# A NOTE ON LONG CYCLES IN SPARSE RANDOM GRAPHS 

MICHAEL ANASTOS


#### Abstract

Let $L_{c, n}$ denote the size of the longest cycle in $G(n, c / n), c>1$ constant. We show that there exists a continuous function $f(c)$ such that $L_{c, n} / n \rightarrow f(c)$ a.s. for $c \geq 20$, thus extending a result of Frieze and the author to smaller values of $c$. Thereafter, for $c \geq 20$, we determine the limit of the probability that $G(n, c / n)$ contains cycles of every length between the length of its shortest and its longest cycles as $n \rightarrow \infty$.


## 1. Introduction

Let $L_{c, n}$ denote the size of the longest cycle in $G(n, p), p=c / n$ i.e. the random graph on [ $n$ ] where each edge appears independently with probability $p$. Erdős [12] conjectured that if $c>1$ then w.h.p. ${ }^{1}$ $L_{c, n} \geq \ell(c) n$ where $\ell(c)>0$ is independent of $n$. This was proved by Ajtai, Komlós and Szemerédi [1] and in a slightly weaker form by Fernandez de la Vega [14] who proved that the conjecture is true for $c>4 \log 2$ ( $\log$ is in base $e$ ). Although this answers Erdős's question and provides the order of magnitude of $L_{c, n}$ for $c>1$ it leaves open the question of providing matching upper and lower bounds on $L_{c, n}$ up to the linear in $n$ order term. Bollobás [5] realized that for large $c$ one could find a large path/cycle w.h.p. by concentrating on a large subgraph with large minimum degree and demonstrating Hamiltonicity. In this way he showed that $L_{c, n} \geq\left(1-c^{24} e^{-c / 2}\right) n$ w.h.p. This was then improved by Bollobás, Fenner and Frieze [8] to $L_{c, n} \geq\left(1-c^{6} e^{-c}\right) n$ and then by Frieze [15] to $L_{c, n} \geq\left(1-\left(1+\epsilon_{c}\right)(1+c) e^{-c}\right) n$ w.h.p. where $\epsilon_{c} \rightarrow 0$ as $c \rightarrow \infty$. This last result is optimal up to the value of $\epsilon_{c}$, as there are $(1+c) e^{-c} n+o(n)$ vertices of degree 0 or 1 w.h.p. Finally the scaling limit of $L_{c, n}$ was determined by Anastos and Frieze [3] for sufficiently large $c$. They showed that there exists some absolute constant $C_{0}>1$ and a function $f(\cdot)$ such that for $c \geq C_{0}$, $L_{c, n} / n \rightarrow f(c)$ a.s. In addition they gave a way of computing $L_{c, n}$ within arbitrary accuracy. They also proved analogous results for the longest direct cycle in sparse random digraphs [4].

Denote by $L_{c, n}^{P}$ the length of the longest path in $G(n, p)$. In addition for a graph $G$ denote by $L(G)$ the size of the longest cycle of $G$. The main theorem of this paper is the following one.

Theorem 1.1. Let $G \sim G(n, c / n)$.
(a) There exists a continuous function $f:[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0,1]$ such that $L_{c, n} / n \rightarrow f(c)$ almost surely for $c \geq 20$, constant.
(b) W.h.p. G has a cycle of length $L(G)-i$ for $0 \leq i \leq 0.1 c^{3} e^{-c} n$, for $20 \leq c \leq 0.4 \log n$.
(c) W.h.p. $\left|L_{c, n}-L_{c, n}^{P}\right| \leq(2000 \log n) / c+1$ for $20 \leq c \leq 0.4 \log n$.

We discuss the case $c \geq 0.4 \log n$ shortly. Part (a) of Theorem 1.1, except for the continuity of $f$, is proven in [3] for sufficiently large $c$. The proof there relies on identifying a subgraph $H_{3}$ of $G$ and showing that after contracting every maximal path whose interior vertices are of degree 2 into a single edge we get a graph $H_{3}^{\prime}$ of minimum degree 3 with the property that it has a Hamilton cycle that passes through all the "new" edges. To find the Hamilton cycle there a version of the coloring argument of Fenner and Frieze [13] is used. For the corresponding calculations the condition $c \geq 10^{6}$ is asserted. Our improvement on $c$ comes from considering

[^0]a subgraph $H_{4}$ of $G$ in place of $H_{3} . H_{4}$ is constructed in a similar manner as $H_{3}$. The alterations done to its construction are such that $H_{4}^{\prime}$, the graph obtained after contracting every maximal path whose interior vertices are of degree 2 into an edge, has minimum degree 4. This enables us to use a different argument to find a suitable Hamilton cycle in $H_{4}^{\prime}$ and thus extend the range of $c$ for which part (a) of Theorem 1.1 is true to $c \geq 20$.

A graph $G$ is called pancyclic if it contains a cycle of length $\ell$ for every $\ell \in[3,|V(G)|]$. The study of pancyclic graphs was initiated by Bondy [9]. Cooper and Frieze [11] proved that the threshold for $G(n, p)$ being pancyclic is the same as being hamiltonian which is $p_{H}=(\log n+\log \log n) / n$. Their methods can be extended to prove that the probability of the 2 -core of $G(n, p)$ being pancyclic is the same as being hamiltonian which is $1-o(1)$ for $p \geq(1+\epsilon) \log n / 3 n$ for any constant $\epsilon>0$. Thus for $c \geq 0.4 \log n$ the size of the longest cycle in $G(n, p)$ equals to the size of its 2 -core, say $n^{\prime}$, and there exists a cycle of length $\ell$ in $G$ for every $\ell \in\left[3, n^{\prime}\right]$ w.h.p.

For a fixed set $S \subset \mathbb{N} \backslash\{1,2\}$ the probability that $G(n, c / n)$ contains a cycle of length $l$ for $l \in S$ is given by a result of Bollobás (see [7], §4.1) and separately by a result of Karoński and Ruciński [17]. For $l \geq 3$ let $Z_{c, l}$ be the number of cycles of length $l$ in $G(n, c / n)$. They proved that for every finite set $S \subset \mathbb{N} \backslash\{1,2\}$ the joint distribution of $\left\{Z_{c, l}: l \in S\right\}$ converges in distribution to the joint distribution of $\left\{\operatorname{Poisson}\left(c^{l} / 2 l\right): l \in S\right\}$. Recently, Alon, Krivelevich and Lubetzky [2] studied the set of cycle lengths of randomly augmented graphs and showed that if one sprinkles $\epsilon n$ random edges on top of some graph $G$ on $[n]$ then, in addition to $L(G)$, the new graph w.h.p. contains a cycle of length $\ell$ for every $\ell$ such that both $\ell, L(G)-\ell$ tend to infinity with $n$. For graphs $G, F$ on the same vertex set denote by $G \oplus F$ the graph $(V(G), E(G) \cup E(F))$.

Theorem 1 (Theorem 3.1 of [2]). Fix $\delta>0$, let $H$ be a graph on [ $n$ ] with a longest cycle of size $L(H)$, $F \sim G(n, \delta / n)$ and $G=H \oplus F$. There exist absolute constants $C_{1}, C_{2}>0$ such that, for any $3 \leq \ell \leq$ $|V(H)| / 2$, we have that $G$ contains a cycle of length l for every $l \in[\ell, L(H)-\ell+4]$ with probability at least $1-C_{1} e^{-C_{2}\left(\delta^{2} \wedge 1\right) \ell}$.

To generalize the notion of pancyclic graphs Brandt [10] introduced the notion of weakly pancyclic graphs. A graph $G$ is weakly pancyclic if it contains cycles of every length between the lengths of its shortest and longest cycles. In the following theorem we study the distribution of the set of cycles lengths of $G(n, p)$ and determine the limit of the probability that it is weakly pancyclic as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1.2. Let $G \sim G(n, c / n), c \geq 20$. Then for every $S \subseteq[L(G)] \backslash\{1,2\}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Pr}(G \text { contains a cycle of length } l \text { for } l \in S)=\prod_{k \in S}\left(1-e^{-\frac{c^{k}}{2 k}}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Pr}(G \text { is weakly pancyclic })=\sum_{k \geq 3} \prod_{\ell=3}^{k-1} e^{-\frac{c^{\ell}}{2 \ell}} \prod_{\ell=k}^{\infty}\left(1-e^{-\frac{c^{\ell}}{2 \ell}}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Observe that (1) is given by Bollobás and by Karoński and Ruciński in the case max $S=O(1)$. In the proof of Theorem 1.2 we make use of a weak lower bound on $L_{c, n}$ given by the following Lemma. Its proof is located at the end of Section 4.
Lemma 1.3. W.h.p. $n-0.04 c^{3} e^{-c} n \leq L_{c, n}$ for $20 \leq c \leq 0.4 \log n$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2: For $c \geq 0.4 \log n$ Theorem 1.2 follows from the fact that the 2 -core of $G(n, p)$ is pancyclic w.h.p. thus we may assume that $20 \leq c<0.4 \log n$. Let $d$ be such that $n-0.05 d^{3} e^{-d} n=$ $n-0.1 c^{3} e^{-c} n$. Then $d<c$, in particular $c-d=\Omega(1)$. We may generate $G$ by letting $G_{1} \sim G(n, d / n)$, $G_{2} \sim G\left(n, p^{\prime}\right)$ and $G=G_{1} \oplus G_{2}$ where $(1-c / n)=\left(1-p^{\prime}\right)(1-d / n)$. Let $\epsilon>0$ and $\ell$ be the minimum positive integer such that $C_{1} e^{-C_{2}\left(\delta^{2} \wedge 1\right) \ell}<\epsilon$ and $\prod_{k=\ell+1}^{\infty}\left(1-e^{-\frac{c^{k}}{2 k}}\right)>1-\epsilon$ where the constants $C_{1}, C_{2}$ are as in the statement of Theorem 1. Also denote by $\mathcal{L}(G)$ the set $\{l \in[n]: G$ spans a cycle of length $l\}$.

Lemma 1.3 applied to $G_{1}$ and Theorem 1 applied to $G_{1} \oplus G_{2}$ give that $G$ contains a cycle of length $l$ for every integer $l \in\left[\ell, n-0.05 d^{3} e^{-d} n\right]=\left[\ell, n-0.1 c^{3} e^{-c} n\right]$ with probability at least $1-C_{1} e^{-C_{2}\left(\delta^{2} \wedge 1\right) \ell}+o(1)$. On the other hand part (b) of Theorem 1.1 implies that $\mathcal{L}(G)$ contains the integers in $\left[L(G)-0.1 c^{3} e^{-c} n, L(G)\right]$ w.h.p. As $L(G)-0.1 c^{3} e^{-c} n \leq n-0.1 c^{3} e^{-c} n$ we have that $\mathcal{L}(G)$ contains $[\ell, L(G)]$ with probability at least $1-C_{1} e^{-C_{2}\left(\delta^{2} \wedge 1\right) \ell}+o(1)$. Combining this last statement with the results of Bollobás and of Karoński and Ruciński gives (1). Indeed for $S \subset[L(G)] \backslash\{1,2\}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\prod_{k \in S}\left(1-e^{-\frac{c^{k}}{2 k}}\right)+\epsilon & \geq \prod_{k \in S \cap[\ell]}\left(1-e^{-\frac{c^{k}}{2 k}}\right)=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Pr}(S \cap[\ell] \subseteq \mathcal{L}(G)) \\
& \geq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Pr}(S \subseteq \mathcal{L}(G)) \geq \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \operatorname{Pr}(S \cap[\ell] \subseteq \mathcal{L}(G) \text { and }[\ell+1, L(G)] \subseteq L(G)) \\
& \geq \prod_{k \in S \cap[\ell]}\left(1-e^{-\frac{c^{k}}{2 k}}\right)-C_{1} e^{-C_{2}\left(\delta^{2} \wedge 1\right) \ell} \geq \prod_{k \in S}\left(1-e^{-\frac{c^{k}}{2 k}}\right)-\epsilon .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly one can derive (2); the summation at (2) corresponds to the sum over $k$ of the probabilities that $G$ is weakly pancyclic and has girth $k$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 relies on the study of an induced subgraph of $G$ and how it lies in $G$ which we relate to a subset $S$ of $V(G)$ which we call the strong 4 -core of $G$. We define the strong 4 -core of $G$ and establish some of its basic properties in Section 3. Using the strong 4-core we identify an induced subgraph $F$ of $G(n, p)$ such that no subgraph of $G$ that spans more vertices can be hamiltonian. We then prove that $F$ is hamiltonian and derive parts (b) and (c) of Theorem 1.1. This, modulo the Hamiltonicity argument which is presented at Section 6 , is presented at Section 4. Finally, for the sake of completeness, at Section 5 we present the proof of part (a) of Theorem 1.1.

## 2. Preliminaries and Notation

For a graph $G$ we denote by $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ its vertex set and edge set respectively. For $v \in V(G)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $N^{k}(v), N^{<k}(v)$ and $N^{\leq k}(v)$ the set of vertices within distance exactly $k$, less than $k$ and at most $k$ respectively from $v$ in $G$. For $U \subseteq V(G)$ we let $N(U)$ be the set of vertices in $V(G) \backslash U$ that are adjacent to $U$ and $G[U]$ be the subgraph of $G$ induced by $U$. For $M \subseteq\binom{V(G)}{2}$ we let $G \cup M=(V(G), E(G) \cup M)$ and $G \backslash M=(V(G), E(G) \backslash M)$. We denote by $\delta(G)$ and $\Delta(G)$ the minimum and maximum respectively degree of $G$. Finally by $\log x$ we denote the natural logarithm of $x$.

Throughout the paper we make use of Lemma 2.1, an extension of McDiarmid's inequality given by Warnke in [19] (see Theorem 1.2 and Remark 2). Compared to the more general Theorem 1.2 of [19], Lemma 2.1 is restated in a form that is easier to apply in our setting. For the reduction of Lemma 2.1 from Theorem 1.2 of [19] we let $G \sim G(n, p)$ with $n p \leq 2 \log n$, consider the vertex exposure martingale for revealing $G$ and make use of the fact that $G$ has maximum degree smaller than $\log ^{2} n$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-10}\right)$.

Lemma 2.1. Let $G \sim G(n, p)$ with $n p \leq 2 \log n$. Let $f$ be a graph theoretic function such that $\left|f\left(G^{\prime}\right)\right| \leq n$ for every graph $G^{\prime}$ of order $n$. Assume that there exists an integer $d=d(n)$ with the property that for every $v \in[n]$ and every graph $G_{1}$ on $[n]$ of maximum degree $\log ^{2} n$, with $G_{2}$ being the graph obtained from $G_{1}$ by deleting all the edges incident to $v$, we have that

$$
\left|f\left(G_{1}\right)-f\left(G_{2}\right)\right| \leq 0.5 d
$$

Then for every $t>0$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Pr}(|f(G)-\mathbb{E}(f(G))|>t) \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{t^{2}}{2 n(d+1)^{2}}\right)+o\left(n^{-8}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 3. The strong $k$-CORE

The $k$-core of $G$ is the induced subgraph of $G$ whose vertex set is the maximal subset $S$ of $V(G)$ with the property that every vertex in $S$ has at least $k$ neighbors in $S$. It is well known to be unique and it can be obtained by iteratively removing from $G$ vertices with fewer than $k$ neighbors among the vertices left. The concept of the $k$-core was introduced by Bollobás in his study of the evolution of sparse graphs [6]. Some years later, Pittel, Spencer and Wormald [18] proved that the property of having a nonempty $k$-core has a sharp threshold in the random graph model $G(n, p)$. Namely the proved that there exists a constant $c_{k}$ such that $G(n, c / n)$ has a nonempty $k$-core with probability $1-o(1)$ if $c>c_{k}$ and with probability $o(1)$ if $c<c_{k}$. In addition they gave a way of calculating $c_{k}$.

To identify the vertex set of a longest cycle in $G(n, p)$ we use a concept similar to that of the $k$-core. For a graph $G$ we define the strong $k$-core of $G$ to be the maximal subset $S$ of $V(G)$ with the property that every vertex in $S \cup N(S)$ has at least $k$ neighbors in $S$. Observe that if the sets $S_{1}, S_{2} \subset V(G)$ have this property then so does the set $S_{1} \cup S_{2}$. Thus the strong $k$-core of a graph is well-defined. It can also be obtained via the following red/blue/black coloring procedure:

```
Algorithm 1
    Input: a graph \(G\), an integer \(k\).
    Initially color all the vertices of \(G\) black.
    while there exists a black or blue vertex \(v \in V(G)\) with fewer than \(k\) black neighbors do
        Color \(v\) red and its black neighbors blue.
    end while
    Return the coloring of \(G\).
```

For a graph $G$ we let $V_{k, \text { black }}(G), V_{k, b l u e}(G)$ and $V_{k, r e d}(G)$ be the set of vertices whose final color given by Algorithm 1 is black, blue and red respectively. Also denote by $S C_{k}(G)$ the vertex set of its strong $k$-core. Observe that the set $V_{k, b l a c k}(G)$ has the property that no vertex in $V_{k, \text { black }}(G) \cup N\left(V_{k, b l a c k}(G)\right)$ is red. Therefore every vertex $v \in V_{k, \text { black }}(G) \cup N\left(V_{k, b l a c k}(G)\right)$ has at least $k$ neighbors in $V_{k, b l a c k}(G)$. Consequentially, $V_{k, b l a c k}(G) \subseteq S C_{k}(G)$. On the other hand no vertex in $S C_{k}(G)$ would ever be colored red or blue. Indeed assume otherwise and let $v$ be the first vertex in $S C_{k}(G)$ that receives a color red or blue. If that color is red then at that moment $v$ has fewer than $k$ black neighbors. Else if $v$ receives color blue then it has a neighbor $u$ that receives color red and therefore at that moment $u$ has less than $k$ black neighbors. As in both cases $S C_{k}(G)$ is a subset of the set of black vertices at the moment that $v$ receives a color other than black we get a contradiction.

For the rest of this paper we will denote by $V_{\text {black }}(G)$ the vertex set of the strong 4-core of $G$, by $V_{\text {blue }}(G)$ the neighborhood of $V_{\text {black }}(G)$ and by $V_{\text {red }}(G)$ the rest of the vertices of $G$. We call the vertices in $V_{\text {black }}(G)$, $V_{\text {blue }}(G)$ and $V_{\text {red }}(G)$, black, blue and red respectively. In addition we denote by $G^{r / b}$ the subgraph of $G$ induced by $V_{b l u e}(G) \cup V_{\text {red }}(G)$. A crucial observation about the structure of the subgraph of $G$ induced by $V_{\text {blue }} \cup V_{\text {red }}(G)$ is the following one.
Observation 3.1. During the execution of Algorithm 1 with inputs $G$, 4, every time a vertex is colored red at most 3 of its neighbors are colored blue. Thus every component $C$ of $G^{r / b}$ contains at least $\frac{|C|}{4}$ red vertices. These vertices do not have any neighbor outside $C$.

In the following Lemma we summarize the properties of the strong 4-core of a random graph that we are going to use later on.

Lemma 3.2. Let $G \sim G(n, c / n), 20 \leq c \leq 2 \log n$. For $i \geq 1$ let $X_{i}$ be the number of vertices in $G$ that lie in components of size $i$ in $G^{r / b}$. Then the following hold with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.
(a) $\mathbb{E}\left(X_{i}\right) \leq 0.8^{-i} n /(c i)$ and $X_{i} \leq 0.8^{-i} n /(c i)+n^{0.55}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \log ^{3} n$.
(b) $X_{i}=0$ for $i \geq\left(10^{3} \log n\right) / c$.
(c) At most $0.03 c^{3} e^{-c} n$ red vertices lie in a component of $G^{r / b}$ with at least 2 red vertices.
(d) $\left|V_{\text {red }}(G)\right| \leq 0.25 c^{3} e^{-c} n$ and $\left|V_{\text {red }}(G) \cup V_{\text {blue }}(G)\right| \leq c^{3} e^{-c} n$.

Proof. (a) Observation 3.1 implies that for every component of size $i$ we can identify sets $S, T$ with $|S| \geq i / 4$, $|S|+|T|=i$ such that $G$ spans a tree on $S \cup T$ and no vertex in $S$ has a neighbor outside $S \cup T$. Therefore for $i \geq 1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(X_{i}\right) & \leq i\binom{n}{i} i^{i-2} p^{i-1}\binom{i}{i / 4}(1-p)^{\frac{i(n-i)}{4}} \leq\left(\frac{e n}{i}\right)^{i} i^{i-1} p^{i-1} 2^{i} e^{-\frac{p i(n-i)}{4}} \\
& \leq \frac{n}{c i}\left(2 e n p e^{-(0.25+o(1)) c}\right)^{i} \leq \frac{0.8^{-i} n}{c i}
\end{aligned}
$$

At the last inequality we used that $c \geq 20$. For $v \in[n]$ deleting all the edges incident to $v$ in $G$ may increase or decrease the number of components of $G^{r / b}$ of size $i$ by at most $d(v)+1 \leq \Delta(G)+1$ (any "new" component contains an endpoint of a deleted edge). Therefore, Lemma 2.1 implies that $X_{i} \leq 0.8^{-i} n /(c i)+n^{0.55}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \log ^{3} n$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.
(b) From the above calculation we also get,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(\sum_{i=\frac{10^{3} \log n}{c}}^{\log ^{3} n} X_{i}>0\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=\frac{10^{3} \log n}{c}}^{\log ^{3} n} X_{i}\right) \leq \sum_{i=\frac{10^{3} \log n}{c}}^{\log ^{3} n} n\left(2 e c e^{-0.235 c}\right)^{i} e^{-0.01 c i}=O\left(n^{-9}\right)
$$

Now assume that $G^{r / b}$ has a component $C$ of size larger than $\log ^{3} n$. For $t \geq 0$ let $m_{t}$ be the largest component spanned by the vertices of $C$ that are either red or blue right after the $t^{t h}$ time the whileloop of Algorithm 1 is executed. Since at every step of our process a single vertex is colored red we have that $m_{t+1} \leq 1+\Delta(G) \cdot \max \left\{m_{t}, 1\right\}$. Thus either $\Delta(G) \geq \log ^{1.5} n-1$ or there exists $t \geq 0$ such that $\log ^{1.5} n \leq m_{t} \leq \log ^{3} n$. In the second case at time $t$ the vertices of $C$ span a component $C^{\prime}$ on $m_{t}$ vertices with at least $m_{t} / 4$ red vertices. Those red vertices have no neighbor outside $C^{\prime}$ in $G$. Therefore $G^{r / b}$ spans a component of size at least $\log ^{3} n$ with probability at most

$$
O\left(n^{-9}\right)+\sum_{i=\log ^{1.5} n}^{\log ^{3} n} n\left(2 e n p e^{-(0.25+o(1)) c}\right)^{i}+\operatorname{Pr}\left(\operatorname{Bin}(n, p) \geq \log ^{-1.5} n-1\right)=o\left(n^{-2}\right)
$$

(c),(d) Let $Y$ and $Y_{i}, i \geq 1$ be the number of red vertices that lie in a component of $G^{r / b}$ with at least 2 and exactly $i$ respectively red vertices. Then, $Y=Y_{2}+\sum_{i \geq 3} Y_{i}$. A component of $G^{r / b}$ with exactly 2 red vertices consists either of two adjacent vertices $u, v$ that have at most 5 neighbors in total in $[n] \backslash\{u, v\}$ or two non-adjacent vertices $u, v$ that have a common neighbor $w$ and at most 6 additional neighbors in total in $[n] \backslash\{u, v, w\}$. Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(Y_{2}\right) & \leq 2\binom{n}{2} p \sum_{i=0}^{5}\binom{n}{i} 2^{i} p^{i}(1-p)^{2(n-2-i)}+2\binom{n}{2} n p^{2} \sum_{i=0}^{6}\binom{n}{i} 2^{i} p^{i}(1-p)^{2(n-3-i)} \\
& \leq(1+o(1)) c n \sum_{i=0}^{5} \frac{2^{i} p^{i} n^{i}}{i!} e^{-2 p n}+(1+o(1)) c^{2} n \sum_{i=0}^{6} \frac{2^{i} p^{i} n^{i}}{i!} e^{-2 p n} \\
& \leq(1+o(1)) c^{2} e^{-2 c} n\left(\sum_{i=0}^{5} \frac{(2 c)^{i}}{i!c}+\sum_{i=0}^{6} \frac{(2 c)^{i}}{i!}\right) \leq c^{2} e^{-2 c} n \cdot \frac{2 c^{6}}{6!} \leq 10^{-4} c^{3} e^{-c} n
\end{aligned}
$$

Thereafter, similarly to the calculation of $\mathbb{E}\left(X_{s}\right)$ we have,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{s=3}^{\log ^{3} n} \mathbb{E}\left(Y_{s}\right) & \leq \sum_{s=3}^{\log ^{3} n} \sum_{t=0}^{3 s} s\binom{n}{s+t}\binom{s+t}{t}(s+t)^{s+t-2} p^{s+t-1}(1-p)^{(n-s-t) s} \\
& \leq \sum_{s=3}^{\log ^{3} n}\left(\sum_{t=0}^{3 s} c^{-t}\right) s\binom{n}{4 s}\binom{4 s}{3 s}(4 s)^{4 s-2} p^{4 s-1} e^{-p(n-4 s) s} \\
& \leq \sum_{s=3}^{\log ^{3} n} \frac{1.1(4 c s)^{4 s-1} e^{-c s} n}{(3 s)!s!} \leq \sum_{s=3}^{6} \frac{1.1(4 c s)^{4 s-1} e^{-c s} n}{(3 s)!s!}+\sum_{s=7}^{\log ^{3} n} \frac{1.1 n}{4 c s}\left(\frac{e^{4} c^{4} 4^{4} e^{-c}}{3^{3}}\right)^{s} \\
& \leq 0.015 c^{3} e^{-c} n+c^{3} e^{-c} n \sum_{s=7}^{\log ^{3} n} \frac{1.1 e^{4} 4^{4}}{3^{3} 4 s}\left(\frac{e^{4} c^{4} 4^{4} e^{-c}}{3^{3}}\right)^{s-1} \\
& \leq 0.015 c^{3} e^{-c} n+c^{3} e^{-c} n \sum_{s=7}^{\log ^{3} n} \frac{142.5}{s} \cdot 0.175^{s} \leq 0.02 c^{3} e^{-c} n .
\end{aligned}
$$

Lastly, $Y_{1}$ is bounded above by the number of vertices of degree $0,1,2$ or 3 in $G$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}\left(Y_{1}\right) \leq$ $\left(1+c+0.5 c^{2}+c^{3} / 6\right) e^{-c} n \leq 0.2 c^{3} e^{-c} n$.

For $v \in[n]$ deleting all the edges incident to $v$ in $G$ may increase or decrease the number of components of $G^{r / b}$ with exactly $i$ red vertices by at most $d(v)+1 \leq \Delta(G)+1$ (any "new" component contains an endpoint of a deleted edge). Therefore, part (b) of this lemma and Lemma 2.1 imply that $\left|V_{\text {red }}(G)\right|=\sum_{i=1}^{\log ^{3} n} Y_{i} \leq$ $0.25 c^{3} e^{-c} n$ and $Y=\sum_{i=2}^{\log ^{3} n} Y_{i} \leq 0.03 c^{3} e^{-c} n$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. Finally, by Observation 3.1, $\left|V_{\text {red }}(G) \cup V_{\text {blue }}(G)\right| \leq 4\left|V_{\text {red }}^{2}(G)\right| \leq c^{3} e^{-c} n$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

For proving Theorem 1.1 we will use Theorem 3.3. We apply Theorem 3.3 in the next section while we present its proof in Section 6.

Theorem 3.3. Let $G \sim G(n, c / n), 20 \leq c$. Let $G^{\prime}$ be the subgraph of $G$ induced by $V_{\text {black }}(G) \cup V_{b l u e}(G)$. Then for every $U \subseteq V_{\text {blue }}(G)$ and matching $M$ on $V_{\text {blue }} \backslash U$ we have that $G^{\prime}\left[V\left(G^{\prime}\right) \backslash U\right] \cup M$ contains a Hamilton cycle that spans all the edges in $M$ with probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

Comparing the $k$-core with the strong $k$-core we note the following. The $k$-core can be thought as a procedure that separates the sparse from the denser portion of a graph. On the other hand the strong $k$-core is a procedure that separates the sparse (red) portion of the graph from a dense one (black) by a vertex cut (blue) while ensuring that the vertices in the cut are robustly connected to the dense part. This last key property is what enable us to extend a given matching $M$ on the blue vertices to a cycle that covers all of $M, V_{b l u e}(G) \backslash U$ and $V_{b l a c k}(G)$ in the proof of Theorem 3.3.

## 4. Identifying the vertex set of a longest cycle

We start this section by showing how any red/blue/black vertex coloring of $G$ with the property that there does not exist a red to black edge can be used to upper bound $L(G)$. We then use the red/blue/black coloring associated with the strong 4-core (described in the previous section) to obtain an upper bound on $L(G(n, c / n))$ which will turn out to be tight.

Notation 4.1. For a graph $G$ and a coloring $\gamma: V(G) \rightarrow\{$ red, blue, black $\}$ we let $\mathcal{T}(G, \gamma)$ be the set of the components of the subgraph of $G$ induced by the $\gamma$-blue and $\gamma$-red vertices. Thereafter, for $T \in \mathcal{T}(G, \gamma)$ we denote by $\mathcal{P}_{T, \gamma}$ the set of all sets of vertex disjoint paths with $\gamma$-blue endpoints spanned by $T$. Here we allow paths of length 0. So a single blue vertex counts as a path. For $P \in \mathcal{P}_{T, \gamma}$ let $n(T, \gamma, P)$ be the number of red vertices in $V(T)$ that are not covered by some path in $P$. Finally we let $\phi(T, \gamma)=\min _{P \in \mathcal{P}_{T, \gamma}} n(T, \gamma, P)$.

Lemma 4.2. For any red/blue/black coloring $\gamma$ of $G$ with the property that there is no edge from a red to $a$ black vertex we have,

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(G) \leq|V(G)|-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}(G, \gamma)} \phi(T, \gamma) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. For any $T \in \mathcal{T}(G, \gamma)$ and any cycle $C$ of $G$ we have that $C$ induces a set of vertex disjoint paths on $V(T)$ with $\gamma$-blue endpoints. These paths leave uncovered at least $\phi(T, \gamma)$ many $\gamma$-red vertices of $V(T)$. Hence any cycle of $G$ spans at most $n-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}(G, \gamma)} \phi(T, \gamma)$ vertices.

Henceforward we let $\gamma^{*}: V(G) \rightarrow$ \{red, blue, black $\}$ be the coloring that colors the vertices of $V_{x}(G)$ with color $x$ for $x \in\{$ red,blue,black $\}$. Recall that we refer to $\gamma^{*}$-red/blue/black vertices as simply red/blue/black vertices. For $T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)$ we fix a set of vertex disjoint paths with blue endpoints $P^{*}(T)$ with the property that $\cup_{T \in T\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} P^{*}(T)$ covers all but $\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} \phi\left(T, \gamma^{*}\right)$ red vertices. We also let $\mathcal{T}(G)$ be the set of paths in $\cup_{T \in T\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} P^{*}(T)$ that cover a single red vertex.

Theorem 4.3. Let $G \sim G(n, c / n), c \geq 20$. With probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(G)=n-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} \phi\left(T, \gamma^{*}\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

In addition $G$ spans a cycle of length $L(G)-\ell$ with probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$ for $0 \leq \ell \leq|\mathcal{T}(G)|$.

Proof. The inequality $L(G) \leq n-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} \phi\left(T, \gamma^{*}\right)$ is given by Lemma 4.2. Indeed, as during Algorithm 1 every time a vertex is colored red its black neighbors are color blue we have that there is no edge from $V_{\text {red }}(G)$ to $V_{\text {black }}(G)$ and hence Lemma 4.2 applies.

Now fix $\ell \in\{0,1,2, \ldots,|\mathcal{T}(G)|\}$ and let $\left\{P_{1}, P_{2}, \ldots, P_{|\mathcal{T}(G)|}\right\}$ be an ordering of the paths in $\mathcal{T}(G)$ (recall $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is the set of paths in $\cup_{T \in T\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} P^{*}(T)$ that cover a single red vertex). Let $M(\ell)$ be the matching on $V_{\text {blue }}(G)$ obtained by replacing each path in $\mathcal{P}(\ell):=\left(\cup_{T \in T\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} P^{*}(T)\right) \backslash\left\{P_{i}: i \in[\ell]\right\}$ by a single edge joining its endpoints. Also let $V_{\ell}^{-}$be the set of vertices that lie in the interior of some path in $\mathcal{P}(\ell)$. We define the graph $\Gamma(\ell)$ as follows. $V(\Gamma(\ell))=V_{\text {black }}(G) \cup\left(V_{\text {blue }}(G) \backslash V_{\ell}^{-}\right)$and $E(\Gamma(\ell))$ consists of all the edges of $G$ spanned by $V(\Gamma(\ell))$ plus the edges in $M(\ell)$.

Let $\mathcal{E}_{\ell}$ be the event that $\Gamma(\ell)$ contains a Hamilton cycle $C_{\ell}$ that spans all of the edges of $M(\ell)$. Assume that $\mathcal{E}_{\ell}$ occurs. Replace each edge of $C_{\ell}$ that belongs to $M(\ell)$ with the corresponding path in $\mathcal{P}(\ell)$ and let $C_{\ell}^{\prime}$ be the resulting cycle in $G$. Then $C_{\ell}^{\prime}$ covers $V_{\text {black }}(G) \subseteq V\left(\Gamma_{\ell}\right)$. In addition, as $V_{\text {blue }}(G) \backslash V_{\ell}^{-} \subseteq V\left(\Gamma_{\ell}\right)$ and every vertex in $V_{\ell}^{-}$lies in the interior of some path in $\mathcal{P}(\ell), C_{\ell}^{\prime}$ covers $V_{b l u e}(G)$. Thereafter $C_{\ell}^{\prime}$ also covers every vertex in $V_{\text {red }}(G)$ that is covered by some path in $\mathcal{P}(\ell)$. As $\mathcal{P}(\ell)=\left(\cup_{T \in T\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} P^{*}(T)\right) \backslash\left\{P_{i}\right.$ : $i \in[\ell]\}$, the set of vertex disjoint paths $\cup_{T \in T\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} P^{*}(T)$ covers $\left|V_{r e d}(G)\right|-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} \phi\left(T, \gamma^{*}\right)$ vertices in $V_{\text {red }}(G)$ and each of the $\ell$ paths in $\left\{P_{i}: i \in[\ell]\right\} \subseteq \cup_{T \in T\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} P^{*}(T)$ covers a single vertex in $V_{r e d}(G)$ we have that $C_{\ell}^{\prime}$ covers $\left|V_{\text {red }}(G)\right|-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} \phi\left(T, \gamma^{*}\right)-\ell$ vertices in $V_{r e d}(G)$. All together $C_{\ell}^{\prime}$ covers $\left|V_{\text {black }}(G)\right|+\left|V_{\text {blue }}(G)\right|+\left|V_{\text {red }}(G)\right|-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} \phi\left(T, \gamma^{*}\right)-\ell=n-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} \phi\left(T, \gamma^{*}\right)-\ell$ vertices.

Theorem 3.3 implies that $\Gamma(\ell)$ contains a Hamilton cycle that spans all of the edges of $M(\ell)$, hence $G$ spans a cycle of length $n-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} \phi\left(T, \gamma^{*}\right)-\ell$, with probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

Proof of Lemma 1.3: We construct a set of vertex disjoint paths in $G^{r / b}$ by taking 2 edges incident to every red vertex of degree at least 2 that lies in a component of $G^{r / b}$ containing a single red vertex. This set of edges induces a set of paths of length 2 with blue endpoints that do not cover red vertices in components with at least 2 red vertices and vertices of degree 0 or 1 . $G$ has $(c+1) e^{-c} n+O\left(n^{-0.55}\right)$ vertices of degree 0 or 1 w.h.p. (see [16]). Thus by Lemma 3.2 they do not cover at most $\left(0.03 c^{3}+c+1\right) e^{-c}+O\left(n^{0.6}\right) \geq 0.04 c^{3} e^{-c} n$ red vertices w.h.p. Finally, Theorem 4.3 implies that $L_{c, n} \geq n-0.04 c^{3} e^{-c} n$ w.h.p.

Proof of part (b) of Theorem 1.1 Given Theorem 4.3 it suffices to show that $|\mathcal{T}(G)| \geq 0.1 c^{3} e^{-c} n$ w.h.p. Every vertex of degree 3 lies in $V_{\text {red }}(G)$. Thus $|\mathcal{T}(G)|$ is larger than the number of vertices of degree 3 minus the number of vertices that lie in a component of $G^{r / b}$ with at least 2 red vertices. $G$ has $c^{3} e^{-c} n / 6+O\left(n^{-0.55}\right)$ vertices of degree 3 w.h.p. (see [16]). Thus Lemma 3.2 implies $|\mathcal{T}(G)| \geq(1 / 6-0.03) c^{3} e^{-c}+O\left(n^{-0.55}\right) \geq$ $0.1 c^{3} e^{-c} n$ w.h.p.

Proof of part (c) of Theorem 1.1: Similarly to the derivation of (4), any path $P$ of $G$ may cover at most $|V(G)|-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} \phi(T, \gamma)+2 r(G)$ vertices where $r(G)$ is the size of the largest component of $G^{r / b}$; $2 r(G)$ is an upper bound on the number of vertices found in the first and last component of $G^{r / b}$ that intersects $P$ and we meet as we traverse $P$ from one of its endpoints to the other. Thus by Lemma 3.2, $L_{c, n}^{P}-L_{c, n} \leq 2 \cdot \frac{1000 \log n}{c}$. On the other hand $L_{c, n}^{P}-L_{c, n} \geq-1$ and therefore $\left|L_{c, n}^{P}-L_{c, n}\right| \leq \frac{2000 \log n}{c}+1$.

## 5. The scaling limit of the size of the longest cycle

To prove that $L_{c, n} / n$ has a limit $f(c)$ a.s. we first define a sequence of random variables $L_{c, n, k}$ that can be used to approximate $L_{c, n}$. Thereafter we show that for fixed $k \geq 1$ the sequence of random variables $\left\{L_{c, n, k} / n\right\}_{n \geq 1}$ has a limit $f_{k}(c)$ a.s. This will imply that the sequence $\left\{f_{k}(c)\right\}_{k \geq 1}$ can be used to approximate $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{c, n} / n$. In particular, it will imply that the sequence $\left\{f_{k}(c)\right\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a Cauchy sequence and therefore it has a limit $f(c) . f(c)$ will turn out to be the a.s. limit of $L_{c, n} / n$. For the rest of this section we let $G \sim G(n, c / n), c \geq 20$ constant.
5.1. Approximating the longest cycle. Before defining the random variables $L_{c, n, k}, k \geq 1$ we express the length of the longest cycle of $G$ as the sum of "local" quantities. For this we introduce the following notation.
Notation 5.1. For $v \in V(G)$ we let $\phi(v)=0$ if $\gamma^{*}(v)=$ black. Otherwise we let $\phi(v)=\phi\left(T,\left.\gamma^{*}\right|_{T}\right) /|T| \in$ $[0,1]$ where $T$ is the component of $G^{r / b}$ that contains $v$ and $\left.\gamma^{*}\right|_{T}$ is the restriction of $\gamma^{*}$ on $T$.

Theorem 4.3 implies that with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(G)=n-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)} \phi\left(T, \gamma^{*}\right)=n-\sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}\left(G, \gamma^{*}\right)}|T| \cdot \frac{\phi\left(T, \gamma^{*}\right)}{|T|}=n-\sum_{v \in V(G)} \phi(v) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

We now introduce the sequences of colorings $\left\{\gamma_{k}^{*}(v)\right\}_{k \geq 1}, v \in V(G)$ based on which we will define the local functions $\phi_{k}: V(G) \rightarrow[0,1]$. We later use $\phi_{k}$ to define $L_{c, n, k}$. For $v \in V(G)$ and $k \geq 1$ the coloring $\gamma_{k}^{*}(v): N_{\bar{G}}^{\leq k}(v) \rightarrow\{$ red, blue, black $\}$ is generated as follows. Initially all vertices in $N_{\bar{G}}^{\leq k}(v)$ have color black. While there exists a blue or black vertex $u$ in $N_{G}^{<k}(v)$ with fewer than 4 black neighbors then color $u$ red and its black neighbors in $N_{G}^{<k}(v)$ blue.

For $k \geq 1$, given the colorings $\gamma_{k}^{*}(v), v \in[n]$ we define the function $\phi_{k}^{\prime}: V(G) \rightarrow[0,1]$ as follows. $\phi_{k}^{\prime}(v)=0$ if $\gamma_{k}^{*}(v)=$ black. Otherwise we let $\phi^{\prime}(v)=\phi\left(T, \gamma_{k}^{*}\right) /|T|$ where $T$ is the component containing $v$ in the subgraph of $G\left[N^{\leq k}(v)\right]$ induced by the $\gamma_{k}^{*}(v)$-red and $\gamma_{k}^{*}(v)$-blue vertices. Thereafter, given the function $\phi_{k}^{\prime}$ we define the function $\phi_{k}: V(G) \rightarrow[0,1]$ by $\phi_{k}(v)=0$ if there exists $i \in[k]$ such that $\left|N^{i}(v)\right| \geq 10(c k)^{3 i}$ or $G\left[N^{\leq k}(v)\right]$ spans a cycle and $\phi_{k}(v)=\phi_{k}^{\prime}(v)$ otherwise. Finally we let

$$
\begin{equation*}
L_{c, n, k}(G)=n-\sum_{v \in V(G)} \phi_{k}(v) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equation (6) implies,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|L(G)-L_{c, n, k}(G)\right| \leq \sum_{v \in V(G)} \mathbb{I}\left(\phi_{k}(v) \neq \phi(v)\right) \leq \sum_{v \in V(G)} \mathbb{I}\left(\phi_{k}(v) \neq \phi_{k}^{\prime}(v) \text { or } \phi_{k}^{\prime}(v) \neq \phi(v)\right) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 5.2. With probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$,

$$
\mid\left\{v \in V(G): \phi_{k}(v) \neq \phi_{k}^{\prime}(v) \text { or } \phi_{k}^{\prime}(v) \neq \phi(v)\right\} \left\lvert\, \leq \frac{n}{4 k^{2}}\right.
$$

Proof. Let $X_{k}^{\prime}$ be the set of vertices that lie in a component of $G^{r / b}$ of size at least $k, Y_{k}$ be the set of vertices that are within distance $k$ from a cycle of length at most $2 k$ and $Z_{k}$ be the set of vertices with $\left|N^{i}(v)\right| \geq 10(c k)^{3 i}$ for some $i \leq k$. We begin by showing that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mid\left\{v \in V(G): \phi_{k}(v) \neq \phi_{k}^{\prime}(v) \text { or } \phi_{k}^{\prime}(v) \neq \phi(v)\right\}\left|\leq\left|X_{k}^{\prime} \cup Y_{k} \cup Z_{k}\right| \leq\left|X_{k}^{\prime}\right|+\left|Y_{k}\right|+\left|Z_{k}\right|\right. \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

For that it is sufficient to show that (i) every vertex $v$ that is assigned the color black by $\gamma^{*}$ is also assigned the color black by $\gamma_{k}^{*}(v)$, thus $\phi(v)=\phi_{k}(v)=0$ and (ii) every vertex in $[n] \backslash\left(Y_{k} \cup Z_{k}\right)$ that lies in a component of size at most $k-1$ in $G^{r / b}$ satisfies $\phi_{k}^{\prime}(v)=\phi(v)$. For $(i)$ note that the set of vertices that is assigned color black by $\gamma_{k}^{*}(v)$ in $N^{<k}(v)$ is the maximal subset $S$ of $N^{<k}(v)$ such that every vertex in $S \cup N(S)$ has at least 4 neighbors in $S \cup N^{k}(v)$. On the other hand if we let $N_{b l a c k}^{k}(v)=N^{k}(v) \cap V_{b l a c k}(G)$ we have that the set of vertices that is assigned color black by $\gamma^{*}$ in $N^{<k}(v)$ is the maximal subset $S^{\prime}$ of $N^{<k}(v)$ such that every vertex in $S^{\prime} \cup N\left(S^{\prime}\right)$ has at least 4 neighbors in $S^{\prime} \cup N_{b l a c k}^{k}(v)$. As $N_{b l a c k}^{k}(v) \subseteq N^{k}(v)$ we have that $S^{\prime} \subseteq S$ and (i) follows.

Now let $v \in[n]$ be a vertex that lies in a component $C$ of size at most $k-1$ in $G^{r / b}$ and $N(C)$ be the neighborhood of the vertices in $C$ in the graph $G$. Then every vertex in $N(C)$ is assigned color black by $\gamma^{*}$ and thus by $\gamma_{k}^{*}(v)$, by (i). Thus the set of black vertices in both colorings $\gamma^{*}, \gamma_{k}^{*}(v)$ that lie in $C$ is the maximal subset $S$ of $V(C)$ such that every vertex in $S \cup N(S)$ has at least 4 neighbors in $S \cup N(C)$. Therefore in both colorings every vertex in $N(C)$ receives color black and no vertex in $C$ receives color black. Thereafter the set of blue vertices with respect to either $\gamma^{*}$ or $\gamma_{k}^{*}(v)$ equals to the set of vertices with at least 4 neighbors in $N(C)$, call this set $A$. Finally the vertices in $C \backslash A$ receive color red from both $\gamma^{*}, \gamma_{k}^{*}(v)$. Hence both $\gamma^{*}, \gamma_{k}^{*}(v)$ restricted to $C \cup N(C)$ are identical and therefore $\phi(v)=\phi_{k}(v)$.

We now bound $\left|X_{k}^{\prime}\right|,\left|Y_{k}\right|$ and $\left|Z_{k}\right|$. Lemma 3.2 implies that $\left|X_{k}^{\prime}\right| \leq \sum_{i \geq k} \frac{n}{20 i} 0.8^{i}+O\left(n^{0.6}\right) \leq \frac{n}{10 k^{2}}$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. Thereafter let $Y_{k}^{\prime}$ be the set of vertices that lie on a cycle of size at most $2 k$. Then every vertex in $Y_{k}$ lies within distance at most $2 k$ from a vertex in $Y_{k}^{\prime}$ and therefore $\left|Y_{k}\right| \leq\left|Y_{k}^{\prime}\right| \Delta^{2 k}(G)$.

$$
\mathbb{E}\left(\left|Y_{k}^{\prime}\right|\right) \leq \sum_{i=3}^{3 k}\binom{n}{i} i!p^{i} \leq \sum_{i=3}^{3 k}(n p)^{i}=o\left(n^{0.5}\right)
$$

In addition, for $v \in[n]$ deleting all the edges incident to $v$ in $G$ may decrease $\left|Y_{k}^{\prime}\right|$ by at most $d(v) \leq \Delta(G)$, thus by Lemma 2.1, $\left|Y_{k}^{\prime}\right| \leq n^{0.55}$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. Thereafter in the event $\Delta(G) \leq \log ^{2} n$ and $\left|Y_{k}^{\prime}\right| \leq n^{0.55}$ we have that $\left|Y_{k}\right| \leq k\left|Y_{k}^{\prime}\right| \Delta^{2 k}(G) \leq n^{0.6}$. This occurs with probability at least $1-n\binom{n}{\log ^{2} n} p^{\log ^{2} n}-$ $o\left(n^{-2}\right)=1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

Finally, for $v \in[n]$ and $i \leq k$ the expected size of $N^{i}(v)$ is $c^{i}$. Therefore Markov's inequality implies that $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\left|N^{i}(v)\right| \geq 10(c k)^{3 i}\right) \leq c^{i} /\left(10(c k)^{3 i}\right)$ and in extension that $\mathbb{E}\left(\left|Z_{k}\right|\right) \leq n \sum_{i=1}^{k} c^{i} /\left(10(c k)^{3 i} \leq n /\left(9 c^{2} k^{3}\right)\right.$. Thereafter, for $v \in[n]$ deleting all the edges incident to $v$ in $G$ may decrease $\left|Z_{k}\right|$ by at most $\Delta^{k}(G)$. Thus by Lemma 2.1, $\left|Y_{k}^{\prime}\right| \leq n /\left(9 c^{2} k^{3}\right)+n^{0.55} \leq n / 10 k^{2}+o(n)$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

The bounds on $\left|X_{k}^{\prime}\right|,\left|Y_{k}\right|$ and $\left|Z_{k}\right|$ and (9) imply,

$$
\left\lvert\,\left\{v \in V(G): \phi_{k}(v) \neq \phi_{k}^{\prime}(v) \text { or } \phi_{k}^{\prime}(v) \neq \phi(v)\right\}\left|\leq\left|X_{k}^{\prime}\right|+\left|Y_{k}\right|+\left|Z_{k}\right| \leq \frac{n}{10 k^{2}}+n^{0.6}+\frac{n}{10 k^{2}} \leq \frac{n}{4 k^{2}}\right.\right.
$$

with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

Lemma 5.2 and (8) imply the following.
Lemma 5.3. $\left|L(G)-L_{c, n, k}(G)\right| \leq \frac{n}{4 k^{2}}$ with probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$.
5.2. The limits of the approximations. We now let $\mathcal{H}_{k}$ be the set of pairs $\left(H, o_{H}\right)$ where $H$ is a rooted tree, $o_{H}$ is a distinguished vertex of $H$ that is considered to be the root, every vertex in $V(H)$ is within distance at most $k$ from $o_{H}$ and there are at most $10(c k)^{3 i}$ vertices at distance $1 \leq i \leq k$ from $o_{H}$. For
$\left(H, o_{H}\right) \in \mathcal{H}_{k}$ let $X_{\left(H, o_{H}\right)}(G)$ be the number of copies of $\left(H, o_{H}\right)$ in $G$. Also let $\phi\left(H, o_{H}\right)$ be equal to the value of $\phi_{k}(v)$ in the event $\left(G\left[N^{\leq k}(v)\right], v\right)=\left(H, o_{H}\right)$. Then,

$$
L_{c, n, k}(G)=n-\sum_{v \in V(G)} \phi_{k}(v)=n-\sum_{\left(H, o_{H}\right) \in \mathcal{H}_{k}} \phi\left(H, o_{H}\right) X_{\left(H, o_{H}\right)}(G)
$$

For $k \geq 1$ we let

$$
\rho_{c, k}=1-\sum_{\left(H, o_{H}\right) \in \mathcal{H}_{k}} \frac{\phi\left(H, o_{H}\right) c^{|V(H)|-1}}{\operatorname{aut}\left(H, o_{H}\right)}
$$

Here by $\operatorname{aut}\left(H, o_{H}\right)$ we denote the number of automorphisms of $H$ that map $o_{H}$ to $o_{H}$. Then,

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{L_{c, n, k}(G)}{n}\right) & =1-\sum_{\left(H, o_{H}\right) \in \mathcal{H}_{k}} \frac{\phi\left(H, o_{H}\right) \mathbb{E}\left(X_{\left(H, o_{H}\right)}(G)\right)}{n} \\
& =1-\sum_{\left(H, o_{H}\right) \in \mathcal{H}_{k}} \frac{\left.\phi\left(H, o_{H}\right)\binom{n}{|V(H)|}|V(H)|!p^{|E(H)|}(1-p)^{(|V(H)|}\right)-|E(H)|}{a u t\left(H, o_{H}\right) \cdot n} \\
& =1-\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\left(H, o_{H}\right) \in \mathcal{H}_{k}} \frac{c^{|V(H)|-1}}{\operatorname{aut}\left(H, o_{H}\right)}+O\left(n^{-0.9}\right)=\rho_{c, k}+O\left(n^{-0.9}\right) . \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

Lemma 5.4. With probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\rho_{c, k}-\frac{L_{c, n, k}(G)}{n}\right|=O\left(n^{-0.4}\right) \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Fix $\left(H, o_{H}\right) \in \mathcal{H}_{k}$. By Lemma 2.1 we have that $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\left|\mathbb{E}\left(X_{H, o_{H}}(G)\right)-X_{H, o_{H}}(G)\right| \geq n^{0.55}\right)=o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. As the cardinality of $\mathcal{H}_{k}$ is finite, by the union bound, we have that $\left|\mathbb{E}\left(X_{H, o_{H}}(G)\right)-X_{H, o_{H}}(G)\right| \leq n^{0.55}$ for all $\left(H, o_{H}\right) \in \mathcal{H}_{k}$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. Thus,

$$
\left|L_{c, n, k}(G)-n+\sum_{\left(H, o_{H}\right) \in \mathcal{H}_{k}} \phi\left(H, o_{H}\right) \mathbb{E}\left(X_{H, o_{H}}(G)\right)\right| \leq n^{0.6}
$$

with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. The above inequality combined with (10) imply (11).
Lemma 5.5. For integers $k_{2}>k_{1} \geq 1$ we have,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\rho_{c, k_{1}}-\rho_{c, k_{2}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2 k_{1}^{2}} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Let $1 \leq k_{1}<k_{2}$. Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4 imply,

$$
\begin{aligned}
n\left|\rho_{c, k_{1}}-\rho_{c, k_{2}}\right| & \leq\left|n \rho_{c, k_{1}}-L_{c, n, k_{1}}(G)\right|+\left|L_{c, n, k_{1}}(G)-L(G)\right|+\left|L_{c, n, k_{2}}(G)-L(G)\right|+\left|n \rho_{c, k_{2}}-L(G)\right| \\
& \leq O\left(n^{0.6}\right)+\frac{n}{4 k_{1}^{2}}+\frac{n}{4 k_{2}^{2}}+O\left(n^{0.6}\right)<O\left(n^{0.6}\right)+\frac{n}{2 k_{1}^{2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

with probability $1-O\left(n^{2}\right)$. Thus $\left|\rho_{c, k_{1}}-\rho_{c, k_{2}}\right| \leq \frac{1}{2 k_{1}^{2}}$ with positive probability for sufficiently large $n$. As $\rho_{c, k_{1}}, \rho_{c, k_{2}}$ are independent of $n$ (12) follows.
(12) implies that the sequence $\left\{\rho_{c, k}\right\}_{k \geq 1}$ is a Caushy sequence. Therefore it has a limit as $k \rightarrow \infty$ which we denote by $\rho_{c}$.

Proof of part (a) of Theorem 1.1 Define $f:[0, \infty) \rightarrow[0,1]$ by $f(c)=\rho_{c}$ for $c \geq 20$ and $f(c)=\rho_{20}$ for $0 \leq c \leq 20$. Then for $k \geq 2$, lemmas 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 imply,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left|n \rho_{c}-L_{c, n}\right| & \leq n\left|\rho_{c}-\rho_{c, k}\right|+\left|n \rho_{c, k}-L_{c, n, k}(G)\right|+\left|L_{c, n, k}(G)-L_{c, n}(G)\right| \\
& \leq n \sum_{i \geq k} \frac{1}{2 i^{2}}+O\left(n^{0.6}\right)+\frac{n}{4 k^{2}} \leq \frac{n}{2(k-1)}+O\left(n^{0.6}\right)+\frac{n}{4 k^{2}} \leq \frac{2 n}{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

with probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$. As $\sum_{i \geq 1} i^{-2}<\infty$ the Borel-Cantelli Lemma implies that $\mid \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(L_{c, n} / n\right)-$ $\rho_{c} \mid \leq 2 / k$ a.s and therefore $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{L}_{c, n} / n=\rho_{c}=f(c)$ a.s. for $c \geq 20$.

Now let $0<\epsilon \leq 10^{-3}$. To prove that $f$ is continuous it suffices to show that $|f(c)-f(c+\epsilon)| \leq \epsilon$ for $c \geq 20$. Let $G_{1} \sim G(n, c / n), G_{2} \sim G(n,(c+\epsilon) / n)$ and $E=e_{1}, e_{2}, \ldots, e_{2 \epsilon n}$ be a sequence of $2 \epsilon n$ edges where $e_{i}$ is chosen independently, uniformly at random from $\binom{[n]}{2}$. Let $G_{1}^{+}=G_{1} \cup E$. Then $G_{1}, G_{2}, E$ can be coupled such that $L\left(G_{2}\right) \leq L\left(G_{1}^{+}\right)$w.h.p., where $G_{1}^{+}$is the simple graph obtained from $G_{1} \cup E$ by replacing its multiple edges with the corresponding single edges. We may bound $L\left(G_{1} \cup E\right)$ by $L\left(G_{1}\right)$ plus the number of vertices in components of $\left(G_{1}\right)^{r / b}$ that span an endpoint of an edge in $E$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.2,

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{E}\left(L\left(G_{2}\right)\right. & \leq \mathbb{E}\left(L\left(G_{1} \cup E\right)\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(L\left(G_{1}\right)\right)+4 \epsilon n \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i \cdot \frac{0.8^{i} n /(c i)}{n} \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}\left(L\left(G_{1}\right)\right)+4 \epsilon n \cdot \frac{4}{c} \leq \mathbb{E}\left(L\left(G_{1}\right)\right)+0.8 \epsilon n \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

$\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{c, n} / n=f(c)$ a.s. implies that $\mathbb{E}\left(L\left(G_{1}\right)\right)=n f(c)+o(n)$ and $\mathbb{E}\left(L\left(G_{2}\right)\right)=n f(c+\epsilon)+o(n)$. Combining these equalities with (13) gives,

$$
|f(c)-f(c+\epsilon)| \leq\left|\frac{\mathbb{E}\left(L\left(G_{1}\right)\right)}{n}-\frac{\mathbb{E}\left(L\left(G_{2}\right)\right)}{n}+o(1)\right| \leq 0.8 \epsilon+o(1)
$$

Hence $|f(c)-f(c+\epsilon)| \leq \epsilon$ as desired.

## 6. Proof of Theorem 3.3

Fix $U \subseteq V_{\text {blue }}(G)$ a matching $M$ on $V_{4, \text { blue }} \backslash U$ and let $H=G^{\prime}\left[V\left(G^{\prime}\right) \backslash U\right]$. We prove Theorem 3.3 in 3 steps. In the first one we decompose $H$ into a graph $H^{\prime} \subset H$, an edge set $E_{1} \subset E(H)$ and a vertex set $V_{1} \subset V(H)$ with the following properties. $\left|E_{1}\right|=\Omega(n / \log \log n),\left|V_{1}\right|=O(n / \log \log n)$ and given $V_{1}, E(H) \backslash E_{1},\left|E_{1}\right|$ the set $E_{1}$ is uniformly distributed over all the sets of edges of size $\left|E_{1}\right|$ that are spanned by $V(H) \backslash V_{1}$ and are disjoint from $E(H) \backslash E_{1}$. Then, by applying the Tutte-Berge formula twice, we find a set of pairwise disjoint vertex paths in $H \cup M$ of size at most $4 n / \log ^{0.5} n$ that cover both $V(H)$ and $M$. Finally, using Pósa rotations we merge these paths into a Hamilton cycle that covers $M$.
6.1. Decomposing $H$. To decompose $H$ we first assign to every edge $e$ of $G$ a $\operatorname{Bernoulli}\left(p^{\prime}\right)$ random variable $Y_{e}$ with $p^{\prime}=1 / c \log \log n$. Then we let $H_{1}$ be the subgraph of $H$ with edge set $E\left(H_{1}\right)=\left\{e \in E(H): Y_{e}=0\right\}$ and we reveal $H_{1}$. Thereafter, given $V_{\text {red }}(G)$ we identify $V_{b l a c k}(G)$ and let $V_{1}$ be the set of vertices of $V(H)$ with less than 4 neighbors in $V_{\text {black }}(G)$. Finally we reveal all the edges of $H$ incident to $V_{1}$, define $H^{\prime}$ by $V\left(H^{\prime}\right)=V(H)$ and $E\left(H^{\prime}\right)=E\left(H_{1}\right) \cup\left\{u v \in E(H):\{u, v\} \cap V_{1} \neq \emptyset\right\}$ and let $E_{1}=E(H) \backslash E\left(H^{\prime}\right)$.

Given $H^{\prime}, V_{1}$ and $e_{1}=\left|E_{1}\right|$ let $\mathcal{S}\left(H^{\prime}, V_{1}, e_{1}\right)$ be the set that consists of all the sets of edges $T$ that are spanned by $V(H) \backslash V_{1}$, do not intersect $E\left(H^{\prime}\right)$ and have size $e_{1}$. Observe that $\operatorname{Pr}\left(T=E_{1} \mid H^{\prime}, V_{1}, e_{1}\right)=0$ for $T \notin \mathcal{S}\left(H^{\prime}, V_{1}, e_{1}\right)$. On the other hand for $T \in \mathcal{S}\left(H^{\prime}, V_{1}, e_{1}\right)$ we have that $\operatorname{Pr}\left(T=E_{1} \mid H^{\prime}, V_{1}, e_{1}\right)$ is independent $T$. Hence the distribution of $E_{1}$ is uniform over the elements of $\mathcal{S}\left(H^{\prime}, V_{1}, e_{1}\right)$. The sizes of $V_{1}$ and $E_{1}$ are given by the following lemma. Its proof is located in Appendix A.

Lemma 6.1. Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text {sample }}$ be the event that $\left|V_{1}\right| \leq 10 n / \log \log n$ and $n / 1000 \log \log n \leq\left|E_{1}\right|$. Then, $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text {sample }}\right)=1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.
6.2. Finding a large 2-matching. For integers $k, \ell, r$, we say that a graph $F$ has the property $\mathcal{P}(k, \ell, r)$, equivalently $F \in \mathcal{P}(k, \ell, r)$, if the following hold. $F$ spans at most $k$ vertex disjoint cycles of length at most $\ell$ and there does not exist a partition of $V(F)$ into 3 pairwise disjoint sets $U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}$ such that $\left|U_{1}\right|>r$, $\left|U_{2}\right| \leq\left|U_{1}\right|$ and every vertex in $U_{1}$ has at most 1 neighbor in $U_{1} \cup U_{3}$.

Lemma 6.2. Let $F$ be a graph and $\ell, k, r$ be such that $F \in \mathcal{P}(k, \ell, r)$. Then, for every matching $M$ on $V(F)$ the graph $F \backslash M$ spans a matching $M^{\prime}$ of size at least $0.5|V(F)|-0.5(r+k+(|V(F)| / \ell))$.

Proof. For a graph $G$ and $U \subset V(G)$ let $o d d_{G}(U)$ be the number of odd components of $G[V(G) \backslash U]$. In addition denote by $\alpha^{\prime}(G)$ the matching number of $G$. The Tutte-Berge formula states

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha^{\prime}(G)=0.5 \min _{U \subseteq V(G)}\left(|U|-\operatorname{odd}_{G}(U)+|V(G)|\right) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $S \subseteq V(F)$ be a set that minimizes $|S|-o d d_{F \backslash M}(S)$ of maximum size, $A$ be the set of isolated vertices in $F[V(F) \backslash S] \backslash M$ and $B=V(F) \backslash(S \cup A)$. Observe that $B$ does not span a tree in $F \backslash M$. Indeed, assume otherwise, that is that $B$ spans a tree $T$. Let $l$ be a leaf of $T$ and $p$ the parent of $l$ (in the case that $T$ consists of a single edge $e$ we let $p, l$ be the endpoints of $e$ ). If $|V(T)|$ is even then $T \backslash\{p\}$ spans at least one odd component, namely the one consisting of the vertex $l$. Else if $|V(T)|$ is odd then $T \backslash\{p\}$ spans at least one odd component in addition to $\{l\}$, hence at least 2. Therefore with $S^{\prime}=S \cup\{p\}$,

$$
\left|S^{\prime}\right|-\operatorname{odd}_{F \backslash M}\left(S^{\prime}\right) \leq(|S|+1)-\left(\operatorname{odd}_{F \backslash M}(S)+1\right)=|S|-\operatorname{odd}_{F \backslash M}(S)
$$

contradicting the maximality of $S$. Therefore every component spanned by $B$ contains a cycle. $F \in \mathcal{P}(k, \ell, r)$ implies that there exist at most $k$ cycles of length at most $\ell$ in $F$, hence in $F \backslash M$ and therefore $B$ spans at most $k+|B| /(\ell+1) \leq k+|V(F)| / \ell$ many components. In this case (14) and the choice of $S$ imply that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha^{\prime}(F \backslash M)=0.5|V(F)|+0.5|S|-0.5 o d d_{F \backslash M}(S) \geq 0.5|V(F)|+0.5|S|-0.5(|A|+k+(|V(F)| / \ell)) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $|A| \leq r$ then (15) gives that $\alpha^{\prime}(F \backslash M) \geq 0.5|V(F)|-0.5(r+k+(|V(F)| / \ell))$. On the other hand if $|A|>r$ then every vertex in $A$ has no neighbor in $A \cup B$ in $F \backslash M$ and therefore it has at most one neighbor in $A \cup B$ in $F$. Hence, as $F$ belongs to $\mathcal{P}(k, \ell, r)$ (with $(A, S, B)=\left(U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}\right)$ ) we have that $|S| \geq|A|$. In this case (15) gives that $\alpha^{\prime}(F \backslash M) \geq 0.5|V(F)|-0.5(k+(|V(F)| / \ell))$.

We prove the following lemma in Appendix B.
Lemma 6.3. Let $U^{\prime} \subseteq V_{\text {blue }}(G) \backslash U$. Then both $H^{\prime}$ and $H^{\prime}\left[V\left(H^{\prime}\right) \backslash U^{\prime}\right]$ belong to $\mathcal{P}\left(n / \log ^{0.5} n, \log ^{0.5} n, 0\right)$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. In addition $H^{\prime} \cup M$ does not span a set of $n / \log ^{0.5} n$ vertex disjoint cycles of length at most $\log ^{0.5} n$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

By combining lemmas 6.2 and 6.3 we prove the following one.
Lemma 6.4. There exists a set of vertex disjoint paths $\mathcal{P}$ in $H^{\prime} \cup M$ of size at most $4 n / \log ^{0.5} n$ that cover both $V\left(H^{\prime}\right)$ and $M$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

Proof. Let $M_{1}$ be a maximum matching in $H^{\prime} \backslash M, M_{1}^{+}=M \cup M_{1}, V_{M}$ be the set of vertices that are incident to 2 edges in $M_{1}^{+}$and $M_{2}$ be a maximum matching in $H^{\prime}\left[V\left(H^{\prime}\right) \backslash V_{M}\right] \backslash M_{1}^{+}$. To construct the set $\mathcal{P}$, let $\mathcal{C}$ be the set of components induced by $M_{1}^{+} \cup M_{2}$. Remove from every cycle in $\mathcal{C}$ an edge that does not belong to the matching $M$ and let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of the resulting $|\mathcal{C}|$ paths.

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the event that $H^{\prime}, H^{\prime}\left[V\left(H^{\prime}\right) \backslash V_{M}\right] \in \mathcal{P}\left(n / \log ^{0.5} n, \log ^{0.5} n, 0\right)$ and $H^{\prime} \cup M$ does not span a set of $n / \log ^{0.5} n$ vertex disjoint cycles of length at most $\log ^{0.5} n$. In the event $\mathcal{E}$, by Lemma $6.2,\left|M_{1}\right| \geq$ $0.5\left|V\left(H^{\prime}\right)\right|-n /\left(\log ^{0.5} n\right)$ and $\left|M_{2}\right| \geq 0.5\left(\left|V\left(H^{\prime}\right)\right|-\left|V_{M}\right|\right)-n /\left(\log ^{0.5} n\right)$. Therefore the components in $\mathcal{C}$ span at least $\left|V\left(H^{\prime}\right)\right|-2 n / \log ^{0.5} n$ edges in total. In addition, as every cycle in $\mathcal{C}$ belongs to $H^{\prime} \cup M, \mathcal{C}$ spans at most $n / \log ^{0.5} n$ cycles of length less than $\log ^{0.5} n$ and $2 n / \log ^{0.5} n$ cycles in total. This implies that $\mathcal{P}$ is a set of vertex disjoint paths that covers $\left|V\left(H^{\prime}\right)\right|$ and spans at least $\left|V\left(H^{\prime}\right)\right|-4 n / \log ^{0.5} n$ edges. Thus

$$
\left|V\left(H^{\prime}\right)\right|-4 n / \log ^{0.5} n \leq \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}}|E(P)|=\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}}|V(P)|-1=\left|V\left(H^{\prime}\right)\right|-|\mathcal{P}|
$$

Hence $|\mathcal{P}| \leq 4 n / \log ^{3} n$ with probability $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathcal{E})=1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.
6.3. Merging the paths into a Hamilton cycle. Let $\mathcal{P}=\left\{P_{1}^{\prime}, P_{2}^{\prime}, \ldots, P_{\ell}^{\prime}\right\}$ be a minimum size set of vertex disjoint paths that cover both $M$ and $V\left(H^{\prime}\right)$. For $i \in[\ell]$ let $v_{i, 1}, v_{i, 2}$ be the two endpoints of $P_{i}^{\prime}$ (in the case that $P_{i}^{\prime}$ is a path of length 0 , equivalently it consists of a single vertex $v_{i}$, then $v_{1, i}=v_{i}=$ $\left.v_{2, i}\right)$. Then $P_{1}=P_{1}^{\prime}, v_{1,2} v_{2,1}, P_{2}^{\prime}, v_{2,2} v_{3,1}, \ldots, P_{\ell}^{\prime}$ is a Hamilton path of $H^{\prime} \cup R$ where $R=\left\{v_{i, 2} v_{i+1,1}\right.$ : $i \in[\ell-1]\}$. We transform $P_{1}$ into a Hamilton cycle of $H=H^{\prime} \cup E_{1}$ in $\ell$ iterations of an extensionrotation procedure. Given a Hamilton path $P=v_{1}, e_{1}, v_{2}, e_{2}, \ldots, v_{i}, e_{i}, v_{i+1}, \ldots, e_{n^{\prime}-1}, v_{n^{\prime}}$ we say that the path $P^{\prime}=v_{1}, e_{1}, \ldots ., v_{i}, v_{i} v_{n^{\prime}}, v_{n^{\prime}}, e_{n^{\prime}-1}, v_{n^{\prime}-1}, \ldots ., e_{i+1}, v_{i+1}$ is obtained by a Pósa rotation with $v_{1}$ being the fixed endpoint. We call $e_{i}$ the deleted edge, $v_{1} v_{n^{\prime}}$ the inserted edge, $v_{i}$ the pivot vertex and $v_{i+1}$ the new endpoint. We say that the Pósa rotation that transforms $P$ to $P^{\prime}$ is admissible w.r.t. to the pair of edge sets $\left(W, W^{\prime}\right)$ if the inserted edge belongs to $W$ and the deleted edge does not belong to $W^{\prime}$.

Let $\ell=|\mathcal{P}|$. For $i \in[\ell]$ we let $E_{i}^{\prime}$ be the set of edges in $E_{1}$ that have been revealed during the first $i-1$ iterations, thus $E_{1}^{\prime}=\emptyset$. We start the $i^{t h}$ iteration with a Hamilton path $P_{i}$ in $H^{\prime} \cup E_{i}^{\prime} \cup R$ that spans $\ell-i$ edges of $R$. We then proceed by performing all sequences of Pósa rotations that fix the vertex $v$ and are admissible w.r.t. $\left(E\left(H^{\prime}\right), M\right)$ (each such sequence starts with the path $P_{i}$ ). Let $E n d_{i}$ be the set of distinct new endpoints obtained and for $w \in E n d_{i}$ let $P_{w, i}$ be a path from $v$ to $w$ obtained by the Pósa rotations. Thereafter, for $w \in E n d_{i}$ we perform all sequences of Pósa rotations that fix the vertex $w$ and are admissible w.r.t. $\left(E\left(H^{\prime}\right), M\right)$ (each such sequence starts with the path $\left.P_{w, i}\right)$ and we let $E n d_{w, i}$ be the set of distinct new endpoints obtained.

For $w \in E n d_{i}, z \in E n d_{w, i}$ we let $P_{\{w, z\}, i}$ be a path from $w$ to $z$ obtained by the above procedure. If there exists a path $P_{\{w, z\}, i}$ that contains fewer edges in $R$ than $P_{i}$ then we let $P_{i+1}$ be such a path that spans $\ell-i-1$ edges in $R$, set $E_{i+1}^{\prime}=E_{i}^{\prime}$ and proceed to the next iteration. Else, we reveal the edges in $E_{1} \backslash E_{i}^{\prime}$ one by one until we identify an edge $w, z$ with $w \in E n d_{i}, z \in E n d_{w, i}$. Once such an edge is identified, we let $H_{i}$ be the Hamilton cycle with edge set $E\left(P_{\{w, z\}, i}\right) \cup\{\{w, z\}\}$. If $i=\ell$ then we output $H_{\ell}$. Else, $H_{i}$ spans $\ell-i-1$ edges in $R$, we remove such an edge from $H_{i}$ and let $P_{i+1}$ be the resultant Hamilton path. If at any point we have revealed all the edges in $E_{1}$ and have not constructed $H_{\ell}$ yet, then we terminate the algorithm.

For $e \in E_{1}$ set $X_{e}=1$ if $e$ is not revealed by the above algorithm or when $e$ is revealed it is used to construct some Hamilton cycle $H_{i}, i \leq \ell$. Set $X_{e}=0$ otherwise. All Pósa rotations performed by the above algorithm are admissible w.r.t. $\left(E\left(H^{\prime}\right), M\right)$, thus they never delete an edge from $M$ or add an edge from $R$ to a path while they are performed. Here we are using that $\mathcal{P}$ is of minimum size, hence $R \cap E\left(H^{\prime}\right)=\emptyset$. So in the event $\sum_{e \in E_{1}} X_{e} \geq \ell, H_{\ell}$ is a Hamilton cycle of $H^{\prime} \cup E_{1} \cup R=H \cup R$ that spans at most $|R|-\ell=0$ edges in $R$ and all of the edges of $M$.

Let $\mathcal{E}_{\text {exp }}$ be the event the following hold: (i) every set $W \subset[n]$ of size at most 12 spans at most $|W|+2$ edges in $H^{\prime}$, (ii) for every $S \subset[n]$ and $T \subseteq[n] \backslash S$ with $5 \leq|S| \leq n / c^{5}$ and $|T| \leq 2|S|$ we have that the set $S \cup T$ spans fewer than $1.5|S|+|T|$ edges in $H^{\prime}$ and (iii) for every set $S \subset[n]$ satisfying $n / c^{9} \leq|S| \leq 10^{-30} n$ we have that $\left|N_{H^{\prime}}(S) \backslash V_{\text {blue }}(G)\right| \leq 2|S|$. In the analysis of the above algorithm we make use of the following lemma.

Lemma 6.5. $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text {exp }}\right)=1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

Proof. As $H^{\prime} \subseteq G$ we have,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}(\neg(i)) \leq \sum_{s=4}^{12}\binom{n}{s}\binom{0.5 s^{2}}{s+3} p^{s+3}=O\left(n^{-2}\right)
$$

In addition,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}(\neg(i i)) & \leq \sum_{s=5}^{\frac{n}{c^{9}}} \sum_{t=0}^{2 s}\binom{n}{s+t}\binom{0.5(s+t)^{2}}{1.5 s+t} p^{1.5 s+t} \leq \sum_{s=5}^{\frac{n}{c^{9}}} \sum_{t=0}^{2 s}\left(\frac{e n}{s+t}\right)^{s+t}\left(\frac{0.5 e(s+t)^{2} p}{1.5 s+t}\right)^{1.5 s+t} \\
& \leq O\left(n^{-2}\right)+\sum_{s=\log ^{2} n}^{c^{9}} \sum_{t=0}^{2 s}\left(\frac{0.5 e^{2} n p}{1.16}\right)^{s+t}\left(\frac{0.5 e(s+t) p}{1.16}\right)^{0.5 s} \\
& \leq O\left(n^{-2}\right)+\sum_{s=\log ^{2} n}^{\frac{n}{c^{9}}} 2 s\left(\frac{e^{2} c}{2.32}\right)^{3 s}\left(\frac{3 e}{2.32 c^{9}}\right)^{0.5 s} \leq O\left(n^{-2}\right)+\sum_{s=\log ^{2} n}^{\frac{n}{c^{9}}} s\left(\frac{3 e^{13}}{2.32^{7} c^{3}}\right)^{0.5 s}=O\left(n^{-2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

For $c \leq 1000$, as $n / c^{9}>10^{-30} n$, we have that $\operatorname{Pr}\left(\mathcal{E}_{\text {exp }}\right)=1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$. Thereafter for $c>1000$ and $s \geq n / c^{9}$ Lemma 3.2 implies that $\left|V_{\text {blue }}(G) \cup V_{\text {red }}(G)\right| \leq c^{3} e^{-c} n \leq n / c^{9} \leq 0.1 s$ with probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$. In addition by construction each edge $e$ spanned by $V_{\text {black }}(G)$ does not belong to $H^{\prime}$ only if (i) $e \notin E(G)$ or (ii) $e \in E(G)$ and $Y_{e}=1$, hence with probability at most $1-p+p p^{\prime}$ independently. Thus,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left(\neg \mathcal{E}_{\text {exp }}\right) & \leq O\left(n^{-2}\right)+\sum_{s=\frac{n}{c^{9}}}^{10^{-30} n}\binom{n}{s}\binom{n}{2.1 s}\left(1-p+p p^{\prime}\right)^{s(n-3.1 s)} \\
& \leq O\left(n^{-2}\right)+\sum_{s=\frac{n}{c^{9}}}^{10^{-30} n}\left(\frac{e n}{s}\right)^{s}\left(\frac{e n}{2.1 s}\right)^{2.1 s} e^{-(1+o(1)) p s \cdot 0.999 n} \\
& \leq O\left(n^{-2}\right)+\sum_{s=\frac{n}{c^{9}}}^{10^{-30} n}\left[5\left(\frac{n}{s}\right)^{3.1 s} e^{-0.99 c}\right]^{s} \leq O\left(n^{-2}\right)+\sum_{s=\frac{n}{c^{9}}}^{10^{-30} n}\left[c^{30} e^{-0.99 c}\right]^{s}=O\left(n^{-2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Theorem 3.3 follows from Lemma 6.6.
Lemma 6.6. $\sum_{e \in E_{1}} X_{e} \geq \ell$ with probability $1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the event that the events $\mathcal{E}_{\text {sample }}$ and $\mathcal{E}_{\text {exp }}$ occur, and there exists a set of at most $4 n / \log n$ vertex disjoint paths in $H^{\prime} \cup M$ that cover both $M$ and $V\left(H^{\prime}\right)$. Lemmas 6.1, 6.4 and 6.5 imply that $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathcal{E})=1-O\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

Let $P$ be any Hamilton $u-v$ path in $H^{\prime} \cup E_{1} \cup R$. Recall that $u$ has at least 4 neighbors in $V_{b l a c k}(G)$ in $H^{\prime}$. At most 1 of those neighbors precedes $u$ on $P$. Also as these neighbors belong to $V_{\text {black }}(G)$ they are not incident to $M$ which is spanned by $V_{\text {blue }}(G)$. Therefore there are at least 3 admissible Pósa rotations w.r.t $\left(E\left(H^{\prime}\right), M\right)$ that can be performed on $P$ and fix $v$. If none of the corresponding deleted edges belongs to $R$, then the corresponding, at least 3 , pivot vertices are adjacent to $u$ and the corresponding new endpoint in $H^{\prime}$. Call this observation (*).

Let $i \in[\ell]$ and $P_{i}, v, \operatorname{End}_{i},\left\{\operatorname{End}_{w, i}: w \in \operatorname{End}_{i}\right\},\left\{P_{w, i}: w \in \operatorname{End}_{i}\right\},\left\{P_{\{w, z\}, i}: w \in \operatorname{End}_{i}, z \in \operatorname{End}_{w, i}\right\}$ be as described earlier. Assume that at iteration $i$ we do not perform a Pósa rotation where the deleted edge belongs to $R$. Let Pivot $_{i}$ be the set of pivot vertices that we meet while constructing the set $E n d_{i}$ (starting from $\left.P_{i}\right) .(*)$ implies that, in $H^{\prime}$, every vertex in $E n d_{i}$ is adjacent to at least 3 vertices in Pivot $_{i}$ and every vertex in Pivot $_{i}$ is adjacent to at least 2 vertices in $E n d_{i}$. It follows that the set End En $_{i} \cup$ Pivot $_{i}$ spans at least $1.5\left|E n d_{i}\right|+\mid$ Pivot $_{i} \backslash E n d_{i} \mid$ many edges in $H^{\prime}$. If $4 \leq\left|E n d_{i}\right| \leq n / c^{9}$, by considering a first time a vertex in Pivot $_{i}$ is used as a pivot vertex, every vertex in Pivot $_{i}$ has a neighbor on $P_{i}$ that belongs to $E n d_{i}$, hence $\mid$ Pivot $_{i} \backslash E n d_{i}|\leq 2| E n d_{i} \mid$. In the special case that $\left|E n d_{i}\right|=4$, let $v, u$ be the endpoints of $P_{i}, E n d_{i}=\left\{u, u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}\right\}$ where $u_{3}$ is the vertex further from $u$ on $P_{i}$ and $w_{j}$ be the vertex preceding $u_{j}$ on $P_{i}$ for $j=1,2,3 .(*)$ states that there are at least 3 admissible Pósa rotations w.r.t $\left(E\left(H^{\prime}\right), M\right)$ that can be performed on $P_{i}$ and fix $v$. As $E n d_{i}=\left\{u, u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}\right\}$ and no two of these Pósa rotations result in a pair
of paths with the same endpoints we have that $v w_{i} \in E\left(H^{\prime}\right)$ for $i=1,2,3$. Let $P_{i, j}$ be the path from $v$ to $u_{j}$ that can be obtained by a single Pósa rotation from $P_{i}$. Observe that on both $P_{i, 1}, P_{i, 2}$ the vertex $w_{3}$ precedes $u_{3}$ (as we traverse them starting from $v$ ). Once again, as $E n d_{i}=\left\{u, u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}\right\},(*)$ implies that $u_{1} w_{3}, u_{2} w_{3} \in E(G)$. Thus $w_{3} \in$ Pivot $_{i} \backslash E n d_{i}$ has 4 neighbors in End ${ }_{i}$. It follows that Pivot $_{i} \cup E n d_{i}$ has size $s \in[4,12]$ and spans at least $1.5 \mid$ End $_{i}|+|$ Pivot $_{i} \backslash E n d_{i} \mid+1=s+3$ many edges in $H^{\prime}$.

Partition $N_{H^{\prime}}\left(E n d_{i}\right)$ to $N_{1} \uplus N_{2}$ where $N_{1}$ is the set of vertices in $N_{H^{\prime}}\left(E n d_{i}\right)$ that have a neighbor on $P_{i}$ who belongs to $E n d_{i}$. Then $\left|N_{1}\right| \leq 2\left|E n d_{i}\right|$. Let $u \in N_{2}=N_{H^{\prime}}\left(E n d_{i}\right) \backslash N_{1}$, say $u \in N_{H^{\prime}}(w)$ with $w \in E n d_{i}$. As none of the neighbors of $u$ on $P_{i}$ belong to $E n d_{i}$, the Pósa rotation that inserts to $P_{w, i}$ the edge $u w$ and deletes an edge incident to $u$ is not admissible w.r.t $\left(E\left(H^{\prime}\right), M\right)$. Thus $u$ is incident to an edge in $M$. As every edge in $M$ is spanned by $V_{\text {blue }}(G)$ we have that $u \in V_{\text {blue }}(G)$. It follows that

$$
\left|N_{H^{\prime}}\left(\operatorname{End}_{i}\right) \backslash V_{\text {blue }}(G)\right|=\left|N_{1}\right| \leq 2\left|E n d_{i}\right|
$$

In the event $\mathcal{E}$, the event $\mathcal{E}_{\text {exp }}$ occurs. By taking $S=E n d_{i}, T=\operatorname{Pivot}_{i} \backslash E n d_{i}$ and $W=E n d_{i} \cup$ Pivot $_{i}$ at the definition of $\mathcal{E}_{\exp }$ the above imply that in the event $\mathcal{E}$ we have that $\left|E n d_{i}\right| \geq 10^{-30} n$ and (similarly) $\left|E n d_{w, i}\right| \geq 10^{-30} n$ for $w \in E n d_{i}$. Hence at iteration $i$ there exists a set of at least $(0.5+o(1)) 10^{-60} n^{2}$ pairs $\{w, z\} \subset V(H) \backslash V_{1}$ such that during iteration $i$ the Hamilton path $P_{\{w, z\}, i}$ is generated. Here we are using that in the event $\mathcal{E}$ the set $V_{1}$ spans $o\left(n^{2}\right)$ pairs of vertices. Thus for every edge $e \in E_{1}$ that is revealed at iteration $i$ we have that $X_{e}=1$ with probability at least $(1+o(1)) 10^{-60}$ independently of the identity of the edges in $E_{1}$ that are revealed beforehand. It follows that,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(\sum_{e \in E_{1}} X_{e}<\ell\right) \leq \operatorname{Pr}\left(\left.\operatorname{Bin}\left(\frac{n}{1000 \log \log n},(1+o(1)) 10^{-60}\right) \leq \frac{4 n}{\log ^{0.5} n} \right\rvert\, \mathcal{E}\right)+\operatorname{Pr}(\neg \mathcal{E})=O\left(n^{-2}\right)
$$

## 7. Concluding Remarks

We have shown how one can identify a longest cycle in $G \sim G(n, c / n)$ and proved that $\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} L(G) / n$ converges to a constant $f(c)$ a.s. for $c \geq 20$. In addition we determined the probability that $G$ is weakly pancyclic. Our proofs rely on structural properties of the strong 4-core of the binomial random graphs that hold with high probability. This motivates the further study of the strong $k$-core of $G(n, p)$ and in particular determining $n p_{k}$, where $p_{k}$ is the threshold of appearance of a non-empty strong $k$-core for $k \geq 3$ in $G(n, p)$. We believe that one can extend the range for which Theorem 1.1 holds to $c>n p_{3}$ via the study of the strong 3 -core.
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## Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 6.1

Proof. Let $F^{\prime}$ be the subgraph of $G$ induced by $\left\{e \in G: Y_{e}=1\right\}$. Then $F^{\prime} \sim G(n, 1 / n \log \log n)$. Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left(\left|V_{1}\right|>\frac{10 n}{\log \log n}\right) & \leq \operatorname{Pr}\left(\left|E\left(F^{\prime}\right)\right|>\frac{5 n}{\log \log n}\right) \\
& \leq \operatorname{Pr}\left(\operatorname{Bin}\left(n, \frac{1}{n \log \log n}\right)>\frac{5 n}{\log \log n}\right)+o\left(n^{-2}\right)=o\left(n^{-2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the event that $H$ spans at least 0.25 cn edges. Lemma 3.2 states that $\left|V_{\text {red }}(G) \cup V_{\text {blue }}(G)\right| \leq$ $c^{3} e^{-c} n \leq 0.01 n$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. As every edge spanned by $V_{\text {black }}(G)$ belongs to $H$,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}(\neg \mathcal{E}) \leq\binom{ n}{0.01 n} \operatorname{Pr}\left(\operatorname{Bin}\left(\binom{0.99 n}{2}, \frac{c}{n}\right)<0.25 c n\right)+o\left(n^{-2}\right) \leq 2^{n} e^{-\frac{0.49^{2} \cdot 0.495 c n}{2}}+o\left(n^{-2}\right)=o\left(n^{-2}\right) .
$$

Furthermore, let $E_{5}^{\prime}=E_{5} \cap E(H)$ and $E_{2}^{\prime}$ be the set of edges are incident to vertices of degree at least 2 in $F^{\prime}$. Observe that every edge of $E_{5}^{\prime} \backslash E_{2}^{\prime}$ belongs to $E_{1}$. Thus $\left|E_{1}\right| \geq n / 1000 \log \log n$ if $\left|E_{5}^{\prime}\right| \geq n / 200 \log \log n$ and $\left|E_{2}^{\prime}\right| \leq n / 400 \log \log n$. In the event $\mathcal{E}$ we have that $\left|E_{5}\right| \geq|E(H)|-4 n \geq|E(H)|-0.2 \mathrm{cn} \geq 0.05 \mathrm{cn}$. It follows that,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(\left|E_{5}^{\prime}\right|<\frac{n}{200 \log \log n}\right) \leq \operatorname{Pr}\left(\left.\operatorname{Bin}\left(0.05 c n, \frac{1}{c \log \log n}\right) \leq \frac{n}{200 \log \log n} \right\rvert\, \mathcal{E}\right)+o\left(n^{-2}\right)=o\left(n^{-2}\right) .
$$

For upper bounding $E_{2}$, let $X_{i}$ be the number of vertices of degree $i$ in $F^{\prime}$. By Lemma 2.1 we have that $X_{i} \leq n\binom{n}{i}\left(p p^{\prime}\right)^{i}+n^{0.6}$ for $i \geq 0$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. In addition,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(\Delta\left(F^{\prime}\right) \geq \log ^{2} n\right) \leq \operatorname{Pr}\left(\Delta(G) \geq \log ^{2} n\right) \leq n \operatorname{Pr}\left(\operatorname{Bin}(n, 2 \log n / n) \geq \log ^{2} n\right)=o\left(n^{-2}\right)
$$

Hence, $\left|E_{2}^{\prime}\right| \leq \sum_{i=2}^{\log ^{2} n} i\left|X_{i}\right| \leq \sum_{i=2}^{\log ^{2} n} n 2^{i+1}(\log \log n)^{-i}+n^{0.6} \leq n / 400 \log \log n$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. It follows that $\left|E_{1}\right| \geq\left|E_{5}^{\prime}\right|-\left|E_{2}^{\prime}\right| \geq n /(1000 \log \log n)$ with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$.

## Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 6.3

Proof. Let $Z$ and $Z^{+}$respectively be the maximal number of vertex disjoint cycles of length at most $\log ^{0.5} n$ in $H^{\prime} \cup M$ and at most $\log ^{0.6} n$ in $G$ respectively. Say a cycle in $H^{\prime} \cup M$ is heavy if it spans an edge in $M$ that corresponds to a path in a component of $G^{r / b}$ with more than $\log ^{0.1} n$ vertices. Let $Z_{H}$ be the number of heavy cycles in $H^{\prime} \cup M$ and $X_{\geq \log ^{0.1} n}$ be the number of components of $G^{r / b}$ of size at least $\log ^{0.1} n$. Then $Z \leq Z^{+}+Z_{H} \leq Z^{+}+X_{\geq \log ^{0.1} n}$. Thereafter using that $Z^{+}$is bounded by the number of cycles of length at most $\log ^{0.6} n$ and Lemma 3.2 we have,

$$
\mathbb{E}(Z) \leq \sum_{i=3}^{\log ^{0.6} n}\binom{n}{i} \frac{(i-1)!}{2} p^{i}+n(0.8)^{\log ^{0.1} n} \leq \sum_{i=3}^{\log ^{0.6} n}(n p)^{i}+n(0.8)^{\log ^{0.1} n} \leq \frac{n}{\log n}
$$

By adding/deleting a single edge $Z$ may increase/decrease by at most 1. Thus, by Lemma $2.1, \operatorname{Pr}(Z \geq$ $\left.n / \log ^{0.5} n\right)=o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. As both graphs $H^{\prime}$ and $H^{\prime}\left[V\left(H^{\prime}\right) \backslash U^{\prime}\right]$ are subgraphs of $H^{\prime} \cup M$ we have that none of these 3 graphs contains a union of $n / \log ^{0.5} n$ vertex disjoint cycles of length at most $\log ^{0.5} n$.

Given the above, to prove that Lemma 6.3 it suffices to prove that with probability $1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$ the following hold:
(P1) There does not exists a pair of sets $S, T$ of size $|S|=|T| \leq n / 1.25 c^{3}$ and every vertex in $S$ has at least 3 neighbors in $T$ in $G$.
(P2) There do exist sets $S, R \subset V(G)$ of size $|R| \leq|S| \in\left[n / 1.25 c^{3}, 0.3 n\right]$ such every vertex in $S$ has at most 1 neighbor not in $R \cup V_{\text {blue }}(G) \cup V_{\text {red }}(G)$ in $G \backslash E_{1}$.
(P3) There does not exists a set $U \subset[n]$ of size $0.3 n$ such that $G[U] \backslash E_{1}$ is a matching.

Indeed let $F \in\left\{H^{\prime}, H^{\prime}\left[V\left(H^{\prime}\right) \backslash U\right]\right\}$ and assume that $V(F)$ has a partition into pairwise disjoint sets $U_{1}, U_{2}, U_{3}$ such that $\left|U_{2}\right| \leq\left|U_{1}\right|$ and in $F$ every vertex in $U_{1}$ has at most 1 neighbor in $U_{1} \cup U_{3}$, hence in $U_{1}$. As every vertex in $U_{1}$ has at most one neighbor in $U_{1} \cup U_{3}$ and at least 4 neighbors in $V_{\text {black }}(G) \subseteq V(F)$ it must have at least 3 neighbors in $U_{2}$. Thus, as $F=G[V(F)] \backslash E_{1}$, if (P1) and (P3) hold then $n /\left(1.25 c^{3}\right) \leq\left|U_{1}\right| \leq 0.3 n$. Thereafter as $V_{\text {black }}(G) \subseteq V(F)$, every vertex in $U_{1}$ has at most 1 neighbor in $\left(U_{1} \cup U_{3}\right) \cap V_{\text {black }}(G)$ in $F$ hence at most 1 neighbor in $G \backslash E_{1}$ that does not lie in $U_{2} \cup V_{\text {red }}(G) \cup V_{\text {blue }}(G)$. Thus if (P1) and (P3) hold then (P2) does not hold.

We now bound $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{P} 1), \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{P} 2)$ and $\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{P} 3)$.

$$
\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{P} 1) \leq \sum_{s=3}^{\frac{n}{1.25 c^{3}}}\binom{n}{2 s}\binom{2 s}{s}\left(\binom{s}{3} p^{3}\right)^{s} \leq \sum_{s=3}^{\frac{n}{1.25 c^{3}}}\left(\frac{e n}{2 s}\right)^{2 s} 2^{2 s}\left(\frac{(s p)^{3}}{6}\right)^{s} \leq \sum_{s=3}^{\frac{n}{1.25 c^{3}}}\left(\frac{e^{2} c^{3} s}{6 n}\right)^{s}=o\left(n^{-2}\right)
$$

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the event that $\left|V_{\text {blue }}(G) \cup V_{\text {red }}(G)\right| \leq c^{3} e^{-c} n$. By Lemma $3.2, \operatorname{Pr}(\mathcal{E})=1-o\left(n^{-2}\right)$. In the event $\mathcal{E}$, if (P2) holds then $V(G)$ spans a pair of disjoint sets $S, R^{\prime} \subset[n]$ such that (i) $|S| \in\left[n / 1.25 c^{3}\right.$, $\left.0.3 n\right]$, (ii) $\left|R^{\prime}\right| \leq|S|+c^{3} e^{-c} n$, (iii) every vertex in $R^{\prime}$ has a neighbor in $S$ in $G$, and (iv) every vertex in $S$ has at most 1 neighbor in $V(G) \backslash R^{\prime}$ in $G \backslash E_{1}$. Here we may substitute conditions (ii) and (iii) with the weaker condition (v) $\left|R^{\prime}\right|=|S|+c^{3} e^{-c n}$, this is done for bounding $p_{2}$ below. Thereafter, for $c \geq 20$ we have that if $n / 1.25 c^{3} \leq|S| \leq 0.01 n$ then $c^{3} e^{-c} n \leq 0.17|S|$, else if $|S| \geq 0.01 n$ then $c^{3} e^{-c} n \leq 0.01|S|$. Recall that each edge $e$ does not belong to $G \backslash E_{1}$ only if (i) $e \notin E(G)$ or (ii) $e \in E(G)$ and $Y_{e}=1$, hence with probability at most $1-p+p p^{\prime}$ independently. Thus for $c \geq 20, \operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{P} 2) \leq p_{1}+p_{2}$ where,

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{1} & \leq \sum_{s=\frac{n}{1.25 c^{3}}}^{0.01 n} \sum_{r=0}^{1.17 s}\binom{n}{s}\binom{n}{r}(s p)^{r}((n-r) p+1)^{s}\left(1-p+p p^{\prime}\right)^{s(n-(s+r))} \\
& \leq \sum_{s=\frac{n}{1.25 c^{3}}}^{0.01 n} \sum_{r=0}^{1.17 s}\left(\frac{e n}{s}\right)^{s}\left(\frac{e s n p}{r}\right)^{r}(n p+1)^{s} e^{-0.975 s p n} \\
& \leq n \sum_{s=\frac{n}{1.25 c^{3}}}^{0.01 n}\left[\left(\frac{e n}{s}\right)\left(\frac{e s n p}{1.17 s}\right)^{1.17}(n p+1) e^{-0.975 p n}\right]^{s} \\
& \leq n^{2}\left[\left(1.25 e c^{3}\right)(e c)^{1.17} c e^{-0.975 c}\right]^{s}=o\left(n^{-2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{2} & \leq \sum_{s=0.01 n}^{0.3 n}\binom{n}{2.01 s}\binom{2.01 s}{s}((n-2.01 s) p+1)^{s}\left(1-p+p p^{\prime}\right)^{s(n-2.01 s)} \\
& \leq \sum_{s=0.01 n}^{0.3 n}\left[\left(\frac{e n}{2.01 s}\right)^{2.01} 2^{2.01}(c(1-2.01 s / n)+1) e^{-(1+o(1)) c(1-2.01 s / n)}\right]^{s}=o\left(n^{-2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}(\mathrm{P} 3) & \left.\leq\binom{ n}{0.3 n} \sum_{s=0}^{0.15 n}\binom{0.3 n}{2 s} \frac{(2 s)!}{s!2^{s}} p^{s}\left(1-p+p p^{\prime}\right)\right)^{\binom{0.3 n}{2}-s} \\
& \leq 2^{-\left(0.3 \log _{2} 0.3+0.7 \log _{2} 0.7+o(1)\right) n} \sum_{s=0}^{0.15 n} 2^{0.3 n}\left(\frac{2 s p}{e}\right)^{s} e^{-p\binom{0.3 n}{2}} \leq 2^{1.2 n} \sum_{s=0}^{0.15 n}\left(\frac{2 s p}{e}\right)^{s} e^{-p\binom{0.3 n}{2}} \\
& \leq n\left[2^{4}\left(\frac{0.15 c}{e}\right)^{0.5} e^{-0.15 c}\right]^{0.3 n} \leq n\left[2^{4}\left(\frac{3}{e}\right)^{0.5} e^{-3}\right]^{0.3 n}=o\left(n^{-2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$
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