

# Trail Trap: a variant of Partizan Edge Geography

Calum Buchanan<sup>1</sup>   MacKenzie Carr<sup>2</sup>   Alexander Clifton<sup>3</sup>   Stephen G. Hartke<sup>4</sup>  
 Vesna Iršič<sup>5</sup>   Nicholas Sieger<sup>6</sup>   Rebecca Whitman<sup>7</sup>

May 13, 2024

## Abstract

We study a two-player game played on undirected graphs called Trail Trap, which is a variant of a game known as Partizan Edge Geography. One player starts by choosing any edge and moving a token from one endpoint to the other; the other player then chooses a different edge and does the same. Alternating turns, each player moves their token along an unused edge from its current vertex to an adjacent vertex, until one player cannot move and loses. We present an algorithm to determine which player has a winning strategy when the graph is a tree, and partially characterize the trees on which a given player wins. Additionally, we show that Trail Trap is NP-hard, even for connected bipartite planar graphs with maximum degree 4 as well as for disconnected graphs. We determine which player has a winning strategy for certain subclasses of complete bipartite graphs and grid graphs, and we propose several open problems for further study.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $G = (V(G), E(G))$  be a graph (all graphs we consider are undirected, finite, and simple). A *walk* on  $G$  is a sequence  $v_1 v_2 \dots v_m$  of vertices in  $V(G)$  such that  $v_i v_{i+1} \in E(G)$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$ . A *trail* is a walk with no repeated edges and a *path* is a trail with no repeated vertices. In this work, we study a perfect information game, *Trail Trap*, first introduced in [1], in which two players compete to build edge-disjoint trails on  $G$ .

To begin a game of Trail Trap on a graph  $G$ , Player 1 (P1) chooses a starting vertex on which to place their token, then moves the token along an incident edge  $e$  (should such an edge exist) to an adjacent vertex, completing their turn. Player 2 (P2) then places their token on any vertex, and moves it along an incident edge  $f \neq e$  (should such an edge exist), to its second endpoint. Continuing with P1, the players alternate turns, each moving their token from its current vertex along an unused edge to a neighboring vertex. A player cannot make a move along an edge previously used by either player, but there are no restrictions on vertices: a player may place their token on the same vertex multiple times throughout the game, and the two tokens may simultaneously occupy a vertex. The first player unable to make a move loses the game. Since  $|E(G)|$  is finite, Trail Trap cannot end in a draw.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics & Statistics, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT, USA [calum.buchanan@uvm.edu](mailto:calum.buchanan@uvm.edu)

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada [mackenzie\\_carr@sfu.ca](mailto:mackenzie_carr@sfu.ca)

<sup>3</sup>Discrete Mathematics Group, Institute for Basic Science, Daejeon, South Korea [yoa@ibs.re.kr](mailto:yoa@ibs.re.kr)

<sup>4</sup>Department of Mathematical and Statistical Sciences, University of Colorado Denver, USA [stephen.hartke@ucdenver.edu](mailto:stephen.hartke@ucdenver.edu)

<sup>5</sup>University of Ljubljana, Slovenia [vesna.irsic@fmf.uni-lj.si](mailto:vesna.irsic@fmf.uni-lj.si)

<sup>6</sup>University of California, San Diego, CA, USA [nsieger@ucsd.edu](mailto:nsieger@ucsd.edu)

<sup>7</sup>University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA [rebecca\\_whitman@berkeley.edu](mailto:rebecca_whitman@berkeley.edu)

We denote a *move* on a graph  $G$ , the act of moving a token from one vertex  $u$  to an adjacent vertex  $v$ , by  $u \rightarrow v$ . Interchangeably, we say that a player *moves* from  $u$  to  $v$ . An edge  $uv$  is *used* if either player has moved from  $u$  to  $v$  or from  $v$  to  $u$  on any previous turn, and *unused* otherwise. Each player’s sequence of moves, at every turn, forms a trail through the graph. Thus, rather than moving tokens, we can think of the players as constructing edge-disjoint trails on the graph.

We provide an example of gameplay on the “diamond” graph  $G$ , illustrated in Figure 1. Suppose P1 first makes the move  $b \rightarrow c$ , and suppose P2 begins their trail with  $c \rightarrow d$ . From here, P1’s second move must be  $c \rightarrow a$ , since this is the only unused edge incident to  $c$ . Similarly, P2’s second move is  $d \rightarrow b$ , and P1 then makes the move  $a \rightarrow b$ . Since P2 has no available moves out of vertex  $b$  (indeed, all the edges in the graph are used), the game is over and P1 wins.




Figure 1: Sample gameplay on the diamond graph, with five consecutive game states shown.

However, P2’s first move  $c \rightarrow d$  wasn’t optimal, and with a different first move, P2 can ensure victory. In fact, with optimal play, P2 can win on  $G$  no matter P1’s first move. We leave this as an exercise to the reader.

To win, P1 must construct a trail strictly longer than that of P2, but P2 wins if the trails are the same length. In general, we say that a player has a *winning strategy* on a graph  $G$  if they can win Trail Trap on  $G$  no matter the other player’s moves. If P1 has a winning strategy on  $G$ , then we say that  $G$  is *P1-win* (*P2-win* is defined analogously). As Trail Trap is a two-player perfect information game, exactly one of P1 and P2 wins on any given graph. In this paper, we address the problem of characterizing P1-win graphs for several families, including complete bipartite graphs and trees. We also give a polynomial-time algorithm to determine the winner of Trail Trap on trees and prove that determining a winner is NP-hard even on some restricted graph classes.

In the following subsection, we provide a brief survey of Geography games, of which Trail Trap can be considered a variant. Then, in Section 2, we provide a P1-win condition and a P2-win condition for Trail Trap which each apply to many classes of graphs. In Section 3, we give exact win conditions for subsets of complete graphs, complete bipartite graphs, grid graphs, and prism graphs. In Section 4, we characterize the P1-win trees and give an  $O(n^2)$  algorithm to determine the winner for trees of order  $n$ . In Section 5, we prove that determining the winner is NP-hard on several restricted classes of graphs. Open questions arise in each section, and we summarize these in Section 6.

### 1.1 Related Geography games

Trail Trap can be seen as a variant of Geography, part of a larger family of walk-construction games (see [3]). Geography is a two-player game in which players take turns moving a single, shared token from one vertex to an adjacent vertex, beginning at a fixed starting vertex (or root). In Vertex Geography, no vertex can

be repeated, and in Edge Geography, no edge can be repeated. As in Trail Trap, the winner is the last player able to make a legal move. Both Vertex and Edge Geography can be played on directed or undirected graphs.

Vertex Geography is the simplest game in the Geography family, and Fraenkel, Scheinerman, and Ullman [11] provide an exact characterization of when each player wins on an undirected graph  $G$  with a given starting vertex  $v$ . Specifically, they show that  $(G, v)$  is P1-win if and only if every maximum matching in  $G$  includes an edge incident to  $v$ . In Unrooted Vertex Geography, a generalization where P1’s first move is to choose the starting vertex (and then P2 makes the first “full” move to a new vertex), the graph  $G$  is P2-win if and only if it has a perfect matching. It follows that the winners of both of these variants can be computed in polynomial time [9]. Monti and Sinaireri [15] consider a modified version of Vertex Geography where the goal is to determine whether P1 can force a win within  $k$  moves. They show that this problem is PSPACE-complete, even for bipartite graphs, but can be solved in polynomial time for trees.

Edge Geography is typically more complicated than Vertex Geography. The winner for Edge Geography on undirected graphs can be computed in polynomial time for a few special families, including bipartite and complete graphs [11]. However, Undirected Edge Geography in general is PSPACE-complete, even for subcubic planar graphs. The same holds for an unrooted generalization defined analogously to Unrooted Vertex Geography. On directed graphs, both Vertex Geography and Edge Geography are PSPACE-complete (for these general results, see Lichtenstein and Sipser [14], and Schaefer [17]).

Alternatively, there are *partizan* variants of Vertex and Edge Geography, where each player has a separate token and only moves their own token. (Note that in the literature “partizan” sometimes has an alternate meaning where there are distinct rules for each player; for instance, in [6]). Partizan games are typically more computationally complex than shared-token games. Fraenkel and Simonson [12] show that the winning player in both Partizan Vertex Geography and Partizan Edge Geography can be determined in  $O(n^2)$  time for directed trees and  $O(n)$  time for undirected trees, where  $n$  is the order of the graph. However, no other classes are known to be solvable in polynomial time. Fox and Geissler [10] show that Partizan Vertex Geography is PSPACE-complete for undirected bipartite graphs. Partizan Vertex Geography and Partizan Edge Geography are both NP-hard for directed acyclic graphs and directed planar graphs [12]. Both games are known to be PSPACE-complete on bipartite digraphs with bounded degree: specifically, where the in-degree and out-degree of each vertex is at most two, and their sum is at most three [12].

Trail Trap is formally a variant of Unrooted Partizan Edge Geography. In this variation, each player places a token *and* moves along an edge on their first turn. In contrast, in the other unrooted (unpartizan) games considered in [12], P1 places the token on their first turn, and P2 is the first to move the token. This additional degree of freedom for the players can change the outcome of the game. For example, the path on three vertices is P1-win in the game where both players place tokens before either moves, but P2-win in Trail Trap.

## 2 Preliminaries

We briefly introduce definitions and notation pertaining to degrees, distance, and moves. We adopt the standard graph-theoretic notation used in [8] and refer the reader there for additional background.

Given a graph  $G$ , the *degree* of a vertex  $v$  in  $V(G)$ , denoted by  $\deg_G(v)$ , is the number of edges in  $E(G)$  incident to  $v$ . The *distance* between vertices  $u, v \in V(G)$ , denoted by  $d_G(u, v)$ , is the length of the shortest path from  $u$  to  $v$ . By convention,  $d_G(u, v) = \infty$  if there is no path from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $G$ . We write  $\deg(v)$  and  $d(u, v)$  if the graph is clear from context.

In a game of Trail Trap on  $G$ , a *move*  $m$  is formally an ordered pair  $u \rightarrow v$ , where  $uv \in E(G)$ . Let

$u$  be the *tail* of move  $m$  and  $v$  be the *head*. We let  $m^{-1}$  denote the move  $v \rightarrow u$ . Let  $M$  be the set of possible moves on  $G$ . We label turns alternating players, such that P1's first move is turn 1, P2's first move is turn 2, and so on. (There is no formal difference between a move and a turn, but the colloquial usage of turn as a "time to make a move" is useful for us.) For a natural number  $r \leq |E(G)|$ , an  $r$ -*partial game*  $S$  of Trail Trap is an ordered  $r$ -tuple of moves, such that each edge of  $G$  occurs at most once and, for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, r-2\}$ , the head of move  $i$  is equal to the tail of move  $i+2$ . An  $r$ -partial game is *incomplete* (has a legal continuation) if there exists an edge of  $G$  not in  $S$  and incident to the head of move  $r-1$ . Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be the set of all  $r$ -partial games, over all  $0 \leq r \leq |E(G)|$ , and let  $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  be the subset of incomplete  $r$ -partial games.

We also introduce several definitions related to graph connectivity and trails. A graph  $G$  is *connected* if there exists a trail on  $G$  between any pair of its vertices, and  $G$  is *disconnected* if it contains at least two *components*, or maximal connected subgraphs. Given a trail  $t = v_1 v_2 \dots v_m$  on  $G$ , let  $\ell(t) = m-1$  be the length of  $t$ . Let  $\ell(G)$  be the maximum length of a trail on  $G$ . We denote the maximum length of a trail on  $G$  that starts at a given vertex  $v$  by  $\ell(G, v)$ .

In Trail Trap, each player's trail is restricted to a single component of  $G$ . On a disconnected graph  $G$ , there are two ways a game of Trail Trap can go: either both players make trails on the same component, or each plays on a separate component. If both players draw trails on the same component  $H$ , then it suffices to determine a winner for  $H$ . If both players use different components, however, then the game runs in parallel, with the players unable to interfere with one another's trails. The longest trail on a disconnected graph is important, but does not completely determine who wins. Figure 2 shows an example graph  $G$  where the longest trail is in a component which induces a P1-win graph, but  $G$  itself is P2-win. In a winning strategy for P1 on  $G$ , P1 must end their first move on the vertex of degree 3 (see Corollary 10 later for a proof). However, P1 can then create a trail of at most four edges, which P2 can match on the other component.




Figure 2: A disconnected P2-win graph in which the component containing the longest trail is a P1-win graph.

**Proposition 1.** *A disconnected graph  $G$  is P1-win if and only if there exists a component  $H$  with a trail  $t = v_1 v_2 \dots v_{m+1}$  such that there exists a winning strategy  $f$  for P1 on  $H$  with  $f(\emptyset) = v_1 \rightarrow v_2$ , and for all other components  $H'$  of  $G$ ,  $\ell(H') < m$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be disconnected. Suppose first that  $G$  is P1-win and that P1 has a winning strategy on  $G$  beginning with the move  $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$  on component  $H$ . It follows that  $H$  is P1-win and that there is a winning strategy for P1 on  $H$  beginning with the move  $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$ . Suppose that the longest trail on  $H$  beginning with  $v_1 v_2$  has length  $m$ . If there exists another component  $H'$  where  $\ell(H') \geq m$ , then P2 can play on  $H'$  and create a trail at least as long as P1's longest possible trail. Hence, P2 would win on  $G$ . Thus,  $\ell(H') < m$ .

Conversely, suppose that there exists a component  $H$  such that  $H$  is P1-win, a winning strategy for P1 on  $H$  that starts with the move  $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$ , a trail of length  $m$  on  $H$  beginning with edge  $v_1v_2$ , and no other component  $H'$  satisfying  $\ell(H') \geq m$ . We can construct a winning strategy for P1 on  $G$  as follows. First, P1 plays the move  $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$ . If P2 plays on a separate component, they get a trail of length less than  $m$  while P1 can continue along a trail of length  $m$ . Thus, P2 is forced to play on  $H$ . However, as there exists some winning strategy for P1 on  $H$ , beginning with the move  $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$ , P1 can now win by following that P1-win strategy for Trail Trap on  $H$ .  $\square$

To determine the winner on a disconnected graph, we must be able to compare the maximum trail length of components in general and from any given starting vertex. In Section 5 we discuss the computational complexity of determining the maximum trail length of a graph, and show that this problem is NP-hard. Upper and lower bounds are known for maximum trail length on a graph with a given number of vertices and edges [5], but nothing more specific is known, despite the invariant's simplicity. For a given connected graph  $G$ , it is well known that there is a trail containing every edge in  $G$  if and only if  $G$  contains at most two vertices of odd degree. If  $G$  contains no vertices of odd degree, then  $G$  is Eulerian, and there exists a trail containing every edge and beginning and ending on the same vertex. Some related material exists on partitioning the edges of a graph into Eulerian trails [13], and determining the number of edges by which a graph is deficient from being Eulerian [4]. Without an independent means of determining maximum trail length, Proposition 1 is insufficient for determining a winner on a disconnected graph. As a counterpart to Proposition 1, we show in Section 5 that Trail Trap is NP-hard even on disconnected graphs.

There are some special cases for which the winner of Trail Trap can be easily determined. Trivially, if  $|E(G)| = \emptyset$ , then  $G$  is P2-win (P1 is the first to be unable to move), and if  $|E(G)| = 1$ , then  $G$  is P1-win. We assume henceforth that  $|E(G)| \geq 2$ . Observe also that graphs with maximum degree at most 2 (including all paths and cycles) are P2-win since P1 is limited to making only one move (either by the choice of move or by P2 making a move on the only edge where P1 could have moved next). A generalization of this observation is discussed in Corollary 10.

Another broad strategy is what Berlekamp, Conway, and Guy [2] call the ‘‘Tweedledee and Tweedledum’’ strategy, where P2 mirrors each of P1’s moves. The result also holds on multigraphs.

**Proposition 2.** *If a graph  $G$  has an involutive automorphism with no fixed edges, then  $G$  is P2-win.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a graph with an involutive automorphism  $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow V(G)$  with no fixed edges. If P1 moves  $v_i \rightarrow v_j$  on turn  $k$ , then P2 moves  $\phi(v_i) \rightarrow \phi(v_j)$  on turn  $k + 1$ . The move is legal since, if  $k \geq 3$ , P2 ended their previous move on  $\phi(v_i)$ , and since edge  $v_iv_j$  was unused before turn  $k$ , it follows that  $\phi(v_i)\phi(v_j)$  was unused before turn  $k + 1$ . Hence P2 can always play after P1; as  $G$  is finite, P2 wins.  $\square$

### 3 The Game on Common Graph Families

We consider a number of classes of graphs, to illustrate strategies on Trail Trap as well as the difficulty of the problem. Almost all graphs on four or fewer vertices (still with at least two edges) are P2-win. There are two exceptions:  $K_{1,3}$  and  $K_4$ . This trend appears to continue: we show computationally that most small connected graphs are P2-win (see Table 1).

We use a depth-first recursive algorithm to evaluate if a given graph  $G$  is P1-win or P2-win. We say a player wins an incomplete  $r$ -partial game  $I$  if they can win the game on  $G$  with optimal play, given that both players’ starting sequence of moves was the partial game  $I$ . For any incomplete  $r$ -partial game  $I$ , we iterate through all possible moves for the player whose turn it is and assert that they can win  $I$  with optimal play if and only if they can win at least one of the resulting  $(r + 1)$ -partial games extending  $I$ .

$n$	Number of Graphs	P2-win	Percent P2-win
3	2	2	100%
4	6	4	67%
5	21	17	81%
6	112	88	79%
7	853	734	86%

Table 1: The number of P2-win graphs out of graphs with a small number of vertices.

We justify why the above algorithm works. Given  $G$  and an incomplete  $r$ -partial game  $I$  on  $G$ , let  $E_I$  be the set of edges of  $G$  unused in  $I$  and let  $G_I = (V(G), E_I)$ . Consider the set  $\mathcal{J}$  of  $(r + 1)$ -partial games extending  $I$ , such that for any given  $J \in \mathcal{J}$ , the sequence of the first  $r$  moves of  $J$  is equal to  $I$ , and the tail of move  $r + 1$  is equal to the head of move  $r - 1$ . Suppose  $r$  is odd, such that P1 plays first on  $G_J$ . If for all  $J \in \mathcal{J}$  there exists a winning strategy for P1 on  $G_J$  where the tail of the first move is equal to the head of move  $r$ , then by following the strategy, P1 wins  $I$  with optimal play. Failing this, P2 wins, since there exists an  $(r + 1)$ -partial game  $J$  unwinnable by P1. If  $r$  is even, then an analogous argument shows that P2 wins  $I$  with optimal play if and only if for all  $J \in \mathcal{J}$  there exists a winning strategy for P2 on  $G_J$  where the tail of the first move is equal to the head of move  $r$ .

For highly symmetric graphs, such as complete or complete bipartite graphs, we speed up the computations by limiting the choices for the first few moves, without loss of generality.

We continue by considering complete graphs. For small cases, we are able to determine the winner by hand. The following proposition is due to Arneman, Catanzaro, and Danison [1], but restated here with a shorter proof.

**Proposition 3.** *The complete graph  $K_4$  is P1-win, and  $K_5$  is P2-win.*

*Proof.* Denote the vertices of  $K_n$  by  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$ . On  $K_4$ , suppose without loss of generality that P1 initially makes the move  $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$ . We consider three cases based on P2's first move:

- (i) If P2's first move also ends at  $v_2$ , then P1 makes their second move on the only unused edge incident to  $v_2$ , to win.
- (ii) If P2's first move ends at  $v_3$  (respectively,  $v_4$ ), then P1 should move  $v_2 \rightarrow v_4$  (resp.  $v_2 \rightarrow v_3$ ). Irrespective of P2's second move, P1 moves  $v_4 \rightarrow v_1$  (resp.  $v_3 \rightarrow v_1$ ) to win.
- (iii) If P2's first move is  $v_3 \rightarrow v_1$  (resp.,  $v_4 \rightarrow v_1$ ) then P1 should move  $v_2 \rightarrow v_4$ . P2 must then move  $v_1 \rightarrow v_4$  (resp.  $v_1 \rightarrow v_3$ ) and P1 moves  $v_4 \rightarrow v_3$  to win.

Therefore, P1 has a winning strategy on  $K_4$ .

On  $K_5$ , suppose again without loss of generality that P1 initially moves  $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$ . Have P2 move  $v_2 \rightarrow v_3$  and then, without loss of generality, P1 responds  $v_2 \rightarrow v_4$ . Have P2 move  $v_3 \rightarrow v_1$ . We consider three cases based on P1's third move:

- (i) If P1 now moves  $v_4 \rightarrow v_1$ , then P2 moves  $v_1 \rightarrow v_5$  to win.
- (ii) If P1 now moves  $v_4 \rightarrow v_3$ , then P2 moves  $v_1 \rightarrow v_5$ . P1 must now move  $v_3 \rightarrow v_5$ , and then P2 moves  $v_5 \rightarrow v_4$ . P1 must now move  $v_5 \rightarrow v_2$ , and then P2 moves  $v_4 \rightarrow v_1$  to win.

(iii) If P1 now moves  $v_4 \rightarrow v_5$ , then P2 moves  $v_1 \rightarrow v_4$ . Irrespective of P1's next move, P2 moves  $v_4 \rightarrow v_3$  to win.  $\square$

For larger complete graphs and other families, analyzing games by hand is prohibitively difficult. We determine computationally that  $K_6$  and  $K_7$  are P1-win, and  $K_8$  and  $K_9$  are P2-win.

We now turn to complete bipartite graphs, for which we are able to determine a winner on some infinite subfamilies.

**Theorem 4.** *The complete bipartite graph  $K_{p,q}$  is P2-win if at least one of  $p, q$  is even. If  $p = 3$  and  $q \geq 5$  is odd, then  $K_{p,q}$  is P1-win.*

*Proof.* Given  $G = K_{p,q}$ , let  $(L, R)$  be the bipartition of  $V(G)$  with  $L = \{u_1, \dots, u_p\}$  and  $R = \{v_1, \dots, v_q\}$ . Consider the involutive automorphism  $\phi$  which sends  $u_i$  to  $u_{p+1-i}$  and  $v_j$  to  $v_{q+1-j}$ . The only way an edge is fixed is if the edge  $u_i v_j$  satisfies  $i = p+1-i$  and  $j = q+1-j$ . However, as  $i$  and  $j$  are integers, this only occurs if  $p$  and  $q$  are both odd. Thus, if either  $p$  or  $q$  is even, then  $K_{p,q}$  is P2-win by Proposition 2.

For  $p = 3$  and  $q \geq 13$  odd, we show that P1 has a winning strategy. Let P1's first move be  $u_1 \rightarrow v_1$ ; subsequently, whenever P1 is moving from  $L$  to  $R$ , they follow the strategy of moving to a vertex  $v_j$  in  $R$  that has not been previously visited by either player, as long as this is possible. This ensures that even if P2 immediately uses an edge incident to  $v_j$ , P1 will be able to move back to  $L$  via an unused edge.

Suppose first that P2 initially also moves from  $L$  to  $R$ . This means P2 is always moving to the partite set ( $L$  or  $R$ ) that P1 is currently on. Before P2 makes a move from  $L$  to  $R$ , every vertex in  $R$ , except for P1's current vertex has an odd number of unused edges. If P2 moves to a vertex with one unused edge, then they can make no further moves, and P1 can win by moving back to  $L$  along an unused edge incident to their current vertex. If P2 moves to a vertex  $v_j$  with two unused edges, this must be P1's current vertex, so then P1's subsequent move uses the last available edge incident to  $v_j$  to win. Thus it suffices to consider/assume that whenever P2 moves to  $R$ , they move to a vertex with all three edges previously unused.

According to P1's strategy of moving to vertices in  $R$  with three incident unused edges whenever possible, the two players are taking turns visiting previously unvisited vertices in  $R$ . Since  $|R| = q$  is odd, P2 will run out of previously unvisited vertices in  $R$  to move to right after P1 moves to their  $\frac{(q+1)}{2}$ <sup>th</sup> vertex in  $R$ . Thus, P2 will be forced to move to a vertex in  $R$  with one or two unused vertices, ensuring their defeat as described earlier.

Suppose instead that P2 initially moves from  $R$  to  $L$ . As long as there are vertices in  $R$  with three unused edges, P1 can move to such a vertex when going from  $L$  to  $R$  and subsequently return to  $L$  along an unused edge. As such, P1 cannot lose until all vertices from  $R$  have been visited. We show that P1 can force a game position where both P1 and P2 have their tokens on vertices in  $L$ , it is P2's turn, all vertices in  $R$  have zero, one, or three unused edges, and an even number have three unused edges. Given this, we show next that P1 can win by forcing P2 to move to a vertex of  $R$  with one unused edge.

Without loss of generality, P2 can either start from  $v_1$  or from some other vertex of  $R$ . If P2 begins at  $v_1$ , then without loss of generality, they move to  $u_2$ . P1 can then move to  $u_3$ . At this point, both players are in  $L$ , it is P2's turn, and  $R$  contains one vertex with zero unused edges and  $q-1$  vertices with three unused edges.

If otherwise P2 begins at  $v_2$ , then up to symmetry we assume P2 moves to  $u_1$  or  $u_2$ . P1 can then move to  $u_3$ . If P2 now moves to  $v_1$ , they cannot move further, and P1 makes another move to win. P2 cannot legally move to  $v_2$ , so up to symmetry suppose they move to  $v_3$ . P1 can then move to  $v_2$ . Suppose that both P1 and P2 now return to any sensible (not immediately losing) vertices in  $L$ . At this point, it is P2's turn and  $R$  contains one vertex with no unused edges, two vertices with one unused edge, and  $q-3$  vertices with three unused edges.

In either case, it is now impossible for P2 to move to a vertex in  $R$  with two unused edges at any future point. Since  $q$  is by assumption odd, there are an even number of vertices left in  $R$  with three unused edges. It is P2's turn, so ultimately, P2 will be forced to be first to visit a vertex in  $R$  with one unused edge, assuming P1 uses the strategy of moving to a vertex in  $R$  with three unused edges whenever possible. Once this happens, P2 cannot make another move and P1 can win if they are able to make one final move from  $L$  to  $R$ .

Next, we show that we can specify P1's midgame strategy to ensure they have a final (winning) move available, i.e., that when P2 enters a vertex in  $R$  along its last unused edge, P1 can still make one more move. Suppose P2 enters a vertex in  $R$  along its last unused incident edge on turn  $r$  of the game. Necessarily,  $r$  is even, and since there are at most  $2q + 1$  previously used edges,  $r \leq 2q + 2$ . We also know P1's previous move was from  $R$  to  $L$  and they had a choice between two vertices in  $L$ . Hence as long as there are at least four unused edges incident to these two vertices at the conclusion of turn  $r - 2$ , P1 can choose to move to a vertex in  $L$  with three unused edges, or with only two unused edges and not occupied by P2. Thus P1 must win if  $r - 2 \leq 2q - 4$ , as this guarantees four unused edges incident to some pair of vertices in  $L$ . If instead at the end of turn  $r - 2$ , some pair of vertices in  $L$  has at least  $2q - 3$  incident used edges, then  $r - 2 \geq 2q - 3$ . If each vertex in  $L$  has at least four used edges at the conclusion of turn  $r - 2$ , then there have been at least  $2q + 1$  moves, so  $r - 2 \geq 2q + 1$ . This contradicts  $r \leq 2q + 2$ .

Lastly, we show that P1 can guarantee all vertices in  $L$  have at least four used edges at the conclusion of turn  $r - 2$ . Any move by P1 from  $L$  to  $R$  after turn 7 but before turn  $r$  is to a vertex with three unused edges. Such a vertex will still have two unused edges after P2 makes their next move, so P1 will have two choices for where to go next in  $L$  and can choose the option with more unused edges. Regardless of what P2 does, P1 is able to start cycling through the vertices in  $L$ , using two edges incident to each in a span of six of their moves. This means that if P1 has already been at every vertex in  $L$  within their first four moves (within the first seven turns of the game), then they can use four edges incident to each vertex of  $L$  within their first twelve moves. P1 can, for instance, start on  $u_1$  and end turns 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, and 23 on vertices  $u_3, u_2, u_1, u_3, u_2, u_1$ , respectively. If they have only been to two different vertices in  $L$  within their first four moves, they can visit a new vertex on their sixth move and still ensure they use four edges incident to each vertex of  $L$  within their first twelve moves, for example starting on  $u_1$  and ending turns 3, 7, 11, 15, 19, and 23 on vertices  $u_3, u_1, u_2, u_3, u_2, u_1$ , respectively. Thus, P1 wins if they are able to make at least twelve moves within the first  $r - 2$  turns of the game. This occurs if  $r - 2 \geq 24$ . As  $r = 2q$  or  $r = 2q + 2$ , it suffices to have  $2q - 2 \geq 24$ , implying  $q \geq 13$ . Thus,  $K_{3,q}$  is P1-win when  $q$  is odd and  $q \geq 13$ .

We confirm computationally that  $K_{3,5}, K_{3,7}, K_{3,9}$ , and  $K_{3,11}$  are P1-win, whereas  $K_{3,3}$  is P2-win.  $\square$

If both sides of the bipartition have a large odd number of vertices, the winner remains unknown. Our computations show mixed results:  $K_{5,5}, K_{5,7}, K_{5,11}$ , and  $K_{7,7}$  are P2-win, and  $K_{5,9}$  is P1-win.

In preparation for our next class of graphs, we modify Proposition 2 for  $r$ -partial games.

**Proposition 5.** *Given a graph  $G$  and an  $r$ -partial game  $S$  on  $G$ , let  $E_S$  be the set of edges of  $G$  unused in  $S$ , let  $G_S = (V(G), E_S)$ , and let  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  be the ending vertices of moves  $r - 1$  and  $r$ , respectively, of  $S$ . If there exists an involutive automorphism  $\phi : V(G_S) \rightarrow V(G_S)$  of  $G_S$  with no fixed edges and  $\phi(v_1) = v_2$ , then P1 wins with optimal play if  $r$  is odd and P2 wins with optimal play if  $r$  is even.*

*Proof.* The proof is analogous to that of Proposition 2. If the player whose turn it is on turn  $r + (2k + 1)$ ,  $k \geq 0$ , moves  $v_i \rightarrow v_j$ , then the other player responds with  $\phi(v_i) \rightarrow \phi(v_j)$  on turn  $r + (2k + 2)$ . This move is always legal since:

- (i) On turns  $r + 1$  and  $r + 2$ , players must begin at  $v_1$  and  $v_2 = \phi(v_1)$ , respectively, while for  $k > 0$ , move  $r + 2k - 1$  ended on  $v_i$ , so move  $r + 2k$  must have ended on  $\phi(v_i)$ .



- (ii) If edge  $v_i v_j$  was unused before turn  $r + 2k + 1$ , then the distinct edge  $\phi(v_i)\phi(v_j)$  was unused before turn  $r + 2k + 2$ .

Thus the player whose turn it is on move  $r + 2k + 2$  can win with optimal play. Therefore, P1 can win with optimal play if  $r$  is odd and P2 can win with optimal play if  $r$  is even.  $\square$

We next consider graph products. The *Cartesian product* of graphs  $G$  and  $H$ , denoted by  $G \square H$  is the graph with vertex set  $V(G \square H) = V(G) \times V(H)$  where two vertices  $(x, y)$  and  $(u, v)$  are adjacent in  $G \square H$  if and only if  $x = u$  in  $G$  and  $yv \in E(H)$  or  $y = v$  in  $H$  and  $xu \in E(G)$ .

Both grid graphs (the Cartesian product of two paths) and prism graphs (the Cartesian product of a cycle and an edge) are solvable in particular cases.

**Proposition 6.** *If  $n > 3$  is odd, then  $P_2 \square P_n$  is P1-win.*

*Proof.* Let  $G = P_2 \square P_n$  with  $V(G) = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\}$  and  $E(G) = \{u_i v_i : 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup \{u_i u_{i+1} : 1 \leq i \leq n-1\} \cup \{v_i v_{i+1} : 1 \leq i \leq n-1\}$ . Let  $j = \frac{n+1}{2}$  and let P1 begin with move  $u_j \rightarrow v_j$ . We consider each of P2's possible first moves, in turn.

- (i) If P2 begins with move  $v_{j-1} \rightarrow v_j$  (similarly,  $v_{j+1} \rightarrow v_j$ ), then P1 next moves to the vertex  $v_{j+1}$  (resp.  $v_{j-1}$ ), and wins the game.
- (ii) If P2 begins with move  $v_j \rightarrow v_{j-1}$  (similarly,  $v_j \rightarrow v_{j+1}$ ), then P1 again moves to  $v_{j+1}$  (resp.  $v_{j-1}$ ). The involutive automorphism on  $G$  sending  $u_{j-x}$  to  $u_{j+x}$  and  $v_{j-x}$  to  $v_{j+x}$ , for  $-\frac{n+1}{2} + 1 \leq x \leq \frac{n+1}{2} - 1$ , meets the conditions of Proposition 5, so P1 wins on  $G$ .
- (iii) If P2 begins with move  $u_j \rightarrow u_{j-1}$  (similarly,  $u_j \rightarrow u_{j+1}$ ), then P1 should move  $v_j \rightarrow v_{j+1}$  (resp.  $v_j \rightarrow v_{j-1}$ ). The involutive automorphism on  $G$  sending  $u_{j-x}$  to  $u_{j+x}$  and  $v_{j-x}$  to  $v_{j+x}$ , for  $-\frac{n+1}{2} + 1 \leq x \leq \frac{n+1}{2} - 1$ , meets the conditions of Proposition 5, so P1 wins on  $G$ .
- (iv) If P2 begins with move  $u_{j-1} \rightarrow u_j$  (similarly,  $u_{j+1} \rightarrow u_j$ ), then P1 should move  $v_j \rightarrow v_{j+1}$  (resp.  $v_j \rightarrow v_{j-1}$ ). On their next turn, P2 must move  $u_j \rightarrow u_{j+1}$  (resp.  $u_j \rightarrow u_{j-1}$ ). On each subsequent turn, P1 should move  $v_{j+x} \rightarrow v_{j+x+1}$  (resp.  $v_{j-x} \rightarrow v_{j-x-1}$ ). If P2 ever moves  $u_{j+x} \rightarrow v_{j+x}$ , then P1 has already played on the edge  $v_{j+x} v_{j+x+1}$  and thus P1 wins the game after completing an additional move (such as  $v_{j+x+1} \rightarrow u_{j+x+1}$ ). When P1 reaches the edge  $v_{n-1} v_n$ , P2 must play on the edge  $u_{n-1} u_n$ . On the next turn, P1 plays on the edge from  $v_n \rightarrow u_n$  and wins the game.
- (v) If P2 begins with move  $u_{j-1} \rightarrow v_{j-1}$  (similarly,  $u_{j+1} \rightarrow v_{j+1}$ ), then P1 should move  $v_j \rightarrow v_{j+1}$  (resp.  $v_j \rightarrow v_{j-1}$ ). Ignoring edge  $u_{j+1} v_{j+1}$ , the involutive automorphism on  $G$  sending  $u_{j-x}$  to  $v_{j+x}$  and  $v_{j-x}$  to  $u_{j+x}$ , for  $-\frac{n+1}{2} + 1 \leq x \leq \frac{n+1}{2} - 1$ , meets the conditions of Proposition 5, so P1 wins on  $G - u_{j+1} v_{j+1}$ . Since P2 is never able to use edge  $u_{j+1} v_{j+1}$  and P1 can choose to ignore it, P1 wins the game.

For the remaining cases, we assume, without loss of generality, that  $x$  is positive.

- (vi) If P2 starts with a move of the form
  - $u_{j-x} \rightarrow u_{j-x+1}$  or  $v_{j-x} \rightarrow v_{j-x+1}$ , for any  $x$ ,
  - $u_{j-x} \rightarrow v_{j-x}$  or  $u_{j-x} \rightarrow u_{j-x-1}$ , for even  $x$ ,
  - $v_{j-x} \rightarrow u_{j-x}$  or  $v_{j-x} \rightarrow v_{j-x-1}$ , for odd  $x$ , or
  - $u_1 \rightarrow v_1$  or  $v_1 \rightarrow u_1$ ,

then P1 will make the following sequence of moves, beginning on the next turn with  $\ell = 0$ . P1 will move  $v_{j+2\ell} \rightarrow v_{j+2\ell+1}$ , then  $v_{j+2\ell+1} \rightarrow u_{j+2\ell+1}$ , then  $u_{j+2\ell+1} \rightarrow u_{j+2\ell+2}$ , then  $u_{j+2\ell+2} \rightarrow v_{j+2\ell+2}$ . See Figure 3. On the following turn, increase  $\ell$  by 1 and repeat the sequence of moves, until the edge  $u_n v_n$  is played. We call this pattern the zigzag strategy. Then, P1 can play on the edge  $v_n v_{n-1}$  or  $u_n u_{n-1}$ , whichever is incident to their current vertex. This is a trail beginning with  $u_j v_j$  that has length  $n + 1$ . Meanwhile, P2 can only play on edges with at least one endpoint among  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_j, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_j$ , excluding the edges  $u_j v_j$  and  $v_j v_{j+1}$ , since P1 plays on the edges  $u_j v_j, v_j v_{j+1}, v_{j+1} u_{j+1}$  and  $u_{j+1} u_{j+2}$  in their first four turns, and P2 requires at least three turns to reach the edge  $u_j u_{j+1}$ . The longest trail that P2 can build using these edges and beginning with one of the edges described above has length  $n$ . Therefore, P1 wins the game after at most  $2n + 1$  turns.






Figure 3: A sequence of five moves in the zigzag strategy for P1 in the proof of Proposition 6.

(vii) Suppose that P2's initial move is  $v_{j-2} \rightarrow u_{j-2}$ . We already handled  $v_1 \rightarrow u_1$  so we may assume  $j \geq 4$ . P1 will play  $v_j \rightarrow v_{j+1}$  on their second move. If P2 continues with  $u_{j-2} \rightarrow u_{j-1}$ , P1 will play  $v_{j+1} \rightarrow u_{j+1}$ . At this point, P1 will be able to guarantee a trail of length  $n + 1$  via the zigzag strategy while P2 cannot get a trail of length longer than  $n$ . Thus, P2's second move is instead  $u_{j-2} \rightarrow u_{j-3}$ . P2 will continue to make moves of the form  $u_{j-x} \rightarrow u_{j-x-1}$  before finally making a move of the form  $u_{j-x} \rightarrow v_{j-x}$ , either by choice or out of necessity. Suppose that this first such move is  $u_{j-a} \rightarrow v_{j-a}$  which would thus be P2's  $a^{\text{th}}$  move, with  $a \geq 3$ . Meanwhile, P1 will continue to play moves of the form  $v_{j+x} \rightarrow v_{j+x+1}$  so that after  $a$  moves, P1 is at  $v_{j+a-1}$ . See Figure 4a. On P1's  $(a + 1)^{\text{th}}$  turn, they will play  $v_{j+a-1} \rightarrow v_{j+a}$ . If P2 now plays  $v_{j-a} \rightarrow v_{j-a-1}$ , P2 cannot use any further edges with endpoints outside of  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{j-a-1}, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{j-a}$  and thus cannot make more than  $2j - 2a - 2$  additional moves, so is ultimately limited to a trail of length at most  $(a + 1) + (2j - 2a - 2) = 2j - a - 1 = n - a \leq n - 3$ . In this case, P1 could continue with moves of the form  $v_{j+x} \rightarrow v_{j+x+1}$  until reaching  $v_n$ , then play  $v_n \rightarrow u_n$ , followed by moves of the form  $u_{j+x} \rightarrow u_{j+x-1}$  until reaching  $u_j$  for a total of  $2(n - (j - 1)) = n + 1$  moves. Therefore, on P2's  $(a + 1)^{\text{th}}$  turn, suppose that they make the move  $v_{j-a} \rightarrow v_{j-a+1}$ . P1 follows with  $v_{j+a} \rightarrow u_{j+a}$ . Now suppose that P2 keeps making moves of the form  $v_{j-x} \rightarrow v_{j-x+1}$  at least until  $v_{j-2} \rightarrow v_{j-1}$ ; otherwise they are moving to a vertex with no other unused edges and P1 will be able to win just by making an additional move. Meanwhile P1 proceeds to play moves of the form  $u_{j+x} \rightarrow u_{j+x-1}$ . After each player has made  $2a - 1$  moves, P1 is at  $u_{j+3}$  and P2 is at  $v_{j-1}$ . P1 moves  $u_{j+3} \rightarrow u_{j+2}$  and P2 either moves  $v_{j-1} \rightarrow u_{j-1}$  or loses on their next turn. See Figure 4b. P1 now moves  $u_{j+2} \rightarrow u_{j+1}$  and regardless of P2's response, P1 wins with the move  $u_{j+1} \rightarrow u_j$ .

(viii) Lastly, suppose that P2 plays some previously unaddressed starting move. Then P1 will continue with  $v_j \rightarrow v_{j-1}, v_{j-1} \rightarrow u_{j-1}, u_{j-1} \rightarrow u_j$ . This is possible because P2 will not be able to play on



(a) Trails built in the first  $2a$  turns, with P1 starting at  $u_j$  and P2 at  $v_{j-2}$



(b) Trails built in the first  $4a + 1$  turns, with P1 starting at  $u_j$  and P2 at  $v_{j-2}$

Figure 4: Strategy for P1 in case (vii) of the proof of Proposition 6. Labels indicate the first and most recent moves by each player.

edge  $u_{j-1}u_j$  within their first three moves. At this point, P1 can continue by playing the following sequence of moves, similar to the zigzag strategy, beginning with  $\ell = 0$ . P1 will move  $u_{j+2\ell} \rightarrow u_{j+2\ell+1}$ , then  $u_{j+2\ell+1} \rightarrow v_{j+2\ell+1}$ , then  $v_{j+2\ell+1} \rightarrow v_{j+2\ell+2}$ , then  $v_{j+2\ell+2} \rightarrow u_{j+2\ell+2}$ . On the following turn, increase  $\ell$  by 1 and repeat the sequence of moves until edge  $u_n v_n$  is played. This guarantees P1 a trail of length at least  $n + 3$ . Meanwhile P2 can only play on edges with at least one endpoint among  $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{j-1}, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{j-1}$ . The longest trail that P2 can build using just these vertices has length  $n$ . Therefore, P1 wins the game after at most  $2n + 1$  turns.  $\square$

Note: If  $m$  and  $n$  have the same parity, then  $P_m \square P_n$  is P2-win, by Proposition 2. We conjecture that  $P_m \square P_n$  is P2-win if  $m \neq 2$  with  $n \geq m$ .

**Proposition 7.** *The  $n$ -gonal prism graph,  $C_n \square K_2$ , is P2-win for all  $n$ .*

*Proof.* If  $n$  is even, then P2 has a winning strategy by Proposition 2. Now, suppose that  $n$  is odd, with  $n = 2k - 1$  for some integer  $k$ . Let  $U = \{u_{-k+1}, u_{-k+2}, \dots, u_{-1}, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k\}$  and  $V = \{v_{-k+1}, v_{-k+2}, \dots, v_{-1}, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$  each induce  $C_n$  with vertices in the specified order. Then  $G := C_n \square K_2$  is formed by taking the disjoint union  $U \cup V$  of the two cycles along with the additional edges  $u_i v_i$  for  $-k + 1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $i \neq 0$ . Note that 0 is skipped in the vertex indices.

Without loss of generality, we assume that P1 starts by moving either on edge  $u_{-1}u_1$  or  $u_1v_1$ . To describe P2's strategy, we define the following involutive automorphism  $\phi : V(G) \rightarrow V(G)$ . Let  $\phi(u_i) = v_{-i}$  for  $-k + 1 \leq i \leq k - 1$ , and  $\phi(u_k) = v_k$ . Note that the only edge fixed by  $\phi$  is  $u_k v_k$ .

If P1's previous move was  $x \rightarrow y$ , then P2 on their turn will move  $\phi(x) \rightarrow \phi(y)$ . Thus P2 can respond to any move by P1 except for if P1 moves in either direction along edge  $u_k v_k$ . Suppose without loss of generality that P1 moves  $u_{k-1} \rightarrow u_k$  on turn  $r$ , then  $u_k \rightarrow v_k$  on turn  $r + 2$ . On turn  $r + 1$ , P2 thus moved from  $\phi(u_{k-1}) = v_{-k+1}$  to  $\phi(u_k) = v_k$ . Now on turn  $r + 3$ , P2 moves  $v_k \rightarrow v_{k-1}$ , using up the last available

edge incident to  $v_k$ . This edge must be unused at this point in the game, since vertex  $v_k$  has degree 3 and was not used as the first vertex in either trail. Thus, P1 has no possible move, and the described strategy is a winning strategy for P2.  $\square$

## 4 The Game on Trees

We now discuss Trail Trap on an arbitrary tree  $T$ . Fraenkel and Simonson [12] showed that Rooted Partizan Edge Geography (Trail Trap with fixed starting vertices for both players) can be solved in  $O(n)$  time on an undirected tree, which trivially provides an  $O(n^3)$  time solution to Trail Trap on  $T$  by iterating over all pairs of starting vertices. We are able to shave off a factor of  $n$  using Lemma 11 which shows that if P1 has a winning strategy on  $T$ , then they must first move their token to a central vertex. Since a tree has at most two central vertices, this provides an  $O(n^2)$  time algorithm to resolve Trail Trap on  $T$  (see Theorem 14). To better understand the structure of P1-win trees, we provide a set of necessary conditions for  $T$  to be a P1-win in Theorem 13.

We also discuss certain obstacles to a full characterization of P1-win trees.

### 4.1 Basic Observations

A key observation in solving Trail Trap on trees is that every trail in a tree is a path, and there is a unique path between each pair of vertices of a tree. The *eccentricity*  $\text{ecc}(v)$  of a vertex  $v$  in a graph  $G$  is  $\max\{d(v, x) : x \in V(G)\}$ . The *radius* of a graph  $G$  is  $\text{rad}(G) = \min_{v \in V(G)} \text{ecc}(v)$ , and the *diameter* of  $G$  is  $\text{diam}(G) = \max_{v \in V(G)} \text{ecc}(v)$ .

Note that if  $G$  is a tree, then  $\ell(G) = \text{diam}(G)$  and  $\ell(G, v) = \text{ecc}_G(v)$  for any vertex  $v$ , a fact which we will use extensively later.

The *center*  $C(G)$  of a graph  $G$  is the set of vertices of minimum eccentricity, i.e.,  $C(G) = \{x \in V(G) : \text{ecc}(x) = \text{rad}(x)\}$ . A vertex  $v \in C(G)$  is called a *central vertex* of  $G$ .

**Lemma 8** (Folklore). *If  $T$  is a tree, then it has one or two central vertices, and if it has two, then they are adjacent. Further,  $T$  has a single central vertex if and only if  $\text{diam}(T) = 2 \text{rad}(T)$ , and  $T$  has two central vertices if and only if  $\text{diam}(T) = 2 \text{rad}(T) - 1$ .*

In general, Trail Trap can be more easily analyzed when P1's first move occurs on a cut edge. We record a sufficient condition for P2 to win in the following lemma.

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $u \rightarrow v$  be P1's first move on a graph  $G$ . If there is an edge  $xy$  in  $G - uv$  such that  $v$  and  $y$  are in different components of the subgraph  $G' = G - uv - xy$  and  $\ell(G', y) \geq \ell(G', v)$ , then P2 wins on  $G$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that an edge  $xy$  exists in  $G - uv$  such that  $v$  and  $y$  are in different components of the subgraph  $G' = G - uv - xy$  and such that  $\ell(G', y) \geq \ell(G', v)$ . Let  $x \rightarrow y$  be P2's first move. Notice that  $\ell(G', v)$  and  $\ell(G', y)$  are, respectively, the maximum number of remaining moves that P1 and P2 can make. Since  $v$  and  $y$  are in different components of  $G'$ , neither player can claim an edge from a longest trail available to the other. Thus, P1 can make at most  $1 + \ell(G', v)$  moves, and P2 can make at least this many, so P2 wins on  $G$ .  $\square$

This lemma is particularly useful for solving Trail Trap on graphs with few edges. Recall that, if a graph has at most one edge, then the winner of Trail Trap is easily determined, and thus we assume that all graphs have at least two edges.

**Corollary 10.** *Let  $G$  be a P1-win graph with at least two edges. If  $u \rightarrow v$  is P1's first move in a winning strategy, then  $\deg(v) \geq 3$ . Furthermore, if all vertices of  $G$  have degree at most 2, then  $G$  is P2-win.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a graph and let  $u \rightarrow v$  be P1's first move. First, suppose  $v$  has degree 1, and let  $xy$  be any other edge in  $G$ . Then  $v$  and  $y$  are in different connected components of  $G - uv - xy$ . Furthermore,  $\ell(G - uv - xy, v) = 0$  and  $\ell(G - uv - xy, y) \geq 0$ , so by Lemma 9, P2 wins. Now suppose  $v$  has degree 2, and let  $w$  be the unique neighbor of  $v$  other than  $u$ . Then the set  $\{uv, vw\}$  forms an edge cut of  $G$  such that  $v$  and  $w$  are in different connected components of  $G - uv - vw$ . Furthermore,  $\ell(G - uv - vw, v) = 0$  and  $\ell(G - uv - vw, w) \geq 0$ , so Lemma 9 implies that P2 wins. Hence we conclude  $\deg(v) \geq 3$ . The second claim follows immediately.  $\square$

The following lemma is one of the key conceptual insights into the behavior of Trail Trap on a tree: In any winning strategy, P1 must start by moving their token to a central vertex. If there are two central vertices, then P1 must move between them. Figure 5 depicts two scenarios in which P1 does not first move into a central vertex, and one in which they do not first move between two central vertices, leaving P2 with a winning strategy.

**Lemma 11.** *If  $u \rightarrow v$  is P1's first move in Trail Trap on a tree  $T$  and  $v$  is not a central vertex of  $T$ , then P2 wins. Furthermore, if  $T$  has two central vertices  $c$  and  $c'$  and P1 plays neither  $c \rightarrow c'$  nor  $c' \rightarrow c$  as their first move, then P2 wins.*

*Proof.* Our goal is to apply Lemma 9, so we must show that if  $u \rightarrow v$  is an edge in  $T$  such that  $v$  is not a central vertex, there is an edge  $xy \in T$  such that  $v$  and  $y$  are in different components of  $T - uv - xy$  and  $\ell(T - uv - xy, v) \leq \ell(T - uv - xy, y)$ .

Let  $c$  be the central vertex of  $T$  nearest to  $v$ . Let  $r$  be the radius of  $T$ , and let  $k = \text{dist}_T(c, v)$ . By assumption,  $k > 0$  as  $v$  is not a central vertex. Let  $vPc$  be the unique path from  $v$  to  $c$ .

If  $u \notin vPc$ , let  $vx$  be the edge incident to  $v$  in  $vPc$ . See Figure 5a for an illustration of this case. We claim that  $vx$  is our desired edge. First observe that  $x$  is not in the same component of  $T - uv - vx$  as  $v$ . Second, if  $T'$  is the component of  $T - \{uv, vx\}$  which contains  $v$ , we observe that  $\ell(T', v) = \text{ecc}_{T'}(v) \leq r - k$  as every path  $wPc$  from  $w \in T'$  to  $c$  must contain  $v$  and every such path has length at most  $r$ . By definition of a central vertex, there are at least two edge-disjoint paths of length  $r$  which end at  $c$  if  $c$  is the unique central vertex, or two edge-disjoint paths of length  $r - 1$  which end at each of the central vertices and do not use the edge between the two central vertices. In either case, there is a path  $P'$  of length  $r$  which ends at  $c$  and is edge-disjoint from  $vPc$ . If  $T''$  is the component of  $T - \{uv, vx\}$  containing  $x$ , it follows that  $\ell(T'', x) \geq |xPc| + |P'| = k - 1 + r$ . As  $k > 0$ , it follows that  $\ell(T'', x) \geq r - 1 + k > r - k \geq \ell(T', v)$ . By Lemma 9, P2 wins.

Now assume that  $u \in vPc$ . See Figure 5b for an illustration of this case. Let  $ux$  be the first edge in the path  $uPc$ . The vertex  $x$  is not in the same component of  $T - \{uv, ux\}$  as  $v$ , and by identical reasoning as before,  $\ell(T - uv - ux, x) \geq k - 2 + r \geq r - k \geq \ell(T - uv - ux, v)$ . Hence, we can apply Lemma 9 to conclude that P2 also wins in this scenario.

For the second claim, assume that  $T$  has two central vertices  $c$  and  $c'$ , and that P1's first move is an edge  $u \rightarrow c$  where  $u \neq c'$ . See Figure 5c for an illustration of this case. We claim that P2 can win by first moving  $c \rightarrow c'$ . By definition of a central vertex, there are at least two edge-disjoint paths of length  $r - 1$  in  $T$ , which end at  $c$  and  $c'$  and do not use the edge  $cc'$ . As all paths from  $c$  which do not contain  $cc'$  have length at most  $r - 1$ , it follows that  $\ell(T - uc - cc', c) \leq r - 1$ . Since  $\ell(T - uc - cc', c') = r - 1$ , P2 wins by Lemma 9.  $\square$




Figure 5: The scenarios considered in the proof of Lemma 11.




Figure 6: A tree with a single central vertex which does not meet condition (i) to be P1-win in Theorem 13.

We suspect that a generalization of Lemma 11 holds for broader classes of graphs, such as those whose central vertices form a cut set.

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $u \rightarrow v$  be P1's first move on a tree  $T$  with at least three vertices. If  $v$  is not a central vertex of degree 3, then P2 wins. Furthermore, if  $u$  and  $v$  are both central vertices of  $T$  and  $\deg(u) \neq 2$ , then P2 again wins.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 11, we may assume that  $v$  is a central vertex. If  $\deg(v) \leq 2$ , then P2 wins by Corollary 10. If  $\deg(v) > 3$ , then we have two cases to consider. If there exists two paths  $P, P'$  in  $T - uv$  which start at  $v$  and have length  $\ell(T - uv, v)$ , let  $w$  be a neighbor of  $v$  not on either path. By construction, P2 may play a trail of length  $\ell(T - uv, v) + 1$  starting with the edge  $wv$  whereas P1 may at best play a trail of total length  $\ell(T - uv, v) + 1$ . Thus P2 wins. If there is only one path  $P$  starting at  $v$  of length  $\ell(T - uv, v)$ , let  $w$  be the neighbor of  $v$  on the path  $P$ . Then  $uv, vw$  is a pair of edges which satisfies the conditions of Lemma 9. Indeed,  $v$  and  $w$  are in different connected components of  $T - uv - vw$ , and  $\ell(T - uv - vw, w) \geq \ell(T - uv - vw, v)$ . Thus P2 again wins.

For the second claim, recall that if  $T$  has radius  $r$  and two central vertices  $u$  and  $v$ , then  $\ell(T - uv, u) = \ell(T - uv, v) = r - 1$ . Let  $P_u$  be a path of length  $r - 1$  in  $T - uv$  starting at  $u$ , and let  $w$  be a neighbor of  $u$  not in  $P_u \cup \{v\}$ . Such a vertex exists since  $T \neq K_2$  and  $\deg(u) \neq 2$  implies  $\deg(u) > 2$ . We claim that the edges  $uv$  and  $wu$  satisfy the conditions of Lemma 9. Indeed,  $u$  and  $v$  are in different components of  $T - uv - wu$ , and  $\ell(T - uv - wu, u) = r - 1 = \ell(T - uv - wu, v)$ . Thus by Lemma 9, P2 wins on  $T$ .  $\square$

We now give a number of necessary conditions for a tree to be P1-win.

**Theorem 13.** *Let  $T$  be a P1-win tree with radius  $r$ . If  $T$  has a single central vertex  $c$ , then  $\deg(c) = 3$ . Further, for some neighbor  $x$  of  $c$ ,*

- (i) *the component of  $T - cx$  containing  $x$  has diameter at most  $r$ , and*
- (ii) *the component of  $T - cx$  containing  $c$  has just one central vertex, namely  $c$ .*

*If  $T$  has two central vertices  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  with  $\deg(c_1) \geq \deg(c_2)$ , then  $\deg(c_1) = 3$  and  $\deg(c_2) = 2$ . Further,*

- (iii) *the component of  $T - c_1c_2$  containing  $c_2$  has diameter at most  $r - 1$ , and*
- (iv) *the component of  $T - c_1c_2$  containing  $c_1$  has just one central vertex, namely  $c_1$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemmas 11 and 12, in order for a tree  $T$  to be a P1-win, either  $T$  has a single central vertex  $c$  of degree 3 and P1's first move ends at  $c$ , or  $T$  has two central vertices  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  of degrees 3 and 2, respectively, and P1's first move is  $c_2 \rightarrow c_1$ .

Suppose that  $T$  has a single central vertex  $c$  with  $N(c) = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ . If, for all  $i$ , the component of  $T - cx_i$  that contains  $x_i$  has diameter strictly greater than  $r$ , then no matter which move  $x_i \rightarrow c$  P1 makes first, P2 can construct a trail of length  $r + 1$  in the component of  $T - cx_i$  containing  $x_i$ . As P1 must then play in the component containing  $c$ , P1 can construct a trail of length at most  $r + 1$  in total (including the edge  $x_i \rightarrow c$ ), so P1 loses in this case. Without loss of generality, suppose the component of  $T - cx_1$  containing  $x_1$  has diameter at most  $r$ . If  $c$  is not the unique central vertex of its component of  $T - cx_1$ , then exactly one of  $x_2$  or  $x_3$  has eccentricity  $r - 1$  in  $T - c$ , say  $x_2$ . P2's winning strategy is to start with  $c \rightarrow x_2$ . This means that P1 can construct a trail of length at most  $r$ , while P2 can construct a trail of length at least  $r$ .

Suppose that  $T$  has two central vertices  $c_1, c_2$  with  $\deg(c_1) = 3$  and  $\deg(c_2) = 2$ . Recall that  $c_2 \rightarrow c_1$  is P1's first move in any winning strategy. If the diameter of the component of  $T - c_1c_2$  containing  $c_2$  is at least  $r$ , then P2 can find a trail of length at least  $r$  in this component, and P1 has at most  $r - 1$  moves remaining in the component containing  $c_1$ . Furthermore, if  $c_1$  is not the unique central vertex of its component in  $T - c_1c_2$ , then P2 has a winning strategy, as described above.  $\square$

Theorem 13 provides a set of necessary conditions for a tree  $T$  to be P1-win. Figure 6 depicts an example of a tree with a single central vertex which does not meet condition (i) in Theorem 13, and thus is P2-win.

We have established that, for P1 to win on a tree  $T$ , their first move must end at a central vertex of  $T$ . Now, suppose that  $T$  satisfies the necessary conditions of Theorem 13 but is still P2-win. Further, suppose that P1 starts by moving  $x \rightarrow c$  as in the proof of Theorem 13, where  $c$  is a central vertex and the component of  $T - cx$  containing  $x$  has diameter at most  $\text{ecc}(c) \in \{r - 1, r\}$ . P2's first move in every winning strategy is in the component of  $T - cx$  containing  $c$ . Further, P2 moves their token towards the center in every winning strategy starting with the same P1 move; otherwise, P2 obtains a trail of length at most  $r$ , and P1 obtains one of length  $r + 1$ . Other conditions for P1 to win can be proved in this case, but they require more extensive case analysis; a simple characterization of P1-win trees remains elusive. For instance, if a tree  $T$  with one central vertex meets the necessary conditions of Theorem 13, and if  $c$  is contained in every path of length greater than  $r$  in its component of  $T - cx$ , then  $T$  is a P1-win. On the other hand, if the latter condition does not hold, and if P1 does not move their token towards P2's on their second move, then P2 has a winning strategy for the resulting partial game.

Figure 7 depicts two such scenarios. Let  $T$  be the tree in Figure 7a. To determine that  $T$  is P1-win, we must consider the case in which the two players move towards one another on the top branch from  $c$ : if P2 starts by moving from a leaf along the path of length 4 in this branch, then P1 must move towards P2 to win. Having done so, P1 is able to stop P2 from taking this path, and wins. In Figure 7b, while the tree




Figure 7: Two trees meeting the necessary (but not sufficient) conditions of Theorem 13 to be P1-win.

does meet the necessary conditions of Theorem 13, parity conditions on the path from P2's first move to the central vertex determine the winner. We leave this as an exercise for the reader.

Now, if there exists a path  $P$  of length at least  $r$  which does not contain the center  $c$ , it suffices to consider Trail Trap where P1 has played into  $c$  and P2 has played an edge  $x \rightarrow y$  elsewhere in the tree. This variation of Trail Trap with fixed starting locations is precisely the game of Rooted Partizan Edge Geography. As part of providing an algorithm for a Geography variant on directed graphs, Fraenkel and Simonson [12] give an  $O(n)$  time algorithm for determining the winner of Rooted Partizan Edge Geography on an undirected tree. Hence, we have an efficient algorithm to resolve the trees left unsolved by our partial characterization of P1-win trees in Theorem 13.

As we have noted, one can naively determine the winner of Trail Trap on a tree in  $O(n^3)$  time by running Fraenkel and Simonson's algorithm once for each pair of starting moves. Using Lemmas 11 and 12, we can shave off a factor of  $n$ .

**Theorem 14.** *The winner of Trail Trap on a tree  $T$  can be determined in  $O(n^2)$  time.*

*Proof.* We informally sketch the algorithm. We assume that we have a  $O(n)$ -time subroutine  $RPEG$  which takes in a tree  $T$ , P1's first move  $u \rightarrow v$ , and P2's first move  $x \rightarrow y$  and returns P1-win or P2-win. Note that  $u, v, x, y$  may not be distinct. We have that  $RPEG(T, u \rightarrow v, x \rightarrow y)$  returns P1-win if and only if P1 wins Rooted Partizan Edge Geography on  $T$  with the given starting moves  $u \rightarrow v$  and  $x \rightarrow y$ .

Our algorithm first computes the central vertices of  $T$ . This can be done in  $O(n^2)$  time by running a breadth-first search from every vertex.

If  $T$  has one central vertex  $c$ , our algorithm first checks if  $c$  has degree 3, and returns P2-win if not. If  $c$  has degree 3, our algorithm iterates over P1's starting moves  $u \rightarrow c$  for each neighbor  $u$  of  $c$ , then iterates over all starting moves  $x \rightarrow y$  for P2, and finally runs  $RPEG(T, u \rightarrow c, x \rightarrow y)$ . If there is a starting move  $x \rightarrow y$  for P2 such that  $RPEG(T, u \rightarrow c, x \rightarrow y)$  returns P2-win, then our algorithm considers a different starting edge for P1. If P2 has a winning starting edge for each of the three choices of a starting edge for P1, then our algorithm returns P2-win. Otherwise, our algorithm returns P1-win.

As there are three possible starting edges for P1 and  $O(n)$  starting edges for P2 (as  $T$  is a tree), our algorithm runs in  $O(n^2)$  time.

If  $T$  has two central vertices  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  with  $\deg(c_1) \geq \deg(c_2)$ , our algorithm checks if  $\deg(c_1) = 3$  and  $\deg(c_2) = 2$ , and returns P2-win if not. If these degree conditions are satisfied, the algorithm then iterates over all starting moves  $x \rightarrow y$  for P2 and runs  $RPEG(T, c_2 \rightarrow c_1, x \rightarrow y)$ . If there is an edge  $x \rightarrow y$  such that  $RPEG(T, c_2 \rightarrow c_1, x \rightarrow y)$  returns P2-win, then our algorithm returns P2-win and returns P1-win otherwise.

As there is exactly one possible starting move for P1 by Lemma 11 and  $O(n)$  possible starting moves for P2, our algorithm runs in  $O(n^2)$  time on a tree with 2 central vertices.



The correctness of the algorithm then follows from Lemmas 11 and 12.  $\square$

## 5 NP-hardness

In this section we prove that Trail Trap is NP-hard for both connected and disconnected graphs. In the case of connected graphs, we prove that Trail Trap is NP-hard even on a subclass of bipartite planar graphs. As a tool in our proofs we will consider the following decision problems. Recall that a Hamiltonian path in a graph is a path that visits every vertex of the graph exactly once.

HAMILTONIAN PATH PROBLEM

Input: A graph  $G$ .

Question: Does  $G$  have a Hamiltonian path?

LONG TRAIL PROBLEM

Input: A graph  $G$ .

Question: Does  $G$  have a trail of length at least  $|V(G)| + 1$ ?

FIXED LONG TRAIL PROBLEM

Input: A graph  $G$  and a vertex  $u \in V(G)$ .

Question: Does  $G$  have a trail of length at least  $|V(G)| + 1$  starting at  $u$ ?

Before we prove that Trail Trap is NP-hard, we recall a known result and establish the computational complexity of the auxiliary problems mentioned above. Recall that if a problem is NP-complete, then it is also NP-hard.

**Theorem 15** ([16, Theorem 23]). *The HAMILTONIAN PATH PROBLEM is NP-complete on bipartite cubic planar graphs.*

It turns out that the HAMILTONIAN PATH PROBLEM on cubic graphs is closely related to the problem of finding the length of the longest trail on a cubic graph. Observe also that if  $G$  is a cubic graph, then every trail in  $G$  is of length at most  $|V(G)| + 1$ . The following approach was inspired by [7].

**Lemma 16.** *The LONG TRAIL PROBLEM is NP-complete on bipartite cubic planar graphs.*

*Proof.* Given a trail in a graph  $G$ , we can check in polynomial time if the length of the trail is at least  $|V(G)| + 1$ . Thus the LONG TRAIL PROBLEM is in NP.

Let  $G$  be a bipartite cubic planar graph on  $n$  vertices. We prove that  $G$  has a trail of length  $n + 1$  if and only if  $G$  has a Hamiltonian path.

Let  $v_1 \dots v_n$  be a Hamiltonian path in  $G$ . Since  $G$  is cubic, there is a vertex  $v_i$ ,  $i \notin \{2, n\}$ , such that  $v_1 v_i \in E(G)$ , and there is a vertex  $v_j$ ,  $j \notin \{n - 1, i\}$ , such that  $v_n v_j \in E(G)$ . Then  $v_i v_1 \dots v_n v_j$  is a trail of length  $n + 1$  in  $G$ .

Suppose instead that  $G$  has a trail  $\mathcal{T}$  of length  $n + 1$ , say  $v_{i_1} \dots v_{i_{n+2}}$ . Since  $G$  is cubic, a vertex appears in  $\mathcal{T}$  once, or possibly twice if it is an end-vertex of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Since  $\mathcal{T}$  visits  $n + 2$  vertices, all vertices of  $G$  appear on  $\mathcal{T}$  at least once, with end-points appearing on  $\mathcal{T}$  twice. Thus  $v_{i_2} \dots v_{i_{n+1}}$  is a Hamiltonian path in  $G$  as it visits every vertex of  $G$  exactly once.

Hence it follows from Theorem 15 that the LONG TRAIL PROBLEM is NP-complete on bipartite cubic planar graphs.  $\square$

**Corollary 17.** *The FIXED LONG TRAIL PROBLEM is NP-complete on bipartite cubic planar graphs.*

*Proof.* Since the LONG TRAIL PROBLEM is in NP, so too is the FIXED LONG TRAIL PROBLEM. We will reduce the LONG TRAIL PROBLEM on bipartite cubic planar graphs to the FIXED LONG TRAIL PROBLEM on bipartite cubic planar graphs. Suppose that for bipartite cubic planar graphs, we have an algorithm with complexity  $f(n)$  to decide if there is a trail of length  $n + 1$  in  $G$  starting at  $u$ . Then by repeating this algorithm  $n$  times (at each vertex) we would obtain an algorithm with complexity  $nf(n)$  for deciding whether there is a trail of length  $n + 1$  in  $G$ , starting anywhere. If  $f(n)$  is polynomial in  $n$ , then so is  $nf(n)$ . Thus, by Lemma 16, determining whether  $G$  has a trail of length  $n + 1$  starting at a fixed vertex is also NP-hard, and hence also NP-complete.  $\square$

We are now able to prove that Trail Trap is NP-hard on connected bipartite planar graphs with maximum degree 4.

**Theorem 18.** *Trail Trap is NP-hard on connected bipartite planar graphs with maximum degree 4.*

*Proof.* Let  $G$  be a connected bipartite planar cubic graph on  $n$  vertices and fix a vertex  $w \in V(G)$ . We construct the graph  $\widehat{G}$  from  $G$  by adding a new vertex  $u$  adjacent to  $w$ , i.e.  $V(\widehat{G}) = V(G) \cup \{u\}$  and  $E(\widehat{G}) = E(G) \cup \{uw\}$ . Since  $G$  is cubic, the maximum trail length of  $G$  is at most  $n + 1$ , so every trail in  $\widehat{G}$  that does not start or end at  $u$  is of length at most  $n + 1$  (since  $\deg_{\widehat{G}}(u) = 1$ ). Therefore  $\widehat{G}$  has a trail of length  $n + 2$  if and only if  $G$  has a trail of length  $n + 1$  starting at  $w$ . By Corollary 17, determining whether  $\widehat{G}$  has a trail of length  $n + 2$  is NP-hard, since it is equivalent to determining whether  $G$  has a trail of length  $n + 1$  starting at  $w$ .

We reduce finding a trail of length  $n + 2$  in  $\widehat{G}$  to Trail Trap on some connected bipartite planar graph (with maximum degree 4) as follows. Let  $Q$  be the path with vertices  $v_1, \dots, v_{2n+3}$  and edges  $v_i v_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 2n+2$ . Since  $v_{n+2}$  is the unique central vertex of  $Q$ , we refer to it as  $c$ . Let  $G'$  be the graph obtained from the disjoint union of  $Q$  and  $\widehat{G}$  by adding an edge  $uc$  (see Figure 8). Observe that  $G'$  is connected, bipartite, planar and has maximum degree 4. We claim that P2 wins in Trail Trap on  $G'$  if and only if  $\widehat{G}$  has a trail of length  $n + 2$ .




Figure 8: The graph  $G'$ .

If  $\widehat{G}$  does not have a trail of length  $n + 2$ , then P1's winning strategy is to start the game by playing  $u \rightarrow c$ , thus securing a trail of length  $n + 2$ . If P1 does so, then P2 can only get a trail of length at most  $n + 1$ , regardless of whether they begin play on  $Q$  or  $\widehat{G}$ . Thus, P1 wins.

If  $\widehat{G}$  does have a trail of length  $n + 2$ , then there are several options for P1's first move.

(i) P1's first move is  $x \rightarrow y$  for some  $xy \in E(\widehat{G})$ .

If P2 moves  $u \rightarrow c$ , then since  $G$  is cubic and  $\widehat{G}$  is defined as above,  $\ell(G' - xy - uc, y) \leq n + 1$ , and clearly  $\ell(G' - xy - uc, c) = n + 1$ . Thus by Lemma 9, P2 wins.

(ii) P1's first move is  $c \rightarrow u$  or  $v_{i\pm 1} \rightarrow v_i$ , where  $v_i \neq c$ .

Since  $\deg(u) = 2$  and  $\deg(v_i) \leq 2$ , P2 wins by Corollary 10.

(iii) P1's first move is  $x \rightarrow c$  for some  $x \in V(G')$ .

This means the longest trail P1 can get is of length  $n + 2$ . P2's winning strategy is to make their first move by playing  $u \rightarrow w$  (possible no matter which of the three options is P1's first move), and then continue along a trail of length  $n + 2$  in  $\widehat{G}$ . Thus, P2 secures a trail of length  $n + 2$  and wins.

Thus, P2 wins Trail Trap on  $G'$  if and only if  $\widehat{G}$  has a trail of length  $n + 2$ , which implies that Trail Trap is NP-hard on connected bipartite planar graphs with maximum degree 4.  $\square$

We conclude the section by noting that Trail Trap is also NP-hard on disconnected graphs. Our reduction works as follows. Starting with a connected graph  $G$  we define a disconnected graph  $G'$  as a disjoint union of  $G$  and  $K_1$ . Observe that players can only make valid moves on the component isomorphic to  $G$ . Thus P1 wins Trail Trap on  $G$  if and only if P1 wins Trail Trap on  $G'$ . Since Trail Trap is NP-hard on connected graphs by Theorem 18, Trail Trap is also NP-hard on disconnected graphs.

**Corollary 19.** *Trail Trap is NP-hard on disconnected graphs.*

Observe that the proof of Corollary 19 actually verifies that Trail Trap is NP-hard even on disconnected bipartite planar graphs with maximum degree 4.

## 6 Open Problems

There are a number of problems remaining, some of which we mention here.

**Question 20.** *For which  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is  $K_n$  a P1-win graph?*

For  $n > 9$ , determining the winner of Trail Trap on  $K_n$  requires excessive computation time with our current implementation. Similarly, we are unable to compute the winner on complete bipartite graphs exceeding 16 vertices (besides those covered by Theorem 4). However, we pose a conjecture for balanced complete bipartite graphs.

**Conjecture 21.** *For  $n \geq 3$  odd,  $K_{n,n}$  is P2-win.*

We show above that Trail Trap is NP-hard even on rather restricted classes of graphs. We suspect that the following stronger statement is true.

**Conjecture 22.** *Trail Trap is PSPACE-complete.*

Since a study of cubic graphs is crucial to our proof that Trail Trap is NP-hard, the following is of interest.

**Question 23.** *Is there a non-trivial restricted class of cubic graphs that are P1-win? For instance, what can be said about Trail Trap on Hamiltonian cubic graphs?*

Finally, we find that nearly all small graphs are P2-win. Indeed, much of our work focuses on finding graph classes where P1 wins. As a result, we conjecture the following:

**Conjecture 24.** *The proportion of P1-win graphs on  $n$  vertices tends to 0 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

## Acknowledgments

Part of this research was conducted at the 2022 Graduate Research Workshop in Combinatorics, which was supported in part by NSF grant 1953985 and a generous award from the Combinatorics Foundation. M.C. was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Canadian Graduate Scholarship (No. 456422823). A.C. was supported by the Institute for Basic Science (IBS-R029-C1). V.I. was supported by the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency (ARIS) under the grants Z1-50003, P1-0297, J1-2452, and N1-0285, and by the European Union (ERC, KARST, 101071836).

We thank Eva Arneman, Altea Catanzaro, and Saideh Danison, of the Girls' Angle Math Club, for the early development of Trail Trap with mentor R.W.

## References

- [1] E. Arneman, A. Catanzaro, and S. Danison, eds. A. Galtman and R. Whitman. 3D Trap. *Girls' Angle Bulletin*, 14(6):8–11, 2021. URL:<https://girlsangle.org/page/bulletin-archive/GABv14n06E.pdf>.
- [2] E. R. Berlekamp, J. H. Conway, and R. K. Guy. *Winning Ways for Your Mathematical Plays*, volume 1. New York: Academic Press, 1982.
- [3] H. L. Bodlaender. Complexity of path-forming games. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 110:215–245, 1993.
- [4] F. T. Boesch, C. Suffel, and R. Tindell. The spanning subgraphs of Eulerian graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 1:79–84, 1977.
- [5] B. Bollobás and F. Harary. The trail number of a graph. In B. Bollobás, editor, *Graph Theory*, volume 62 of *North-Holland Mathematics Studies*, pages 51–60. North-Holland, 1982.
- [6] J. Bosboom, C. Chen, L. Chung, S. Compton, M. Coulombe, E. D. Demaine, M. L. Demaine, I. T. F. A. Filho, D. Hendrickson, A. Hesterberg, C. Hsu, W. Hu, O. Kortén, Z. Luo, and L. Zhang. Edge matching with inequalities, triangles, unknown shape, and two players. *Journal of Information Processing*, 28:987–1007, 2020.
- [7] M. De Biasi. Is the longest trail problem easier than the longest path problem? Theoretical Computer Science Stack Exchange. URL:<https://cstheory.stackexchange.com/q/20685> (version: 2014-01-22).
- [8] R. Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 5th edition, 2017.
- [9] J. Edmonds. Paths, trees, and flowers. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 17:449–467, 1965.
- [10] N. Fox and C. Geissler. On the computational complexities of various geography variants. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 314(1):105–128, 2022.
- [11] A. S. Fraenkel, E. R. Scheinerman, and D. Ullman. Undirected edge geography. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 112:371–381, 1993.
- [12] A. S. Fraenkel and S. Simonson. Geography. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 110(1):197–214, 1993.
- [13] C. Hierholzer. Ueber die Möglichkeit, einen Linienzug ohne Wiederholung und ohne Unterbrechung zu umfahren. *Mathematische Annalen*, 6(1):30–32, 1877.

- [14] D. Lichtenstein and M. Sipser. Go is polynomial-space hard. *Journal of the ACM*, 27(2):393–401, 1980.
- [15] A. Monti and B. Sinimeri. On variants of vertex geography on undirected graphs. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 251:268–275, 2018.
- [16] A. Munaro. On line graphs of subcubic triangle-free graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 340(6):1210–1226, 2017.
- [17] T. J. Schaefer. On the complexity of some two-person perfect-information games. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 16(2):185–225, 1978.