

ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE IN BIPARTITE PFAFFIAN GRAPHS

ANDREAS BJÖRKLUND, PETTERI KASKI, AND JESPER NEDERLOF

ABSTRACT. Finding a Hamiltonian cycle in a given graph is computationally challenging, and in general remains so even when one is further given one Hamiltonian cycle in the graph and asked to find another. In fact, no significantly faster algorithms are known for finding another Hamiltonian cycle than for finding a first one even in the setting where another Hamiltonian cycle is structurally guaranteed to exist, such as for odd-degree graphs. We identify a graph class—the bipartite Pfaffian graphs of minimum degree three—where it is NP-complete to decide whether a given graph in the class is Hamiltonian, but when presented with a Hamiltonian cycle as part of the input, another Hamiltonian cycle can be found efficiently.

We prove that Thomason’s lollipop method [Ann. Discrete Math., 1978], a well-known algorithm for finding another Hamiltonian cycle, runs in a linear number of steps in cubic bipartite Pfaffian graphs. This was conjectured for cubic bipartite planar graphs by Haddadan [MSc thesis, Waterloo, 2015]; in contrast, examples are known of both cubic bipartite graphs and cubic planar graphs where the lollipop method takes exponential time.

Beyond the lollipop method, we address a slightly more general graph class and present two algorithms, one running in linear-time and one operating in logarithmic space, that take as input (i) a bipartite Pfaffian graph G of minimum degree three, (ii) a Hamiltonian cycle H in G , and (iii) an edge e in H , and output at least three other Hamiltonian cycles through the edge e in G .

We also present further improved algorithms for finding optimal traveling salesperson tours and counting Hamiltonian cycles in bipartite planar graphs with running times that are not known to hold in general planar graphs.

We prove our results by a new structural technique that efficiently witnesses each Hamiltonian cycle H through an arbitrary fixed anchor edge e in a bipartite Pfaffian graph using a two-coloring of the vertices as advice that is unique to H . Previous techniques—the Cut&Count technique of Cygan, Nederlof, Pilipczuk, Pilipczuk, Van Rooij, and Wojtaszczyk [FOCS’11, TALG’22] in particular—were able to reduce the Hamiltonian cycle problem only to essentially *counting* problems; our results show that counting can be avoided by leveraging properties of bipartite Pfaffian graphs. Our technique also has purely graph-theoretical consequences; for example, we show that every cubic bipartite Pfaffian graph has either zero or at least six distinct Hamiltonian cycles; the latter case is tight for the cube graph.

(AB) IT UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN, DENMARK

(PK) AALTO UNIVERSITY, FINLAND

(JN) UTRECHT UNIVERSITY, THE NETHERLANDS

E-mail addresses: anbjo@itu.dk, petteri.kaski@aalto.fi, j.nederlof@uu.nl.

1. INTRODUCTION

Finding a Hamiltonian cycle in a given undirected graph is a well-known, well-researched, and hard problem. This paper studies the question whether knowledge of one Hamiltonian cycle helps in finding another one. More precisely, the ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE problem asks, given as input (i) a graph¹ G , (ii) a Hamiltonian cycle H in G , and (iii) an edge $e \in E(H)$, to find another Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$ in G with $e \in E(H')$.

Our interest is in the class of bipartite *Pfaffian*² graphs, a superclass of the bipartite planar graphs. This focus is partly motivated by the fact that both in cubic bipartite graphs and cubic planar graphs, a well-known general algorithm for finding another Hamiltonian cycle, Thomason's lollipop method [Tho78], requires exponential time in the worst case, c.f. Section 1.1. Also, the problem of deciding if the graph contains a Hamiltonian cycle at all remains NP-hard in the family of cubic bipartite planar graphs, as proved by Akiyama, Nishizeki, and Saito [ANS80].

As our main result, we show that ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE admits both a linear-time algorithm as well as a logarithmic-space algorithm in bipartite Pfaffian graphs of minimum degree three. Further restricted to cubic bipartite Pfaffian graphs, we prove that Thomason's lollipop method runs in a linear number of steps and can be implemented to run in linear time. This is to our knowledge a first example of a nontrivial graph class where ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE is efficiently solvable; such an example was solicited by Kintali [Kin09]. By trivial we here intend a graph class in which Hamiltonicity detection is NP-hard but is artificially constructed to ensure a simple local rerouting of any Hamiltonian cycle. Rather, in our case the global properties of bipartiteness, Pfaffianity, and the everywhere-local property of minimum-degree three, interplay to enable an efficient algorithm. Without the minimum-degree constraint, the problem is NP-hard (see Appendix A).

Our techniques have also purely graph-theoretic consequences. We show that every cubic bipartite Pfaffian graph has at least three other Hamiltonian cycles through any edge of a Hamiltonian cycle. All three Hamiltonian cycles can be found in linear time. We also show that such Hamiltonian graphs must have at least six Hamiltonian cycles. The 8-vertex cube graph (\square), the canonical example in this class, is an extremal example to both results. It has precisely six distinct Hamiltonian cycles with every graph edge in exactly four of them.

1.1. Motivation and earlier work. While a graph need not be Hamiltonian, and a Hamiltonian graph need not admit another Hamiltonian cycle, there exist graph families with Hamiltonian members where another Hamiltonian cycle is always known to exist. Perhaps the most prominent such family are the odd-degree graphs, which via Smith's Theorem (see [Tut46]) have an even number of Hamiltonian cycles through any given edge. Thomason [Tho78] gave a constructive proof by describing an algorithm that solves for another Hamiltonian cycle in cubic graphs. The algorithm is often called Thomason's lollipop method as it transforms a Hamiltonian cycle to another one by a sequence of lollipop graphs, see Section 3.3 for a precise description of the algorithm. Dropping the requirement that the Hamiltonian cycle should go through a specific edge, Bosák [Bos67] proved that every cubic bipartite graph has an even number of Hamiltonian cycles. Thomassen [Tho96, Tho97] showed that no bipartite graph in which every vertex in one of the two parts of the bipartition has degree at least three, has a unique Hamiltonian cycle. A famous conjecture due to Sheehan [She75] claims that no 4-regular graph can have a unique Hamiltonian cycle; Thomassen's result proves Sheehan's conjecture for bipartite graphs.

Papadimitriou [Pap94] popularized the ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE problem and Thomason's algorithm by introducing the complexity class PPA and showed the containment of the problem in odd-degree graphs; completeness for PPA remains open. It is also open whether the problem

¹We tacitly work with undirected simple loopless graphs unless mentioned otherwise, as well as assume knowledge of standard graph-theoretic terminology [Wes96]. Our conventions with graphs can be found in Section 1.6.

²We postpone a precise definition and motivation of Pfaffian graphs to Section 1.5. Planar graphs are Pfaffian.

can be solved in polynomial time—indeed, the drawback of Thomason’s algorithm is that it may run for a very long time; Krawczyk [Kra99] and Cameron [Cam01] showed that Thomason’s algorithm requires exponential time for a family of cubic planar graphs. Later this was shown by Zhong [Zho18] also for cubic bipartite graphs. The best bound to date is the recent result of Briański and Szady [BS22], which shows that there are cubic 3-connected planar graphs on n vertices, in which Thomason’s lollipop algorithm runs in $\Omega(1.18^n)$ time.

The above papers reason about Thomason’s algorithm specifically, but it may of course be other algorithms that solve the problem more efficiently. Some progress in this direction was provided by Bazgan, Santha, and Tuza [BST99] that showed that one given a cubic graph on n vertices and one of its Hamiltonian cycles can find another cycle of length $(1 - \epsilon)n$ for any fixed constant $\epsilon > 0$ in polynomial time. Deligkas, Mertzios, Spirakis, and Zamaraev [DMSZ20] derived an exponential-time polynomial-space deterministic algorithm that given a cubic graph along with one of its Hamiltonian cycles finds another Hamiltonian cycle; the algorithm is shown to be faster than the fastest known exponential-time polynomial-space deterministic algorithm for finding a Hamiltonian cycle in cubic graphs.

1.2. Main results for bipartite Pfaffian graphs. Let us now review our main results for bipartite Pfaffian graphs and the underlying techniques in more detail. Our main theorems are as follows.

Theorem 1 (Main; Linear-time ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE in minimum degree three). *There exists a deterministic linear-time algorithm that, given as input (i) a bipartite Pfaffian graph G with minimum degree three, (ii) a Hamiltonian cycle H in G , and (iii) an edge $e \in E(H)$, outputs a Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$ in G with $e \in E(H')$.*

Theorem 2 (Main; Logarithmic-space ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE in minimum degree three). *There exists a deterministic logarithmic-space algorithm that, given as input (i) a bipartite Pfaffian graph G with minimum degree three, (ii) a Hamiltonian cycle H in G , and (iii) an edge $e \in E(H)$, outputs a Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$ in G with $e \in E(H')$.*

One consequence of the above algorithm is that it indirectly proves that there are efficient parallel circuits for generating another Hamiltonian cycle in this graph class, due to the known complexity class containment $L \subseteq NC^2$ by exponentiation of the state transition matrix by iterated squaring.

The framework underlying our main theorems can also be used to prove an upper bound on the number of steps needed for Thomason’s lollipop method to terminate.

Theorem 3 (Thomason’s lollipop method in cubic bipartite Pfaffian graphs). *Thomason’s lollipop method starting from any Hamiltonian cycle H and any edge $e \in E(H)$ in an n -vertex cubic bipartite Pfaffian graph G , terminates after at most n steps.*

It was conjectured in a master thesis at Waterloo by Haddadan [Had15] that Thomason’s lollipop method runs in a linear number of steps in cubic bipartite planar graphs. It was there also proven to hold for the subfamily of such graphs that does not have the wheel graph on six vertices as a minor. However, as the author himself points out, finding a first Hamiltonian cycle in this limited graph family does not seem intractable. We are not aware of any other papers providing a polynomial time bound on Thomason’s lollipop method in any graph class.

Our framework also can be used to prove the following structural results for Hamiltonian cycles.

Corollary 4 (Non-uniqueness in minimum degree three). *For every bipartite Pfaffian graph G of minimum degree three and for every edge $e \in E(G)$, it holds that G has either zero or at least four distinct Hamiltonian cycles H with $e \in E(H)$.*

The cube graph is a cubic bipartite Pfaffian graph with six distinct Hamiltonian cycles. We show that no Hamiltonian graph in this class can have fewer Hamiltonian cycles.

Corollary 5 (Cubic tight lower bound). *Every cubic bipartite Pfaffian graph has either zero or at least six distinct Hamiltonian cycles.*

Chia and Ong [CO07] (in the paragraph after Theorem 10) asked whether there exists cubic bipartite planar graphs with exactly four Hamiltonian cycles. The above Corollary rules out that possibility.

Remarks. One consequence of Theorem 1 is that if the ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE problem in general odd degree graphs is PPA-complete as hypothesized by Papadimitriou [Pap94, Open Problem (4)], then any proof cannot carry over to cubic bipartite planar graphs unless also $\text{PPA} = \text{FP}$. Our result also seems related to another well-known conjecture, namely Barnette’s conjecture (cf. Tutte [Tut69, Unsolved Problem V]), which states that every cubic 3-connected bipartite planar graph (*Barnette graph*) has a Hamiltonian cycle. Gorsky, Steiner, and Wiederrecht [GSW23] recently extended the conjecture by showing that if Barnette’s conjecture is true, it also holds that every cubic bipartite 3-connected Pfaffian graph has a Hamiltonian cycle. It is known that if Barnette’s conjecture is true, then there is a Hamiltonian cycle through every edge in every such graph, see Kelmans [Kel94]. Moreover, it was indirectly shown by Holton, Manvel, and McKay [HMM85] that any Barnette graph larger than the smallest such graph—namely the cube graph—can be reduced to a smaller Barnette graph in such a way that if the smaller graph has a Hamiltonian cycle through every edge, then the larger one must also have a Hamiltonian cycle. This means that if it was possible given any single Hamiltonian cycle in a Barnette graph to generate a Hamiltonian cycle through any specific edge *not* on the initial cycle, then Barnette’s conjecture would be constructively true. We remark that our algorithm is not known to be able to do this, not even indirectly by applying it several times in a chain of Hamiltonian cycle transformations. We do note however, that our algorithms in Theorems 1 and 2 not only make sure the edge $e = \{s, t\}$ is part of both Hamiltonian cycles, they also retain the other edge incident to s on H ; this can be observed by Lemma 16, that is, no edge incident to s is changed by the algorithms since it is not on the alternating cycle we use. In particular this makes it possible given H and any given edge $f \in E(G)$ *not* on H , to find another Hamiltonian cycle H' such that f is also not part of H' .

1.3. Overview of techniques. At the heart of our algorithms and structural results is what we believe to be a new framework for efficiently witnessing a Hamiltonian cycle H through an arbitrary *anchor* edge e in a bipartite Pfaffian graph G . We associate a (not necessarily proper) two-coloring $\chi_H : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ to H that is unique to H (but dependent on a fixed but arbitrary Pfaffian orientation of G as well as e) and that defines a unique *acyclic* Hamiltonian³ orientation of $G \setminus e$. We will refer to such an χ_H as a *good coloring*. This acyclicity in particular enables the unique recovery of H in linear time by standard topological sorting when given χ_H as advice. The reader may want to consult Figure 1 (on page 8) for an advance illustration at this point; the framework itself is developed in Section 2.

We also show that it suffices to know χ_H in only one of the parts of a bipartition of G to efficiently extend to a Hamiltonian cycle, which is not necessarily equal to H however. More precisely, we show that a coloring λ of one of the parts leads to an auxiliary bipartite graph F_λ whose perfect matchings correspond to the good colorings χ_H extending λ , which in turn each define a unique Hamiltonian cycle H . We refer to Figure 2 (on page 11) for an advance illustration of this setting.

Finally, when G has minimum degree three, we observe that we can use F_λ to efficiently switch from one Hamiltonian cycle H in G (described by a perfect matching M_H in F_λ) to another Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$ in G by switching along an alternating cycle in F_λ which can be discovered through a directed cycle in an auxiliary directed graph $D_{\lambda, H}$. Moreover, we show that this construction and discovery can be executed in deterministic linear time. We refer to Figure 3

³In precise terms, the orientation is a directed acyclic graph that contains as a directed subgraph a directed Hamiltonian *path* from one end of e to the other.

(on page 15) for an advance illustration of this setting; the switching construction itself is developed in Section 3.

1.4. Further results. There are further algorithmic consequences of our framework on Pfaffian graphs to the problems of deterministically finding and counting Hamiltonian cycles as well as the Traveling Salesperson Problem (TSP) in the bipartite Pfaffian/planar setting.

Our framework for witnessing Hamiltonicity should be contrasted with the Cut&Count approach for detecting Hamiltonian cycles by Cygan, Nederlof, Pilipczuk, Pilipczuk, Van Rooij, and Wojtaszczuk [CNP⁺22], which reduces the Hamiltonian cycle problem to a local problem by showing that a cycle cover of the input graph is Hamiltonian if and only if the number of the exponentially many vertex partitions that are consistent (defined in a certain local way) with it is *odd*. This approach therefore necessarily reduces the original decision problem to a parity counting problem, which has several disadvantages that seem inherent to the approach, including the need for randomization and a running time factor that is pseudo-polynomial in the integer weights for edge-weighted problem variants. Our framework shows that for bipartite Pfaffian graphs there is a more natural way to witness that a cycle cover is Hamiltonian using only a *single* vertex partition; that is, χ_H .

Earlier work. Before stating our results, let us set the stage by reviewing pertinent earlier work. To start with, let us recall that in terms of complexity lower bounds, an algorithm for detecting Hamiltonicity in a given n -vertex planar graph with worst-case $\exp(o(\sqrt{n}))$ running time would violate the Exponential Time Hypothesis, as seen by combining the Sparsification Lemma of Impagliazzo, Paturi, and Zane [IPZ01] with the reduction in Garey, Johnson, and Tarjan [GJT76], see Deĭneko, Klinz, and Woeginger [DKW06].

Algorithms for detecting and finding a Hamiltonian cycle in a given n -vertex planar graph running in worst-case $\exp(O(\sqrt{n}))$ time have also been known since the work of Deĭneko, Klinz, and Woeginger [DKW06]. Further exploiting the properties of planar graphs, Dorn, Penninkx, Bodlaender, and Fomin [DPBF10] improved the base in the exponential running time significantly. Subsequently several powerful algorithmic techniques have been developed to get faster algorithms for connectivity problems in general and Hamiltonicity problems in particular, including the Cut&Count technique of Cygan, Nederlof, Pilipczuk, Pilipczuk, Van Rooij, and Wojtaszczuk [CNP⁺22], the rank-based method with representative sets and reductions via fast Gaussian elimination in Bodlaender, Cygan, Kratsch, and Nederlof [BCKN15], and especially the technique of bases of perfect matchings in Cygan, Kratsch, and Nederlof [CKN18]. Pino, Bodlaender, and Van Rooij [PBvR17, Pin16] use these techniques over branch width to bring the base of the exponential running time down as much as possible in the planar case.

As far as we know though, there have been no studies showing that the input graph being bipartite would help getting even faster algorithms in planar graphs. One reason to expect it would is that the fastest known algorithm for Hamiltonicity detection in a bipartite graph is much faster than the fastest for a general graph, see Björklund [Bjö14]. Another one is the TSP algorithm restricted to bipartite graphs by Nederlof [Ned20] that has a $O(c^n)$ running time for some $c < 2$ if matrix multiplication is in quadratic time, as opposed to what is known for general graphs.

Our results. By effectively testing all possible coloring-advice bits in our new Hamiltonicity framework, we get improved deterministic algorithms parameterized by various graph decompositions' width measures in the class of bipartite Pfaffian (or planar) graphs. Earlier parameterized algorithms of this type apply to all graphs, and it is not obvious how to further exploit a bipartite structure and modify these algorithms for improved running time. Our takeaway message is that it nevertheless appears to be easier to count and find weighted Hamiltonian cycles in bipartite planar graphs than in general planar ones. Let us now state each of our results and highlight a comparison with pertinent earlier algorithms.

Theorem 6 (Bipartite Pfaffian TSP parameterized by path width). *Given an edge-weighted bipartite Pfaffian graph G on n vertices along with a path decomposition of width $\text{pw}(G)$, we can compute the minimum weight Hamiltonian cycle in G in $4^{\text{pw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time.*

Bodlaender, Cygan, Kratsch, and Nederlof [BCKN15] present an algorithm running in $(2 + 2^{\omega/2})^{\text{pw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time with $\omega < 2.373$ the square matrix multiplication exponent that works for any graph. Our algorithm is only asymptotically better if $\omega > 2$. Our technique also generalizes to other graph decompositions, in particular the branch width.

Theorem 7 (Bipartite Pfaffian TSP parameterized by branch width). *Given an edge-weighted bipartite Pfaffian graph G on n vertices along with a branch decomposition of width $\text{bw}(G)$, we can compute the minimum weight Hamiltonian cycle in G in $8^{\text{bw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time.*

The most striking application of the above result is perhaps that it gives an improved running time for TSP in bipartite planar graphs

Corollary 8 (Bipartite planar TSP). *Given an edge-weighted bipartite planar graph G on n vertices, we can compute the minimum weight Hamiltonian cycle in G in $O(2^{6.366\sqrt{n}})$ time.*

This should be contrasted with the best known result for general planar graphs which is the $O(2^{6.570\sqrt{n}})$ time bound by Pino, Bodlaender, and Van Rooij [PBvR17] (see also [Pin16] for the full argument). Our result matches the running time of the randomized *graphic* planar TSP algorithm in Cygan, Nederlof, Pilipczuk, Pilipczuk, Van Rooij, and Wojtaszczyk [CNP⁺22].

Our technique also makes it possible to count the Hamiltonian cycles.

Theorem 9 (Bipartite Pfaffian counting Hamiltonian cycles parameterized by path width). *Given a bipartite Pfaffian graph G on n vertices along with a path decomposition of width $\text{pw}(G)$, we can count the Hamiltonian cycles in G in $4^{\text{pw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time.*

The best known result for general graphs is the $6^{\text{pw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time algorithm by Bodlaender, Cygan, Kratsch, and Nederlof [BCKN15]. It is also known that improving this general graph result to $(6 - \epsilon)^{\text{pw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ is impossible unless the Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis is false, see Curticapean, Lindzey, and Nederlof [CLN18]. There is also a general graph $(2^\omega + 2)^{\text{tw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time algorithm parameterized in the tree width by Włodarczyk [Wło19].

Theorem 10 (Bipartite Pfaffian counting Hamiltonian cycles parameterized by branch width). *Given a bipartite Pfaffian graph G on n vertices along with a branch decomposition of width $\text{bw}(G)$, we can count the Hamiltonian cycles in G in $2^{\omega \text{bw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time, where $\omega < 2.373$.*

For this problem we get a much faster algorithm in bipartite planar graphs.

Corollary 11 (Bipartite planar counting of Hamiltonian cycles). *Given a bipartite planar graph G on n vertices, we can compute the number of Hamiltonian cycles in G in $O(2^{5.049\sqrt{n}})$ time.*

The best known bound for general planar graphs as far as we can tell is to implicitly build on a result of Bodlaender, Cygan, Kratsch, and Nederlof [BCKN15] to get a $O(2^{6.508\sqrt{n}})$ time algorithm.

1.5. Pfaffian graphs. Let us now define and motivate Pfaffian graphs in more detail. An *orientation* of a graph G replaces every edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ with either the directed arc (u, v) or the directed arc (v, u) , thereby obtaining a directed graph \vec{G} . A cycle C in G is *central* if the graph $G \setminus V(C)$ admits a perfect matching. We say that an orientation of a cycle is *consistent* if it is strongly connected. An orientation \vec{G} of G is *Pfaffian* if for every central cycle C in G it holds that both consistent orientations of C have an odd number of arcs in common with \vec{G} . A graph is *Pfaffian* if it admits a Pfaffian orientation.

The bipartite Pfaffian graphs are most famous as the graph class in which Pólya's permanent problem has a solution, the bipartite graphs in which one can compute the number of perfect

matchings efficiently by reduction to a matrix determinant, see e.g. Robertson, Seymour, and Thomas [RST99] and McCuaig [McC04]. This brings us to one of our motivations to study the complexity of the detection (and counting) of Hamiltonian cycles on this graph class: Previous algorithms for Hamiltonian cycles (such as the one by Björklund [Bjö14]) use determinant-based methods previously designed for counting matchings (modulo 2) in polynomial time; given this close connection between the two problems it is natural to ask whether Pfaffianity can be exploited for detecting and counting Hamiltonian cycles, similarly as for counting perfect matchings.

The bipartite Pfaffian graphs were characterized by Little [Lit75] as those graphs G that do not have a vertex set $U \subseteq V(G)$ such that $G \setminus U$ has a perfect matching and the induced subgraph $G[U]$ admits an even subdivision of $K_{3,3}$ as a subgraph. McCuaig [McC04] and Robertson, Seymour, and Thomas [RST99] gave a structural characterization of bipartite Pfaffian graphs and the latter also outlined an $O(n^3)$ time algorithm for their recognition; this algorithm can also produce a Pfaffian orientation when one exists.

A general Pfaffian graph, as opposed to a bipartite one, can be very dense as observed by Norine [Nor05]: there is an infinite family of n -vertex Pfaffian graphs with $\Omega(n^2)$ edges. This construction in particular poses obstacles to find characterizations as the ones mentioned above for bipartite graphs. Indeed, it is not known how to efficiently recognize a general Pfaffian graph.

The most famous Pfaffian graphs are the *planar* ones, graphs whose vertices can be embedded in the plane with straight lines connecting the vertices of every edge without any two lines crossing each other except at endpoints. That these graphs are Pfaffian was discovered by Kasteleyn [Kas67]; furthermore, there is a linear-time algorithm that finds a Pfaffian orientation given a planar graph by Little [Lit74].

1.6. Conventions and organization. We assume knowledge of standard graph-theoretic terminology; see e.g. West [Wes96]. Graphs in this paper are undirected unless otherwise mentioned; this in particular also applies to subgraphs such as paths, cycles, and Hamiltonian cycles. No graph or directed graph in this paper has loops or multiple edges. For a graph or directed graph G , we write $V(G)$ for the vertex set of G and $E(G)$ for the edge set of G . We identify the *edges* of a graph with two-subsets $\{u, w\}$ where u and w are distinct vertices. We call the edges of a directed graph *arcs* in what follows, and identify each arc with a two-tuple (u, w) where u and w are distinct vertices. We recall our conventions with orientations and Pfaffian graphs from Section 1.5.

We work with Iverson’s bracket notation—for a logical proposition P , we define

$$\llbracket P \rrbracket = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } P \text{ is true;} \\ 0 & \text{if } P \text{ is false.} \end{cases}$$

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents our novel witnessing technique for Hamiltonian cycles in bipartite Pfaffian graphs. We prove our main theorems and their indirect structural corollaries in Section 3. Our further results on finding and counting Hamiltonian cycles as well as on TSP are proved in Section 4. Finally, in Appendix A we prove the NP-hardness of ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE in bipartite Pfaffian graphs without constrained vertex degrees.

2. HAMILTONIAN CYCLES IN BIPARTITE PFAFFIAN GRAPHS

This section presents what we believe to be a novel technique to efficiently witness Hamiltonian cycles in bipartite Pfaffian graphs via (not necessarily proper) two-colorings of the vertices. We also show how to efficiently construct a Pfaffian orientation from a known Hamiltonian cycle in a bipartite Pfaffian graph, as well as show how to efficiently find a witness by extending a given partial witness defined on only one of the parts of a bipartition.

Throughout this section G is an n -vertex bipartite Pfaffian graph and \vec{G} is a fixed but otherwise arbitrary Pfaffian orientation of G . Since we are interested in whether G is Hamiltonian, without loss of generality we may assume that n is even and $n \geq 4$ in what follows.

Select an arbitrary edge $e \in E(G)$ and call it the *anchor* edge.

2.1. Preliminaries: The structure of Pfaffian orientations. We start by recalling the known structure of Pfaffian orientations of G . Namely, de Carvalho, Lucchesi, and Murty [dCLM05] observed that all Pfaffian orientations of G are obtainable from each other by reversals of arcs across vertex cuts. More precisely, for any Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} and any vertex $u \in V(G)$, it holds that reversing the arcs incident to u in \vec{G} results in another Pfaffian orientation; furthermore, every Pfaffian orientation of G can be obtained by starting with an arbitrary Pfaffian orientation of G and repeating such operations for different vertices [dCLM05].

2.2. The two-coloring defined by an anchored Hamiltonian cycle. We are interested in characterising each Hamiltonian cycle H in G that traverses the selected anchor edge e —we say that such an H is *anchored*—using a function $\chi_H : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that is unique⁴ to H and from which we will (in the next subsection) see H can be efficiently constructed.

Towards this end, let us study the Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} at the anchor e . Let $(s, t) \in E(\vec{G})$ be the arc in \vec{G} whose underlying edge in G is the anchor edge $e = \{s, t\}$. Construct from the Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} a new orientation \vec{G}_e of G that is otherwise identical to \vec{G} except that the arc (s, t) has been replaced with the arc (t, s) . That is, by definition we have $(t, s) \in E(\vec{G}_e)$.

Now consider an arbitrary anchored Hamiltonian cycle H in G . Since $e \in E(H)$, there is a unique consistent orientation \vec{H} of H such that $(t, s) \in E(\vec{H})$. Let us write v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} for the vertices of G indexed in the directed \vec{H} -path order from s to t ; that is,

$$(1) \quad v_0 = s, \quad v_{n-1} = t, \quad \text{and} \quad (v_i, v_{(i+1) \bmod n}) \in E(\vec{H}) \quad \text{for all } i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1.$$

Associate with H the (not necessarily proper) vertex-coloring function $\chi_H : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ defined by setting

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} \chi_H(v_0) &= 0 \quad \text{and} \\ \chi_H(v_{i+1}) &\equiv \chi_H(v_i) + \llbracket (v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E(\vec{G}_e) \rrbracket \pmod{2} \quad \text{for all } i = 0, 1, \dots, n-2. \end{aligned}$$

Because \vec{G} is a Pfaffian orientation and H is a central cycle of G , we have

$$(3) \quad |E(\vec{H}) \cap E(\vec{G})| = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \llbracket (v_i, v_{(i+1) \bmod n}) \in E(\vec{G}) \rrbracket \equiv 1 \pmod{2}.$$

Since \vec{G} and \vec{G}_e differ only in the orientation of $e \in E(H)$, from (3) we immediately have

$$(4) \quad |E(\vec{H}) \cap E(\vec{G}_e)| = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \llbracket (v_i, v_{(i+1) \bmod n}) \in E(\vec{G}_e) \rrbracket \equiv 0 \pmod{2}.$$

We thus conclude

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \chi_H(v_0) &\stackrel{(2)}{\equiv} 0 \stackrel{(4)}{\equiv} |E(\vec{H}) \cap E(\vec{G}_e)| = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \llbracket (v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E(\vec{G}_e) \rrbracket + \llbracket (v_{n-1}, v_0) \in E(\vec{G}_e) \rrbracket \\ &\stackrel{(2)}{\equiv} \chi_H(v_{n-1}) + \llbracket (v_{n-1}, v_0) \in E(\vec{G}_e) \rrbracket \pmod{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since by definition of \vec{G}_e we have $(t, s) \in E(\vec{G}_e)$, from (1) and (5) we conclude that $\chi_H(t) = 1$. Furthermore, from (2) and (5) we have for all $(u, w) \in E(\vec{H})$ that

$$(6) \quad \chi_H(w) \equiv \chi_H(u) + \llbracket (u, w) \in E(\vec{G}_e) \rrbracket \pmod{2}.$$

⁴Unique but not canonical; as we will see, the function χ_H will depend not only on the Hamiltonian cycle H but also on the choice of our assumed fixed but arbitrary Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} of G .

That is, each arc $(u, w) \in E(\vec{H})$ is χ_H -monochromatic (i.e. both endpoints are assigned the same value by χ_H) if and only if $(w, u) \in E(\vec{G}_e)$.

2.3. The orientation induced by a good coloring. Suppose now that we do not know anything about the (anchored) Hamiltonian cycles of G , if any, and have access only to the Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} and the orientation \vec{G}_e ; the latter is easily obtainable from \vec{G} , cf. Section 2.2.

Consider an arbitrary vertex coloring $\chi : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with $\chi(s) = 0$ and $\chi(t) = 1$. The last observation in Section 2.2 suggests that we should explore reversing exactly the χ -monochromatic arcs in \vec{G}_e . Let us make this formal as follows. Let the orientation \vec{G}_e^χ induced by the coloring χ be the unique orientation of G that for each edge $\{u, w\} \in E(G)$ satisfies

$$(7) \quad (u, w) \in E(\vec{G}_e^\chi) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \chi(w) \equiv \chi(u) + \mathbb{I}[(u, w) \in E(\vec{G}_e)] \pmod{2}.$$

To witness the serendipity of (7), suppose that G admits an anchored Hamiltonian cycle H ; it follows immediately from (6) and (7) that $E(\vec{H}) \subseteq E(\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H})$. Thus, if we know only the coloring χ_H but not H , we can search for $E(\vec{H})$ in $E(\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H})$; let us next analyse this situation in more detail from the standpoint of our arbitrary χ .

Call the coloring χ *good* if there exists an anchored Hamiltonian cycle H in G with $\chi = \chi_H$; otherwise call χ *bad*. The following lemma shows that the orientation \vec{G}_e^χ for a good χ enables *linear-time* and unique algorithmic recovery of H by standard longest-path search in a directed acyclic graph (DAG); in fact, mere topological sorting suffices, as is apparent from the proof. See also Figure 1 for an illustration of the concepts involved in a Hamiltonian planar graph.




FIGURE 1. Illustration of orientations induced by good colorings. Left: an undirected bipartite planar graph G drawn in one of its orientations \vec{G}_e with $e = \{s, t\}$, one arc reversal away from a Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} . Middle and right: two vertex colorings χ_H and coloring-induced orientations $\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H}$ for two different Hamiltonian cycles H , with the arcs of \vec{H} drawn in bold in each case. Observe that every monochromatic arc reverses its orientation with respect to \vec{G}_e , whereas bichromatic arcs keep their orientation. Observe also that the removal of the arc (t, s) from $\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H}$ leaves an acyclic Hamiltonian directed graph, whereby the directed Hamiltonian path and hence H can be found, for example, by topological sorting; cf. Lemma 12.

Lemma 12 (Acyclic Hamiltonicity of good-coloring-induced orientations). *Let χ be good. Then, the orientation $\vec{G}_e^\chi \setminus (t, s)$ of $G \setminus e$ is acyclic with the unique source vertex s and the unique sink vertex t . Moreover, the longest directed path in $\vec{G}_e^\chi \setminus (t, s)$ is unique and a directed Hamiltonian path.*

Proof. Since χ is good, there exists an anchored Hamiltonian cycle H with $\chi = \chi_H$. Furthermore, we can follow the notational conventions in Section 2.2 with respect to this H , including the vertex-indexing v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} for G and (1) in particular. From $E(\vec{H}) \subseteq E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)$ we thus conclude that the sequence v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} defines a longest directed path (which is also a directed Hamiltonian path from s to t) in the directed graph $\vec{G}_e^\chi \setminus (t, s)$. It follows immediately that s is the only possible source vertex and t is the only possible sink vertex in $\vec{G}_e^\chi \setminus (t, s)$.

Let us next show that $\vec{G}_e^\chi \setminus (t, s)$ is acyclic as a directed graph. To reach a contradiction, suppose that \vec{D} is a directed cycle in $\vec{G}_e^\chi \setminus (t, s)$. Since $(t, s) = (v_{n-1}, v_0) \notin E(\vec{D})$ and \vec{D} is a directed cycle with $V(\vec{D}) \subseteq \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$, there must exist $0 \leq i < j \leq n-1$ with at least two proper inequalities among the three such that $(v_j, v_i) \in E(\vec{D})$ and thus $(v_j, v_i) \in E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)$. Let \vec{C} be the directed cycle with $V(\vec{C}) = \{v_i, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_j\}$ and $E(\vec{C}) = \{(v_i, v_{i+1}), (v_{i+1}, v_{i+2}), \dots, (v_{j-1}, v_j), (v_j, v_i)\}$. In particular, $\vec{C} \neq \vec{H}$ since $(t, s) \notin E(\vec{C})$. Let C be the underlying undirected cycle of \vec{C} , and observe that C is a cycle of G . Since G is bipartite, C is even and has at least four vertices. Thus, the edges of $H \setminus V(C)$ contain a perfect matching of $G \setminus V(C)$, implying that C is central. Since C avoids e and \vec{C} is a consistent orientation of C , we conclude by Pfaffianity that

$$|E(\vec{C}) \cap E(\vec{G}_e)| = |E(\vec{C}) \cap E(\vec{G})| \equiv 1 \pmod{2}.$$

But this is a contradiction since for all $(u, w) \in E(\vec{C})$ we have $(u, w) \in E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)$, and thus by (7) it holds that $\chi(w) \equiv \chi(u) + \mathbb{1}[(u, w) \in E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)] \pmod{2}$; take the sum of these congruences over all arcs $(u, w) \in E(\vec{C})$ to conclude that $|E(\vec{C}) \cap E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)| \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$, a contradiction. Thus, $\vec{G}_e^\chi \setminus (t, s)$ is acyclic as a directed graph.

From acyclicity it also immediately follows that s is a source vertex and t is a sink vertex of $\vec{G}_e^\chi \setminus (t, s)$; indeed, any arc into s or any arc out of t would complete a directed cycle together with an appropriate proper segment of the directed Hamiltonian path $s = v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} = t$. This longest path (of n vertices) is also seen to be unique in $\vec{G}_e^\chi \setminus (t, s)$; indeed, the existence of any other such path would again imply an arc that would complete a directed cycle together with an appropriate proper segment of v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} . \square

An immediate corollary of the proof Lemma 12 is that there are at most 2^{n-2} Hamiltonian cycles through any fixed edge in an n -vertex bipartite Pfaffian graph. For comparison, there are planar graphs with at least 2.08^n Hamiltonian cycles, see [BKK⁺07].

2.4. Constructing a Pfaffian orientation from a Hamiltonian cycle. Next we address the task of constructing a Pfaffian orientation if we know one Hamiltonian cycle, with the intent of constructing possible further Hamiltonian cycles with the help of the Pfaffian orientation obtained.

Lemma 13 (Constructing a Pfaffian orientation from a Hamiltonian cycle). *There exists a linear-time algorithm that, given as input a bipartite Pfaffian graph G and a Hamiltonian cycle H in G , outputs a Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} of G .*

Proof. Let G and H be given as input, and select an arbitrary edge $e \in E(H)$ as an anchor edge in the sense of Section 2.2. Let \vec{H}' be an arbitrary consistent orientation of H ; let $s, t \in V(G)$ such that $(t, s) \in E(\vec{H}')$ and $e = \{s, t\}$.

Since G is Pfaffian, it has a Pfaffian orientation. Let \vec{G} be an arbitrary Pfaffian orientation of G . Without loss of generality we can assume that $(s, t) \in E(\vec{G})$; indeed, reverse all arcs if $(s, t) \notin E(\vec{G})$. Let \vec{G}_e , \vec{H} , and χ_H be constructed from \vec{G} , e , and H as in Section 2.2. In particular, we have $\vec{H}' = \vec{H}$.

Now observe that $\vec{A} = \vec{G}_e^{\chi_H} \setminus (t, s)$ is acyclic and Hamiltonian by Lemma 12. Furthermore, since \vec{A} is acyclic and has the directed Hamiltonian path $\vec{H}' \setminus (t, s)$, we can in linear time construct \vec{A} from G , \vec{H}' , and e by orienting $G \setminus e$ so that (i) the edges of $H \setminus e$ are oriented as in $\vec{H}' \setminus (t, s)$, and (ii) all the other edges of $G \setminus e$ are oriented into arcs in directed $\vec{H}' \setminus (t, s)$ -order; indeed, otherwise a directed cycle would result.

Next, let $\chi : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the proper two-coloring of the vertices of G with $\chi(s) = 0$ and $\chi(t) = 1$; such a χ exists and is unique because G is bipartite Hamiltonian. Since no edge of G is χ -monochromatic, we have $(\vec{G}')_e = (\vec{G}')_e^\chi$ for all Pfaffian orientations \vec{G}' of G . We will construct

a sequence $\chi_0, \chi_1, \dots, \chi_n : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ of colorings and a sequence $\vec{G}_0, \vec{G}_1, \dots, \vec{G}_n$ of Pfaffian orientations of G such that

$$(8) \quad \vec{A} \cup (t, s) = \vec{G}_e^{\chi_H} = (\vec{G}_0)_e^{\chi_0} = (\vec{G}_1)_e^{\chi_1} = \dots = (\vec{G}_n)_e^{\chi_n} = (\vec{G}_n)_e^\chi = (\vec{G}_n)_e.$$

This concludes that $\vec{A} \cup (s, t)$ is a Pfaffian orientation of G . Moreover, $\vec{A} \cup (s, t)$ is constructible in linear time from the given input G and H .

It remains to construct the sequences $\chi_0, \chi_1, \dots, \chi_n$ and $\vec{G}_0, \vec{G}_1, \dots, \vec{G}_n$ as well as conclude (8). The first two identities in (8) are immediate when we set $\chi_0 = \chi_H$ and $\vec{G}_0 = \vec{G}$. Let v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n be an arbitrary enumeration of the n vertices of G . For $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, define $\chi_k : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ by the rule

$$\chi_k(v_j) = \begin{cases} \chi(v_j) & \text{if } j \leq k; \\ \chi_{k-1}(v_j) & \text{if } j > k. \end{cases}$$

It is immediate that $\chi_n = \chi$, which establishes the last two identities in (8). Furthermore, χ_{k-1} and χ_k are identical except possibly at v_k . Also observe that $\chi_k(s) = \chi_H(s) = \chi(s) = 0$ and $\chi_k(t) = \chi_H(t) = \chi(t) = 1$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$. To define the sequence \vec{G}_k for $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$, split into cases as follows: when $\chi_k(v_k) = \chi_{k-1}(v_k)$, set $\vec{G}_k = \vec{G}_{k-1}$; when $\chi_k(v_k) \neq \chi_{k-1}(v_k)$, set \vec{G}_k to be otherwise identical to \vec{G}_{k-1} except reverse all arcs incident to v_k . In both of these cases we observe by (7) that $(\vec{G}_{k-1})_e^{\chi_{k-1}} = (\vec{G}_k)_e^{\chi_k}$, which establishes all the remaining equalities in (8). Furthermore, \vec{G}_k is a Pfaffian orientation since \vec{G}_{k-1} is a Pfaffian orientation; indeed, recall Section 2.1 and that $\vec{G}_0 = \vec{G}$ is a Pfaffian orientation by assumption. \square

2.5. Finding a good coloring. Let us now study the task of finding a good coloring χ given the bipartite Pfaffian graph G , the Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} , and the anchor edge e as input; also recall the conventions and further notation—in particular, the vertices s and t —from Sections 2.2 and 2.3. In this setting, a natural question to ask is how much one needs to reveal from a good coloring χ to enable efficient completion to a good coloring. We now show that it suffices to reveal χ in one of the parts of the bipartition of G by a reduction to bipartite perfect matching in an auxiliary bipartite graph.

More precisely, let the sets L (“left”) and R (“right”) form a partition of the vertices of G such that $s \in L, t \in R$, and every edge of G has one end in L and the other end in R .⁵ Let $\lambda : L \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with $\lambda(s) = 0$ be a given further input. Our task is to find whether there exists a good coloring $\chi : V(G) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ with $\chi(\ell) = \lambda(\ell)$ for all $\ell \in L \subseteq V(G)$; that is, whether there exists a good coloring that extends the partial coloring λ .

Construct an auxiliary bipartite graph F_λ as follows. Let the vertex set $V(F_\lambda) = V(G) \times \{0, 1\}$. To avoid notational confusion between arcs and vertices of F_λ , we will use bracketed notation $[u, k]$ for vertices of F_λ with $u \in V(G)$ and $k \in \{0, 1\}$. The edge set $E(F_\lambda)$ is defined by the following rule. For all $\ell \in L, r \in R, p \in \{0, 1\}$, and $\rho \in \{0, 1\}$ with $\{\ell, r\} \in E(G)$, we have

$$(9) \quad \{[\ell, p], [r, \rho]\} \in E(F_\lambda)$$

if and only if both

$$(10) \quad \rho \equiv \lambda(\ell) + \mathbb{I}[(\ell, r) \in \vec{G}_e] \pmod{2}$$

and

$$(11) \quad \ell \neq s \quad \text{or} \quad p \neq 0 \quad \text{or} \quad r = t.$$

⁵This bipartition (L, R) of G is in fact unique unless G is not Hamiltonian. Moreover, (L, R) is computable in linear time from the given input.

For an edge $\{[\ell, p], [r, \rho]\} \in E(F_\lambda)$, we say that the edge $\{\ell, r\} \in E(G)$ is the *projection* of the edge (to G) and call p the *port* at ℓ and ρ the *parity* at r , stressing that port and parity have asymmetric roles in our construction even though both range in $\{0, 1\}$.

Let us now start analysing the structure of F_λ in more detail. First, the parts $L \times \{0, 1\}$ and $R \times \{0, 1\}$ witness by (9) that F_λ is bipartite. In particular, F_λ has $2n$ vertices with $|L| = |R| = n/2$, where we recall that $n \geq 4$ is the number of vertices in G with n even. Second, recalling that $s \in L$ and $t \in R$, the constraint (11) effectively states that $[s, 0]$ is adjacent only to $[t, 0]$ in F_λ ; indeed, recalling that $\lambda(s) = 0$ and $(s, t) \notin \vec{G}_e$, from (10) we have that $[s, 0]$ is not adjacent to $[t, 1]$. Third, for all $\ell \in L \setminus \{s\}$, we observe from (10) and (11), the latter being trivially true, that the vertices $[\ell, 0]$ and $[\ell, 1]$ have identical vertex neighborhoods in F_λ .

We are now ready for our first key lemma. Recall the coloring χ_H associated to an anchored Hamiltonian cycle H of G from Section 2.2. The first lemma shows that every perfect matching in F_λ gives rise to an anchored Hamiltonian cycle; different perfect matchings may give rise to the same anchored Hamiltonian cycle however. This structure is illustrated in Figure 2.



FIGURE 2. Illustration of a perfect matching in the graph F_λ . Left: The graph G drawn in one of its orientations \vec{G}_e with $e = \{s, t\}$ and the bipartition (L, R) with vertices in L drawn as white circles and the vertices in R drawn as black boxes. Right: The graph F_λ and the coloring λ drawn as an oriented overlay of G . Observe that each vertex $r \in R$ has two copies $[r, \rho]$ in F_λ , one for each parity $\rho \in \{0, 1\}$, with a blue square indicating parity 0 and an orange square indicating parity 1. Although each vertex $\ell \in L$ has two copies $[\ell, p]$ in F_λ , one copy for each port $p \in \{0, 1\}$, we contract these two copies into one vertex (circle) in the drawing, and display for each vertex its color $\lambda(\ell) \in \{0, 1\}$ (blue or orange) instead. Each arc in the drawing is oriented from L to R and represents two edges of F_λ with opposite ports. A perfect matching M in F_λ is represented by the bold arcs. In particular, observe that each circle is incident to two bold arcs; these two bold arcs represent two edges in M with opposite ports. These opposite ports are otherwise arbitrary except for the edge of M that projects to $\{s, t\}$, which must have port 0. Also observe that from the drawn M it is visually intuitive how to obtain a Hamiltonian cycle in G corresponding to M by turning the bold arcs into the edges of a Hamiltonian cycle in G ; this intuition is made rigorous in Lemma 14 by the Hamiltonian cycle $H[M]$ of G obtained from M .

Lemma 14 (Perfect matchings witness good extensions). *For every perfect matching M in F_λ , there exists a Hamiltonian cycle $H[M]$ in G with $\chi_{H[M]}(\ell) = \lambda(\ell)$ for all $\ell \in L$.*

Proof. Let M be an arbitrary perfect matching in F_λ . For $[\ell, p] \in L \times \{0, 1\}$ and $[r, \rho] \in R \times \{0, 1\}$, let us use functional notation $M([\ell, p]) = [r, \rho]$ or $M([r, \rho]) = [\ell, p]$ to signal that the vertices $[\ell, p]$ and $[r, \rho]$ are matched by M in F_λ . We construct the anchored Hamiltonian cycle $H[M]$ as well as the coloring $\chi = \chi_{H[M]}$ with $\chi(\ell) = \lambda(\ell)$ for all $\ell \in L$ by traversing all the vertices of F_λ in an order determined by M to yield the Hamiltonian cycle $H[M]$. In particular, we will define $H[M]$ in

steps by introducing, one vertex at a time, a vertex order v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} for the vertices of G with $v_0 = s, v_{n-1} = t$, and $(v_i, v_{(i+1) \bmod n}) \in E(\overrightarrow{H[M]}) \subseteq E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$.

Our traversal starts from the vertex $[\ell_0, p_0]$ of F_λ defined by $\ell_0 = s$ and $p_0 = 1$. The traversal then follows edges in the perfect matching M , changing parity (at vertices in $R \times \{0, 1\}$) and port (at vertices in $L \times \{0, 1\}$) to arrive at subsequent edges; for these changes, for $z \in \{0, 1\}$ it is convenient to write $\bar{z} = (z + 1) \bmod 2$ for notational brevity; that is, $\bar{0} = 1$ and $\bar{1} = 0$.

In precise terms, the traversal is as follows. Assuming we have defined $\ell_j \in L$ and $p_j \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, i\}$ with $i \geq 0$, we proceed to define $\ell_{i+1} \in L$ and $p_{i+1} \in \{0, 1\}$ as follows. Set $v_{2i} = \ell_i$ and $\chi(\ell_i) = \lambda(\ell_i)$. Define $r_i \in R$ and $\rho_i \in \{0, 1\}$ by $M([\ell_i, p_i]) = [r_i, \rho_i]$. Set $v_{2i+1} = r_i$ and $\chi(r_i) = \rho_i$. Define $\ell'_i \in L$ and $p'_i \in \{0, 1\}$ by $M([r_i, \bar{p}_i]) = [\ell'_i, p'_i]$. Set $\ell_{i+1} = \ell'_i$ and $p_{i+1} = \bar{p}'_i$ as well as $\chi(\ell_{i+1}) = \lambda(\ell_{i+1})$ and $v_{2(i+1)} = \ell_{i+1}$. We continue this process for $i = 0, 1, \dots$ and claim that eventually $\ell_{i+1} = \ell_0$ and $p_{i+1} = p_0$ with $i + 1 = n/2$, at which point $\{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}\} = V(G)$ and $H[M]$ is a Hamiltonian cycle in G with $\chi_{H[M]} = \chi$ with $\chi(\ell) = \lambda(\ell)$ for all $\ell \in L$.

Let us now analyse the traversal process in more detail. First, we observe that $\ell_{i+1} \neq \ell_i$; indeed, suppose that $\ell_{i+1} = \ell_i$ and observe that the traversal step from ℓ_i to ℓ_{i+1} changes parity from ρ_i to $\bar{\rho}_i$ at r_i , yet from (10) we observe that every edge of F_λ that projects to the edge $\{\ell_i, r_i\} = \{\ell_{i+1}, r_i\}$ has the same parity at r_i , a contradiction. Next, let us observe that $(v_{2i}, v_{2i+1}) = (\ell_i, r_i) \in E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)$. Indeed, the identity is immediate, and membership holds by (7) and

$$\chi(r_i) = \rho_i \stackrel{(10)}{\equiv} \lambda(\ell_i) + \mathbb{I}[(\ell_i, r_i) \in \vec{G}_e] = \chi(\ell_i) + \mathbb{I}[(\ell_i, r_i) \in \vec{G}_e] \pmod{2}.$$

Let us then observe that $(v_{2i+1}, v_{2i+2}) = (r_i, \ell_{i+1}) \in E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)$. Again the identity is immediate, and membership holds by (7), the fact that \vec{G}_e^χ orients $\{\ell_{i+1}, r_i\} \in E(G)$ in one of two possible orientations, and

$$\chi(r_i) = \rho_i \neq \bar{\rho}_i \stackrel{(10)}{\equiv} \lambda(\ell_{i+1}) + \mathbb{I}[(\ell_{i+1}, r_i) \in \vec{G}_e] = \chi(\ell_{i+1}) + \mathbb{I}[(\ell_{i+1}, r_i) \in \vec{G}_e] \pmod{2}.$$

Next let us show that all the vertices ℓ_i and r_i traversed by the process are distinct, until $\ell_{i+1} = \ell_0$ for some $i \geq 1$, noting that the case $i = 0$ has already been excluded earlier. Suppose $\ell_1, \ell_2, \dots, \ell_i$ are distinct; since M contains exactly two edges (of opposite parities) that project to edges incident to any fixed $r \in R$, we observe that these two edges of M have been each traversed once by the process for each r_0, r_1, \dots, r_i since $\ell_0, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_i$ are distinct, implying that r_0, r_1, \dots, r_i are distinct, and thus that $v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{2i+1}$ are distinct. So suppose that $\ell_{i+1} = \ell_j$ for some $0 \leq j \leq i$; also note that this must happen for some $i < |L| = n/2$. If $j \geq 1$, we have a contradiction since M contains exactly two edges (of opposite ports) that project to edges incident to any fixed $\ell \in L$, and for $\ell = \ell_j$ these two edges (projecting to $\{\ell_j, r_{j-1}\}$ and $\{\ell_j, r_j\}$) have already been traversed; so there is no edge in M that projects to $\{\ell_j, r_i\} = \{\ell_{i+1}, r_i\}$, a contradiction. So we must have $j = 0$. This implies in particular that $(v_k, v_{(k+1) \bmod (2i+2)}) \in E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, 2i + 1$. Furthermore, since the edge of M that is incident to $[\ell_0, p_0] = [s, 1]$ has already been traversed, we have that the edge $\{[\ell_{i+1}, \bar{p}_{i+1}], [r_i, \bar{\rho}_i]\}$ in M must be the edge $\{[s, 0], [t, 0]\}$ (recall our analysis earlier that $[s, 0]$ is adjacent only to $[t, 0]$ in F_λ); thus we conclude that $\chi(t) = \chi(r_i) = \rho_i \neq \bar{\rho}_i = 0$; that is, $\chi(t) = 1$.

Let us next show that $i = n/2 - 1$. So to reach a contradiction, suppose that $i < n/2 - 1$. In particular, the edges of G underlying the arcs $(v_k, v_{(k+1) \bmod (2i+2)}) \in E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, 2i + 1$ trace a cycle of even length $2i + 2 < n$ in G . This leaves some of the vertices in G , and thus all corresponding vertices of F_λ regardless of port/parity, unvisited by the traversal process. By starting the traversal process again from an arbitrary unvisited vertex in $L \times \{0, 1\}$, we end up tracing a further even-length cycle in G , and repeating the process until all vertices of G are visited, we obtain a vertex-disjoint union of even-length cycles that together cover the vertices of G , as well as a coloring χ such that all the cycles (in their consistently oriented form as they were traversed) occur as directed subgraphs of \vec{G}_e^χ . Since $2i + 2 < n$, this cycle cover thus contains a cycle C

that does not contain the anchor edge e and whose consistent orientation \vec{C} is a subgraph of \vec{G}_e^χ ; observing that C is central—indeed, use every other edge from each even cycle other than C in the cover to witness a perfect matching in $G \setminus V(C)$ —this leads to a contradiction via Pfaffianity by the same argument as was used in the proof of Lemma 12; thus, $i = n/2 - 1$.

Since $i = n/2 - 1$, it follows from $(v_k, v_{(k+1) \bmod n}) \in E(\vec{G}_e^\chi)$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ and from Lemma 12 we conclude that $\chi = \chi_{H[M]}$ for the anchored Hamiltonian cycle $H[M]$ in G defined by $V(H[M]) = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1}\}$ and $E(H[M]) = \{(v_k, v_{(k+1) \bmod n}) : k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. \square

Conversely, we show that every good extension of λ is witnessed by a perfect matching in F_λ .

Lemma 15 (Good extensions witness perfect matchings). *For every anchored Hamiltonian cycle H in G with $\chi_H(\ell) = \lambda(\ell)$ for all $\ell \in L$, there exists a perfect matching M_H in F_λ with $H[M_H] = H$.*

Proof. Let H be an anchored Hamiltonian cycle in G with $\chi_H(\ell) = \lambda(\ell)$ for all $\ell \in L$. Let \vec{H} be the consistent orientation of H with distinct vertices v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} so that $v_0 = s$, $v_{n-1} = t$, and $(v_k, v_{(k+1) \bmod n}) \in E(\vec{H}) \subseteq E(\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H})$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. Set $\ell_i = v_{2i}$, $r_i = v_{2i+1}$, and $\rho_i = (\chi_H(\ell_i) + \llbracket (\ell_i, r_i) \in \vec{G}_e \rrbracket) \bmod 2$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, n/2 - 1$. Observe also that by (7) and $(\ell_i, r_i) \in E(\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H})$, we have $\chi_H(r_i) = \rho_i$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, n/2 - 1$.

Start with an empty matching M_H . It is immediate from (10) and (11) that $\{[\ell_i, 1], [r_i, \rho_i]\} \in E(F_\lambda)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n/2 - 1$. Take each of these $n/2$ vertex-disjoint edges into M_H . Next observe that we have $\{[\ell_{(i+1) \bmod (n/2)}, 0], [r_i, \bar{\rho}_i]\} \in E(F_\lambda)$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n/2 - 1$; indeed, from $(r_i, \ell_{(i+1) \bmod (n/2)}) \in E(\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H})$ we conclude by (7) that

$$\rho_i = \chi_H(r_i) \equiv \chi_H(\ell_{(i+1) \bmod (n/2)}) + \llbracket (r_i, \ell_{(i+1) \bmod (n/2)}) \in E(\vec{G}_e) \rrbracket \pmod{2};$$

that is,

$$\bar{\rho}_i \equiv \chi_H(\ell_{(i+1) \bmod (n/2)}) + \llbracket (\ell_{(i+1) \bmod (n/2)}, r_i) \in E(\vec{G}_e) \rrbracket \pmod{2},$$

so (10) holds. Furthermore, (11) holds expect possibly when $\ell_{(i+1) \bmod (n/2)} = s$; but then $i = n/2 - 1$ and thus $r_i = t$, so (11) holds also in this case. Take each of these $n/2$ vertex-disjoint edges into M_H and observe that the n edges now in M_H constitute a perfect matching in F_λ .

By tracing the traversal process in the proof of Lemma 14 with the definition of the perfect matching M_H above, we conclude that $H[M_H] = H$. \square

Thus, F_λ has a perfect matching if and only if λ has a good extension. Moreover, from the proofs of Lemma 14 and Lemma 15 we observe that the transformations $M \mapsto H[M]$ and $H \mapsto M_H$ are computable in linear time. We also observe that for every anchored Hamiltonian cycle H in G there are exactly $2^{n/2-1}$ perfect matchings M in F_λ with $H[M] = H$; these M are all obtainable from each other by transposing ports at zero or more vertices $\ell \in L \setminus \{s\}$.

3. ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE IN BIPARTITE PFAFFIAN GRAPHS

This section studies the problem of finding another Hamiltonian cycle when given as input (i) a bipartite Pfaffian graph G and (ii) a Hamiltonian cycle H in G . Recall from Lemma 13 that we can in linear time construct a Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} from this input. In what follows we thus tacitly assume that such a \vec{G} is available and fixed together with an arbitrary anchor edge $e \in E(H)$.

3.1. Linear-time solvability in minimum degree three. Our first objective in this section is our main theorem, which we restate below for convenience.

Theorem 1 (Main; Linear-time ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE in minimum degree three). *There exists a deterministic linear-time algorithm that, given as input (i) a bipartite Pfaffian graph G with minimum degree three, (ii) a Hamiltonian cycle H in G , and (iii) an edge $e \in E(H)$, outputs a Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$ in G with $e \in E(H')$.*

We now proceed to prove Theorem 1. Recall and assume the setting of Section 2.5. Observe that from the given input, we can in linear total time (a) find a Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} using H , (b) compute the orientation \vec{G}_e , (c) compute the coloring χ_H , (d) compute the vertex bipartition (L, R) of G , (e) restrict χ_H to L to obtain the coloring λ , (f) construct the graph F_λ , as well as (g) construct the perfect matching M_H in F_λ .

Using M_H and F_λ , introduce the directed graph $D_{\lambda, H}$ with the vertex set $V(D_{\lambda, H}) = L$ and the arc set defined for all distinct $\ell, \ell' \in L$ by the rule $(\ell, \ell') \in E(D_{\lambda, H})$ if and only if there exist $p, p' \in \{0, 1\}$, $r \in R$, and $\rho \in \{0, 1\}$ such that

$$(12) \quad \{[\ell, p], [r, \rho]\} \in E(F_\lambda) \setminus M_H \quad \text{and} \quad \{[\ell', p'], [r, \rho]\} \in M_H.$$

That is, an arc $(\ell, \ell') \in E(D_{\lambda, H})$ indicates that (disregarding ports p and p') we can walk from ℓ to ℓ' in F_λ by traversing first an edge not in M_H , followed by an edge in M_H . We stress that the traversal (12) *preserves* the parity ρ for consecutive edges, whereas the traversal in the proof of Lemma 14 *changes* parity for consecutive edges; the latter also uses edges only in M_H .

We recall that G has minimum degree at least three; this enables us to find a Hamiltonian cycle other than H in G with the help of a directed cycle in $D_{\lambda, H}$ revealed in the following lemma.

Lemma 16 (Existence of an s -avoiding directed cycle in $D_{\lambda, H}$). *Suppose that every vertex of G has degree at least three. Then, the directed graph $D_{\lambda, H}$ contains at least one directed cycle that avoids the vertex s .*

Proof. It suffices to show that all vertices of $D_{\lambda, H}$ have out-degree at least one and that the vertex s is a source; that is, s has in-degree zero. Towards this end, since every vertex of G has degree at least three, for every $\ell \in L$ there exist distinct $r, r', r'' \in R$ and three edges $\{\ell, r\}, \{\ell, r'\}, \{\ell, r''\} \in E(G)$. Furthermore, since ℓ gives rise to the vertices $[\ell, 0]$ and $[\ell, 1]$ in F_ℓ , the edges of M_H project to at most two of these three edges; without loss of generality we may assume that the edge $\{\ell, r\}$ is not in the projection of M_H . For $p = 1$ and the unique $\rho \in \{0, 1\}$ such that (10) holds we thus have by (9) that $\{[\ell, p], [r, \rho]\} \in E(F_\lambda) \setminus M_H$. Since M_H is a perfect matching in F_λ , there exist $\ell' \in L$ and $p' \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $\{[\ell', p'], [r, \rho]\} \in M_H$; we must have $\ell' \neq \ell$ since $\{\ell, r\}$ is not in the projection of M_H . Thus, we have $(\ell, \ell') \in E(D_{\lambda, H})$ by (12). Since $\ell \in L$ was arbitrary, we conclude that every vertex of $D_{\lambda, H}$ has out-degree at least one.

It remains to show that s has in-degree zero in $D_{\lambda, H}$. To reach a contradiction, suppose that there exists an arc $(\ell, s) \in E(D_{\lambda, H})$. From (12) we thus have that there exist $p, p', \rho \in \{0, 1\}$ and $r \in R$ with $\{[\ell, p], [r, \rho]\} \in E(F_\lambda) \setminus M_H$ and $\{[s, p'], [r, \rho]\} \in M_H$. Let us split into two cases based on the value of p' and obtain a contradiction in both cases.

In the first case, suppose that $p' = 0$. Recall that in the graph F_λ we have that the vertex $[s, 0]$ is adjacent only to the vertex $[t, 0]$. Since M_H is a perfect matching, we must thus have $\{[s, 0], [t, 0]\} \in M_H$, and hence $r = t$ and $\rho = 0$. From (10) we thus have that $0 = \rho \equiv \lambda(\ell) + \mathbb{I}[(\ell, r) \in \vec{G}_e] = \chi_H(\ell) + \mathbb{I}[(\ell, t) \in \vec{G}_e] \pmod{2}$. Now recall that $\chi_H(t) = 1$. In particular, we have $\chi_H(t) \not\equiv \chi_H(\ell) + \mathbb{I}[(\ell, t) \in \vec{G}_e] \pmod{2}$, implying by (7) that $(t, \ell) \in E(\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H})$. But then since $\ell \neq s$ we have that the arc (t, ℓ) together with the directed (ℓ, t) -subpath of the directed Hamiltonian path $\vec{H} \setminus (t, s)$ yields a directed cycle in $\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H} \setminus (t, s)$, a contradiction to acyclicity in Lemma 12.

In the second case, suppose that $p' = 1$. Then, in the construction of M_H in Lemma 15 we observe that we must have $\ell_0 = s$, $r_0 = r$, and $\chi_H(r) = \chi_H(r_0) = \rho_0 = \rho$. In particular, we have $(s, r) \in E(\vec{H})$. From (10) and $\lambda(\ell) = \chi_H(\ell)$ we thus conclude that

$$\chi_H(r) = \rho \equiv \lambda(\ell) + \mathbb{I}[(\ell, r) \in \vec{G}_e] \equiv \chi_H(\ell) + \mathbb{I}[(\ell, r) \in \vec{G}_e] \pmod{2},$$

implying by (7) that $(\ell, r) \in \vec{G}_e^{\chi_H}$. But then since $\ell \neq s$ we have that the arc (ℓ, r) together with the directed (r, ℓ) -subpath of the directed Hamiltonian path $\vec{H} \setminus (t, s)$ yields a directed cycle in $\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H} \setminus (t, s)$, a contradiction to acyclicity in Lemma 12. \square

By the previous lemma we thus know that $D_{\lambda,H}$ contains an s -avoiding directed cycle \vec{Q} with $V(\vec{Q}) = \{\ell_0, \ell_1, \dots, \ell_{k-1}\} \subseteq L$ and $(\ell_j, \ell_{(j+1) \bmod k}) \in E(\vec{Q})$ for each $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ and $k \geq 2$. We will use \vec{Q} to construct from M_H another Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$ in G . Figure 3 illustrates the construction.




FIGURE 3. Obtaining another Hamiltonian cycle using a directed cycle in $D_{\lambda,H}$. Left: Two perfect matchings M_H in F_λ drawn as oriented overlays of G (cf. Figure 2), with further overlaying drawn in green and constituting the arcs of $D_{\lambda,H}$. Right: The corresponding two orientations $\vec{G}_e^{\chi_H}$ and colorings χ_H . Top and bottom: In both cases we have that $D_{\lambda,H}$ contains a unique s -avoiding directed cycle \vec{Q} . Using \vec{Q} in each case we can switch between the top and bottom Hamiltonian cycles in G . Note in particular that the two vertex colorings agree in L but differ in R .

From (12) applied to each arc of \vec{Q} in turn we conclude that for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ there exist $r_j \in R$ and $\rho_j, p_j \in \{0, 1\}$ with

$$(13) \quad \{[\ell_j, p_j], [r_j, \rho_j]\} \in E(F_\lambda) \setminus M_H \quad \text{and} \quad \{[\ell_{(j+1) \bmod k}, p'_j], [r_j, \rho_j]\} \in M_H.$$

We observe that the vertices $[r_j, \rho_j]$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ are distinct because M_H is a perfect matching and $\ell_{(j+1) \bmod k}$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ are distinct. In spite of this, the edges (13) for $j = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ need *not* form a cycle in F_λ because we can have $p'_j \neq p_{(j+1) \bmod k}$. Here is where the fact that \vec{Q} is s -avoiding pays off. Let $M = M_H$ and recall that the vertices $[\ell, 0]$ and $[\ell, 1]$ for each $\ell \in L \setminus \{s\}$ have identical vertex neighborhoods in F_λ . Thus, whenever we have $p'_j \neq p_{(j+1) \bmod k}$, we can modify M by transposing the vertices $[\ell_{(j+1) \bmod k}, 0]$ and $[\ell_{(j+1) \bmod k}, 1]$ in the edges of M ; by the identical vertex neighborhoods property, the resulting M will still be a perfect matching in F_λ . Moreover, we have $H = H[M_H] = H[M]$; indeed, the traversal construction in Lemma 14 is insensitive to the specific values of the (opposite) ports. For $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ we thus now have

$$(14) \quad \{[\ell_j, p_j], [r_j, \rho_j]\} \in E(F_\lambda) \setminus M \quad \text{and} \quad \{[\ell_{(j+1) \bmod k}, p_{(j+1) \bmod k}], [r_j, \rho_j]\} \in M;$$

that is, these edges now form a $2k$ -vertex cycle in F_λ . Let us write A for this cycle in F_λ .

Observe in particular from (14) that the edges of A alternate between edges in M and edges not in M . Thus, we have that the symmetric difference $M' = (M \setminus E(A)) \cup (E(A) \setminus M)$ is a perfect matching in F_λ . Furthermore, M' and M project to a different set of edges of G ; indeed, from (14) we have that r_j changes adjacency from $\ell_{(j+1) \bmod k}$ in $H[M]$ to ℓ_j in $H[M']$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$. It follows that $H' = H[M'] \neq H[M] = H$. Thus, we have constructed a Hamiltonian cycle H' in

G that is different from H . Moreover, this construction is computable in deterministic linear time. This completes the proof of Theorem 1. \square

3.2. Logarithmic-space solvability in minimum degree three. We next describe how we can implement the ideas of the previous section in an algorithm that uses little space. We consider as input a bipartite Pfaffian graph G of minimum degree three, a consistently oriented Hamiltonian cycle \vec{H} in G , and an arc $(t, s) \in \vec{H}$. More precisely, we assume both graphs G and \vec{H} are given in the input as a list of adjacency lists for each vertex. We seek to output a list of edges of another Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$ with $\{s, t\} \in E(H')$. We assume that the vertices of G are represented as $O(\log n)$ -bit integers in the input, where n is the number of vertices in G .

Theorem 2 (Main; Logarithmic-space ANOTHER HAMILTONIAN CYCLE in minimum degree three). *There exists a deterministic logarithmic-space algorithm that, given as input (i) a bipartite Pfaffian graph G with minimum degree three, (ii) a Hamiltonian cycle H in G , and (iii) an edge $e \in E(H)$, outputs a Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$ in G with $e \in E(H')$.*

Proof. Suppose that G has n vertices. We describe an algorithm that uses space that is only logarithmic in n ; however, this algorithm no longer runs in linear time but merely in polynomial time. Recalling the proof of Theorem 1 and the alternating cycle A in F_λ , the algorithm outputs (i) all edges in H but not in A , and (ii) all edges in A but not on H ; the edges (i) and (ii) together form another Hamiltonian cycle H' containing the edge $e = \{s, t\}$. The algorithm relies on the following logarithmic-space subroutines to accomplish the listing (i) and (ii).

First, from the given input \vec{H} we can compute in space logarithmic in n the following numerical identifier $\text{id}(v)$ for any given vertex v . Namely, we set $\text{id}(v)$ to equal the number of arcs along the consistently oriented \vec{H} from s to v . From a given v we can compute $\text{id}(v)$ by keeping track of one vertex w (where we currently are) and a counter c (how many edges we have traversed along \vec{H}). Starting with $w = s$ and $c = 0$, as long as $w \neq v$, we traverse arcs of \vec{H} , setting w to the next vertex after w on \vec{H} and increasing c by one, and repeat until we reach v , at which point we return $c = \text{id}(v)$. Also observe that this identifier subroutine enables us to determine whether a given vertex is in the set L (even identifier) or the set R (odd identifier) in the bipartition (L, R) of G with $s \in L$.

Second, from Lemma 13 applied to G and H with $e = \{s, t\}$ we observe that the Pfaffian orientation \vec{G}^χ , where χ is the proper coloring of the vertices of G with $\chi(s) = 0$, has the property that each edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ is oriented from u to v in \vec{G}^χ if and only if $\text{id}(u) < \text{id}(v)$. Thus, using the subroutine for the vertex identifiers, we can compute in logarithmic space in n the orientation of any given edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ in \vec{G}^χ .

Third, we develop a subroutine for accessing the arcs of a subgraph $D'_{\lambda, H}$ of $D_{\lambda, H}$ with $V(D'_{\lambda, H}) = V(D_{\lambda, H}) = L$ and with the property that there is exactly one out-arc from each vertex. That is, we describe a subroutine that given a vertex $v \in L$ computes in logarithmic space the end-vertex $u \in L$ of an arc (v, u) in $D_{\lambda, H}$. To accomplish this, we compute $\text{id}(v)$, find the first vertex w adjacent to v in G from the adjacency list for v , such that $\{v, w\} \notin E(H)$. Next, we compute $\text{id}(w)$. If $\text{id}(v) < \text{id}(w)$, we locate the vertex u as the one immediately preceding w along \vec{H} ; otherwise, that is, when $\text{id}(v) > \text{id}(w)$, we locate the vertex u as the one immediately succeeding w along \vec{H} . By the structure of χ and \vec{G}^χ , this will ensure that the parity at w is the same in F_λ for the edges projecting to $\{v, w\}$ and $\{u, w\}$ in G .

Fourth, we can find a vertex on the unique cycle in $D'_{\lambda, H}$ by starting from s and walking along the arcs of $D'_{\lambda, H}$ for n steps. The subroutine again only needs two additional variables, the current vertex and a counter keeping track of how many steps we have taken; each step is taken with the subroutine in the previous paragraph. Once we have found a vertex on the cycle, we can easily enumerate the vertices in A along a consistent orientation \vec{A} by traversing the arcs on the cycle in

$D'_{\lambda,H}$ (again using the subroutine from the previous paragraph) until we get back to the starting vertex on the cycle. This also requires storing only two pointers (vertices).

Finally, the listing (i) (the listing (ii)) can be done by making one revolution over \vec{H} (over \vec{A}) and for each arc traversed using the subroutines for one revolution over \vec{A} (over \vec{H}) to check that the underlying edge is not in A (not in H). Both enumerations are thus computable in logarithmic space. \square

3.3. Thomason's lollipop method in cubic bipartite Pfaffian graphs. In this section we prove that Thomason's lollipop method runs in a linear number of steps in cubic bipartite Pfaffian graphs. Let us first set up some preliminaries and then describe Thomason's lollipop method.

Let G be a Hamiltonian cubic graph and let H be a Hamiltonian cycle in G . Select an edge $e = \{s, t\}$ in the Hamiltonian cycle H . Let us call e the *anchor* edge. A *lollipop* is a connected graph with one vertex of degree one, one vertex of degree three, and all other vertices of degree two. All lollipops considered in what follows are subgraphs of G such that t is the unique degree-one vertex and e is the edge incident to t on the lollipop.

The lollipop method is best described as operating on a family of Hamiltonian paths in G . We say that a Hamiltonian path in G that starts at the vertex t and continues via the anchor edge e is an *e-anchored* Hamiltonian path. Now recall that G is cubic, so the vertex t is adjacent to s (via the anchor edge e) and to two other vertices a and b . The lollipop method transforms a given *e-anchored* Hamiltonian path P_e that ends at either a or b into an *e-anchored* Hamiltonian path $P'_e \neq P_e$ that ends at either a or b . Observe in particular that both Hamiltonian paths P_e and P'_e can be completed into *e-anchored* Hamiltonian cycles by adding the missing edge $\{a, t\}$ or $\{b, t\}$ into the respective path.

The transformation from P_e to P'_e is via a sequence of *lollipop steps*. A lollipop step consists of adding one edge to an *e-anchored* Hamiltonian path and removing another one, so that another *e-anchored* Hamiltonian path is formed. More precisely, let Q be an *e-anchored* Hamiltonian path ending at some vertex u . Since G is cubic, u is adjacent to two other vertices, x and y , such that the edges $\{u, x\}$ and $\{u, y\}$ of G are not in Q . Assume that $x \neq t$. Add the edge $\{u, x\}$ into Q to obtain a lollipop Ω where the unique degree-three vertex is x . Now observe that among the three adjacent vertices to x there is a unique vertex $v \notin \{u, t\}$ such that both $\{v, x\} \in E(\Omega)$ and removing $\{v, x\}$ from Ω leaves an *e-anchored* Hamiltonian path Q' ending at v . The transformation from Q to Q' now constitutes one lollipop step. Observe also that lollipop steps are *reversible*; that is, we can go back to Q from Q' by performing a lollipop step starting from Q' .

The *lollipop state graph* $\mathcal{L}(G, s, t)$ has as its vertices the *e-anchored* Hamiltonian paths in G and two vertices are joined by an edge if and only if it is possible to transform between the *e-anchored* Hamiltonian paths by one lollipop step. We observe immediately that $\mathcal{L}(G, s, t)$ has no isolated vertices—indeed, from any vertex Q we can arrive at another vertex $Q' \neq Q$ by a lollipop step—and the degree-one vertices are exactly the *e-anchored* Hamiltonian paths Q that end at a vertex u adjacent to t in G ; that is, $u \in \{a, b\}$; moreover, all other vertices have degree two. Thus, we can transform from P_e to $P'_e \neq P_e$ by tracing a path in $\mathcal{L}(G, s, t)$ from P_e to P'_e .

We now proceed to prove an upper bound on the maximum length of a path in $\mathcal{L}(G, s, t)$ on a cubic bipartite Pfaffian graph G . An example of the lollipop method applied to a cubic bipartite planar graph using the terminology in the subsequent proof is given in Figure 4.

Theorem 3 (Thomason's lollipop method in cubic bipartite Pfaffian graphs). *Thomason's lollipop method starting from any Hamiltonian cycle H and any edge $e \in E(H)$ in an n -vertex cubic bipartite Pfaffian graph G , terminates after at most n steps.*

Proof. To analyze the lollipop method in cubic bipartite Pfaffian graphs, let a cubic bipartite Pfaffian graph G , a Hamiltonian cycle H in G , and $e = \{s, t\} \in E(H)$ be given as input. This input enables us to work in the setting of Section 3.1; let the vertex bipartition (L, R) of G , the




FIGURE 4. An example of the sequence of steps of Thomason’s lollipop method in an n -vertex cubic bipartite planar graph viewed as a sequence of arc reversals in the directed graph $D_{\lambda,H}$. The given input G and H together with $e = \{s, t\}$ is displayed in the top left; the black arcs are oriented as in \vec{G}_e obtained from Lemma 13 on input H . We display the initial Hamiltonian cycle H (top left) and the final Hamiltonian cycle H' (bottom right) obtained by the method, as well as the intermediate e -anchored Hamiltonian paths Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_9 obtained in consecutive lollipop steps; the end-vertex of each Q_i is highlighted with red. The green arcs in Q_0 are the arcs of $D_{\lambda,H}$. Observe that each lollipop step from Q_i to Q_{i+1} can be understood as reversing the light-green arc in Q_i ; the method terminates when the end-vertices of Q_0 and Q_{i+1} agree. By the structure of $D_{\lambda,H}$, we must have $i \leq n$; cf. Theorem 3.

coloring λ of L , the graph F_λ , the perfect matching M_H in F_λ , and the directed graph $D_{\lambda,H}$ be constructed accordingly. Recall that $s \in L$ and $t \in R$.

The lollipop method starts by removing the edge $\{t, u\}$ with $u \neq s$ from H to obtain e -anchored Hamiltonian path P_e . Let Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_h be the sequence of e -anchored Hamiltonian paths traversed by consecutive lollipop steps in $\mathcal{L}(G, s, t)$ with $P_e = Q_0$ and $Q_h = P'_e$. We will show that P'_e ends at u and thus we can obtain a Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$ by inserting the edge $\{t, u\}$ into P'_e . Moreover and crucially, we will show that $h \leq n$.

Our analysis of the lollipop method is based on the directed graph $D_{\lambda,H}$. We recommend consulting Figure 4 for intuition at this point. Recall from the proof of Lemma 16 that, in the directed graph $D_{\lambda,H}$, the vertex s has in-degree zero and every vertex has out-degree at least one. In particular, by traversing out-arcs from the vertex u in $D_{\lambda,H}$, and traversing the eventual directed cycle encountered, as well as traversing backwards to u from the directed cycle, in precise terms we observe that there exist vertices w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{d-1} with $(w_j, w_{(j+1) \bmod d}) \in E(D_{\lambda,H})$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$ as well as vertices $w'_0, w'_1, \dots, w'_{d'}$ with $w_0 = w'_{d'}$, $w'_0 = u$, $\{w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{d-1}\} \cap \{w'_0, w'_1, \dots, w'_{d'-1}\} = \emptyset$, and $(w'_j, w'_{j+1}) \in E(D_{\lambda,H})$ for $j = 0, 1, \dots, d'-1$. That is, the sequence $w'_0, w'_1, \dots, w'_{d'}$ forms a directed path starting at the vertex $u = w'_0$ and ending at the vertex $w_{d'} = w_0$, which is on the directed cycle formed by the vertices w_0, w_1, \dots, w_{d-1} in $D_{\lambda,H}$; the directed cycle and the directed path intersect exactly at the vertex $w_{d'} = w_0$. In particular $d + d' \leq |L| = n/2$.

It will be convenient to introduce the following sequence of vertices visited on the traversal of $D_{\lambda,H}$ from u . For $i = 0, 1, \dots, 2d' + d$, define

$$(15) \quad v_i = \begin{cases} w'_i & \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, d' - 1; \\ w_{i-d'} & \text{for } i = d', d' + 1, \dots, d' + d - 1; \\ w'_{2d'+d-i} & \text{for } i = d' + d, d' + d + 1, \dots, 2d' + d. \end{cases}$$

We have $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E(D_{\lambda,H})$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, d' + d - 1$; these arcs are precisely the arcs traversed forward. We have $(v_{i+1}, v_i) \in E(D_{\lambda,H})$ for $i = d' + d, d' + d + 1, \dots, 2d' + d - 1$; these arcs are precisely the arcs traversed backward. For an arc $(\ell, \ell') \in E(D_{\lambda,H})$, let us write $r(\ell, \ell')$, $\rho(\ell, \ell')$, and $p'(\ell, \ell')$, respectively, for the unique $r \in R$, $\rho \in \{0, 1\}$, and $p' \in \{0, 1\}$ such that (12) holds. Also, let us write $p(\ell, \ell')$ for the minimum $p \in \{0, 1\}$ such that that (12) holds.

Let M^- be a matching with $n-1$ edges in F_λ such that the vertex $[t, 1]$ is left unmatched by M^- ; we call such matchings *almost perfect*—indeed, any perfect matching M in F_λ has n edges. Also observe that the other vertex left unmatched by M^- is $[\ell, p]$ for some $\ell \in L$ and $p \in \{0, 1\}$. Recall the parity-and-port-changing traversal of M in the proof of Lemma 14 resulting in the Hamiltonian cycle $H[M]$. Define a similar parity-and-port-changing traversal of M^- by starting at the vertex $[\ell, p]$ and observe by a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 14 that this traversal defines an e -anchored Hamiltonian path $P[M^-]$ from the vertex ℓ to the vertex t in G ; in particular, observe that $P[M^-]$ is e -anchored since by the structure of F_λ the almost perfect M^- must contain the edge $\{[s, 0], [t, 0]\}$.

We now proceed to characterize the e -anchored Hamiltonian paths Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_h using corresponding almost perfect matchings $M_0^-, M_1^-, \dots, M_h^-$, and conclude that $h = 2d' + d \leq n$ in the process. For $i = 0, 1, \dots, h$, let us write u_i for the end-vertex of Q_i other than t . Recalling that $Q_0 = P_e$ is constructed by deleting the edge $\{u, t\}$ from the Hamiltonian cycle H , let $p \in \{0, 1\}$ be the port and $f \in E(F_\lambda)$ the edge with $f = \{[u, p], [t, 1]\} \in M_H$. Take $M_0^- = M_H \setminus \{f\}$. In particular, we have $Q_0 = P_e = P[M_0^-]$ and $u_0 = v_0 = u$. Let $p_0 = p$; we will fix values $p_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, h$ as we progress in what follows.

We split the analysis into two ranges based on the parameter i . The first range corresponds to the forward-traversal of arcs in $D_{\lambda,H}$. For $i = 0, 1, \dots, d' + d - 1$, we say an almost perfect matching M^- has *property i* if

- (i) $[v_i, p_i]$ is left unmatched by M^- ; and

- (ii) we have $\{[v_j, p(v_j, v_{j+1})], [r(v_j, v_{j+1}), \rho(v_j, v_{j+1})]\} \in M^-$ and $\{[r(v_j, v_{j+1}), \rho(v_j, v_{j+1})], [v_{j+1}, p'(v_j, v_{j+1})]\} \notin M^-$ for all $0 \leq j \leq i-1$; and
- (iii) we have $\{[v_j, p(v_j, v_{j+1})], [r(v_j, v_{j+1}), \rho(v_j, v_{j+1})]\} \notin M^-$ and $\{[r(v_j, v_{j+1}), \rho(v_j, v_{j+1})], [v_{j+1}, p'(v_j, v_{j+1})]\} \in M^-$ for all $i \leq j \leq d' + d$.

The second range corresponds to the backward-traversal of arcs in $D_{\lambda, H}$. For $i = d' + d, d' + d + 1, \dots, 2d' + d$, we say an almost perfect matching M^- has *property i* if

- (i') $[v_i, p_i]$ is left unmatched by M^- ; and
- (ii') we have $\{[v_j, p(v_j, v_{j+1})], [r(v_j, v_{j+1}), \rho(v_j, v_{j+1})]\} \in M^-$ and $\{[r(v_j, v_{j+1}), \rho(v_j, v_{j+1})], [v_{j+1}, p'(v_j, v_{j+1})]\} \notin M^-$ for all $d' \leq j \leq d' + d - 1$ as well as for all $0 \leq j \leq 2d' + d - 1 - i$; and
- (iii') we have $\{[v_j, p(v_j, v_{j+1})], [r(v_j, v_{j+1}), \rho(v_j, v_{j+1})]\} \notin M^-$ and $\{[r(v_j, v_{j+1}), \rho(v_j, v_{j+1})], [v_{j+1}, p'(v_j, v_{j+1})]\} \in M^-$ for all $2d' + d - i \leq j \leq d' - 1$.

From previous observations and (12) we have that M_0^- satisfies property 0.

Let us now analyse the lollipop step mapping Q_i to Q_{i+1} one value $i = 0, 1, \dots, d' + d - 1$ at a time. Suppose that there is an almost perfect matching M_i^- of F_λ that satisfies property i and that $Q_i = P[M_i^-]$. In particular, we have $u_i = v_i$ by (i) and $Q_i = P[M_i^-]$. We claim that the vertex $r(v_i, v_{i+1})$ is the unique degree-three vertex in the lollipop formed by the lollipop step transforming Q_i to Q_{i+1} . Observe by (iii) that $\{[r(v_i, v_{i+1}), \rho(v_i, v_{i+1})], [v_{i+1}, p'(v_i, v_{i+1})]\} \in M_i^-$, implying that $\{r(v_i, v_{i+1}), v_{i+1}\}$ is an edge in $Q_i = P[M_i^-]$. Recalling that M_i^- is almost perfect, all vertices in $R \times \{0, 1\}$ are matched, so $r(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in R$ is in fact adjacent to another vertex $\omega_i \neq v_{i+1}$ along an edge in $Q_i = P[M_i^-]$. By (iii) and (12) we have $\{v_i, r(v_i, v_{i+1})\}$ is an edge in G but not in $Q_i = P[M_i^-]$, and Q_i ends at v_i . Thus, $r(v_i, v_{i+1})$ is the unique degree-three vertex in the lollipop. Next, the lollipop step proceeds to delete an edge adjacent to the degree-three vertex $r(v_i, v_{i+1})$ in the lollipop. This edge is $\{v_{i+1}, r(v_i, v_{i+1})\}$ by the previous analysis. It follows that Q_{i+1} is obtained from Q_i by deleting $\{v_{i+1}, r(v_i, v_{i+1})\}$ and inserting $\{v_i, r(v_i, v_{i+1})\}$. Thus, Q_{i+1} ends at $u_{i+1} = v_{i+1}$. Define M_{i+1}^- by starting with M_i^- and deleting the edge $\{[r(v_i, v_{i+1}), \rho(v_i, v_{i+1})], [v_{i+1}, p'(v_i, v_{i+1})]\}$ as well as inserting the edge $\{[v_i, p(v_i, v_{i+1})], [r(v_i, v_{i+1}), \rho(v_i, v_{i+1})]\}$. Fix $p_{i+1} = p'(v_i, v_{i+1})$. From (i), (ii), and (iii) we have that M_{i+1}^- is an almost perfect matching that satisfies property $i + 1$. Furthermore, $Q_{i+1} = P[M_{i+1}^-]$.

Analysis of the lollipop step mapping Q_i to Q_{i+1} for $i = d' + d, d' + d + 1, \dots, 2d' + d - 1$ is now similar, but relying on properties (i'), (ii'), (iii') instead. From the existence of an almost perfect matching M_i^- of F_λ that satisfies property i and $Q_i = P[M_i^-]$, by a similar analysis we conclude that there exists an almost perfect matching M_{i+1}^- of F_λ that satisfies property $i + 1$ and $Q_{i+1} = P[M_{i+1}^-]$. Since $v_{2d'+d} = u$ and u is adjacent to t in G , from (i') we conclude in particular that $P'_e = Q_{2d'+d}$ and thus $h = 2d' + d$. Since $2d' + d \leq n$, we have shown that the lollipop method terminates in at most n lollipop steps. \square

We note that the algorithm implicit in the proof not only uses at most a linear number of lollipop steps, but also can be implemented with the guidance of $D_{\lambda, H}$ to run in linear time.

3.4. Graph-theoretic structural corollaries. We now restate and prove Corollaries 4 and 5.

Corollary 4 (Non-uniqueness in minimum degree three). *For every bipartite Pfaffian graph G of minimum degree three and for every edge $e \in E(G)$, it holds that G has either zero or at least four distinct Hamiltonian cycles H with $e \in E(H)$.*

Proof. The proof of Theorem 1 in the previous section shows how to generate one other Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$ such that the vertex colorings $\chi_{H'}$ and χ_H differ in at least one vertex in R but agree for all vertices in L . We can change the roles of L and R , s and t , and the two colors in the construction, and compute another Hamiltonian cycle H'' from H with $\chi_{H''}$ different from χ_H in L but the same in R . Clearly, as the vertex coloring is unique for a Hamiltonian cycle, H' and

H'' must be different Hamiltonian cycles that are also different from H . Also, taking either of H' or H'' as the source, again flipping the roles of L and R , we can generate a fourth Hamiltonian cycle H''' whose coloring $\chi_{H'''}$ is different from the colorings of H , H' , and H'' . This way we have generated at least three new distinct Hamiltonian cycles H' , H'' , and H''' from H . \square

Corollary 5 (Cubic tight lower bound). *Every cubic bipartite Pfaffian graph has either zero or at least six distinct Hamiltonian cycles.*

Proof. Given a Hamiltonian cycle H , we can use Theorem 1 to obtain another Hamiltonian cycle H' that in particular must have an edge $f \in E(H') \setminus E(H)$. From Corollary 4 we have thus that there exist at least four distinct Hamiltonian cycles in G with f as the anchor edge. This means we have generated at least five distinct Hamiltonian cycles in G . From Bosák's theorem [Bos67] we know every cubic bipartite graph must have an even number of distinct Hamiltonian cycles, which shows that there must be at least six distinct Hamiltonian cycles in every cubic bipartite Pfaffian graph. \square

4. FASTER ALGORITHMS FOR TSP AND COUNTING HAMILTONIAN CYCLES

In this section we describe and analyze our new algorithms for TSP and counting Hamiltonian cycles restricted to bipartite Pfaffian graphs, in particular bipartite planar ones.

4.1. Algorithmic preliminaries and conventions. Our algorithms in this section differ from earlier ones on planar graphs in that we begin by computing and fixing a Pfaffian orientation \vec{G} of the input graph G . This can be done in linear time in the case of planar graphs, and in $O(n^3)$ time with the algorithm in [RST99] for any bipartite Pfaffian graph. We also fix an arbitrary edge $e \in E(G)$ with $e = \{s, t\}$ for distinct $s, t \in V(G)$ and compute the orientation \vec{G}_e of G as well as the vertex bipartition (L, R) of G with $s \in L$ and $t \in R$.

We will first consider the anchored problems of finding the shortest traveling salesperson tour through e , and counting the Hamiltonian cycles through e . To get the full solution, we can consider each edge in turn and in the case of counting, divide the total amount by n in the end. This only incurs a polynomial overhead on the running time.

Apart from this initial step of fixing an edge and a Pfaffian orientation, our algorithm follows and uses well-known material for dynamic programming over graph decompositions and is only repeated here for the reader's convenience. The only new parts are what we count, how to represent partial solutions of what we count, and how to update them.

4.2. Graph decompositions. We consider some of the most familiar graph decompositions, originally proposed in Robertson and Seymour [RS86, RS91]. We will not explicitly consider tree width as a parameter in our algorithms but define it anyway along the way to explain a path decomposition.

Tree and path decompositions. A *tree decomposition* of an undirected graph G is a tree T_{td} in which each vertex $x \in V(T_{\text{td}})$ is associated with a set of vertices $B_x \subseteq V(G)$, called a *bag*, such that $\cup_{x \in V(T_{\text{td}})} B_x = V(G)$ with the properties

- (1) for every $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$, there exists an $x \in V(T_{\text{td}})$ such that both $u, v \in B_x$, and
- (2) if $v \in B_x$ and $v \in B_y$, then $v \in B_z$ for all $z \in V(T_{\text{td}})$ on the path joining x and y in T_{td} .

The width of a tree decomposition is measured in the size of its largest bag. More precisely, we say that the *width* of the decomposition is equal to $\max_{x \in V(T_{\text{td}})} |B_x| - 1$. A *path decomposition* is a tree decomposition where the tree T_{td} is a path. We also say that the *tree width* $\text{tw}(G)$, and the *path width* $\text{pw}(G)$, of the graph G equals the minimum width of any such decompositions for the graph.

A *nice* tree decomposition as defined in [BCKN15] is a tree decomposition T_{td} with one special bag r called the *root* and in which each bag is one of the following types:

- (1) Leaf bag: a leaf $x \in V(T_{\text{td}})$ with $B_x = \emptyset$.
- (2) Introduce vertex bag: an internal vertex $x \in V(T_{\text{td}})$ with one child vertex y for which $B_x = B_y \cup \{v\}$ for some $v \notin B_y$. This bag is said to *introduce* v .
- (3) Introduce edge bag: an internal vertex $x \in V(T_{\text{td}})$ labeled with an edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ with one child bag y for which $u, v \in B_x = B_y$. This bag is said to *introduce* $\{u, v\}$.
- (4) Forget bag: an internal vertex $x \in V(T_{\text{td}})$ with one child bag y for which $B_x = B_y \setminus \{v\}$ for some $v \in B_y$. This bag is said to *forget* v .
- (5) Join bag: an internal vertex $x \in V(T_{\text{td}})$ with two child vertices p and q with $B_x = B_p = B_q$.

Moreover, every edge $\{u, v\} \in E(G)$ is introduced exactly once. Proposition 2.2 in [BCKN15] shows how to compute a nice tree decomposition from an arbitrary tree decomposition of the same tree width in polynomial time. A nice path decomposition is defined similarly and has no join bags. It is preferable to put the root vertex at one of the two leaf bags.

Branch decompositions. A *branch decomposition* of G is an unrooted binary tree T_{bd} in which edges are associated with subsets of $V(G)$, called *middle sets*. Each leaf in T_{bd} is associated with a unique edge of G . With each edge $x \in E(T_{\text{bd}})$ we associate the *middle set* B_x consisting of every vertex $v \in V(G)$ that appears in both subtrees obtained by removing x from T_{bd} . That is, for each vertex $v \in V(G)$ both of the subtrees have at least one leaf associated with a graph edge in G incident to v . The *width* of the branch decomposition is $\max_{x \in E(T_{\text{bd}})} |B_x| - 1$. The *branch width* $\text{bw}(G)$ of a graph is the minimum width of any branch decomposition of G . An optimal branch decomposition in a planar graph can be found in polynomial time, see Gu and Tamaki [GT08].

4.3. Vertex states in a graph decomposition. The correspondence between perfect matchings and good extensions (Lemma 14 and Lemma 15) makes it possible to count and detect optimally edge-weighted Hamiltonian cycles by considering all colorings in a dynamic programming fashion over graph decompositions. That is, recalling Section 2.5, we consider all ways to *simultaneously* produce a coloring $\lambda : L \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and as well as a perfect matching M in the corresponding bipartite graph F_λ . However, there will be no notion of ports of the vertices in L in our dynamic programming. Indeed, we will just make sure by our vertex states that every vertex in L is mapped twice. Since edges of the graph are considered in a fixed order across the dynamic programming over the graph decomposition, we may interpret the matching in F_λ we build to consistently use port 0 for the first edge we choose incident to any $\ell \in L \setminus \{s\}$, and port 1 for the second edge we choose incident to that ℓ . For $\ell = s$, to meet 11, we treat a chosen edge $\{s, u\}$ with $u \neq t$ to use port 1, and the second edge $\{s, t\}$ to use port 0. To make sure that we indeed pick $\{s, t\}$ as one of the two edges incident to s , we can use an extra global state bit.

One only needs four states per vertex to keep track of partial solutions. For each vertex in the original graph G , that now represents two vertices in the graph F_λ under a partial coloring of the vertices in L , we have the states

- (σ_{00}) we have not matched this vertex,
- (σ_{01}) we have matched this vertex once, and we have colored it 0 (blue),
- (σ_{10}) we have matched this vertex once, and we have colored it 1 (orange),
- (σ_{11}) we have matched this vertex twice.

We do however need to handle vertices in L and R differently. If we have a vertex $\ell \in L$ that is matched once with color c , we have to make sure that the next matching edge uses the same color c for the vertex ℓ . That is, we have already assigned a color to this vertex with λ and we need to stick to it. But for a vertex $r \in R$ that is matched once with color c , we have to make sure the next matching edge uses the *opposite* color $\bar{c} = 1 - c$, as we seek two edges that match differently colored vertices in R in our perfect matching in F_λ . We also only use the states σ_{00}, σ_{01} , and σ_{11} for the vertex s to make sure it gets the color 0 (blue).

TABLE 1. Mapping from vertex states for the endpoints of an edge $\{\ell, r\}$ to the new states, if any. Left: The states' mapping when $(\ell, r) \notin E(\vec{G}_e)$. Right: The states' mapping when $(\ell, r) \in E(\vec{G}_e)$.

$\ell \setminus r$	σ_{00}	σ_{01}	σ_{10}	σ_{11}	$\ell \setminus r$	σ_{00}	σ_{01}	σ_{10}	σ_{11}
σ_{00}	$(\sigma_{01}, \sigma_{01})$ $(\sigma_{10}, \sigma_{10})$	$(\sigma_{10}, \sigma_{11})$	$(\sigma_{01}, \sigma_{11})$	-	σ_{00}	$(\sigma_{01}, \sigma_{10})$ $(\sigma_{10}, \sigma_{01})$	$(\sigma_{01}, \sigma_{11})$	$(\sigma_{10}, \sigma_{11})$	-
σ_{01}	$(\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{01})$	-	$(\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{11})$	-	σ_{01}	$(\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{10})$	$(\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{11})$	-	-
σ_{10}	$(\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{10})$	$(\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{11})$	-	-	σ_{10}	$(\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{01})$	-	$(\sigma_{11}, \sigma_{11})$	-
σ_{11}	-	-	-	-	σ_{11}	-	-	-	-

4.4. Dynamic programming over a path decomposition. We will now see how we can solve minimum TSP over a path decomposition in Theorem 6.

Theorem 6 (Bipartite Pfaffian TSP parameterized by path width). *Given an edge-weighted bipartite Pfaffian graph G on n vertices along with a path decomposition of width $\text{pw}(G)$, we can compute the minimum weight Hamiltonian cycle in G in $4^{\text{pw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time.*

For a variable A , let $A :=_{\min} B$ be shorthand for $A := B$ if A was not previously assigned a value, and $A := \min(A, B)$ otherwise. Similarly, let $A :=_+ B$ be shorthand for $A := B$ if A was not previously assigned a value, and $A := A + B$ otherwise.

As input we are given an edge-weighted graph G with an edge weight function $w : E(G) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, and a path decomposition T_{pd} of width $\text{pw}(G)$. We will compute the optimum TSP tour from below up to the root node r of T_{pd} . We say a node y is *below* another node $x \neq r$ if the path from r to y in T_{pd} goes through x . We define for each vertex $x \in V(T_{\text{pd}})$ a map $M_x : \{\sigma_{00}, \sigma_{01}, \sigma_{10}, \sigma_{11}\}^{B_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$. The mapping captures for each set of states S on the vertices in the bag B_x , the smallest possible sum of edge weights for any matching such that

- (1) all vertices that are not in the bag B_x , but are in some bag for some node y below x , have been matched to the state σ_{11} ,
- (2) all vertices in the bag B_x have been matched to the corresponding state in S , and
- (3) all remaining vertices are unmatched and have state σ_{00} .

We evaluate the nodes in the path decomposition one at a time, starting with the leaf node on the other side of the root. The last node processed is the root (the leaf node on the other side of the path). If $\emptyset \in M_r$, we return $M_r(\emptyset)$ as the length of the shortest traveling salesperson tour through the edge e , otherwise we return that there is not any tour through e . We update the node's states as follows according to type of node. Let y be the current node and x its predecessor (if any):

- (1) *Leaf node.* If y is not the root, we set $M_y(\emptyset) := 0$. If y is the root, we set $M_y = M_x$ with x the forget bag adjacent to this leaf node y ,
- (2) *Introduce vertex node.* $B_y = B_x \cup \{v\}$. For every state $S \in M_x$, we add the state $S' = S + \{v \leftarrow \sigma_{00}\}$ to M_y with $M_y(S') :=_{\min} M_x(S)$.
- (3) *Introduce edge node.* $\{\ell, r\} \in B_y = B_x$, with $\ell \in L$ and $r \in R$. For every state $S \in M_x$, we first add the state $S \in M_y$ with $M_y(S) :=_{\min} M_x(S)$. Next, we add the state S' to M_y for every matching pair in Table 1 where we have replaced the states for ℓ and r in S with the ones given in the tables. We set $M_y(S') :=_{\min} M_x(S) + w(\{\ell, r\})$ to account for the weight of the added edge. Note that there are different state transitions depending on whether or not $(\ell, r) \in E(\vec{G}_e)$.
- (4) *Forget vertex node.* $B_y = B_x \setminus \{v\}$. For each state $S \in M_x$ such that $S(v) = \sigma_{11}$, add $S' = S - \{v\}$ to M_y with $M_y(S') :=_{\min} M_x(S)$.

This concludes the description of the algorithm and the proof of Theorem 6.

We next turn to the proof of Theorem 9.

TABLE 2. Matching states from B_x and B_y in the forget set marked with an “x”.
Left: For vertices in L . Right: For vertices in R .

L	σ_{00}	σ_{01}	σ_{10}	σ_{11}
σ_{00}				x
σ_{01}		x		
σ_{10}			x	
σ_{11}	x			

R	σ_{00}	σ_{01}	σ_{10}	σ_{11}
σ_{00}				x
σ_{01}			x	
σ_{10}		x		
σ_{11}	x			

Theorem 9 (Bipartite Pfaffian counting Hamiltonian cycles parameterized by path width). *Given a bipartite Pfaffian graph G on n vertices along with a path decomposition of width $\text{pw}(G)$, we can count the Hamiltonian cycles in G in $4^{\text{pw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time.*

To modify the algorithm to count Hamiltonian cycles in Theorem 9, we let M map to the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\xi]$ instead of $\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ with ξ a formal polynomial indeterminate. We set the initial state to $M(\emptyset) = 1$ and replace $M(S') :=_{\min} M(S) + w(\{\ell, r\})$ in the introduce-edge nodes with $M(S') :=_+ \xi M(S)$, and also replace the equality operator $:=_{\min}$ with $:=_+$ in all steps. Finally, we look at the coefficient of ξ^n in $M_r(\emptyset)$ to see how many Hamiltonian cycles go through the edge e . Summing over all edges e and dividing by n gives us the final count.

Note that since there are at most $4^{\text{pw}(G)+1}$ states to consider at each bag, the running time follows. This completes the proof of Theorem 9.

4.5. Dynamic programming over a branch decomposition. We will now see how we can solve minimum TSP over a branch decomposition to obtain Theorem 7.

Theorem 7 (Bipartite Pfaffian TSP parameterized by branch width). *Given an edge-weighted bipartite Pfaffian graph G on n vertices along with a branch decomposition of width $\text{bw}(G)$, we can compute the minimum weight Hamiltonian cycle in G in $8^{\text{bw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time.*

Given an edge weighted graph G with weights $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and a branch decomposition T_{bd} of width $\text{bw}(G)$ as input, we first insert a new root node r in T_{bd} at an arbitrary edge $\{u, v\} \in E(T_{\text{bd}})$ by subdividing it as $\{u, r\}$ and $\{r, v\}$. We will compute the optimum TSP tour from the leaves up to the root r in T_{bd} . We say an edge $y \in E(T_{\text{bd}})$ is *below* another edge $x \in E(T_{\text{bd}})$ with $x \neq r$ if the path joining r and y in T_{bd} goes through x . We define for each edge $x \in E(T_{\text{bd}})$ a map $M_x : \{\sigma_{00}, \sigma_{01}, \sigma_{10}, \sigma_{11}\}^{B_x} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$. The mapping captures for each set of states S on the vertices in the middle set B_x , the smallest possible sum of edge weights for any matching such that

- (1) all vertices that are not in the middle set B_x , but are in some middle set for some node y below x , have been matched to the state σ_{11} ,
- (2) all vertices in the middle set B_x have been matched to the corresponding state in S , and
- (3) all remaining vertices are unmatched and have state σ_{00} .

For any internal node $v \neq r$ in T_{bd} we have three incident edges x, y , and z ; let z be the unique edge closest to r in T_{bd} . We define the four pairwise disjoint sets

- (1) the Left set: $L_v = (B_x \cap B_z) \setminus B_y$,
- (2) the Right set: $R_v = (B_y \cap B_z) \setminus B_x$,
- (3) the Forget set: $F_v = (B_x \cap B_y) \setminus B_z$, and
- (4) the Intersection set: $I_v = B_x \cap B_y \cap B_z$.

By identifying the sets $B_x = L_v \cup F_v \cup I_v$, $B_y = R_v \cup F_v \cup I_v$, and $B_z = L_v \cup R_v \cup I_v$, we get a bound of $\text{bw}(G)$ on the size of each of these three unions. In particular

$$(16) \quad |I_v| + |L_v| + |R_v| + |F_v| \leq \frac{3}{2} \text{bw}(G).$$

We compute the mapping M for all edges in the branch decomposition tree in order from furthest to nearest the root r . For any leaf node v and its only incident edge z representing an edge $\{\ell, r\} \in E(G)$, we set $M_z(\ell \leftarrow \sigma_{00}, r \leftarrow \sigma_{00}) = 0$ and either

- (1) $M_z(\ell \leftarrow \sigma_{01}, r \leftarrow \sigma_{01}) = M_z(\ell \leftarrow \sigma_{10}, r \leftarrow \sigma_{10}) = w(\{\ell, r\})$ if $(\ell, r) \notin E(\vec{G}_e)$, or
- (2) $M_z(\ell \leftarrow \sigma_{01}, r \leftarrow \sigma_{10}) = M_z(\ell \leftarrow \sigma_{10}, r \leftarrow \sigma_{01}) = w(\{\ell, r\})$ if $(\ell, r) \in E(\vec{G}_e)$.

For any internal node w with three edges x, y , and z , with z closest to r , we do the following: For every state $S_x \in M_x$ and every state $S_y \in M_y$ such that vertices in I_v have the same state in S_x and S_y , and vertices in F_v have *matching* states in S_x and S_y according to Table 2, we define a new state S' by

- (1) taking I_v vertices' state values from both S_x and S_y (as they agree),
- (2) taking L_v vertices' state values from S_x , and
- (3) taking R_v vertices' state values from S_y .

We set $M_z(S') := \min M_x(S_x) + M_y(S_y)$.

Finally, for the two edges x and y incident to the root r , we list all pairs of states with $S_x \in M_x$ and $S_y \in M_y$ such that all vertices match according to Table 2. The minimum of $M_x(S_x) + M_y(S_y)$ over all such pairs is the length of the shortest Hamiltonian cycle in G .

This completes the description of the algorithm in Theorem 7. We observe that the running time is bounded by $4^{|I_v|+|L_v|+|R_v|+|F_v|}$ at every internal node v . This is at most $8^{\text{bw}(G)}$ by the bound in (16). The computation needed at the root vertex is at most $4^{\text{bw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ if we iterate over all states $S_x \in M_x$ and compute what the unique $S_y \in M_y$ is that matches S_x and look it up in an efficient dictionary structure for M_y . This completes the proof of Theorem 7.

We next turn to the proof of Theorem 10.

Theorem 10 (Bipartite Pfaffian counting Hamiltonian cycles parameterized by branch width). *Given a bipartite Pfaffian graph G on n vertices along with a branch decomposition of width $\text{bw}(G)$, we can count the Hamiltonian cycles in G in $2^{\omega \text{bw}(G)} \text{poly}(n)$ time, where $\omega < 2.373$.*

To modify the algorithm to count Hamiltonian cycles in Theorem 10, we again let M map to $\mathbb{Z}[\xi]$ with ξ a formal polynomial indeterminate. We set the initial states at the leaves to $M(\emptyset) = 1$ and either

- (1) $M_z(\ell \leftarrow \sigma_{01}, r \leftarrow \sigma_{01}) = M_z(\ell \leftarrow \sigma_{10}, r \leftarrow \sigma_{10}) = \xi$ if $(\ell, r) \notin E(\vec{G}_e)$, or
- (2) $M_z(\ell \leftarrow \sigma_{01}, r \leftarrow \sigma_{10}) = M_z(\ell \leftarrow \sigma_{10}, r \leftarrow \sigma_{01}) = \xi$ if $(\ell, r) \in E(\vec{G}_e)$.

We also replace $M_z(S') := \min M_x(S_x) + M_y(S_y)$ for $M_z(S') := + M_x(S_x)M_y(S_y)$ at the internal nodes. Finally, for the root r we compute the sum T over all pairs of states $S_x \in M_x$ and $S_y \in M_y$ such that vertices match according to Table 2 of $M_x(S_x)M_y(S_y)$. The coefficient of ξ^n in T is the number of Hamiltonian cycles through e . Summing this contribution over all edges e and dividing by n gives us the final count.

Contrary to the TSP case, there is a known technique to speed up the counting computation at every internal node proposed by Dorn [Dor06]. As we in this case want to compute a sum-product formula for each triple of states in I_v, L_v , and R_v at an internal node v , we can invoke fast matrix multiplication to get the counts faster than through a naïve enumeration. For each state $\iota \in I_v$, we define two matrices $A_{v,\iota}$ that is a $4^{|L_v|} \times 4^{|F_v|}$ matrix with rows representing states in L_v and columns states in F_v , and $B_{v,\iota}$ that is a $4^{|F_v|} \times 4^{|R_v|}$ matrix with columns representing states in R_v and rows representing states in F_v . However, the rows are *permuted* so that matching states according to Table 2 are paired up. That is, the forget set at column index i in $A_{v,\iota}$ and the forget set at row i in $B_{v,\iota}$ are such that each pair of vertex states match. This enables us to compute the matrix product $C_{v,\iota} = A_{v,\iota}B_{v,\iota}$ to get the state $\iota \cup \lambda \cup \rho$ by mapping it to the entry $C_{v,\iota}[\lambda, \rho]$. Dorn [Dor06] proved that the worst computation times occurs when $|L_v| = |R_v| = |F_v| = \frac{\text{bw}(G)}{2}$, which gives us the running time in Theorem 10.

Finally, we turn to Corollary 8 and Corollary 11, restated below for convenience.

Corollary 8 (Bipartite planar TSP). *Given an edge-weighted bipartite planar graph G on n vertices, we can compute the minimum weight Hamiltonian cycle in G in $O(2^{6.366\sqrt{n}})$ time.*

Corollary 11 (Bipartite planar counting of Hamiltonian cycles). *Given a bipartite planar graph G on n vertices, we can compute the number of Hamiltonian cycles in G in $O(2^{5.049\sqrt{n}})$ time.*

These follow from Theorem 7 and 10, respectively, after applying a bound on the branch width for planar graphs by Fomin and Thilikos [FT06]. They prove $\text{bw}(G) < 2.122\sqrt{n}$ in a planar graph, and as mentioned above, such a branch decomposition can be found in polynomial time. This concludes the description of our algorithmic results.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank the anonymous reviewers of an earlier version of this manuscript for their comments, in particular for pointing out [GSW23]. AB is supported by the VILLUM Foundation, Grant 16582. JN is supported by the project CRACKNP that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 853234).

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A. NP-COMPLETENESS IN PLANAR GRAPHS

In this section we prove that the degree requirement is necessary in Theorem 1 and 2, i.e., when we drop the minimum degree constraint, just detecting if the graph has another Hamiltonian cycle becomes NP-hard.

Theorem 17 (Hardness of detecting another Hamiltonian cycle). *Given a bipartite Pfaffian graph G and a Hamiltonian cycle H in G as input, it is NP-complete to decide whether G has a Hamiltonian cycle $H' \neq H$.*

The problem is clearly in NP as one can guess a Hamiltonian cycle in polynomial time and check that it is a Hamiltonian cycle and that it differs from the given one. Our hardness–reduction borrows several parts of the original proof by Garey, Johnson, and Tarjan [GJT76] that HAMILTONIAN CYCLE is NP-complete in planar graphs. In particular we use the xor-gadget and the cross-over construction from these reductions, see Figure 6 and Figure 8. We do however reduce from another problem than SAT as we find it easier to argue one-to-one correspondence between a Hamiltonian cycle and a solution to our NP-hard problem. We reduce from the EXACT SET COVER problem, that given an n -element universe U and a family \mathcal{F} of subsets of U asks if there is a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $\bigcup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} S = U$. Karp [Kar72] showed that EXACT SET COVER is NP-complete. Given an instance (U, \mathcal{F}) to EXACT SET COVER, we build a slightly larger instance (U, \mathcal{F}') , with $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{F} \cup \{U\}$, that is, we add a subset covering all of the universe by itself. With foresight, we will encode (U, \mathcal{F}') in a graph so that every solution to the EXACT SET COVER problem corresponds to a unique Hamiltonian cycle in the graph. We will then provide the Hamiltonian cycle corresponding to the solution $\mathcal{S} = \{U\}$ and ask for another Hamiltonian cycle. Any other Hamiltonian cycle will then by definition correspond to a solution to the original EXACT SET COVER instance (U, \mathcal{F}) .

A common component in our gadgets is the forced edge, drawn as a thick black edge in the figures. It is encoded by a path on three edges with two intermediate additional degree-two vertices. We will encode the condition for each $u \in U$ that exactly one subset in \mathcal{F} covers it with a gadget called avoid-one. The gadget encodes a set of choices c_1, \dots, c_k . It is depicted in Figure 5.




FIGURE 5. The avoid-one gadget. Left: The gadget itself. Thick edges must be used by a Hamiltonian cycle. This is accomplished by replacing each thick edge with a path on three edges and two additional degree-two vertices. The key property of the gadget is that in any Hamiltonian cycle in our final construction, exactly one of the k choice edges c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k is not part of the cycle. Middle: Any Hamiltonian cycle enters and exits only at the terminals a and b avoiding exactly one of the choices, here c_2 . It will follow from the rest of the construction that the Hamiltonian cycle could not enter and exit also via a choice edge, since that part would then form a cycle of its own. Right: A schematic version of the gadget used in subsequent figures.

We also need the xor-gadget that given a pair of edge-connected vertex pairs a_1, a_2 and b_1, b_2 ensures that a Hamiltonian cycle either goes through a_1, a_2 or b_1, b_2 but not both, see Figure 6.



FIGURE 6. The xor-gadget. Left: The gadget itself. Thick edges must be used by a Hamiltonian cycle. The key property of the gadget is that in any Hamiltonian cycle in our final construction, either the cycle enters and leaves through a_1 and a_2 or through b_1 and b_2 , but not both. Right: A schematic version of the gadget used in subsequent figures.

Our instance graph will have one strain of subset choice gadgets at the top, and one strain of avoid-one gadgets for each element in the universe U at the bottom. The two strains are connected with each other at both the left and right end. Between the two strains run several xor-gadgets that ensure consistence of the subset selection and the universe cover. See Figure 7. Note that the xor-gadgets may cross each other but any such crossing can be resolved by a well-known uncrossing gadget from [GJT76], see Figure 8. This completes our construction.




FIGURE 7. An instance corresponding to the EXACT SET COVER instance $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_6\}$ and $\mathcal{F} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_6\}$. Only two subsets $S_3 = \{u_1, u_4, u_5\}$ and $S_4 = \{u_2, u_3, u_4\}$ are drawn for clarity.




FIGURE 8. Crossing and uncrossing. Left: Two crossing xor-gadgets. Right: Uncrossing via the cross-over construction from [GJT76].

We now proceed with a proof Theorem 17. We will first argue that the set of solutions to the EXACT COVER instance (U, \mathcal{F}') corresponds one-to-one to the Hamiltonian cycles in the constructed graph. First consider any solution $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{F}'$ to the EXACT COVER instance (U, \mathcal{F}') . We can construct a Hamiltonian cycle through the constructed graph by taking the upper path (c.f. Figure 7) on each subset choice gadget for each subset $S_i \in \mathcal{F} \setminus \mathcal{S}$, and the lower path for each subset choice gadget $S_i \in \mathcal{S}$, including covering all vertices in the associated xor-gadgets. Since this is a solution to the EXACT COVER problem, this part of the cycle will block exactly one of the choice edges in each avoid-one gadget with the corresponding xor-gadget, and we can take the unique path from

a to b in the gadget that passes every vertex of the gadget and avoids using the one choice edge which is blocked from the subset choice gadget string side.

In the other direction, any Hamiltonian cycle must cover all choice edges in an avoid-one gadget except precisely one, since the xor-gadgets assure us that we cannot have paths entering and exiting at both sides. That means in particular that it is impossible for the Hamiltonian cycle to leave an avoid-one gadget in a choice edge to continue in a subset choice gadget (and vice versa). The path has to return to the other end of the choice edge. The omitted choice edge in each avoid-one gadget must be covered from the subset choice gadget string side, which forces the Hamiltonian cycle to take the lower path exactly for the subsets needed to cover U in a solution to the EXACT COVER instance (U, \mathcal{F}') .

The proof now follows by providing the unique Hamiltonian cycle that represents the planted solution $\mathcal{S} = \{U\}$ and ask for another one. By the above one-to-one relationship, that other Hamiltonian cycle encodes a solution to (U, \mathcal{F}) , which is NP-hard to find. This completes the proof of Theorem 17. \square

REFERENCES

- [ANS80] Takanori Akiyama, Takao Nishizeki, and Nobuji Saito. NP-completeness of the Hamiltonian cycle problem for bipartite graphs. *Journal of Information Processing*, 3:73–76, 1980.
- [BCKN15] Hans Bodlaender, Marek Cygan, Stefan Kratsch, and Jesper Nederlof. Deterministic single exponential time algorithms for connectivity problems parameterized by treewidth. *Information and Computation*, 243:86–111, 2015. 40th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP 2013). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2014.12.008>.
- [Bjö14] Andreas Björklund. Determinant sums for undirected Hamiltonicity. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 43(1):280–299, 2014.
- [BKK⁺07] Kevin Buchin, Christian Knauer, Klaus Kriegel, André Schulz, and Raimund Seidel. On the number of cycles in planar graphs. In Guohui Lin, editor, *Computing and Combinatorics, 13th Annual International Conference, COCOON 2007, Banff, Canada, July 16-19, 2007, Proceedings*, volume 4598 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 97–107. Springer, 2007. doi:[10.1007/978-3-540-73545-8_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-73545-8_12).
- [Bos67] J. Bosák. Hamiltonian lines in cubic graphs. In *Theory of Graphs, International Symposium, Rome, July 1966*, pages 35–46. Gordon & Breach, New York, 1967.
- [BS22] Marcin Briański and Adam Szady. A short note on graphs with long Thomason chains. *Discrete Mathematics*, 345(1):112624, 2022. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2021.112624>.
- [BST99] Cristina Bazgan, Miklos Santha, and Zsolt Tuza. On the approximation of finding a(nother) Hamiltonian cycle in cubic Hamiltonian graphs. *J. Algorithms*, 31(1):249–268, 1999. doi:[10.1006/jagm.1998.0998](https://doi.org/10.1006/jagm.1998.0998).
- [Cam01] Kathie Cameron. Thomason’s algorithm for finding a second hamiltonian circuit through a given edge in a cubic graph is exponential on Krawczyk’s graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 235(1):69–77, 2001. Czech and Slovak 3. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X\(00\)00260-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0012-365X(00)00260-0).
- [CKN18] Marek Cygan, Stefan Kratsch, and Jesper Nederlof. Fast Hamiltonicity checking via bases of perfect matchings. *J. ACM*, 65(3):12:1–12:46, 2018.
- [CLN18] Radu Curticapean, Nathan Lindzey, and Jesper Nederlof. A tight lower bound for counting Hamiltonian cycles via matrix rank. In Artur Czumaj, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2018, New Orleans, LA, USA, January 7-10, 2018*, pages 1080–1099. SIAM, 2018. doi:[10.1137/1.9781611975031.70](https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611975031.70).
- [CNP⁺22] Marek Cygan, Jesper Nederlof, Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, Johan M. M. Van Rooij, and Jakub Onufry Wojtaszczyk. Solving connectivity problems parameterized by treewidth in single exponential time. *ACM Transactions on Algorithms*, 18(2), 2022. doi:[10.1145/3506707](https://doi.org/10.1145/3506707).
- [CO07] G.L. Chia and Siew-Hui Ong. Hamilton cycles in cubic graphs. *AKCE International Journal of Graphs and Combinatorics*, 4(3):251–259, 2007. doi:[10.1080/09728600.2007.12088840](https://doi.org/10.1080/09728600.2007.12088840).
- [dCLM05] Marcelo H. de Carvalho, Cláudio L. Lucchesi, and U. S.R. Murty. On the number of dissimilar pfaffian orientations of graphs. *RAIRO - Theoretical Informatics and Applications*, 39(1):93–113, 2005. doi:[10.1051/ita:2005005](https://doi.org/10.1051/ita:2005005).
- [DKW06] Vladimir G. Deĭneko, Bettina Klinz, and Gerhard J. Woeginger. Exact algorithms for the hamiltonian cycle problem in planar graphs. *Oper. Res. Lett.*, 34(3):269–274, 2006. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orl.2005.04.013>, doi:[10.1016/J.ORL.2005.04.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ORL.2005.04.013).
- [DMSZ20] Argyrios Deligkas, George B. Mertzios, Paul G. Spirakis, and Viktor Zamaraev. Exact and approximate algorithms for computing a second hamiltonian cycle. In Javier Esparza and Daniel Král’, editors, *45th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 2020, August 24-28, 2020, Prague, Czech Republic*, volume 170 of *LIPICs*, pages 27:1–27:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020. doi:[10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2020.27](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.MFCS.2020.27).
- [Dor06] Frederic Dorn. Dynamic programming and fast matrix multiplication. In Yossi Azar and Thomas Erlebach, editors, *Algorithms - ESA 2006, 14th Annual European Symposium, Zurich, Switzerland, September 11-13, 2006, Proceedings*, volume 4168 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 280–291. Springer, 2006. doi:[10.1007/11841036_27](https://doi.org/10.1007/11841036_27).
- [DPBF10] Frederic Dorn, Eelko Penninkx, Hans L. Bodlaender, and Fedor V. Fomin. Efficient exact algorithms on planar graphs: Exploiting sphere cut decompositions. *Algorithmica*, 58(3):790–810, 2010. doi:[10.1007/s00453-009-9296-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-009-9296-1).
- [FT06] Fedor V. Fomin and Dimitrios M. Thilikos. New upper bounds on the decomposability of planar graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 51(1):53–81, 2006. doi:[10.1002/jgt.20121](https://doi.org/10.1002/jgt.20121).
- [GJT76] M. R. Garey, D. S. Johnson, and R. Endre Tarjan. The planar Hamiltonian circuit problem is NP-complete. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 5(4):704–714, 1976. doi:[10.1137/0205049](https://doi.org/10.1137/0205049).
- [GSW23] Maximilian Gorsky, Raphael Steiner, and Sebastian Wiederrecht. Matching theory and barnette’s conjecture. *Discrete Mathematics*, 346(2):113249, 2023.

- URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012365X22004551>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2022.113249>.
- [GT08] Qian-Ping Gu and Hisao Tamaki. Optimal branch-decomposition of planar graphs in $o(n^3)$ time. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 4(3), jul 2008. doi:[10.1145/1367064.1367070](https://doi.org/10.1145/1367064.1367070).
- [Had15] Haddadan, Arash. Finding a second hamiltonian cycle in barnette graphs. Master’s thesis, 2015. URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/10012/9630>.
- [HMM85] Derek A. Holton, Bennet Manvel, and Brendan D. McKay. Hamiltonian cycles in cubic 3-connected bipartite planar graphs. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. B*, 38:279–297, 1985.
- [IPZ01] Russell Impagliazzo, Ramamohan Paturi, and Francis Zane. Which problems have strongly exponential complexity? *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 63(4):512–530, 2001. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.2001.1774>.
- [Kar72] Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In Raymond E. Miller and James W. Thatcher, editors, *Proceedings of a symposium on the Complexity of Computer Computations, held March 20-22, 1972, at the IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, New York, USA*, The IBM Research Symposia Series, pages 85–103. Plenum Press, New York, 1972. doi:[10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-2001-2_9).
- [Kas67] Pieter W. Kasteleyn. Graph theory and crystal physics. *Graph Theory and Theoretical Physics*, pages 43–110, 1967.
- [Kel94] A.K. Kelmans. Constructions of cubic bipartite 3-connected graphs without Hamiltonian cycles. *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.*, 158:127–140, 1994.
- [Kin09] Shiva Kintali. Finding a second Hamilton circuit. 2009. URL: <https://kintali.wordpress.com/2009/07/25/finding-a-second-hamiltonian-circuit/>
- [Kra99] Adam Krawczyk. The complexity of finding a second Hamiltonian cycle in cubic graphs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 58(3):641–647, 1999. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.1998.1611>.
- [Lit74] Charles H. C. Little. An extension of Kasteleyn’s method of enumerating the 1-factors of planar graphs. In *Combinatorial Mathematics (Proc. Second Australian Conf., Univ. Melbourne, Melbourne, 1973)*, number 403 in Lecture Notes in Mathematics, pages 63–72. Springer, Berlin, 1974.
- [Lit75] Charles H. C. Little. A characterization of convertible $(0, 1)$ -matrices. *J. Combinatorial Theory*, 18:187–208, 1975.
- [McC04] William McCuaig. Pólya’s permanent problem. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 11(1), 2004.
- [Ned20] Jesper Nederlof. Bipartite TSP in $O(1.9999^n)$ time, assuming quadratic time matrix multiplication. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2020, Chicago, IL, USA, June 22-26, 2020*, pages 40–53. ACM, 2020. doi:[10.1145/3357713.3384264](https://doi.org/10.1145/3357713.3384264).
- [Nor05] Serguei Norine. *Matching structure and Pfaffian orientations of graphs*. PhD thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2005.
- [Pap94] Christos H. Papadimitriou. On the complexity of the parity argument and other inefficient proofs of existence. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 48(3):498–532, 1994. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0000\(05\)80063-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0000(05)80063-7).
- [PBvR17] Willem J. A. Pino, Hans L. Bodlaender, and Johan M. M. van Rooij. Cut and Count and Representative Sets on Branch Decompositions. In Jiong Guo and Danny Hermelin, editors, *11th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation (IPEC 2016)*, volume 63 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 27:1–27:12, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2017. Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. URL: <http://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2017/6945>, doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.IPEC.2016.27](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.IPEC.2016.27).
- [Pin16] Willem J. A. Pino. Cut and count and representative sets on branch decompositions. Master’s thesis, Utrecht university, August 2016.
- [RS86] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. II. Algorithmic aspects of tree-width. *Journal of Algorithms*, 7(3):309–322, 1986.
- [RS91] Neil Robertson and Paul D. Seymour. Graph minors. X. Obstructions to tree-decomposition. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 52(2):153–190, 1991. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0095-8956\(91\)90061-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0095-8956(91)90061-N).
- [RST99] Neil Robertson, Paul D. Seymour, and Robin Thomas. Permanents, Pfaffian orientations, and even directed circuits. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 150(3):929–975, 1999. doi:[10.2307/121059](https://doi.org/10.2307/121059).
- [She75] John Sheehan. The multiplicity of Hamiltonian circuits in a graph. In *Recent advances in graph theory (Proc. 2nd Czechoslovak Sympos., Prague, 1974)*, pages 477–480. Academia, Prague, 1975.
- [Tho78] Andrew G. Thomason. Hamiltonian cycles and uniquely edge colourable graphs. In B. Bollobas, editor, *Advances in Graph Theory*, volume 3 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, pages 259–268. Elsevier, 1978. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-5060\(08\)70511-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-5060(08)70511-9).
- [Tho96] Carsten Thomassen. On the number of Hamiltonian cycles in bipartite graphs. *Combinatorics, Probability & Computing*, 5:437–442, 1996.

- [Tho97] Carsten Thomassen. Chords of longest cycles in cubic graphs. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 71(2):211–214, 1997. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0095895697917767>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1006/jctb.1997.1776>.
- [Tut46] William T. Tutte. On Hamiltonian circuits. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 21:98–101, 1946.
- [Tut69] William T. Tutte, editor. *Recent Progress in Combinatorics: Proceedings. New York*. Academic Press, 1969.
- [Wes96] Douglas B. West. *Introduction to Graph Theory*. Prentice Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, 1996.
- [Wło19] Michał Włodarczyk. Clifford algebras meet tree decompositions. *Algorithmica*, 81(2):497–518, 2019. doi:[10.1007/s00453-018-0489-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00453-018-0489-3).
- [Zho18] Liang Zhong. The complexity of Thomason’s algorithm for finding a second Hamiltonian cycle. *Bulletin of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 98(1):18–26, 2018. doi:[10.1017/S0004972718000242](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972718000242).