

# ON THE PROBABILITY THAT A RANDOM SUBGRAPH CONTAINS A CIRCUIT

PETER NELSON

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mu > 2$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We show that, if  $G$  is a sufficiently large simple graph of average degree at least  $\mu$ , and  $H$  is a random spanning subgraph of  $G$  formed by including each edge independently with probability  $p \geq \frac{1}{\mu-1} + \varepsilon$ , then  $H$  contains a cycle with probability at least  $1 - \varepsilon$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.1.** *For all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\mu > 2$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{Z}$  so that, if  $G$  is a graph on at least  $N$  vertices with average degree at least  $\mu$ , and  $H$  is a random spanning subgraph of  $G$  formed by including each edge of  $G$  independently with probability  $p \geq \frac{1}{\mu-1} + \varepsilon$ , then  $H$  contains a circuit with probability at least  $1 - \varepsilon$ .*

The same result was shown by Alon and Bachmat [1] in the special case where  $G$  is regular. They also show that, for any  $\varepsilon > 0$  and integer  $d \geq 3$ , there is a  $d$ -regular graph  $G$  such that a random spanning subgraph of  $G$  in which edges are chosen with probability  $\frac{1}{d-1} - \varepsilon$  contains a circuit with probability at most  $\varepsilon$ ; in other words,  $\frac{1}{\mu-1}$  cannot be replaced by any smaller value in the above theorem if  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$ . On the other hand, it can be shown that if  $\mu \notin \mathbb{Z}$ , then the value  $\frac{1}{\mu-1}$  can be lowered; we discuss this in the next section.

Our proof is based on that of the main theorem of [12], which concerns the related question of the probability that  $H$  contains at least half of the edges of some circuit of  $G$ . The aim of this paper is to present the relatively simple proof of Theorem 1.1 without the inherent and numerous technicalities of [12].

Similar questions concerning cycles in random subgraphs of graphs with a given *minimum* degree were considered in [6] and [9].

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

All graphs are simple and finite unless otherwise stated. We use some standard graph theory terminology such as *path*, *walk*, *girth* and *adjacency matrix* (for a directed graph); see [4] for a reference. For  $p \in [0, 1]$ , a  $p$ -random subset of a set  $E$  refers to a set  $X \subseteq E$  obtained by including each element of  $E$  independently at random with probability  $p$ . We also use some basic probability theory; for a reference, see [5].

**Zero-one Laws.** Let  $E$  be a finite set. For each  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq 2^E$ , let  $f_{\mathcal{W}}: [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$  be defined by  $f_{\mathcal{W}}(p) = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{W}} p^{|X|}(1-p)^{|E|-|X|}$ ; i.e.  $f_{\mathcal{W}}(p)$  is the probability that a  $p$ -random subset of  $E$  is in  $\mathcal{W}$ . An important tool in our proof is a theorem of Margulis that gives a very general sufficient condition for  $f_{\mathcal{W}}(p)$  to display a zero-one-law type behaviour. In [11], Margulis states his theorem in very high generality (and in Russian). Our statement follows a convenient ‘discrete’ formulation found in ([13], Section 2).

We say that  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq 2^E$  is *increasing* if, whenever  $X \in \mathcal{W}$  and  $X \subseteq X'$ , we have  $X' \in \mathcal{W}$ . Given  $X \in 2^E$ , let  $s(X)$  denote the collection of subsets of  $E$  that differ from  $X$  by a single addition or removal (i.e. the Hamming sphere of radius 1 around  $X$  in  $2^E$ ). Let  $\Delta(\mathcal{W})$  denote the minimum nonzero value of  $|s(X) \setminus \mathcal{W}|$  over all  $X \in \mathcal{W}$ .

Note that, if  $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{W} \neq 2^E$  and  $\mathcal{W}$  is increasing, the function  $f_{\mathcal{W}}(p)$  is monotonely increasing with  $f_{\mathcal{W}}(0) = 0$  and  $f_{\mathcal{W}}(1) = 1$ . Margulis’ theorem states that if  $\Delta(\mathcal{W})$  is sufficiently large, then the value of  $f_{\mathcal{W}}(p)$  is nearly always close to zero or one.

**Theorem 2.1.** *For all  $\varepsilon > 0$  there exists  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$  so that, if  $E$  is a finite set, and  $\mathcal{W} \subseteq 2^E$  is increasing and satisfies  $\Delta(W) \geq s$ , then the interval  $\{p \in [0, 1]: \varepsilon \leq f_{\mathcal{W}}(p) \leq 1 - \varepsilon\}$  has length less than  $\varepsilon$ .*

We will apply this result in the very special case where  $E$  is the edge set of a graph  $G$ , and  $\mathcal{W}$  is the collection of edge-sets of subgraphs of  $G$  that contain a circuit. In this setting, it is easy to see that the parameter  $\Delta(\mathcal{W})$  is exactly the girth of  $G$ .

**Non-backtracking walks.** A *non-backtracking walk* of length  $\ell$  in a graph  $G$  is a walk  $(v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{\ell})$  of  $G$  so that  $v_{i+1} \neq v_{i-1}$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell - 1\}$ . In all nontrivial cases, the number of such walks grows roughly exponentially in  $\ell$ ; in this section we state a result of Alon et al. that estimates the base of this exponent. Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a connected graph of minimum degree at least 2. Let  $\overline{E} = \{(u, v) \in V^2 : u \sim_G v\}$  be the  $2|E|$ -element set of arcs of  $G$ . Let  $B = B(G) \in \{0, 1\}^{\overline{E} \times \overline{E}}$  be

the matrix so that  $B_{(u,v),(u',v')} = 1$  if and only if  $u' = v$  and  $u \neq v'$ . It is easy to see that

- (1)  $B$  is the adjacency matrix of a strongly connected digraph (essentially the ‘line digraph’ of  $G$ ), and
- (2) For each integer  $\ell \geq 2$ , the entry  $(B^{\ell-1})_{e,f}$  is the number of non-backtracking walks of length  $\ell$  in  $G$  with first arc  $(v_0, v_1) = e$  and last arc  $(v_\ell, v_{\ell+1}) = f$ .

By (1) and the Perron-Frobenius theorem (see [7], section 8.8), there is a positive real eigenvalue  $\lambda_*$  of  $B$  and an associated positive real eigenvector  $w_*$ , so that  $|\lambda_*| \geq |\lambda|$  for every eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of  $B$ . Furthermore, by Gelfand’s formula [8] we have  $\lambda_* = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|B^n\|^{1/n}$ , where  $\|B^n\|$  denotes the sum of the absolute values of the entries of  $B^n$ . By (2), the parameter  $\lambda_* = \lambda_*(B(G))$  thus governs the growth of non-backtracking walks in  $G$ . It is clear that if  $G$  is  $d$ -regular we have  $\lambda_*(B(G)) = d - 1$ ; the following result of Alon et al. [2] shows that the average degree gives a similar lower bound for general graphs:

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\mu \geq 2$ . If  $G$  is a connected graph of average degree at least  $\mu$  and minimum degree at least 2, then  $\lambda_*(B(G)) \geq \mu - 1$ .*

In fact, the argument in [2] shows that  $\lambda_*(B(G)) \geq \Lambda(G)$ , where  $\Lambda(G)$  is a certain symmetric function in the degree sequence of  $G$  that is bounded below by  $\mu - 1$ . When  $\mu \notin \mathbb{Z}$ , the inequality  $\Lambda(G) \geq \mu - 1$  cannot hold with equality; in fact one can show (see [12], Lemma 3.2) that  $\lambda_*(B(G)) \geq \mu - 1 + \frac{\eta(\mu)^3}{8\mu^3}$ , where  $\eta(\mu)$  denotes the distance from  $\mu$  to the nearest integer. This can easily be shown to lead to an improved version of Theorem 1.1 where  $\frac{1}{\mu-1}$  is replaced by a strictly smaller value for nonintegral  $\mu$ .

### 3. COVERING TREES

Given a connected graph  $G = (V, E)$  of minimum degree at least 2, we denote the set of arcs of  $G$ , as before, by  $\bar{E}$ . Given an arc  $e_0 = (u_0, u_1) \in \bar{E}$ , the *covering tree of  $G$  at  $e_0$* , for which we write  $\Gamma_{e_0}(G)$ , is the infinite rooted tree  $\Gamma$  whose root is the length-zero walk  $(u_0)$ , the other vertices are the non-backtracking walks of  $G$  whose first arc is  $e_0$ , and the children of each walk  $(u_0, u_1, \dots, u_k) \in V(\Gamma)$  are exactly its extensions by a single arc: that is, the nonbacktracking walks of the form  $(u_0, u_1, \dots, u_k, u_{k+1})$ . Note that the unique child of the root is the walk  $(e_0) = (u_0, u_1)$ .

Given such a  $\Gamma$  with root  $r$ , we borrow some terminology from [10]. For  $x \in V(\Gamma)$ , we write  $|x|$  for the distance from  $x$  to  $r$  in  $\Gamma$ . For  $x, y \in V(\Gamma)$ , we write  $x \preceq y$  if  $x$  is on the path from  $r$  to  $y$ , and  $x \wedge y$

for the *join* of  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\Gamma$ : that is, the unique vertex  $z$  on both the path from  $r$  to  $x$  and the path from  $r$  to  $y$  for which  $|z|$  is maximized.

The map  $\theta: V(\Gamma) \rightarrow V(G)$  that assigns each walk to its final vertex is a graph homomorphism that is injective when restricted to the neighbourhood of any vertex. To analyse the probability that a  $p$ -random subset of  $E(G)$  contains a circuit, we consider the probability that a  $p$ -random subset of  $E(\Gamma)$  contains a long path containing the root. The following lemma is a stronger ‘constructive’ version of Theorem 6.2 of [10] (which applies to general infinite rooted trees) in the case where  $\Gamma$  is the covering tree of a finite graph.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph of minimum degree at least 2 and let  $\lambda = \lambda_*(B(G))$ . There is an arc  $e_0$  of  $G$  so that, if  $p \in [0, 1]$  and  $X$  is a  $p$ -random subset of  $E(\Gamma_{e_0}(G))$ , then, for each integer  $n \geq 1$ , the probability that  $X$  contains a  $n$ -edge path of  $\Gamma_{e_0}(G)$  containing the root is at least  $p - \frac{1}{\lambda}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $B = B(G)$ , and let  $w \in \mathbb{R}^{\overline{E}(G)}$  be the (positive, real) eigenvector of  $B(G)$  corresponding to  $\lambda$  whose largest entry is 1. Let  $e_0 \in \overline{E}(G)$  be such that  $w(e_0) = 1$ ; we show that  $e_0$  satisfies the lemma. We may assume that  $p > \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma_{e_0}(G)$ , let  $r$  be the root of  $G$ , and let  $\pi: V(\Gamma) \setminus \{r\} \rightarrow \overline{E}(G)$  be the map associating each walk with its last arc.

Let  $\phi: V(\Gamma) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  be defined by  $\phi(r) = 1$  and  $\phi(v) = \lambda^{1-|v|}w(\pi(v))$  for all  $v \neq r$ . Note that  $\phi(e_0) = w(e_0) = 1$  and that, since  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $B$ , the sum of  $\phi(x)$  over the children  $x$  of a vertex  $v$  (or over the descendants  $x$  of  $v$  at any fixed level) is equal to  $\phi(v)$ . In other words,  $\phi$  is a *unit flow* of  $\Gamma$ .

For  $X \subseteq E(\Gamma)$ , let  $R_X$  denote the vertex set of the component of  $\Gamma[X]$  containing  $r$ . Define a random variable  $Q = Q(X)$  by

$$Q = p^{-n} \sum_{|x|=n} \phi(x) 1_{R_X}(x).$$

Since  $\sum_{|x|=n} \phi(x) = 1$  and each vertex at distance  $n$  from the root is in  $R_X$  with probability exactly  $p^n$ , we have  $\mathbf{E}(Q) = 1$ . We now bound the variance of  $Q$ .

**Claim 3.1.1.**  $\mathbf{E}(Q^2) \leq (p - \frac{1}{\lambda})^{-1}$ .

*Proof.* Note that  $|x \wedge y| \geq 1$  whenever  $|x|, |y| \neq 0$ . We have

$$\mathbf{E}(Q^2) = p^{-2n} \sum_{|x|=|y|=n} \phi(x)\phi(y)\mathbf{P}(x, y \in R_X)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= p^{-2n} \sum_{|x|=|y|=n} \phi(x)\phi(y)p^{2n-|x \wedge y|} \\
&= \sum_{|x|=|y|=n} \phi(x)\phi(y)p^{-|x \wedge y|} \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq |z| \leq n} p^{-|z|} \sum_{\substack{|x|=|y|=n \\ x \wedge y = z}} \phi(x)\phi(y) \\
&\leq \sum_{1 \leq |z| \leq n} p^{-|z|} \left( \sum_{\substack{|x|=n \\ x \succ z}} \phi(x) \right)^2 \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq |z| \leq n} p^{-|z|} \phi(z)^2 \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n p^{-i} \sum_{|z|=i} \phi(z)^2
\end{aligned}$$

Now by definition of  $\phi$  and the fact that  $w(e) \leq 1$  for all  $e$  we have

$$\phi(z)^2 = \lambda^{2-2|z|} w(\pi(z))^2 \leq \lambda^{2-2|z|} w(\pi(z)).$$

For each  $e \in \overline{E}$ , let  $b_e \in \mathbb{R}^{\overline{E}}$  be the corresponding standard basis vector. For each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the number of  $z \in V(\Gamma)$  with  $|z| = i$  and  $\pi(z) = e$  is exactly  $b_{e_0}^T B^{i-1} b_e$ , so it follows from  $Bw = \lambda w$  and  $b_{e_0}^T w = 1$  that

$$\sum_{|z|=i} \phi(z)^2 \leq \lambda^{2-2i} b_{e_0}^T B^{i-1} \sum_{e \in \overline{E}} b_e w(e) = \lambda^{2-2i} b_{e_0}^T B^{i-1} w = \lambda^{1-i}.$$

Therefore  $\mathbf{E}(Q^2) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n p^{-i} \lambda^{1-i} < (p - \frac{1}{\lambda})^{-1}$ , since  $p\lambda > 1$ .  $\square$

The Cauchy-Schwartz inequality now gives

$$1 = \mathbf{E}(Q)^2 = \mathbf{E}(Q \cdot 1_{Q>0})^2 \leq \mathbf{E}(Q^2) \mathbf{P}(Q > 0) \leq (p - \frac{1}{\lambda})^{-1} \mathbf{P}(Q > 0),$$

so  $\mathbf{P}(Q > 0) \geq p - \frac{1}{\lambda}$ . If  $Q > 0$  then  $X$  contains an  $n$ -edge path of  $\Gamma$  containing the root; the lemma follows.  $\square$

#### 4. CIRCUITS

In this section, we prove our main theorem. First we show that, if  $G$  is ‘non-degenerate’ and  $\lambda = \lambda_*(B(G))$ , then a  $(\frac{1}{\lambda} + \varepsilon)$ -random subset of  $E(G)$  contains a circuit with non-negligible probability.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $G$  be a connected graph with minimum degree at least 2 and let  $\lambda = \lambda_*(B(G))$ . Let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $p \in [\frac{1}{\lambda} + \varepsilon, 1]$ . If  $X$  is a  $p$ -random subset of  $E(G)$ , then  $X$  contains a circuit of  $G$  with probability at least  $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p_1 = p - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \geq \lambda^{-1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ , and let  $p_2 \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  be such that  $1 - p = (1 - p_1)(1 - p_2)$ . Let  $X_1$  be a  $p_1$ -random subset of  $E(G)$  and  $X_2$  be a  $p_2$ -random subset of  $E(G)$  independent of  $X_1$ ; note that  $X_1 \cup X_2$  is identically distributed to a  $p$ -random subset of  $E(G)$ .

Let  $e_0 = (u, v)$  be an arc of  $G$  given by Lemma 3.1 for  $p_1$  and  $\lambda$  and let  $\Gamma = \Gamma_e(G)$ . Let  $\theta: V(\Gamma) \rightarrow V(G)$  denote the natural homomorphism from  $\Gamma$  to  $G$ . For each set  $U \subseteq V(G)$ , let  $G(U)$  denote the subgraph of  $G$  induced by  $U$ .

Given  $X_1$ , let  $R(X_1)$  denote the set of vertices  $x$  of  $G$  for which there is a non-backtracking walk of  $G[X_1]$  from  $u$  to  $x$  that either contains no arc (that is,  $x = u$ ), or has first arc  $(u, v)$ . Observe that either  $R(X_1) = \{u\}$ , or  $R(X_1)$  is the vertex set of a connected subgraph of  $G$  containing the edge  $uv$ . Similarly, for a  $p_1$ -random subset  $Y_1$  of  $E(\Gamma)$ , let  $R(Y_1)$  denote the vertex set of the component of  $\Gamma[Y_1]$  containing the root. Observe that  $G(R(X_1))$  and  $G(\theta(R(Y_1)))$  are both connected subgraphs of  $G$  containing  $u$  (in general these graphs have edges not in  $X_1$  or  $\theta(Y_1)$ ). Let  $C_G$  denote the event that  $G(R(X_1))$  contains a circuit, and  $C_\Gamma$  the event that  $G(\theta(R(Y_1)))$  contains a circuit.

**Claim 4.1.1.**  $\mathbf{P}(C_G) = \mathbf{P}(C_\Gamma)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{Z}'$  denote the collection of subsets of  $V(G)$  that induce an acyclic connected subgraph of  $G$  containing  $u$  and  $v$ , and let  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}' \cup \{\{u\}\}$ . The event  $C_G$  fails to hold exactly when  $R(X_1) \in \mathcal{Z}$ , so

$$1 - \mathbf{P}(C_G) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbf{P}(R(X_1) = Z).$$

Similarly, we have

$$1 - \mathbf{P}(C_\Gamma) = \sum_{Z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbf{P}(\theta(R(Y_1)) = Z).$$

Clearly  $\mathbf{P}(R(X_1) = \{u\}) = \mathbf{P}(\theta(R(Y_1)) = \{u\}) = 1 - p$ . Let  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}'$ . By acyclicity of  $G(Z)$ , there is a unique subtree  $\Gamma_Z$  of  $\Gamma$  that contains the root of  $\Gamma$  and satisfies  $\theta(V(\Gamma_Z)) = Z$ , and moreover  $G(Z)$  and  $\Gamma_Z$  are isomorphic finite trees. Now  $|E(G(Z))| = |E(\Gamma_Z)|$ , and the number of edges of  $G$  with exactly one end in  $Z \setminus \{u\}$  is equal to the number of edges of  $\Gamma$  with exactly one end in  $V(\Gamma_Z)$ , so

$$\mathbf{P}(R(X_1) = Z) = \mathbf{P}(R(Y) = V(\Gamma_Z)) = \mathbf{P}(\theta(R(Y)) = Z).$$

The claim now follows from the above two summations.  $\square$

If  $Y_1$  contains a  $|V(G)|$ -edge path of  $\Gamma$  that contains the root, then this path is mapped by  $\theta$  to a non-backtracking walk of  $G$  visiting some vertex twice, so  $G(\theta(R(Y_1)))$  contains a circuit of  $G$ . Thus, by the claim above and Lemma 3.1, we have  $\mathbf{P}(C_G) = \mathbf{P}(C_\Gamma) \geq p_1 - \lambda \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ .

Suppose that  $C_G$  holds; then  $H = G(R(X_1))$  is a graph containing a cycle and having a spanning tree contained in  $X_1$ . Thus, there is some edge  $f$  of  $H$  such that  $X_1 \cup \{f\}$  contains a circuit of  $H$ ; such an  $f$  exists for every  $X_1$  satisfying  $C_G$ . Now  $f \in X_2$  with probability  $p_2$ , so the probability that  $X_1 \cup X_2$  contains a circuit of  $G$  is at least  $p_2 \mathbf{P}(C_G) \geq \left(\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}$ . This gives the result.  $\square$

We now restate and prove our main theorem.

**Theorem 4.2.** *For all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\mu > 2$ , there exists  $N = N(\varepsilon, \mu) \in \mathbb{Z}$  so that, if  $G$  is a graph on at least  $N$  vertices with average degree at least  $\mu$ , and  $X$  is a  $p$ -random subset of  $E(G)$  for some  $p \in [\frac{1}{\mu-1} + \varepsilon, 1]$ , then  $X$  contains a circuit of  $G$  with probability at least  $1 - \varepsilon$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $\mu > 2$ , and  $p \in [\frac{1}{\mu-1} + \varepsilon, 1]$ . Let  $s = s(\frac{\varepsilon^2}{16})$  be given by Theorem 2.1. Let  $p_1 = p - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}$ . Let  $t$  be an integer so that  $(1 - p_1^s)^t \leq \varepsilon$ . Let  $\mu_1 \in (2, \mu)$  be such that  $\frac{1}{\mu_1-1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \leq p_1$ . Set  $N = \left\lceil \frac{2st}{\mu_1 - \mu} \right\rceil$ .

Let  $G$  be a graph on at least  $N$  vertices with average degree at least  $\mu$ . For each  $x \in [0, 1]$ , let  $f(x)$  denote the probability that an  $x$ -random subset of  $E(G)$  contains a circuit of  $G$ . We will show that  $f(p) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ .

**Claim 4.2.1.** *Either*

- $f(p_1) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ , or
- $G$  has a connected subgraph  $H$  with girth at least  $s$ , minimum degree at least 2, and average degree at least  $\mu_1$ .

*Proof of claim:* Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a maximal collection of pairwise edge-disjoint circuits of size less than  $s$  in  $G$ . If  $|\mathcal{C}| \geq t$  then  $f(p_1) \geq 1 - (1 - p_1^s)^t \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ . If  $|\mathcal{C}| < t$ , then let  $G'$  be obtained by removing the edges of all circuits in  $\mathcal{C}$  from  $G$ . By the maximality of  $\mathcal{C}$ , the graph  $G'$  has girth at least  $s$ . Now by choice of  $N \leq |V(G)|$ , we have

$$|E(G')| \geq |E(G)| - st \geq \frac{\mu}{2}|V(G)| - \frac{\mu - \mu_1}{2}N \geq \frac{\mu_1}{2}|V(G)|,$$

so  $G'$  has average degree at least  $\mu_1$ . Now, let  $G''$  be obtained from  $G'$  by deleting degree-1 vertices until no more such deletions are possible. It is easy to see (since  $\mu_1 \geq 2$ ) that  $G''$  has minimum degree at least 2 and average degree at least  $\mu_1$ . Any connected component  $H$  of  $G''$  with largest-possible average degree will satisfy the claim.  $\square$

Since  $f(p) \geq f(p_1)$ , we may assume that the above subgraph  $H$  exists. Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be the collection of edge sets of subgraphs of  $H$  that contain a circuit; let  $g(x) = \sum_{X \in \mathcal{W}} x^{|X|} (1-x)^{|E(H)|-|X|}$ . This is the probability that an  $x$ -random subset of  $E(H)$  contains a circuit, so we have  $f(x) \geq g(x)$ . By Lemma 2.2 we have  $\lambda_*(B(H)) \geq \mu_1 - 1$ , so  $p_1 \geq (\lambda_*(B(H)))^{-1} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  and therefore  $g(p_1) \geq \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}$  by Theorem 4.1.

Now  $\Delta(\mathcal{W})$  is the girth of  $H$ , so  $\Delta(\mathcal{W}) \geq s$  and therefore the interval  $\{x \in [0, 1] : \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16} \leq g(x) \leq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}\}$  has length at most  $\frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}$  by Theorem 2.1. Therefore  $g(p) = g(p_1 + \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16}) \geq 1 - \frac{\varepsilon^2}{16} \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ . Since  $f(p) \geq g(p)$ , the result follows.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] N. Alon and E. Bachmat, Regular graphs whose subgraphs tend to be acyclic, *Random Struct. Algo.* 29 (2006), 324–337.
- [2] N. Alon, S. Hoory and N. Linial, The Moore Bound for Irregular Graphs, *Graph Combinator.* 18 (2002), 53–57.
- [3] L. Decreusefond and G. Zémor, On the error-correcting capabilities of cycle codes of graphs, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 6 (1997), 27–38.
- [4] R. Diestel, *Graph Theory*, Springer, 2000.
- [5] R. Durrett, *Probability: Theory and Examples* (4th edition), Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [6] A. Frieze and M. Krivelevich, On the non-planarity of a random subgraph, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 22 (2013), 722–732.
- [7] C. Godsil and G. Royle, *Algebraic Graph Theory*, Springer, 2001.
- [8] I. Gelfand, Normierte ringe, *Rech. Math. [Mat. Sbornik]* N.S., 9 (1941), 3–24
- [9] M. Krivelevich and W. Samotij, Long paths and cycles in random subgraphs of  $H$ -free graphs, *Electron. J. Combin.* 21 (2014), P1.30.
- [10] R. Lyons, Random walks and percolation on trees, *Ann. Probab.* 18 (1990), 931–958.
- [11] G. Margulis, Probabilistic characterisations of graphs with large connectivity, *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* 10 (1974), 101–108.
- [12] P. Nelson and Stefan H.M. van Zwam, On the maximum-likelihood decoding threshold for graphic codes, In preparation.
- [13] G. Zémor, Threshold effects in codes, In *Algebraic Coding: Lecture Notes in Computer Science 781*. Springer-Verlag, 278–286.