

An Improved Upper Bound on the Threshold Bias of the Oriented-cycle game

Anita Liebenau ^{*} Abdallah Saffidine [†] Jeffrey Yang [‡]

March 24, 2025

Abstract

We study the b -biased Oriented-cycle game where two players, OMaker and OBreaker, take turns directing the edges of K_n (the complete graph on n vertices). In each round, OMaker directs one previously undirected edge followed by OBreaker directing between one and b previously undirected edges. The game ends once all edges have been directed, and OMaker wins if and only if the resulting tournament contains a directed cycle. Bollobás and Szabó asked the following question: what is the largest value of the bias b for which OMaker has a winning strategy? Ben-Eliezer, Krivelevich and Sudakov proved that OMaker has a winning strategy for $b \leq n/2 - 2$. In the other direction, Clemens and Liebenau proved that OBreaker has a winning strategy for $b \geq 5n/6 + 2$. Inspired by their approach, we propose a significantly stronger strategy for OBreaker which we prove to be winning for $b \geq 0.7845n + O(1)$.

1 Introduction

Orientation games are played on the board $E(K_n)$ by two players, *OMaker* and *OBreaker*, who take turns directing previously undirected edges until all edges have been directed. The resulting directed graph is called a *tournament*. OMaker wins if and only if the resulting tournament has some prespecified property \mathcal{P} . For example, for a given directed graph H , the *oriented H -game* is defined by the property \mathcal{P}_H of containing a copy of H .

As orientation games often favour OMaker, we usually study biased orientation games. In $(a : b)$ *biased orientation games* played under *monotone rules*, OMaker directs between 1 and a undirected edges on each of their turns, and OBreaker directs between 1 and b undirected edges on each of their turns. This is in contrast to *strict rules* where OMaker directs exactly a undirected edges on each of their turns and OBreaker directs exactly b edges on each of their turns. If there are fewer than the specified number of edges available, then the player directs all remaining edges.

Observe that $(a : b)$ biased orientation games are closely related to $(a : b)$ biased Maker–Breaker games played on the edge set of the complete graph K_n . In the latter, the players instead claim edges, and Maker wins if the subgraph formed by their edges satisfies some pre-defined property

^{*}School of Mathematics and Statistics, UNSW Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia. Email: a.liebenau@unsw.edu.au

[†]Potassco Solutions, Potsdam, Germany. Email: abdallah.saffidine@gmail.com

[‡]Previously at School of Mathematics and Statistics, UNSW Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia. Email: jeffrey.z.yang@unswalumni.com

\mathcal{P} . Maker–Breaker games played on K_n often have a corresponding orientation game variant. For instance, the Maker–Breaker H -game is analogous to the aforementioned oriented H -game. A significant amount of literature has been devoted to Maker–Breaker games [1, 2, 3, 8, 11, 4].

Despite their similarities, orientation games are *not* Maker–Breaker games: if a player directs the edge $\{u, v\}$ to form the arc (u, v) , then this also makes the arc (v, u) unavailable. Also, in Maker–Breaker games, claiming more edges can only help a player whereas in orientation games, the edges directed by a player may be exploited by the other player. As such, while Maker–Breaker games typically assume strict rules, we often study orientation games played under monotone rules.

Of particular interest are $(1 : b)$ biased orientation games, called *b-biased orientation games*. Here, OMaker directs one undirected edge on each of their turns. On the other hand, OBreaker directs between 1 and b undirected edges on their turn. Observe that increasing b can only benefit OBreaker as they can opt to direct fewer than b edges per round. That is, these games are *bias monotone*. Therefore, for each K_n and non-degenerate property \mathcal{P} , there exists some *threshold bias* $t(n, \mathcal{P})$ for which OMaker wins if and only if $b \leq t(n, \mathcal{P})$. It is not clear whether strict b -biased orientation games are bias monotone. Thus, we denote by $t^+(n, \mathcal{P})$ the maximum value of b for which OMaker wins the strict b -biased orientation game. It is clear that $t(n, \mathcal{C}) \leq t^+(n, \mathcal{C})$ but not much else is known in general about the relationship between the two quantities.

We study the *Oriented-cycle game* which is an orientation game defined by the property \mathcal{C} of containing a directed cycle. The strict b -biased Oriented-cycle game was introduced by Alon and later studied by Bollobás and Szabó [7]. The strict and monotone variants of the b -biased Oriented-cycle game have since been studied in various other works [6, 10, 5, 9]. We briefly describe some known results.

Regarding the lower bound of the threshold bias, Alon showed that $t^+(n, \mathcal{C}) \geq \lfloor n/4 \rfloor$ (unpublished but mentioned in [7]). Bollobás and Szabó [7] were able to refine Alon’s argument to obtain $t^+(n, \mathcal{C}) \geq \lfloor (2 - \sqrt{3})n \rfloor$. Ben-Eliezer, Krivelevich and Sudakov [6] proved that OMaker wins for $b \leq n/2 - 2$ (under both monotone and strict rules) via a relatively simple strategy: close a directed cycle if possible and otherwise extend the longest directed path. This remains the best known strategy for OMaker at the time of writing. Hence, we know that $t(n, \mathcal{C}) \geq n/2 - 2$.

In the other direction, it is easily observed that OBreaker wins trivially for $b \geq n - 2$. Under monotone rules, the trivial strategy for OBreaker goes as follows: whenever OMaker directs some arc (u, v) , OBreaker directs all available arcs of the form (u, w) for $w \in V$. The trivial strategy for OBreaker in the strict game is described in [10] and we omit it here. Bollobás and Szabó [7] conjectured that OBreaker in fact only wins for $b \geq n - 2$ so that $t^+(n, \mathcal{C}) = n - 3$. This conjecture was refuted by Clemens and Liebenau [10] who showed that $t^+(n, \mathcal{C}) \leq 19n/20 - 1$ for large enough n . Regarding the monotone game, it was also shown in [10] that OBreaker has a winning strategy for $b \geq 5n/6 + 2$. Thus, it was established that $t(n, \mathcal{C}) \leq 5n/6 + 1$.

In this paper, we focus on the b -biased Oriented-cycle game played under monotone rules. We describe how the strategy in [10] for OBreaker in the monotone game can be significantly improved to allow OBreaker to ensure that the resulting tournament remains acyclic for notably smaller values of the bias. Concretely, we prove that OBreaker wins for $b \geq 0.7845n + O(1)$ which implies the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 1.1. $t(n, \mathcal{C}) \leq 0.7845n + O(1)$.

In fact, we conjecture that $t(n, \mathcal{C}) \geq 3n/4 + O(1)$ and that this upper bound on $t(n, \mathcal{C})$ is somewhat close to optimal. We say more about this in the concluding remarks.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. After we introduce some general notation and terminology, we outline the main elements of the strategy for OBreaker in [10] and describe how

it can be improved. We then formally define the directed graph structures which we utilise in our strategy and describe their key properties. Following this, we carefully define several functions and quantities which we use to describe a stronger strategy for OBreaker. We prove several technical results which allow us to quantitatively bound the values of the bias for which the new strategy is winning.

1.1 General Notation and Terminology

We adopt the notation and terminology in [10]. A *directed graph* (digraph) is a pair $D = (V, E)$ consisting of a *vertex set* $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and an *arc set* $E \subseteq V \times V$. Note that we often identify a digraph D with its edge set E . The elements of V are called *vertices* and the elements of D are called *arcs* or *directed edges*. Each arc is an ordered pair of the form (v, w) and its underlying set $\{w, v\}$ is called an *edge*. A *loop* is an arc of the form (v, v) . For an arc (v, w) , we call (w, v) its *reverse arc*. All our digraphs are loopless. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{(v, v) : v \in V\}$ denote the set of loops and let $\overleftarrow{D} := \{(w, v) : (v, w) \in D\}$ denote the set of all reverse arcs. We write $\mathcal{A}(D) := (V \times V) \setminus (D \cup \overleftarrow{D} \cup \mathcal{L})$ to denote the set of all *available arcs*.

For an arc $e \in D$, we write e^+ for its tail and e^- for its head so that $e = (e^+, e^-)$. We write $D^+ := \{e^+ : e \in E\}$ for the set of all tails and $D^- := \{e^- : e \in E\}$ for the set of all heads. We say that $S = (V_S, E_S)$ is a *subdigraph* of D if $V_S \subseteq V$ and $E_S \subseteq E$. For a subset $A \subseteq V$, we write $D[A]$ to denote the directed subgraph of D consisting of arcs spanned by A .

A digraph $D = (V, E)$ where $V = \{v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ (where the v_i are all distinct) is a *directed path* if $E = \{(v_0, v_1), (v_1, v_2), \dots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)\}$ and a *directed cycle* if $E = \{(v_0, v_1), \dots, (v_{k-1}, v_k)\} \cup \{(v_k, v_0)\}$. A digraph is *acyclic* if it does not contain any directed cycles as a subgraph. For two disjoint sets $A, B \subseteq V$, we call the pair (A, B) a *uniformly directed biclique* (or UDB for short) if for all $v \in A, w \in B$, we have that $(v, w) \in D$. Observe that there cannot exist a directed cycle with vertices in both A and B .

An *orientation* of an undirected graph is an assignment of a direction to each edge to produce a directed graph. A *tournament* T is an orientation of the complete graph K_n . In our study of the Oriented-cycle game, two players take turns directing the edges of K_n until a tournament T is obtained. Let D denote the directed graph on n vertices formed by the arcs directed so far by the two players. We say that a player *directs the edge* (v, w) if they direct the pair $\{v, w\}$ from v to w . This adds (v, w) to D and prevents (w, v) from being added to D . For convenience, we define $D + e := D \cup \{e\}$.

2 Safe Digraphs

We outline the key elements of the strategy for OBreaker proposed in [10] to motivate our approach. Their strategy relies on two types of digraph structures: UDBs and α -structures. We shortly define α -structures formally but describe their key properties now. An α -structure cannot be made cyclic with the addition of a single arc. Given an α -structure H and an available arc $e \in \mathcal{A}(H)$, there exists a set of available arcs F for which $(H + e) \cup F$ is also an α -structure. The *rank* of an α -structure provides an upper bound on the number of additional arcs required to create the new α -structure.

At a high level, OBreaker maintains that the digraph D consists of a UDB (A, B) where both $D[V \setminus B]$ and $D[V \setminus A]$ are α -structures such that each arc in D starts in A or ends in B . Let us call a digraph having these properties a *safe* digraph (we provide a formal definition later). By

maintaining that (A, B) is a UDB, OBreaker prevents OMaker from closing a cycle *across* A and B so that any potential cycle must lie entirely within $D[V \setminus B]$ or $D[V \setminus A]$. However, since OBreaker maintains that $D[V \setminus B]$ and $D[V \setminus A]$ are α -structures, OMaker can never close a cycle on their turn. As we will see shortly, the number of edges OBreaker must direct to recover the safety of the digraph depends on the sizes of A and B , and the ranks of the α -structures $D[V \setminus B]$ and $D[V \setminus A]$.

The strategy for OBreaker in [10] consists of three stages. In all three stages, OBreaker maintains that the digraph is safe. Let (A, B) denote the UDB maintained by OBreaker which witnesses that the digraph D is safe. Let k denote the rank of the α -structure $D[V \setminus B]$ and ℓ denote the rank of the α -structure $D[V \setminus A]$. We denote

$$s := \min(|A| - k, |B| - \ell).$$

In the first stage of their strategy, OBreaker increase s by 1 in each round. It can be shown that for $b \geq 5n/6 + 2$, OBreaker can increase s until $s \geq n - b$. Once this achieved, OBreaker moves onto the second stage. Here, OBreaker keeps the value of s fixed and only maintains that the digraph is safe. It can be shown that the number of edges OBreaker must direct to re-establish that the digraph is safe after OMaker's move is at most $\max(|B| + k, |A| + \ell)$. However, since $s \geq n - b$, we have that

$$\max(|B| + k, |A| + \ell) \leq n - \min(|A| - k, |B| - \ell) = n - s \leq b.$$

During the second stage, at least one vertex is added to either A or B in each round. Once $A \cup B = V$, the third stage starts. By this point, OBreaker will have effectively *divided* the board into two sets A and B each of size at most b . OBreaker can then easily ensure that both of these smaller digraphs remain acyclic.

To improve upon the result in [10], we have the following key insight: if OBreaker can increase s at a faster rate during the first stage, then OBreaker can achieve $s \geq n - b$ for smaller values of b . Furthermore, as long as $s \geq n - b$ is achieved while maintaining that the digraph is safe, OBreaker can always go on to complete the remaining stages of the strategy to win the game. Thus, we seek to determine the largest value of s that can be achieved for a given value of the bias b .

Having motivated our approach, we now dive into the technical details. We first present the formal definition of α -structures as defined in [10].

Definition 2.1. *Let V be a set of vertices, r be a non-negative integer and $D \subset (V \times V) \setminus \mathcal{L}$ be a simple digraph. Then D is called an α -**structure of rank r** if there exists $k \leq r$ arcs $e_1, \dots, e_k \in D$ such that for all $u, v \in V$, we have*

$$(u, v) \in D \text{ if and only if } (u, v) = (e_i^+, e_j^-) \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq j \leq k.$$

*The arcs e_1, \dots, e_k are called **decisive arcs** of the α -structure on D .*

Concrete examples of α -structures and the motivation behind the definition of α -structures are available in [10]. As previously mentioned, one key property of α -structures is that they cannot be made cyclic with the addition of a single arc.

Proposition 2.2 (Proposition 2.5 in [10]). *If D is an α -structure, then for every available $e \in \mathcal{A}(D)$ we have that $D + e$ is acyclic.*

The following result provides an upper bound on the number of arcs required to form a new α -structure when an additional arc is added to an existing α -structure.

Proposition 2.3 (Lemma 2.7 in [10]). *Let D be an α -structure of rank r on a vertex set V , and let $e \in \mathcal{A}(D)$ be an available arc. Then there exists a set $\{f_1, \dots, f_t\} \subseteq \mathcal{A}(D)$ of at most $\min\{r, |V| - 2\}$ available arcs such that $D' = D \cup \{e, f_1, \dots, f_t\}$ is an α -structure of rank $r + 1$. Moreover, $D'^+ = D^+ \cup \{e^+\}$ and $D'^- = D^- \cup \{e^-\}$.*

Next, we formally define what a safe digraph is. Our definition of a safe digraph is original and seeks to capture the digraph invariants preserved by OBreaker in the strategy in [10].

Definition 2.4. *For a digraph D and $i, s, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we say that D is (i, s, δ) -**safe** if there exist $A, B \subseteq V$ such that:*

- (i) (A, B) is a UDB,
- (ii) $D[V \setminus B]$ is an α -structure and $D[V \setminus B]^+ \subseteq A$,
- (iii) $D[V \setminus A]$ is an α -structure and $D[V \setminus A]^- \subseteq B$,
- (iv) $\min(|A|, |B|) \geq s$,
- (v) *If $A \cup B \neq V$, then $2s + \delta + i = |A| + |B|$ and the α -structures $D[V \setminus B]$ and $D[V \setminus A]$ have ranks $|A| - s$ and $|B| - s - \delta$ respectively.*

We say that D is **safe** if D is (i, s, δ) -safe for some $i, s, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Another way of understanding Definition 2.4 (v) is that if k and ℓ denote the ranks of $D[V \setminus B]$ and $D[V \setminus A]$ respectively, then $|A| = s + k$ and $|B| = s + \ell + \delta$ so that $\delta = (|B| - \ell) - (|A| - k)$. As we seek to maximise $\min(|A| - k, |B| - \ell)$, we expect that OBreaker maintains δ to be relatively small so that the two quantities are balanced.

We depict a safe digraph below. This is similar to Figure 3 in [10] representing the digraph structure maintained by OBreaker.




Figure 1: A depiction of a safe digraph digraph for which $A \cup B \neq V$. The thick arrow represents all arcs from A to B . The thin arrows represent the decisive arcs of the α -structures $D[V \setminus B]$ and $D[V \setminus A]$ respectively.

Like α -structures, safe digraphs cannot be made cyclic with the addition of a single arc.

Proposition 2.5. *Let D be a safe digraph. Then D is acyclic and for all $e \in \mathcal{A}(D)$, we have that $D + e$ is acyclic.*

Proof. Suppose D is a safe digraph and let (A, B) be a UDB which witnesses that D is safe. Suppose on the contrary that for some available arc $e \in \mathcal{A}(D)$, we have that $D + e$ contains a directed cycle C . We have that (A, B) is a UDB and for all $(v, w) \in D$, either $v \in A$ or $w \in B$. This implies that the edges of C must lie entirely within $D[V \setminus A]$ or entirely within $D[V \setminus B]$. However, $D[V \setminus A]$ and $D[V \setminus B]$ are both α -structures and so cannot be made cyclic with the addition of a single arc, by Proposition 2.2. Thus, $D + e$ is acyclic and by extension, D must have been acyclic too. \square

The following proposition provides an upper bound on the number of arcs required to re-establish safety after an additional arc is added to a safe digraph. The first case corresponds to the case in the first stage where OBreaker is trying to increase s while the second case corresponds to once $s \geq n - b$ is achieved and OBreaker only seeks to maintain safety. This is the main technical result underpinning our improved strategy for OBreaker. In the next section, we describe the intuition behind the various quantities and how to apply the proposition.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $i, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$. Suppose that D is a (i, s, δ) -safe digraph and $|\mathcal{A}(D)| \geq 4$ so that there are at least two undirected edges. Then for all $e \in \mathcal{A}(D)$:*

- (i) *Let $p, q \in \{0, 1\}$ be such that $p+q \leq 1$ and let $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be such that $2x+p+q < |V| - i - 2s - \delta$. Furthermore, suppose that $x+s > 0$. Then there exists $S \subseteq \mathcal{A}(D+e)$ such that $(D+e) \cup S$ is $(i+1, s+x+p, \delta+q-p)$ -safe and $1 \leq |S| \leq x^2 + (p+q+2s+\delta+i+1)x + (p+q+1)(s+i+1)$.*
- (ii) *If $s > 0$, there exists $S \subseteq \mathcal{A}(D \cup \{e\})$ such that $(D+e) \cup S$ is $(i+1, s, \delta)$ -safe and $1 \leq |S| \leq |V| - s$.*

Proof. For convenience, we denote $D' := D + e$. Let (A, B) be a UDB which witnesses that D is (i, s, δ) -safe. We construct a set of arcs $F_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}(D')$ such that $|F_1| \leq |V| - s$ and $D' \cup F_1$ is $(i+1, s, \delta)$ -safe. Within the context of (ii), we show that $|F_1| \geq 1$ and choose $S = F_1$. We also make use of F_1 in proving (i) where we construct another set of arcs F_2 and choose $S = F_1 \cup F_2$. The way in which we construct F_1 depends on whether or not $A \cup B = V$.

We first consider the case where $A \cup B = V$. Assume that $s > 0$. Since $|\mathcal{A}(D)| \geq 4$ there exists an available arc $e' \in \mathcal{A}(D')$. Also, since (A, B) is a UDB, all available arcs are contained in either $\mathcal{A}(D[A])$ or $\mathcal{A}(D[B])$. Thus, suppose that $e \in \mathcal{A}(D[A])$ and $e' \in \mathcal{A}(D'[A])$. Then by Proposition 2.3, there exist available arcs $E_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}(D'[A])$ such that $(D' \cup E_1)[A]$ is an α -structure and $|E_1| \leq |A| - 2$. Again by Proposition 2.3, there exist available arcs $E_2 \subseteq \mathcal{A}(((D' + e') \cup E_1)[A])$ such that $((D' + e') \cup E_1 \cup E_2)[A]$ is an α -structure and $|E_2| \leq |A| - 2$. If $|E_1| \geq 1$, then we choose $F_1 = E_1$. Else, we choose $F_1 = E_2 + e'$. Thus, we ensure that $|F_1| \geq 1$. Furthermore, since D is (i, s, δ) -safe then $|A| \leq |V| - s$ so that indeed $|F_1| \leq |V| - s$. It is clear that (A, B) remains a UDB in $D' \cup F_1$ and that $(D' \cup F_1)[B]$ is an α -structure so that $D' \cup F_1$ is indeed $(i+1, s, \delta)$ -safe. The cases where $e \in \mathcal{A}(D[B])$ and/or $e' \in \mathcal{A}(D'[B])$ can be handled similarly.

Suppose instead that $A \cup B \neq V$. Let k and ℓ denote the ranks of the α -structures $D[V \setminus B]$ and $D[V \setminus A]$ respectively. Since D is (i, s, δ) -safe then we have that $k = |A| - s$, $\ell = |B| - s - \delta$ and $2s + \delta + i = |A| + |B|$. Assume first that $e \in \mathcal{A}(D[V \setminus B])$. By Proposition 2.3, there exist at most k available arcs E_3 such that $(D' \cup E_3)[V \setminus B]$ is an α -structure of rank $k+1$ with $(D' \cup E_3)[V \setminus B]^+ = D[V \setminus B]^+ \cup \{e^+\}$ and $(D' \cup E_3)[V \setminus B]^- = D[V \setminus B]^- \cup \{e^-\}$. We define v to be e^+ if $e^+ \in V \setminus (A \cup B)$ and otherwise an arbitrary vertex in $V \setminus (A \cup B)$. Then there exist available arcs $E_4 \subseteq \mathcal{A}(D' \cup E_3)$ of the form (v, w) (for $w \in B$) such that $(A \cup \{v\}, B)$ is a UDB in $D' \cup E_3 \cup E_4$ and $|E_4| \leq |B|$. We choose $F_1 = E_3 \cup E_4$. Note that our choice of v ensures $(D' \cup F_1)[V \setminus B]^+ \subseteq A \cup \{v\}$ which is one of the conditions of safety. The remaining conditions can

be verified to show that $D' \cup F_1$ is indeed $(i+1, s, \delta)$ -safe. Assuming that $s > 0$, we have $|E_4| \geq 1$ so that $|F_1| \geq 1$. Regarding the upper bound, we have

$$|F_1| \leq |E_3| + |E_4| \leq k + |B| \leq |V| - (|A| - k) \leq |V| - s. \quad (2.1)$$

Assume now that $e \notin \mathcal{A}(D[V \setminus B])$. Note that since (A, B) is a UDB, this implies that $e \in \mathcal{A}(D[V \setminus A])$. This case can be handled similarly and one obtains a similar upper bound

$$|F_1| \leq \ell + |A| \leq |V| - (|B| - \ell) \leq |V| - s - \delta. \quad (2.2)$$

This proves (ii) and we now focus on proving (i). Let $p, q \in \{0, 1\}$ be such that $p + q \leq 1$ and let $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $2x + p + q < |V| - i - 2s - \delta$. Assume that $x + s > 0$ so that either $x > 0$ or $s > 0$. We derive an alternative upper bound on the size of F_1 . By (2.1) and (2.2) we have $|F_1| \leq \mu(k + |B|) + (1 - \mu)(\ell + |A|)$ where $\mu = 1$ if $e \in \mathcal{A}(D[V \setminus B])$ and otherwise $\mu = 0$. Recalling that $k = |A| - s$, $\ell = |B| - s - \delta$ and $|A| + |B| = 2s + \delta + i$, we have that

$$|F_1| \leq s + i + \mu\delta \leq s + i + 1. \quad (2.3)$$

For convenience, we denote $D'' := D' \cup F_1$. We now construct a set of arcs $F_2 \subseteq \mathcal{A}(D'')$ such that $D'' \cup F_2$ is $(i+1, s+x+p, \delta+q-p)$ -safe. Observe that the condition $2x + p + q < |V| - i - 2s - \delta$ implies that $|A| + |B| + 2x + p + q = 2s + 2x + p + q + \delta + i < |V|$ so that there exist disjoint sets of vertices $U, W \subseteq V \setminus (A \cup B)$ where $|U| \leq x + p$ and $|W| \leq x + q$. Then there exist available arcs F_2 (where $F_2^+ \subseteq A \cup U$ and $F_2^- \subseteq B \cup W$) such that $(A \cup U, B \cup W)$ is a UDB in $D'' \cup F_2$ and $|F_2| \leq (x+p)(|B| + 1 - \mu) + (x+q)(|A| + \mu) + (x+p)(x+q)$. It is then easily verified that $D'' \cup F_2$ is $(i+1, s+x+p, \delta+q-p)$ -safe. Thus, in this case we choose $S = F_1 \cup F_2$. Then $D' \cup S$ is $(i+1, s+x+p, \delta+q-p)$ -safe so it just remains to show that $1 \leq |S| \leq x^2 + (p+q+2s+\delta+i+1)x + (p+q)(s+i+1)$. Now if $s > 0$ then $|F_1| \geq 1$ and if $x > 0$ then $|F_2| \geq 1$. In either case, we have that $|S| \geq 1$. Regarding the upper bound, from $k = |A| - s$, $\ell = |B| - s - \delta$ and $|A| + |B| = 2s + \delta + i$ we obtain

$$|F_2| \leq x^2 + (p+q+2s+\delta+i+1)x + (p+q)(s+i+1). \quad (2.4)$$

Hence, combining (2.3) and (2.4) we have

$$|S| \leq |F_1| + |F_2| \leq x^2 + (p+q+2s+\delta+i+1)x + (p+q+1)(s+i+1).$$

This proves (i) and thus, the proposition. \square

3 An Improved Strategy for OBreaker in the Oriented-cycle Game

In our improved strategy, OBreaker repeatedly directs the edges given by Proposition 2.6 (i) until $s \geq n-b$. Following this, they maintain that the digraph is safe by repeatedly applying Proposition 2.6 (ii) until the end of the game. Thus, to fully specify our strategy, we need to provide the values of x, p, q used when we apply Proposition 2.6 (i).

Let x_i, p_i, q_i denote the values of x, p, q chosen by OBreaker in round i within the context of Proposition 2.6 (i). Intuitively, OBreaker should choose x_i to be as large as possible as s will directly increase by x_i . When OBreaker cannot direct sufficiently many edges to add another

vertex to both A and B but adds an additional vertex to only A (respectively B), the quantity p_i (respectively q_i) is equal to 1. The quantities x_i, p_i, q_i need to be chosen such that OBreaker directs at most b edges. We define several functions and quantities which we use in specifying the values of x_i, p_i, q_i chosen by OBreaker in our improved strategy.

Definition 3.1. We define the function $Q : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^5 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$Q(x, \Delta, s, \delta, i) := x^2 + (\Delta + 2s + \delta + i)x + (1 + \Delta)(s + i).$$

Adhering to Proposition 2.6 (i), the maximum quantity of edges which OBreaker directs is given by $Q(x_i, p_i + q_i, s, \delta, i)$. Thus, to ensure that OBreaker directs at most b edges, we require

$$Q(x_i, p_i + q_i, s, \delta, i) \leq b. \quad (3.1)$$

As an initial goal, we seek the largest $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying (3.1) for $p_i = q_i = \delta = 0$.

Definition 3.2. For $b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we define the functions $G_b : [0, 4b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $g_b : [1, 4b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by $G_b(t) := -\frac{t}{2} + \sqrt{bt - \frac{t^2}{4}}$ and $g_b(t) := G_b(t) - G_b(t - 1)$.

The next proposition shows that $g_b(i)$ represents the largest value of x_i satisfying (3.1) for $p_i = q_i = \delta = 0$ and $s = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} g_b(j) = G_b(i - 1)$. In our improved strategy, OBreaker chooses $x_i = \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor$.

Proposition 3.3. For $b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $1 \leq i \leq 4b$, we have $Q(g_b(i), 0, G_b(i - 1), 0, i) = b$.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} Q(g_b(i), 0, G_b(i - 1), 0, i) &= g_b(i)^2 + (2G_b(i - 1) + i)g_b(i) + G_b(i - 1) + i \\ &= \frac{(2G_b(i) + i)^2 - (2G_b(i - 1) + i - 1)^2 + 1 + 2i}{4} \\ &= \frac{4bi - i^2 - 4b(i - 1) + (i - 1)^2 + 1 + 2i}{4} \\ &= b \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $(2G_b(i) + i)^2 = 4bi - i^2$ in the third equality. \square

It turns out that g_b is invertible over a restricted domain where it also has an explicit formula for its inverse. This will be critical later when we try to quantify the values of the bias for which our new strategy is winning.

Proposition 3.4. Let $b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. The function g_b is invertible on the interval $t \in [1, 2b + \frac{1 - \sqrt{8b^2 - 1}}{2}]$ where its inverse $g_b^{-1} : [0, g_b(1)] \rightarrow [1, 2b + \frac{1 - \sqrt{8b^2 - 1}}{2}]$ satisfies

$$g_b^{-1}(x) = 2b \left(1 + \frac{1}{4b} - \sqrt{\frac{(2x + 1)^2}{(2x + 1)^2 + 1}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{(2x + 1)^2 + 1}{16b^2}} \right).$$

Proof. We first prove that g_b is invertible on the larger interval $t \in [1, 4b]$. It is clear that g_b is continuous for $t \in [1, 4b]$. We show that g_b is strictly decreasing in the interior of this interval. For $t \in (1, 4b)$, g_b is differentiable and we have

$$\begin{aligned} g'_b(t) &= G'_b(t) - G'_b(t-1) \\ &= \frac{2b-t}{2\sqrt{4bt-t^2}} - \frac{2b-t+1}{2\sqrt{4b(t-1)-(t-1)^2}} \\ &\leq \frac{-1}{2\sqrt{4bt-t^2}} \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we deduce that it is invertible on the interval $[1, 4b]$. We denote $x_b := g_b(t)$. To obtain an expression for g_b^{-1} , we derive an expression for t in terms of x_b . It follows from definition that

$$x_b = G_b(t) - G_b(t-1) = -\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{bt - \frac{t^2}{4}} - \sqrt{b(t-1) - \frac{(t-1)^2}{4}}$$

which for $t \in [1, 4b]$ is equivalent to

$$t^2 - (4b+1)t + \frac{((2x_b+1)^2 + 1 + 4b)^2}{4((2x_b+1)^2 + 1)} = 0. \quad (3.2)$$

For $t \in [1, 2b + \frac{1-\sqrt{8b^2-1}}{2}]$, we see that g_b^{-1} corresponds to the smaller root of (3.2). Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_b^{-1}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \left((4b+1) - \sqrt{(4b+1)^2 - \frac{((2x+1)^2 + 1 + 4b)^2}{((2x+1)^2 + 1)}} \right) \\ &= 2b \left(1 + \frac{1}{4b} - \sqrt{\frac{(2x+1)^2}{(2x+1)^2 + 1}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{(2x+1)^2 + 1}{16b^2}} \right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We define three integer quantities $\tau_{b,i}, \delta_{b,i}, s_{b,i}$ which we use in describing our strategy for OBreaker. We briefly explain the intuition behind each quantity after it is defined.

Definition 3.5. For $b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor$, we define

$$\tau_{b,i} := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i > 1 \text{ and } g_b(i) - \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor \geq \frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{16b}{i-1} - 4\right)^{-1/2}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In our strategy for OBreaker, $\tau_{b,i} = 1$ corresponds to when OBreaker chooses p_i or q_i to be 1, alternating between the two cases to ensure that $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$. Here, recall that $\delta = (|B| - \ell) - (|A| - k)$ and that we seek to maximise $s = \min(|A| - k, |B| - \ell)$.

Definition 3.6. For $b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor$, we define $\delta_{b,i} := \sum_{j=1}^i \tau_{b,j} \pmod{2}$ and $s_{b,i} := \sum_{j=1}^i \lfloor g_b(j) \rfloor + \sum_{j=1}^i \tau_{b,j} \delta_{b,j-1}$.

We show later that at the end of round i in our strategy for OBreaker, the digraph will be $(i, s_{b,\underline{i}}, \delta_{b,\underline{i}})$ -safe where $\underline{i} := \min(i, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor)$.

Suppose that the digraph D is $(i-1, s_{b,i-1}, \delta_{b,i-1})$ -safe at the start of round i . The following proposition shows that OBreaker can then apply Proposition 2.6 (i) with $x_i = \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor$, $p_i = \delta_{b,i-1} \tau_{b,i}$ and $q_i = (1 - \delta_{b,i-1}) \tau_{b,i}$.

Proposition 3.7. For $b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and integer $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor$, we have

$$Q(\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor, \tau_{b,i}, s_{b,i-1}, \delta_{b,i-1}, i) \leq b.$$

Proof. Recall that by Proposition 3.3, we have $Q(g_b(i), 0, G_b(i-1), 0, i) = b$. Thus, it suffices to show that

$$Q(\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor, \tau_{b,i}, s_{b,i-1}, \delta_{b,i-1}, i) \leq Q(g_b(i), 0, G_b(i-1), 0, i).$$

We show this by establishing that

$$Q(\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor, \tau_{b,i}, s_{b,i-1}, \delta_{b,i-1}, i) \leq Q(\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor, \tau_{b,i}, G_b(i-1) - \delta_{b,i-1}/2, \delta_{b,i-1}, i) \quad (3.3)$$

and that

$$Q(\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor, \tau_{b,i}, G_b(i-1) - \delta_{b,i-1}/2, \delta_{b,i-1}, i) \leq Q(g_b(i), 0, G_b(i-1), 0, i). \quad (3.4)$$

To obtain (3.3), we show that $s_{b,i} \leq G_b(i) - \delta_{b,i}/2$ for $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor$ and then make use of the fact that Q is increasing in all arguments. Recall that $\delta_{b,i} = \sum_{j=1}^i \tau_{b,j} \pmod{2} = \delta_{b,i-1} + \tau_{b,i} \pmod{2}$ and that $\delta_{b,i-1}, \tau_{b,i} \in \{0, 1\}$. For all such $\delta_{b,i-1}$ and $\tau_{b,i}$, one can verify that

$$\delta_{b,i-1}/2 + g_b(i) - \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor - \tau_{b,i} \delta_{b,i-1} \geq \delta_{b,i}/2. \quad (3.5)$$

We now show that $s_{b,i} \leq G_b(i) - \delta_{b,i}/2$ by induction. The case where $i = 0$ holds trivially. Assume now that $s_{b,i-1} \leq G_b(i-1) - \delta_{b,i-1}/2$ for some arbitrary integer $1 \leq i \leq \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor$. Then we have by Definition 3.6 that

$$\begin{aligned} s_{b,i} &= s_{b,i-1} + \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + \tau_{b,i} \delta_{b,i-1} \\ &\leq G_b(i-1) - \delta_{b,i-1}/2 + \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + \tau_{b,i} \delta_{b,i-1} \\ &= G_b(i) - (\delta_{b,i-1}/2 + g_b(i) - \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor) - \tau_{b,i} \delta_{b,i-1} \\ &\leq G_b(i) - \delta_{b,i}/2. \end{aligned}$$

where we apply the induction hypothesis, Definition 3.2 and (3.5) respectively. Hence, we have $s_{b,i} \leq G_b(i) - \delta_{b,i}/2$ for $0 \leq i \leq \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor$ which implies (3.3). Next, we focus on (3.4). Define $\varepsilon_{b,i} := g_b(i) - \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor$. By Definition 3.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &Q(g_b(i), 0, G_b(i-1), 0, i) - Q(\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor, \tau_{b,i}, G_b(i-1) - \delta_{b,i-1}/2, \delta_{b,i-1}, i) \\ &\geq \varepsilon_{b,i}^2 + \varepsilon_{b,i}(2 \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + 2G_b(i-1) + i) - \tau_{b,i}(\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + G_b(i-1) + i). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, to prove that (3.4) holds, it suffices to show that

$$\varepsilon_{b,i}^2 + \varepsilon_{b,i}(2 \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + 2G_b(i-1) + i) - \tau_{b,i}(\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + G_b(i-1) + i) \geq 0. \quad (3.6)$$

It is clear that (3.6) holds for $\tau_{b,i} = 0$ as all the terms are non-negative. Suppose now that $\tau_{b,i} = 1$. Then this implies that $\varepsilon_{b,i} \geq \frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{16b}{i-1} - 4\right)^{-1/2}$. It is easily verified that $\sqrt{\frac{16b}{i-1} - 4} = \frac{4G_b(i-1)}{i-1} + 2$ which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{b,i} &\geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{i-1}{4G_b(i-1) + 2i - 2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{i}{4 \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + 4G_b(i-1) + 2i} \\ &= \frac{\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + G_b(i-1) + i}{2 \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + 2G_b(i-1) + i}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\varepsilon_{b,i}(2 \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + 2G_b(i-1) + i) - (\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + G_b(i-1) + i) \geq 0$$

which proves (3.6) and thus, the proposition. \square

The following proposition summarises our improved strategy for OBreaker.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $n, b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ be such that $b \geq 3$ and $n \leq s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} + b$. For any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we write $\underline{i} := \min(i, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor)$. Suppose that D is a $(i-1, s_{b, \underline{i-1}}, \delta_{b, \underline{i-1}})$ -safe digraph where $i \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $|\mathcal{A}(D)| \geq 2$ and let $e \in \mathcal{A}(D)$. Then either $|\mathcal{A}(D+e)| = 0$ or there exists $S \subseteq \mathcal{A}(D+e)$ such that $(D+e) \cup S$ is $(i, s_{b, \underline{i}}, \delta_{b, \underline{i}})$ -safe and $1 \leq |S| \leq b$.*

Proof. Let D be a digraph which is $(i-1, s_{b, \underline{i-1}}, \delta_{b, \underline{i-1}})$ -safe and assume that $|\mathcal{A}(D+e)| > 0$. We first consider the case where $i \leq \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor$. In this case, we have $i = \underline{i}$ and seek to apply Proposition 2.6 (i) with $p_i = \delta_{b, i-1} \tau_{b, i}$, $q_i = (1 - \delta_{b, i-1}) \tau_{b, i}$ and $x_i = \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor$. Here, observe that $\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor \geq 1$ for $b \geq 3$ so we are guaranteed that either $x_i > 0$ or $s_{b, i} > 0$. Moreover, by Proposition 3.7 we have that $Q(\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor, \tau_{b, i}, s_{b, i-1}, \delta_{b, i-1}, i) \leq b$. Thus, there exists $S \subseteq \mathcal{A}(D+e)$ such that $(D+e) \cup S$ is $(i, s_{b, \underline{i}}, \delta_{b, \underline{i}})$ -safe and $1 \leq |S| \leq b$. Next, we consider the case where $i > \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor$. In this case, we have that $\underline{i} = \underline{i-1} = \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor$. By Proposition 2.6 (ii) and the assumption that $s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \geq n - b$, there exists $S \subseteq \mathcal{A}(D+e)$ such that $(D+e) \cup S$ is $(i, s_{b, \underline{i}}, \delta_{b, \underline{i}})$ -safe and $1 \leq |S| \leq n - s_{b, \underline{i-1}} = n - s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \leq b$. \square

In our improved strategy, OBreaker directs the edges given by Proposition 3.8 in each round. However, they can only successfully carry out the strategy if b is sufficiently large. Proposition 3.8 requires that $n \leq s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} + b$. We determine the values of the bias b for which this holds.

Definition 3.9. *For $B \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we define*

$$C_B := 1 - \frac{1 + \lfloor g_B(1) \rfloor}{2B} + \sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor g_B(1) \rfloor - 1} \left(2 - \sqrt{\frac{(2(a + \phi_{B,a}) + 1)^2}{(2(a + \phi_{B,a}) + 1)^2 + 1}} - \sqrt{\frac{(2a + 3)^2}{(2a + 3)^2 + 1}} \right)$$

where

$$\phi_{B,a} := \frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{16B}{g_B^{-1}(a + 0.5)} - 4 \right)^{-1/2} \quad \text{for } 0 \leq a \leq \lfloor g_B(1) \rfloor - 1.$$

Remark 3.10. *It can be shown that C_B is increasing in B . To see this, first observe that $\phi_{B,a}$ is decreasing in B so that $-\sqrt{\frac{(2(a + \phi_{B,a}) + 1)^2}{(2(a + \phi_{B,a}) + 1)^2 + 1}}$ is increasing in B . Also, recall by definition that $g_B(1) = G_B(1) - G_B(0) = -\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{B - \frac{1}{4}}$.*

We use Definition 3.9 to provide a lower bound on $b + s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor}$.

Proposition 3.11. *For $b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we have that $b + s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \geq C_b b$.*

Proof. By definition, we have

$$s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \tau_{b,i} \delta_{b,i-1}. \quad (3.7)$$

We first derive alternative expressions for both terms on the right-hand side of (3.7) via double counting. Partitioning the sum, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor) \rfloor} \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor + \sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor - 1} \sum_{i=\lfloor g_b^{-1}(a+1) \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(a) \rfloor} \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor.$$

Since g_b^{-1} is decreasing, for all integers $0 \leq a \leq \lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor$ and integers i such that

$$\max(1, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(a+1) \rfloor + 1) \leq i \leq \lfloor g_b^{-1}(a) \rfloor,$$

we have $\lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor = a$. Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor &= \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor) \rfloor} \lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor + \sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor - 1} \sum_{i=\lfloor g_b^{-1}(a+1) \rfloor + 1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(a) \rfloor} a \\ &= \lfloor g_b^{-1}(\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor) \rfloor \cdot \lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor + \sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor - 1} a \cdot (\lfloor g_b^{-1}(a) \rfloor - \lfloor g_b^{-1}(a+1) \rfloor). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, observe that this is a telescoping sum which simplifies to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor = \sum_{a=1}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor} \lfloor g_b^{-1}(a) \rfloor. \quad (3.8)$$

Next, recalling Definition 3.5, we have that $\delta_{b,i} = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \tau_{b,j} \pmod{2}$. Let $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_k < \dots < i_m \leq \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor$ be the values of i for which $\tau_{b,i} = 1$. For all other values of i , we have $\tau_{b,i} = 0$. Thus, we have $\sum_{j=1}^{i_k-1} \tau_{b,j} \pmod{2} = \sum_{1 \leq j < k} \tau_{b,i_j} \pmod{2}$, which implies $\tau_{b,i_k} \delta_{b,i_k-1} = k-1 \pmod{2}$. Hence, we have that $\tau_{b,i} \delta_{b,i-1} = 1$ if and only if $i = i_k$ for some even $1 \leq k \leq m$. Partitioning the sum and applying the aforementioned result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \tau_{b,i} \delta_{b,i-1} &= \sum_{i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} \tau_{b,i} \delta_{b,i-1} + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor, \\ i \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}}} \tau_{b,i} \delta_{b,i-1} \\ &= \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} 1 \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Again, since $\tau_{b,i} = 1$ if $i \in \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ and otherwise $\tau_{b,i} = 0$, this is equivalent to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \tau_{b,i} \delta_{b,i-1} = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \tau_{b,i} \right\rfloor. \quad (3.9)$$

In a similar way to how we derived (3.8), we derive a lower bound on $\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \tau_{b,i}$ as a sum of g_b^{-1} terms. Let a, i be integers such that $0 \leq a \leq \lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor - 1$ and $\lfloor g_b^{-1}(a+1) \rfloor + 1 \leq i \leq g_b^{-1}(a + \phi_{b,a})$. We have $g_b^{-1}(a+1) < \lfloor g_b^{-1}(a+1) \rfloor + 1$ and since g_b is decreasing, we have $a+1 > g_b(i) \geq a + \phi_{b,a}$. Taking the floor and weakening the strict inequality yields $a \geq \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} g_b(i) - \lfloor g_b(i) \rfloor &\geq \phi_{b,a} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{16b}{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(a+0.5) \rfloor} - 4 \right)^{-1/2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{16b}{i-1} - 4 \right)^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

so that $\tau_{b,i} = 1$. Hence, we have the lower bound

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \tau_{b,i} \geq \sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor - 1} (\lfloor g_b^{-1}(a + \phi_{b,a}) \rfloor - \lfloor g_b^{-1}(a+1) \rfloor). \quad (3.10)$$

Putting together (3.8), (3.9) and (3.10), we obtain the lower bound

$$s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \geq \sum_{a=1}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor} \lfloor g_b^{-1}(a) \rfloor + \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor - 1} (\lfloor g_b^{-1}(a + \phi_{b,a}) \rfloor - \lfloor g_b^{-1}(a+1) \rfloor) \right].$$

This implies that

$$s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \geq -1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor - 1} (\lfloor g_b^{-1}(a + \phi_{b,a}) \rfloor + \lfloor g_b^{-1}(a+1) \rfloor). \quad (3.11)$$

We derive a lower bound on $\lfloor g_b^{-1}(x) \rfloor$ for $0 \leq x \leq g_b(1)$. Recalling Proposition 3.4, we have

$$g_b^{-1}(x) \geq \frac{1}{2} + 2b \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{(2x+1)^2}{(2x+1)^2 + 1}} \right)$$

and taking the floor yields

$$\lfloor g_b^{-1}(x) \rfloor \geq -\frac{1}{2} + 2b \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{(2x+1)^2}{(2x+1)^2 + 1}} \right). \quad (3.12)$$

Putting together (3.11) and (3.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} &\geq -1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor - 1} \left(-1 + 2b \left(2 - \sqrt{\frac{(2(a + \phi_{b,a}) + 1)^2}{(2(a + \phi_{b,a}) + 1)^2 + 1}} - \sqrt{\frac{(2a+3)^2}{(2a+3)^2 + 1}} \right) \right) \\ &\geq b \left(-\frac{1 + \lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor}{2b} + \sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor - 1} \left(2 - \sqrt{\frac{(2(a + \phi_{b,a}) + 1)^2}{(2(a + \phi_{b,a}) + 1)^2 + 1}} - \sqrt{\frac{(2a+3)^2}{(2a+3)^2 + 1}} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
b + s_{b, \lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} &\geq b \left(1 - \frac{1 + \lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor}{2b} + \sum_{a=0}^{\lfloor g_b(1) \rfloor - 1} \left(2 - \sqrt{\frac{(2(a + \phi_{b,a}) + 1)^2}{(2(a + \phi_{b,a}) + 1)^2 + 1}} - \sqrt{\frac{(2a + 3)^2}{(2a + 3)^2 + 1}} \right) \right) \\
&= C_b b. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

Having determined the values of b for which OBreaker is able to carry out their improved strategy, we are now able to prove results regarding the threshold bias.

Theorem 3.12. *For all integers $B \geq 3$, we have that $t(n, \mathcal{C}) \leq \frac{n}{C_B} + C_B B$.*

Proof. Fix some integer $B \geq 3$. For $n < C_B B$, OBreaker wins for $b = C_B B$ via the trivial strategy. Otherwise, suppose that $n \geq C_B B$. We show that for $b \geq \frac{n}{C_B}$, OBreaker has a winning strategy. We describe a strategy for OBreaker which maintains that the digraph is safe in each round. The empty digraph is $(0, s_0, \delta_{b,0})$ -safe so the digraph is indeed safe at the start of the game. By Proposition 3.11, we have that $b + s_{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \geq C_b b$. We assumed that $n \geq C_B B$ which implies $b \geq \frac{n}{C_B} \geq B$. Since C_B is increasing in B , we have $C_b \geq C_B$ which implies $b + s_{\lfloor g_b^{-1}(0) \rfloor} \geq C_b b \geq n$. Thus, in each round i while the game has not yet ended, OBreaker can direct the edges given by Proposition 3.8 so that at the end of the round, the digraph is $(i, s_i, \delta_{b,i})$ -safe. Since the digraph remains safe, OMaker can never close a cycle by Proposition 2.5. Thus, OBreaker has a winning strategy in all cases for $b \geq \frac{n}{C_B} + C_B B$ which implies the result. \square

To obtain Theorem 1.1, we can apply Theorem 3.12 with a fixed value of B .

Proof of Theorem 1.1. This is immediate from Theorem 3.12 by setting $B = 10^6$ and noting that $\frac{1}{C_B} \geq 0.7845$ by evaluation. \square

4 Concluding Remarks

While we are able to achieve a significantly lower upper bound on $t(n, \mathcal{C})$ with our new strategy, we believe that there is still slightly more room for improvement. For example, we can describe what is likely a stronger strategy also based on maintaining safety via Proposition 2.6. Suppose that D is (i, s, δ) -safe at the start of the current round for some $i, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$. Let $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be the largest integer satisfying $Q(x, 0, s, \delta, i + 1) \leq b$. If $Q(x, 1, s, \delta, i + 1) \leq b$, then OBreaker directs the edges given by Proposition 2.6 (i) for the given x with $p = \delta$ and $q = 1 - \delta$. Otherwise, if $x \geq 0$, OBreaker directs the edges given by Proposition 2.6 (i) for the given x with $p = 0 = q$. Else, OBreaker can no longer increase s and instead seeks to direct the edges given by 2.6 (ii) assuming that $s \geq n - b$. For $b = 10^6$, it can be calculated programatically that OBreaker can achieve safety for $s = 300211 = 0.300211b$. In order for $s \geq n - b$, we would require $b \geq \frac{1}{1.300211}n > 0.769105n$. Thus, we suspect that the upper bound on the threshold bias can at least be further tightened to $t(n, \mathcal{C}) \leq 0.7692n + O(1)$.

We believe that the optimal strategy for OBreaker involves maintaining safety, but not necessarily via Proposition 2.6. Using Proposition 2.6 necessitates that $|A| - k$ and $|B| - \ell$ differ by at most one, but an optimal strategy likely requires no such constraint. For instance, if OMaker is only directing edges into A or only directing edges out from B , which we believe to be their best response to OBreaker's strategy, then it may be in OBreaker's interest to more aggressively add

more vertices to one of A or B in response. However, we saw that in practice this seemed to only result in a relatively minor improvement over the aforementioned stronger strategy. This leads us to the conjecture mentioned in the introduction.

Conjecture 4.1. $t(n, \mathcal{C}) \geq 3n/4 + O(1)$.

As a final remark, recall that OMaker’s best known strategy involves extending the longest path and was shown to be winning for $b \leq n/2 - 2$. We believe that such a strategy is close to optimal, and a more refined proof can show that this strategy is winning for OMaker for significantly larger values of b .

References

- [1] József Beck. Remarks on positional games. i. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 40(1-2):65–71, 1982.
- [2] József Beck. Random graphs and positional games on the complete graph. volume 118, pages 7–13. Elsevier, 1985.
- [3] József Beck. Deterministic graph games and a probabilistic intuition. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, 3(1):13–26, 1994.
- [4] Małgorzata Bednarska and Tomasz Łuczak. Biased positional games for which random strategies are nearly optimal. *Combinatorica*, 20(4):477–488, 2000.
- [5] Małgorzata Bednarska and Oleg Pikhurko. Biased positional games on matroids. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 26(2):271–285, 2005.
- [6] Ido Ben-Eliezer, Michael Krivelevich, and Benny Sudakov. Biased orientation games. *Discrete Mathematics*, 312(10):1732–1742, 2012.
- [7] Béla Bollobás and Tamás Szabó. The oriented cycle game. *Discrete Mathematics*, 186(1):55–67, 1998.
- [8] Vašek Chvátal and Paul Erdős. Biased positional games. In *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*, volume 2, pages 221–229. Elsevier, 1978.
- [9] Dennis Clemens. *Two-player games on graphs*. Dissertation, 2015.
- [10] Dennis Clemens and Anita Liebenau. A non-trivial upper bound on the threshold bias of the oriented-cycle game. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B*, 122:21–54, 2017.
- [11] Paul Erdős and John L Selfridge. On a combinatorial game. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 14(3):298–301, 1973.