations, one from the left and one from the right. Furthermore, it has two broken edges  $e_1(a)$  (obtained when we rotated  $v_1$ ) and  $e_1(b)$  (obtained when we rotated  $v_k$ ). Note that the edge  $e_1(a)$  belongs to  $I_1$  and does not depend on  $b$ . Similarly, the edge  $e_1(b)$  belongs to  $J_1$  and does not depend on  $a$ . In particular, the order in which  $e_1(a)$  and  $e_1(b)$  appear on the path  $P$  is the same order in which the segments  $I_1$  and  $J_1$  appear. Therefore, this order is universal and does not depend on the endpoints  $a$  and  $b$ . The edges  $e_1(a)$  and  $e_1(b)$  partition the path  $P$  into 3 segments  $Q_1(a, b), Q_2(a, b), Q_3(a, b)$ , where the indices 1, 2, 3 correspond to the order these segments appear on  $P(a, b)$  when we go from  $a$  to  $b$ . We associate with each path  $P(a, b)$  a permutation in  $S_3$  (the permutation group on 1, 2, 3) and a binary vector of length 3. The permutation records the order in which the segments  $Q_i(a, b)$  appear on the path  $P$ . The vector records the direction in which these segments were traversed by the path  $P(a, b)$  as follows. The coordinate  $i$  of the vector is 0 if  $P(a, b)$  traverses  $Q_i(a, b)$  from left to right (in the direction of  $P$ ) and is 1 otherwise. From our construction it follows that, although the location of the segments  $Q_i(a, b)$  does depend on the actual endpoints  $a$  and  $b$ , there is a universal pair  $(\pi, z)$  such that all segments  $Q_i(a, b)$  appear on path  $P$  in the order of  $\pi$ , and all paths  $P(a, b)$  traverse the corresponding segment  $Q_i(a, b)$  in the direction defined by the  $z_i$ . In particular, every edge outside  $I_{1,1} \cup J_{1,1}$  is unbroken has the same index  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  of interval  $Q_i(a, b)$  to which it belongs for all paths  $P(a, b)$ , and therefore is traversed in the same direction by all these paths. ■

**Induction step:** Suppose we have segments  $I_1, \dots, I_t$  and  $J_1, \dots, J_t$  of the path  $P$  and two subsets  $A_t, B_t$  of size  $\log^{t+2} n$ , satisfying properties 1–4. We construct new sets of endpoints  $A_{t+1}$  and  $B_{t+1}$  by first rotating the left end points of all paths  $P(a, b)$ ,  $a \in A_t, b \in B_t$ , keeping right end points fixed, and then vice versa. When we rotate the left end points of all paths  $P(a, b)$ , we obtain new segments  $I_1, \dots, I_t, I_{t+1}$  and  $J_1, \dots, J_t$ , and sets  $A_{t+1}$  and  $B_t$ . The set  $A_{t+1}$  will be larger than the original set  $A_t$  by a factor  $\log^2 n$ . On the other hand, the new set  $B_t$  might decrease by a factor  $2(t+1)$  during this operation. Note that we slightly abusing notation here, since both segments  $I_1, \dots, I_t, J_1, \dots, J_t$  and also set  $B_t$  are changing during the rotation, and are not what they were originally. Next we rotate right endpoints of all paths  $P(a, b)$ ,  $a \in A_{t+1}, b \in B_t$  (here  $B_t$  is the new set we got after rotating left end



points). In the end of the rotation from the right we obtain new segments  $I_1, \dots, I_t, I_{t+1}$  and  $J_1, \dots, J_t, J_{t+1}$ , and sets  $A_{t+1}$  and  $B_{t+1}$ . After the second round of rotations the size of the set  $B_{t+1}$  will be larger than the set  $B_t$  by a factor  $\log^2 n$ , but the set  $A_{t+1}$  might shrink by a factor of  $2(t + 1)$ . Overall, after rotating left and right end points, the sizes of the new sets  $A_{t+1}, B_{t+1}$  are larger than the sizes of the original sets  $A_t, B_t$  by a factor of at least  $\Omega(\log^2 n/t) \gg \log n$ . Moreover we perform rotations so that we preserve all the properties 1–4. Thus, at the end of the induction step we obtain new sets  $A_{t+1}, B_{t+1}$  of size  $\log^{t+3} n$  (this is in fact a lower bound, but we can always delete extra vertices) and two collections of segments  $I_1, \dots, I_{t+1}$  and  $J_1, \dots, J_{t+1}$  satisfying properties 1–4.

Now we give a detailed description of how we rotate the left end points of paths  $P(a, b)$ . Rotation of the right end points is done similarly and we will omit its description here. By the expansion properties of  $G$  we have that  $|N(A_t)| \geq (\log^4 n)|A_t|/15$ . Because of the maximality of paths  $P(a, b)$  and the fact that they all have the same vertex set as  $P$ , all neighbors of vertices in  $A_t$  belong to  $P$ . To give further details of the rotation procedure we need to consider several cases. The first case is when there are at least  $|N(A_t)|/3$  neighbors of  $A_t$  outside the set  $\cup_\ell(I_\ell \cup J_\ell)$ . This is a basic case which is also used to analyze the other two cases. The second case is when there are at least  $|N(A_t)|/3$  neighbors of  $A_t$  inside  $\cup_\ell J_\ell$ . The third (final) case is when there are at least  $|N(A_t)|/3$  neighbors of  $A_t$  inside  $\cup_\ell I_\ell$ . Clearly one of these three cases always happens.

*Case 1.* Suppose that there are at least  $(\log^4 n)|A_t|/45$  vertices of  $N(A_t)$  which do not belong to any segment  $I_\ell$  or  $J_\ell$ . Since  $P \setminus \cup_\ell(I_\ell \cup J_\ell)$  is a union of at most  $2t + 1$  segments, we can take one of them, which we call  $S$ , that contains at least  $\Omega((\log^4 n)|A_t|/t)$  vertices from  $N(A_t)$ . Partition  $S$  into  $\log n$  segments of length  $|S|/\log n \leq n/\log n$ . Then the interior of one of these segments contains at least  $\Omega((\log^3 n)|A_t|/t) \gg (\log^2 n)|A_t|$  points from  $N(A_t)$ . Denote this segment by  $I_{t+1}$ .

Let  $P(a, b)$  be an arbitrary maximum path with  $a \in A_t, b \in B_t$ . This path has  $2t$  broken edges  $\{e_\ell(a)\} \cup \{e_\ell(b)\}$  which partition it into  $2t + 1$  segments  $Q_1(a, b), \dots, Q_{2t+1}(a, b)$ , which are also segments of the original path  $P$ . As usual, the indices of these segments correspond to the order in which they appear on  $P(a, b)$  when we go from  $a$  to  $b$ . Since  $e_\ell(a) \in I_\ell, e_\ell(b) \in J_\ell$  and  $I_{t+1}$  is located outside  $\cup_\ell(I_\ell \cup J_\ell)$ , we have that  $I_{t+1}$  contains none of these edges and its position with respect to  $\{e_\ell(a)\} \cup \{e_\ell(b)\}$  is exactly the same for all  $a \in A_t, b \in B_t$ . Therefore there is an integer  $1 \leq q \leq 2t + 1$ , which does not depend on the endpoints  $a, b$ , such that  $I_{t+1}$  is a subset of the  $q$ -th segment (from the left) of  $P \setminus \{e_\ell(a)\} \cup \{e_\ell(b)\}$ . Let  $1 \leq h \leq 2t + 1$  be such that  $\pi(h) = q$ . By the definition of the permutation  $\pi$ ,  $I_{t+1}$  is a subset of  $Q_h(a, b)$  for all paths  $P(a, b)$ . Without loss of generality, suppose that  $z_h = 0$ , i.e., all paths  $P(a, b)$  traverse the segment  $Q_h(a, b)$  from left to right (in the direction of path  $P$ ). The case when  $z_h = 1$  can be treated similarly.

Let  $v$  be a neighbor of  $a$  in the interior of  $I_{t+1}$  and let  $(a', v)$  be the edge of  $P$  (and hence edge of  $P(a, b)$ ) where  $a'$  is the vertex which is immediately to the left of  $v$ . Then we can rotate the path  $P(a, b)$ , using  $v$  as a pivot and keeping  $b$  fixed, to obtain a new path  $P(a', b)$ . Put  $a' \in A_{t+1}$ , and note that for all  $b \in B_t$ , we will have the same new broken edge  $(a', v)$ , which we denote by  $e_{t+1}(a')$ . Also, for all  $1 \leq \ell \leq t$ , define  $e_\ell(a') = e_\ell(a)$ . By our construction, it is easy to see that for all  $a'$  and  $b$ , the order in which the  $2t + 1$  edges  $\{e_\ell(a')\} \cup \{e_\ell(b)\}$  appear on the path  $P$  is universal (i.e., does not depend on the pair  $(a', b)$ ).

The edges  $\{e_\ell(a')\} \cup \{e_\ell(b)\}$  partition  $P$  into  $2t + 2$  segments  $Q'_1(a, b), \dots, Q'_{2t+2}(a, b)$ , where the indices correspond to the order in which these segments are traversed by the path  $P(a', b)$ . New segments are obtained from segments  $Q_1(a, b), \dots, Q_{2t+1}(a, b)$  as follows.

$Q'_1(a, b)$  is the left part of  $Q_h(a, b)$  from the beginning of  $Q_h(a, b)$  to  $a'$ , and  $Q'_{h+1}(a, b)$  is the right part of  $Q_h(a, b)$  from the pivot vertex  $v$  to the end. For all  $2 \leq p \leq h$ , we have that  $Q'_p(a, b) = Q_{h-p+1}(a, b)$ . Moreover, for all  $h < p \leq 2t + 2$ ,  $Q'_p(a, b) = Q_{p+1}(a, b)$ . Thanks to the correspondence between the old and new segments, the order in which the segments  $\{Q'_p(a, b)\}$  appear on the path  $P$  does not depend on the path  $P(a', b)$ . Therefore, the permutation  $\pi'$  which records this order is the same for all new paths. Finally, we will show that the new vector  $z'$  that records the directions in which  $P(a', b)$  traverses the segments  $\{Q'_p(a, b)\}$  is also universal. Note that after the rotation of  $P(a, b)$  with fixed  $b$  and pivot  $v$ , the new path has opposite direction on the part of  $P(a, b)$  before  $v$ , and same direction as  $P(a, b)$  on the part after  $v$ . Therefore, we have that  $z_1 = 1 - z_h$  and  $z_p = 1 - z_{h-p+1}$  for all  $2 \leq p \leq h$ , and  $z_p = z_{p+1}$  for all  $h \leq p \leq 2t + 2$ . Now we can conclude that the new family of maximum paths possesses properties 1–4.

*Case 2.* Suppose that there are at least  $(\log^4 n)|A_t|/45$  vertices of  $N(A_t)$  inside  $\cup_\ell J_\ell$ . Then there is an index  $\ell^*$  such that  $J_{\ell^*}$  contains at least  $\Omega((\log^4 n)|A_t|/t) > (\log^3 n)|A_t|$  vertices from  $N(A_t)$ . Since some of the segments  $J_\ell$  might be equal, let  $L$  be the set of all indices  $1 \leq \ell \leq t$  such that  $J_\ell = J_{\ell^*}$ . Partition  $J_{\ell^*}$  into  $2t$  segments  $S_1, \dots, S_{2t}$ , each containing  $(\log^3 n)|A_t|/(2t) \gg (\log^2 n)|A_t|$  vertices of  $N(A_t)$ . Since for every fixed  $b \in B_t$ , the number of broken edges  $\{e_\ell(b)\}$  is at most  $t$ , at least half of all the segments  $S_j$  contain no such edge. By averaging, there is a segment  $S_i$  such that for at least half of the vertices  $b \in B_t$  this segment contains no edges  $\{e_\ell(b)\}$ . Let  $B'_i$  be the collection of those  $b$  where  $\{e_\ell(b)\}$  is not in  $S_i$ . For every  $b \in B'_i$ , consider the location of the segment  $S_i$  with respect to the edges  $\{e_\ell(b), \ell \in L\}$ . Note that by properties 1–4, these edges appear in the same order inside  $J_{\ell^*}$  and partition it into at most  $t + 1$  segments, one of which contains  $S_i$ . Therefore, there is a subset  $B''_i \subset B'_i$  of size at least  $|B'_i|/(t + 1)$  such that for all  $b \in B''_i$ , the segment  $S_i$  has exactly the same location with respect to the edges  $\{e_\ell(b)\}, \ell \in L$ .  $J_{\ell^*} \setminus S_i$  consists of two disjoint segments:  $J'$  on the left and  $J''$  on the right. Moreover, let  $L'$  be the set of indices  $\ell \in L$  such that  $e_\ell(b)$  appears on the left of  $S_i$ , and let  $L''$  be the set of indices  $\ell \in L$  such that  $e_\ell(b)$  appear on the right of  $S_i$ .

Define new segments  $J_\ell = J'$  for  $\ell \in L'$  and  $J_\ell = J''$  for  $\ell \in L''$ . Redefine  $B_t = B''_i$ . Note that since we only delete points from  $B_t$ , the new segments and the sets  $A_t$  and  $B_t$  still satisfy all properties 1–4. On the other hand, we now have the segment  $S_i$  of length at most  $n/\log n$  (since it is a subset of  $J_{\ell^*}$ ), which is disjoint from all segments  $I_\ell, J_\ell$  and contains  $\gg (\log^2 n)|A_t|$  vertices of  $N(A_t)$ . Let  $I_{t+1} = S_i$ . Then we can perform a rotation of the points in  $A_t$  as we did in Case 1. Note that in the end we will get a set  $A_{t+1}$  which has size  $\gg (\log^2 n)|A_t|$ . On the other hand, the set  $B_t$  may shrink by a factor of at most  $2(t + 1)$ . However, as we already mentioned in the beginning of the induction step, this loss in the size of  $B_t$  will be compensated later when we rotate right end points.

*Case 3.* If cases 1 and 2 do not occur, then there are less than  $(\log^4 n)|A_t|/45$  vertices outside the set  $\cup_\ell (I_\ell \cup J_\ell)$  and also less than  $(\log^4 n)|A_t|/45$  vertices inside the set  $\cup_\ell J_\ell$ . Since the size of  $N(A_t)$  is at least  $(\log^4 n)|A_t|/15$ , we have at least  $(\log^4 n)|A_t|/45$  neighbors of  $A_t$  inside  $\cup_\ell I_\ell$ . Hence there is an index  $\ell^*$  such that  $I_{\ell^*}$  contains at least  $\Omega((\log^4 n)|A_t|/t) > (\log^3 n)|A_t|$  vertices from  $N(A_t)$ . Let  $L$  be the set of all indices  $1 \leq \ell \leq t$  such that  $I_\ell = I_{\ell^*}$ . Since for every  $a \in A_t$  there are at most  $t$  broken edges  $e_\ell(a)$  inside  $I_{\ell^*}$ , the total number of broken edges inside this segment is at most  $t|A_t| \ll (\log n)|A_t|$ . Therefore, there is a subset  $D$  of at least  $(\log^3 n)|A_t|/2$  vertices from  $N(A_t)$  inside  $I_{\ell^*}$ , such that for every vertex  $u \in D$ , there is a segment of the path  $P$  of length  $\log n$  (constant length here is enough) with center in  $u$ , which contains no broken edges. By definition, for every  $u \in D$  there is a

vertex  $a_u \in A_t$  adjacent to  $u$ . If there are several such vertices, we fix one of them for each  $u$ . By properties 1–4, the broken edges  $\{e_\ell(a), \ell \in L\}$  appear in the same order in  $I_{\ell^*}$  for all  $a \in A_t$ , and partition it into at most  $t + 1$  segments. So, there exists a subset  $D' \subset D$  of size at least  $|D|/(t + 1) \gg (\log^2 n)|A_t|$ , and an index  $j$  such that every  $u \in D'$  appears in the  $j$ -th segment (from the left) of  $I_{\ell^*} \setminus \{e_\ell(a_u), \ell \in L\}$ , where  $a_u$  is the neighbor of  $u$  in  $A_t$  which we fixed.

Since the order of edges  $\{e_\ell(a)\}$  is the same for all  $a$  we conclude that there are two indices  $\ell_1$  and  $\ell_2$  such that every  $u \in D'$  appears after edge  $e_{\ell_1}(a_u)$  and before edge  $e_{\ell_2}(a_u)$ . By properties 1–4, there is an index  $1 \leq h \leq 2t + 1$  such that  $u$  is contained in the segment  $Q_h(a_u, b)$ , and this holds for all  $u \in D'$  and  $b \in B_t$ . Without loss of generality, suppose that  $z_h = 0$ , i.e., all paths  $P(a, b)$  traverse the segment  $Q_h(a, b)$  from left to right (in the direction of path  $P$ ). Let  $a'$  be the left neighbor of  $u$  on the path  $P$ . Then we can rotate  $P(a, b)$ , using  $u$  as a pivot and keeping  $b$  fixed, to obtain a new path  $P(a', b)$ . Put  $a' \in A_{t+1}$ , and note that for all  $b \in B_t$ , we should have the same new broken edge  $(a', u)$  which we denote  $e_{t+1}(a')$ . Also, for all  $1 \leq \ell \leq t$ , let  $e_\ell(a') = e_\ell(a)$ . By our construction,  $e_{t+1}(a')$  is located after  $e_{\ell_1}(a')$  and immediately before  $e_{\ell_2}(a')$ . So the order in which the  $2t + 1$  edges  $\{e_\ell(a')\} \cup \{e_\ell(b)\}$  appear on the path  $P$  do not depend on the pair  $(a', b)$ . The rest of the analysis showing that all new maximum paths  $P(a', b)$  have the same permutation  $\pi'$  and vector  $z'$  is exactly the same as in Case 1 and omitted. Finally, set  $I_{t+1} = I_{\ell^*}$  and note that  $|A_{t+1}| = |D'| \gg (\log^2 n)|A_t|$ . This concludes the description of the rotation procedure for the left end points.

As we mentioned earlier, the rotation of the right end points can be done similarly. Therefore, this also completes the proof of the induction step.  $\blacksquare$

### 4.3. Sparse Pseudorandom Graphs

Theorem 4.6 can be also applied to show that sparse  $(n, D, \lambda)$ -graphs have local resilience with respect to hamiltonicity. For this we first need to prove the following analog of Lemma 4.5.

**Lemma 4.7.** *For any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$  and sufficiently large  $n$  the following holds. Let  $G$  be an  $(n, D, \lambda)$ -graph with  $D/\lambda > \log^2 n$  and let  $H$  be a subgraph of  $G$  with maximum degree  $\Delta(H) \leq (1/2 - \epsilon)D$ , then the graph  $G' = G - H$  is*

- *connected;*
- *every subset  $U$  of  $G'$  of size at most  $n/\log^4 n$  satisfies that  $|N_{G'}(U)| \geq |U| \log^4 n/15$ ;*
- *every subset  $W$  of size at least  $n/\log^3 n$  has  $|N_{G'}(W)| \geq \frac{1+\epsilon}{2}n$ .*

*Proof.* We use the following well known estimate on the edge distribution of an  $(n, D, \lambda)$ -graph  $G$  (see, e.g., [1], Corollary 9.2.5). For every two (not necessarily disjoint) subsets  $B, C \subseteq V$ , let  $e(B, C)$  denote the number of ordered pairs  $(u, v)$  with  $u \in B, v \in C$  such that  $uv$  is an edge. Note that if  $u, v \in B \cap C$ , then the edge  $uv$  contributes 2 to  $e(B, C)$ . In this notation,

$$\left| e(B, C) - \frac{D}{n}|B||C| \right| \leq \lambda\sqrt{|B||C|}.$$

Let  $U$  be a subset of  $G'$  of size at most  $n/\log^4 n$  and let  $X = U \cup N_{G'}(U)$ . Observe that since  $\Delta(H) \leq (1/2 - \epsilon)D$  we have that the minimum degree of  $G'$  is at least  $D - \Delta(H) > D/2$ .

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} e_G(U, X) &\geq e_{G'}(U, X) \geq \frac{D}{2}|U| - 2e_G(U) \geq \frac{D}{2}|U| - \frac{D}{n}|U|^2 - \lambda|U| \\ &\geq \left(\frac{D}{2} - \frac{D}{\log^4 n} - \frac{D}{\log^2 n}\right)|U| \geq \frac{2}{5}D|U|. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that  $|X| \leq \frac{\log^4 n}{14}|U| \leq n/14$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} e_G(U, X) &\leq \frac{D}{n}|U||X| + \lambda\sqrt{|U||X|} \leq \frac{D}{14}|U| + \frac{\lambda \log^2 n}{\sqrt{14}}|U| \\ &< \left(\frac{D}{14} + \frac{D}{\sqrt{14}}\right)|U| < \frac{2}{5}D|U|. \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction implies that  $|X| \geq \frac{\log^4 n}{14}|U|$  and that  $|N_{G'}(U)| \geq |X| - |U| > \frac{\log^4 n}{15}|U|$ .

Now suppose that  $W$  is a set of vertices of size at least  $n/\log^3 n$  such that  $|N_{G'}(W)| < \frac{1+\epsilon}{2}n$ . Let  $Y \subseteq W$  of size  $|Y| = n/\log^3 n$ . Then also  $|N_{G'}(Y)| < \frac{1+\epsilon}{2}n$  and there is a subset  $Z$  of  $G'$  of size at least  $\frac{1-\epsilon}{2}n$  such that  $e_{G'}(Y, Z) = 0$ . Hence all the edges of  $G$  from  $Y$  to  $Z$  were deleted when we removed  $H$  and therefore  $e_G(Y, Z) \leq \Delta(H)|Y| \leq (1/2 - \epsilon)D|Y|$ . On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} e_G(Y, Z) &\geq \frac{D}{n}|Y||Z| - \lambda\sqrt{|Y||Z|} \geq \frac{1-\epsilon}{2}D|Y| - \lambda \log^{3/2} n|Y| \\ &\geq \left(\frac{1-\epsilon}{2} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log n}}\right)D|Y| > (1/2 - \epsilon)D|Y|. \end{aligned}$$

This contradiction implies that  $|N_{G'}(W)| \geq \frac{1+\epsilon}{2}n$ . In particular, every connected component of  $G'$  has size larger than  $n/2$  so  $G'$  is connected. ■

This lemma and Theorem 4.6 imply the following theorem, which strengthens the result of Krivelevich and Sudakov [12] on the hamiltonicity of sparse  $(n, D, \lambda)$ -graphs.

**Theorem 4.8.** *For any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $n$  sufficiently large the following holds. Let  $G$  be an  $(n, D, \lambda)$ -graph such that  $D/\lambda > \log^2 n$ . If  $H$  is a subgraph of  $G$  with maximum degree  $\Delta(H) \leq (1/2 - \epsilon)D$  then  $G' = G - H$  contains a Hamilton cycle. In other words, the local resilience of  $G$  with respect to hamiltonicity is at least  $(1/2 - \epsilon)D$ .*

*Remark.* Using a more careful analysis one can show that in the statement of Proposition 4.6 it suffices to assume that small sets expand by a factor of  $\log^{2+\delta} n$  for arbitrary fixed  $\delta > 0$  (instead of  $\log^4 n/15$ ). Therefore the assertion of Theorem 4.8 holds already when  $p \geq \log^{2+\delta} n/n$  and in Theorem 4.8 it is enough to assume that  $D/\lambda > \log^{1+\delta} n$ .

### 5. CHROMATIC NUMBER

In this section we obtain results on local resilience of random graphs with respect to colorability. We start with the proof of Theorem 2.7, which states that for every positive integer

$d$  and for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exist a constant  $c(d, \epsilon)$  such that if the edge probability  $p > c/n$  then almost surely

$$\max_{H, \Delta(H) \leq d} \chi(G(n, p) \cup H) \leq (1 + \epsilon)\chi(G(n, p)).$$

Since for dense random graphs we obtain much stronger result, we prove the theorem only for  $p = o(1)$ . To do so we will need the following two lemmas which summarize some useful properties of random graphs. The first one is well known and gives the asymptotic value of the chromatic number of random graph. It is an immediate corollary of the result of Łuczak (mentioned earlier) together with a result of Shamir and Spencer about concentration of the chromatic number of  $G(n, p)$ . We refer an interested reader to the Chapter 7 of [7] for the detailed description of these results.

**Lemma 5.1.** *For every  $\epsilon > 0$  there exist  $c(\epsilon)$  such that if  $c/n < p = o(1)$  then with probability at least  $1 - n^{-1}$*

$$(1 - \epsilon/4) \frac{np}{2 \log np} < \chi(G(n, p)) < (1 + \epsilon/4) \frac{np}{2 \log np}.$$

A graph is  $d$ -degenerate if every subgraph of it contains a vertex of degree at most  $d$ . It is a simple and well known fact that every  $d$ -degenerate graph is  $(d + 1)$ -colorable. We will also need the following estimate of the density of small subgraphs of  $G(n, p)$ . This estimate is standard (see, e.g., [7]) and can be easily verified using the first moment method.

**Lemma 5.2.** *If  $p \geq 200/n$ , then a.s. every  $t \leq n/\log^2(np)$  vertices of random graph  $G(n, p)$  span fewer than  $(2np/\log^2(np))t$  edges. Therefore any subgraph of this graph induced by a subset  $U$  of size  $|U| \leq n/\log^2(np)$ , is  $4np/\log^2(np)$ -degenerate.*

**Proof of Theorem 2.7.** Let  $H$  be a graph on the vertex set  $[n]$  with  $\Delta(H) \leq d$  and let  $s = 2d \log^2(np)$ . Pick a partition of vertices of  $H$  into parts  $V_1, \dots, V_s$  of size  $n/s$  uniformly at random. Denote by  $Y$  the number of edges of  $H$  which fall into one of the parts  $V_i$ . For every edge, the probability of it falls into one of the  $V_i$  is  $(1 + o(1))/s$ . By linearity of expectation  $\mathbb{E}[Y] \leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{nd}{2s}$ . By Markov’s inequality, with probability at least  $(1 + o(1))/2 > 1/3$  (i.e. for at least  $1/3$  of all possible partitions) we have that  $Y \leq nd/s = \frac{n}{2 \log^2(np)}$ . Hence for every graph  $H$ , for at least  $1/3$  of all possible partitions, the number of edges of  $H$  falling into one of the parts is at most  $\frac{n}{2 \log^2(np)}$ .

Now fix a partition  $V_1, \dots, V_s$  and consider the probability of the event that for some  $i$ , the subgraph of  $G = G(n, p)$  induced by  $V_i$  has chromatic number greater than  $(1 + \epsilon/4) \frac{np/s}{2 \log(np/s)}$ . If  $np$  is sufficiently large, then by Lemma 5.1 the probability of this event is at most  $s \cdot (n/s)^{-1} = s^2/n = o(1)$ . Therefore with probability  $1 - o(1) > 2/3$  (i.e. for almost every partition) we have that the chromatic number of  $G[V_i]$  is bounded by  $(1 + \epsilon/4) \frac{np/s}{2 \log(np/s)}$ . This implies that almost surely for random graph  $G = G(n, p)$  and every graph  $H$  with maximum degree  $d$  there is a partition  $V_1, \dots, V_s$  such that there are at most  $\frac{n}{2 \log^2(np)}$  edges of  $H$  which are contained in some part  $V_i$  and for every  $i$  we have that  $\chi(G[V_i]) \leq (1 + \epsilon/4) \frac{np/s}{2 \log(np/s)}$ .

Now we can color  $G \cup H$  as follows. First color each induced subgraph  $G[V_i]$  by at most  $(1 + \epsilon/4) \frac{np/s}{2 \log(np/s)}$  colors, using new colors for every  $i$ . This may create some monochromatic edges, all of which belong to  $H$  and are contained in one of the  $V_i$ . The number

of monochromatic edges after this process is at most  $\frac{n}{2 \log^2(np)}$ . These edges are adjacent to a set of at most  $n/\log^2(np)$  vertices which we denote by  $U$ . By Lemma 5.2,  $U$  induces  $4np/\log^2(np)$ -degenerate subgraph of  $G = G(n, p)$ . Since the maximum degree of  $H$  is at most  $d$ , the subgraph of  $G \cup H$  induced by  $U$  is  $(4np/\log^2(np) + d)$ -degenerate. Thus we can color it by  $4np/\log^2(np) + d + 1$  fresh colors. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G(n, p) \cup H) &\leq s(1 + \epsilon/4) \frac{np/s}{2 \log(np/s)} + \frac{4np}{\log^2(np)} + d + 1 \\ &= (1 + \epsilon/4) \frac{np}{2 \log(np) - 4 \log \log(np) - \log(2d)} + \frac{4np}{\log^2(np)} + d + 1. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing an appropriate constant  $c(d, \epsilon)$  we see that for  $p > c/n$  the right hand side of the last inequality can be made smaller than  $(1 + \epsilon)\chi(G(n, p))$ . ■

It is easy to see from the proof that if  $p = n^{-\alpha}$  for some constant  $\alpha < 1$  then the assertion of the Theorem 2.7 remains valid even if we allow to the maximum degree of  $H$  to be as large as  $e^{\log^{1-\delta} n}$ ,  $\delta > 0$ . On the other hand for very dense random graphs we can significantly improve this theorem as follows (this is a quantitative version of Theorem 2.6).

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $0 < \epsilon < 1/3$  be a constant. If the edge probability  $p(n)$  satisfies  $n^{-1/3+\epsilon} \leq p(n) \leq 3/4$  then almost surely*

$$\max_H \chi(G(n, p) \cup H) = (1 + o(1))\chi(G(n, p)) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{n}{2 \log_b(np)},$$

where  $b = 1/(1 - p)$  and the maximum is taken over all graphs with  $\Delta(H) \leq \frac{np^2}{\log^5 n}$ .

When  $p$  is a constant this result implies that a.s. one will not affect the asymptotic value of the chromatic number of  $G(n, p)$  even by adding to it any graph with maximum degree  $O(n/\log^5 n)$ . The magnitude of the maximal degree is clearly best possible up to a polylogarithmic factor. We believe that a stronger result holds for all values of edge probability and will state a conjecture in the concluding remarks.

To prove Theorem 5.3 we need to recall some additional properties of random graphs. Let  $k_0 = k_0(n, p)$  be defined by

$$k_0 = \max \left\{ k : \binom{n}{k} (1 - p)^{\binom{k}{2}} \geq n^4 \right\}.$$

One can show easily that  $k_0$  satisfies  $k_0 \sim 2 \log_b(np)$  with  $b = 1/(1 - p)$ . Also, it follows from known results on the asymptotic value of the independence number of  $G(n, p)$  (see, e.g., [7]) that a.s. the difference between  $k_0$  and the independence number of  $G(n, p)$  is bounded by an absolute constant, as long as  $p(n) \gg n^{-1/2+\epsilon}$  for any positive  $\epsilon > 0$ .

Given a graph  $G$  on  $n$  vertices and an integer  $k_0$ , a collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of pairs of vertices of  $G$  is called a *cover* if every independent set of size  $k_0$  in  $G$  contains a pair from  $\mathcal{C}$ . We set  $X = X(G)$  to be the minimum size of a cover in  $G$ . Note that, by definition,  $X(G)$  is precisely the number of edges we need to add to graph  $G$  in order to destroy all independent sets of size  $k_0$ . When  $G$  is distributed according to  $G(n, p)$ , the the minimum size of a cover in  $G$  becomes a random variable. The following properties of  $X(G(n, p))$  were established in [13].

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $0 < \epsilon < 1/3$  be a constant and let  $n^{-1/3+\epsilon} \leq p \leq 3/4$  then*

(i)  $\mathbb{E}[X] = \Omega\left(\frac{n^2 p^2}{\log^2 n}\right).$

(ii) *For every  $n^2 p > t > 0$ ,  $\Pr[X \leq \mathbb{E}[X] - t] \leq e^{-\frac{t^2}{2n^2 p}}.$*

**Proof of Theorem 5.3.** Let  $G = G(n, p)$  and let  $H$  be graph with maximum degree  $\Delta(H) \leq \frac{np^2}{\log^5 n}$ . First note that a.s. every subset  $W$  of vertices of  $G \cup H$  of size at least  $|W| \geq n/\log^2 n$  contains an independent set of size  $(1 - o(1))2 \log_b(np)$ , where  $b = 1/(1 - p)$ . Indeed, the number of edges of  $H$  inside  $W$  is bounded by

$$\Delta(H)|W| \leq \frac{np^2}{\log^5 n}|W| \leq \frac{|W|^2 p^2}{\log^3 n} \ll \frac{|W|^2 p^2}{\log^2 n}.$$

From Lemma 5.4 we obtain that the probability that there exists  $H$  that destroys all the independent sets of size  $(1 - o(1))2 \log_b(np)$  inside  $W$  is less than

$$2^n e^{-\Omega\left(\frac{(|W|^2 p^2 / \log^2 n)^2}{2n^2 p}\right)} \leq 2^n e^{-n^{1+3\epsilon-o(1)}} = o(1).$$

Now we can color  $G \cup H$  as follows. As long as the set of uncolored vertices has size at least  $n/\log^2 n$ , we can pull out an independent set of size  $(1 - o(1))2 \log_b(np)$  and color it by a new color. Let  $V_0$  be the set of all uncolored vertices after this process.  $V_0$  has size at most  $n/\log^2 n$  and therefore by Lemma 5.2 it induces a  $4np/\log^2(np)$ -degenerate subgraph of  $G$ . Since the maximum degree of  $H$  is at most  $np^2/\log^5 n$ , the subgraph of  $G \cup H$  induced by  $V_0$  is  $4np/\log^2(np) + \Delta(H)$ -degenerate. Since  $4np/\log^2(np) + \Delta(H) \leq 5np/\log^2(np)$ , we can color it by  $5np/\log^2(np) + 1$  fresh colors. As  $2 \log_b(np) = O(\log n/p)$ , it follows that the total number of colors used in the whole operation is at most

$$(1 + o(1))\frac{n}{2 \log_b(np)} + \frac{5np}{\log^2(np)} + 1 = (1 + o(1))\frac{n}{2 \log_b(np)}$$

concluding the proof. ■

## 6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

### 6.1. Local Resilience and Universality

Another popular model of random graphs (already mentioned a few times in this article) is the model of random regular graphs. Given two parameters  $d$  and  $n$ , we fix the vertex set  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$  and consider the set of all simple  $d$ -regular graphs on  $V$ , equipped with the uniform probability.

As mentioned in the introduction, the notion of local resilience first came up in [9]. The goal of this article was to establish a universal theorem between the Erdős-Rényi random graph  $G(n, p)$  and random regular graph with approximately the same density ( $d \approx np$ ). It was showed, among others, that if a property  $\mathcal{P}$  holds almost surely for  $G(n, p)$  and has unbounded local resilience, then it holds almost surely for a random regular graph of approximately the same density. For more details and precise statements, we refer to [9]. (In this article, the term “tolerance” was used instead of “resilience”.)

It was conjectured that most “natural” graph properties have unbounded local resilience given  $p$  being sufficiently large. The results in this article show that for some important properties this is indeed the case. They also shed some light on the question whether the random regular graph model is monotone with respect to  $d$ , see the last section of [9].

## 6.2. A Few Open Problems

We conclude this article with two open problems.

**Problem 6.1.** *Prove that if  $pn/\log n \rightarrow \infty$ . then a.s. the local resilience of  $G(n, p)$  with respect to hamiltonicity is  $(1/2 + o(1))np$ .*

**Problem 6.2.** *Is it true that for all constant  $\delta > 0$  and  $n^{-1+\delta} \leq p \leq 3/4$  random graph  $G(n, p)$  a.s. satisfies that*

$$\max_H \chi(G(n, p) \cup H) = (1 + o(1))\chi(G(n, p)),$$

where the maximum is taken over all graphs  $H$  with maximum degree  $d = o(np/\log np)$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A part of this work was carried out when both authors were visiting Microsoft Research at Redmond, WA. We would like to thank the members of the Theory Group at Microsoft Research for their hospitality and for creating a stimulating research environment. We also like to thank A. Frieze, P. Loh, H. Nguyen, J. Vondrák, and all three referees for carefully reading this manuscript and for very helpful remarks.

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. Alon and J. H. Spencer, The probabilistic method, 2nd edition, Wiley, New York, 2000.
- [2] B. Bollobás, The chromatic number of random graphs, *Combinatorica* 8 (1988), 49–55.
- [3] B. Bollobás, T. I. Fenner, and A. M. Frieze, An algorithm for finding Hamilton paths and cycles in random graphs, *Combinatorica* 7 (1987), 327–341.
- [4] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, Asymmetric graphs, *Acta Math Acad Sci Hungar* 14 (1963), 295–315.
- [5] P. Erdős and A. Rényi, On the existence of a factor of degree one of a connected random graph, *Acta Math Acad Sci Hungar* 17 (1966), 359–368.
- [6] R. Diestel, *Graph Theory*, 2nd edition, Springer, New York, 2000.
- [7] S. Janson, T. Łuczak, and A. Ruciński, *Random graphs*, Wiley, New York, 2000.
- [8] J. H. Kim, B. Sudakov, and V. Vu, On asymmetry of random graphs and random regular graphs, *Random Struct Algorithms* 21 (2002), 216–224.
- [9] J. H. Kim and V. Vu, Sandwiching random graphs, *Adv Math* 188 (2004), 444–469.
- [10] J. Komlós and E. Szemerédi, Limit distributions for the existence of Hamilton circuits in a random graph, *Discrete Math* 43 (1983), 55–63.
- [11] A. Korshunov, A solution of problem of Erdős and Rényi about Hamilton cycles in non-oriented graphs, *Metody Diskr Anal Teoriy Upr Syst Sb Trudov Novosibirsk* 31 (1977), 17–56.



- [12] M. Krivelevich and B. Sudakov, Sparse pseudo-random graphs are Hamiltonian, *J Graph Theory* 42 (2003), 17–33.
- [13] M. Krivelevich, B. Sudakov, V. Vu, and N. Wormald, On the probability of independent sets in random graphs, *Random Struct Algorithms* 22 (2003), 1–14.
- [14] L. Lovász, *Combinatorial problems and exercises*, 2nd edition, Elsevier Science Publisher, The Netherlands, 1993.
- [15] T. Łuczak, The chromatic number of random graphs, *Combinatorica* 11 (1991), 45–54.
- [16] L. Pósa, Hamiltonian circuits in random graphs, *Discrete math* 14 (1976), 359–364.
- [17] P. Turán, Eine extremalaufgabe aus der graphentheorie, *Mat Fiz Lapok* 48 (1941), 436–452.