
FINDING ALL BOUNDED-LENGTH SIMPLE CYCLES IN A DIRECTED GRAPHS - REVISITED

A PREPRINT

Frank Bauernöppel

Computer Engineering

Hochschule für Technik und Wirtschaft, Berlin, Germany

frank.bauernoeppel@htw-berlin.de

Jörg-Rüdiger Sack

Carleton University Ottawa, School of Computer Science, Canada

sack@scs.carleton.ca

December 10, 2025

ABSTRACT

In 2021, Gupta and Suzumura proposed a novel algorithm for enumerating all bounded-length simple cycles in directed graphs [1]. In this work, we present concrete examples demonstrating that the proposed algorithm fails to enumerate certain valid cycles. Via these examples, we perform a detailed analysis pinpointing the specific points at which the proofs in [1] exhibit logical gaps. Furthermore, we propose a corrected formulation that resolves these issues while preserving the desirable property that the algorithm’s computational complexity remains $O((c+1) \cdot k \cdot (n+e))$ where c is the number of simple cycles of a specified maximum length k , and n and e the number of graph nodes and edges respectively.

Keywords Graph Algorithms · Cycle Enumeration · Algorithm Analysis

1 Introduction

Literature Review. The problem of enumerating all *simple cycles* (cycles without repeated vertices) in a graph is fundamental in graph theory, with applications in areas such as chemistry, circuit analysis, and network science. Early work by Tiernan [2] proposed a backtracking-based algorithm for finding elementary circuits, but it suffered from redundancy and exponential runtime in dense graphs. Johnson [3] later introduced the most influential algorithm for directed graphs, combining depth-first search with a blocking/unblocking mechanism to efficiently avoid revisiting fruitless paths.

His algorithm runs in $O((n+e)(c+1))$ time, where n is the number of vertices, e the number of edges, and c the number of simple cycles. Tarjan [4] contributed foundational work on strongly connected components, which remains an essential preprocessing step in many cycle-enumeration methods. Subsequent improvements, such as those by Szwarcfiter and Lauer [5], refined Tiernan’s approach for better practical performance. More recent studies, such as those by Birmelé et al. [6] and Conte et al. [7], focus on output-sensitive and parallel algorithms to handle large-scale networks.

The most recent algorithm for Finding All Bounded-Length Simple Cycles in a Directed Graph is due to Anshul Gupta and Toyotaro Suzumura [1]. Their algorithm builds upon ideas of Johnson’s algorithm. But, instead of using a binary lock value for each node as in Johnson’s algorithm, the new algorithm uses a numeric lock value for each node, which is designed to prevent futile searches when a cycle search gets too deep.

In an experimental investigation of a GIS problem, we examined the Gupta-Suzumura algorithm. During initial testing, one of the expected cycles in a benchmark graph was not detected, leading us to suspect a possible flaw in our

implementation. After carefully verifying the correctness of our code - which was a line-by-line translation of the pseudocode provided in [1] into Python - we proceeded to conduct a detailed analysis of the specific test case.

This analysis revealed that the proof outlined in [1] exhibits logical gaps, and that the published pseudocode, when executed on the identified graph, indeed fails to enumerate one valid simple cycle in the test case, and possibly more in the general case.

In this paper, we present a concrete counter-example to the algorithm of Gupta and Suzumura [1]. We provide a step-by-step examination of the algorithm's execution on this instance (see section 4), analyze the underlying reasons for the omission of certain cycles (section 5), and identify the precise points in the original proofs where inconsistencies or omissions occur. In section 6, we propose a corrected algorithm and establish its correctness. As we then show in section 7, the algorithm preserves the desired property of being sensitive to the number of simple cycles of a specified length.

2 Terminology

A *directed graph* G is defined as an ordered pair (V, E) , where $V = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ denotes the set of *nodes* (or vertices) and $E \subseteq V \times V$ denotes the set of *directed edges*, represented as ordered pairs of nodes.

A node $v_i \in V$ is said to be *connected* to a node $v_j \in V$ by an edge $v_i v_j$ if and only if the ordered pair (v_i, v_j) belongs to E .

A *path* in G is a finite sequence of nodes $(v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_m})$ such that $(v_{i_j}, v_{i_{j+1}}) \in E$ for all $1 \leq j < m$.

A *simple path* is a path in which all nodes are distinct.

A *simple cycle* is a path $(v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_m})$ with $m \geq 2$ such that $(v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \dots, v_{i_{m-1}})$ is a simple path and $v_{i_1} = v_{i_m}$.

The *length* of a path or cycle is defined as the number of edges it contains.

For brevity, edges, paths, and cycles are denoted by concatenating their node sequences. In the graph G from Figure 1 for example, AD is an edge, ADB is a path, and ADA is a cycle.

3 The original Algorithm from [1]

The original algorithm from [1] consists of three functions:

- $LC_CYCLES(G, k)$: The outer loop that initializes data structures and iteratively calls the cycle search function for each node s in the graph G .
- $CYCLE_SEARCH(G^s, s, k, flen)$: A modified depth-first search function that explores paths starting from a given node s in a subgraph G^s of G , looking for cycles of length up to k .
- $RELAX_LOCKS(u, k, blen)$: A helper function that updates the lock values of nodes after a cycle is found, allowing them to be revisited in future searches.

For the sake of self-completeness, Appendix A presents the functions $CYCLE_SEARCH$ and $RELAX_LOCKS$ from [1], translated into Python to demonstrate the counter-example. Function LC_CYCLES mainly manages an outer loop for finding more cycles not containing the first start node s , and is not further relevant here.

4 A Counter-Example to [1]


Consider the directed graph $G = (V, E)$ with

- node set $V = \{A, B, C, D, E\}$ and
- edge set $E = \{AD, AE, BD, BE, CA, CB, DA, DB, EC\}$

The graph G is depicted in Figure 1.

In an internal computer representation of the graph using an adjacency list, the edges are stored in the order shown above. This ordering affects the sequence in which nodes are explored during depth-first searches. In theory, the ordering should not affect the set of cycles found, but here it does, as will be clear later.

It is straightforward to see that graph G contains the following simple cycles starting at the first node A :

Figure 1: Directed graph $G = (V, E)$

- ADA (length 2)
- $AECA$ (length 3)
- $ADBECA$ (length 5)
- $AECBDA$ (length 5)

Let the function $LC_CYCLES(G, k)$ from [1], the outer loop, be called with the above graph G and $k = 5$ as the length bound parameter.

Function LC_CYCLES starts with initializing for each node v in G

- $lock[v]$ to infinity and
- $Blist[v]$ to an empty set.

The *locks* are numeric values designed to block nodes from being revisited during the search under certain conditions. The *Blists* are of no importance here, as they will remain empty throughout the algorithm execution in this example, but are needed in the general case.

After initialization, the first call to $CYCLE_SEARCH(Gs, s, k, 0)$ is made in line 9 of LC_CYCLES with the parameters $s = A$ (the first node of graph G), $Gs = G$, and $k = 5$.

In the following sub-sections, a commented trace of the execution of $CYCLE_SEARCH(G, A, 5, 0)$ is given.

4.1 Finding Cycle ADA

The search starts as follows:

```

1: cycle_search stack=      v='A' k=5 flen=0: push A, blen←inf, lock[A]←0
2: cycle_search stack=A     v='D' k=5 flen=1: push D, blen←inf, lock[D]←1
3: cycle_search stack=AD    v='D' ##### cycle ADA   found, blen←1 #####

```

The result is depicted in Figure 2.




Figure 2: Graph G after first DFS in $CYCLE_SEARCH(G, A, 5, 0)$ found cycle ADA .

4.2 Finding Cycle $ADBECA$

After backtracking to D , the next cycle $ADBECA$ is found when the depth-first-search continues:

```

4: cycle_search stack=AD    v='B' k=5 flen=2: push B, blen←inf, lock[B]←2
5: cycle_search stack=ADB   v='E' k=5 flen=3: push E, blen←inf, lock[E]←3
6: cycle_search stack=ADBE  v='C' k=5 flen=4: push C, blen←inf, lock[C]←4
7: cycle_search stack=ADBEC v='C' ##### cycle ADBECA found, blen←1 #####

```

see Figure 3.




Figure 3: Graph G after second DFS in $CYCLE_SEARCH(G, A, 5, 0)$ found cycle $ADBECA$.

During the search from D , the locks of the visited nodes B , E , and C are set to their index (depth) in the search stack. All other locks remain unchanged.

Backtracking finally returns to A , thereby calling $RELAX_LOCKS(u, k, blen)$ for each node visited, in backtracking order.

```

8:  relax_locks stack=ADBEC v='C' k=5 blen=1 lock[C]=4
9:  relax_locks stack=ADBEC v='C' k=5 blen=1 lock[C]←5 (=k-blen+1)
10: cycle_search stack=ADBEC v='C' flen=4 lock[C]=5: pop C, return blen=1
11: cycle_search stack=ADBE v='E' blen←2
12:  relax_locks stack=ADBE v='E' k=5 blen=2 lock[E]=3
13:  relax_locks stack=ADBE v='E' k=5 blen=2 lock[E]←4 (=k-blen+1)
14: cycle_search stack=ADBE v='E' flen=3 lock[E]=4: pop E, return blen=2
15: cycle_search stack=ADB v='B' blen←3
16:  relax_locks stack=ADB v='B' k=5 blen=3 lock[B]=2
17:  relax_locks stack=ADB v='B' k=5 blen=3 lock[B]←3 (=k-blen+1)
18: cycle_search stack=ADB v='B' flen=2 lock[B]=3: pop B, return blen=3
19: cycle_search stack=AD v='D' blen←1
20:  relax_locks stack=AD v='D' k=5 blen=1 lock[D]=1
21:  relax_locks stack=AD v='D' k=5 blen=1 lock[D]←5 (=k-blen+1)
22: cycle_search stack=AD v='D' flen=1 lock[D]=5: pop D, return blen=1
23: cycle_search stack=A v='A' blen←2

```

In these calls, the *blen* parameter is representing the backward distance to *A* along the cycle found. Since all *Blist* are still empty sets, *RELAX_LOCKS* does never recurse to itself. *RELAX_LOCKS* will possibly increase a lock value of a node when *blen* is sufficiently small. After backtracking to *A*, graph *G* will look as shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4: Graph *G* after backtracking to *A* in *CYCLE_SEARCH*(*G*, *A*, 5, 0).

4.3 Finding Cycle *AECA*

Now, the depth-first search finds cycle *AECA*. The locks of nodes *E* and *C* are set to their index (depth) in the third search stack.

```

24: cycle_search stack=A v='E' k=5 flen=1: push E, blen←inf, lock[E]←1
25: cycle_search stack=AE v='C' k=5 flen=2: push C, blen←inf, lock[C]←2
26: cycle_search stack=AEC v='C' ##### cycle AECA found, blen←1 #####

```

The other nodes are not affected, see Figure 5.




Figure 5: Graph G after third DFS in $CYCLE_SEARCH(G, A, 5, 0)$ found cycle $AECA$.

4.4 Missing Cycle $AE CBDA$

After cycle $AECA$ was found, but before node C is completely explored, node B is considered in the search. But, as the lock of node B has a value of 3 (see steps 17, 18), according to line 9 of the pseudocode, the search does *not* recurse to B .

```

27: relax_locks stack=AEC v='C' k=5 blen=1 lock[C]=2
28: relax_locks stack=AEC v='C' k=5 blen=1 lock[C]←5 (=k-blen+1)
29: cycle_search stack=AEC v='C' flen=2 lock[C]=5: pop C, return blen=1
30: cycle_search stack=AE v='E' blen←2
31: relax_locks stack=AE v='E' k=5 blen=2 lock[E]=1
32: relax_locks stack=AE v='E' k=5 blen=2 lock[E]←4 (=k-blen+1)
33: cycle_search stack=AE v='E' flen=1 lock[E]=4: pop E, return blen=2
34: cycle_search stack=A v='A' blen←2
35: relax_locks stack=A v='A' k=5 blen=2 lock[A]=0
36: relax_locks stack=A v='A' k=5 blen=2 lock[A]←4 (=k-blen+1)
37: cycle_search stack=A v='A' flen=0 lock[A]=4: pop A, return blen=2
38: halt

```

As a consequence, the proposed search algorithm misses cycle $AE CBDA$.

After missing that cycle, the search backtracks from C via E to A , thereby updating (relaxing) the locks along the way. The final result is shown in Figure 6.




Figure 6: Graph G after backtracking to A in $CYCLE_SEARCH(G, A, 5, 0)$.

Finally, $CYCLE_SEARCH(G, A, 5, 0)$ completes and returns to LC_CYCLES . In LC_CYCLES , the outer loop, the first start node $s = A$ will now be removed from the graph and in all further calls to $CYCLE_SEARCH$, node A is no longer contained. Thus, cycle $AECBDA$ cannot be found anymore.

This example demonstrates that the proposed algorithm does not always find all cycles of specified length k in a directed graph.

4.5 Remarks

This counter-example was the first identified through a systematic search of small, strongly connected directed graphs. An arbitrary number of additional counter-examples can be generated by introducing further nodes and edges connected to G exclusively via edges outgoing from D and edges incoming to A , adding more instances of the above construct, etc..

Although modifying the order of edges in the adjacency list - that is, the internal representation of the graph - may enable the algorithm to enumerate all cycles, this does not constitute a valid solution. A correct algorithm must identify all cycles independently of the order in which edges are presented in the input graph. (Trying all orders is obviously infeasible.)

5 Analysis of the Proof

The interesting part in the correctness proof in [1], chapter 4, is Lemma 2: Function $CYCLE_SEARCH$ outputs every cycle of length k or less in subgraph G^s .

The first valid (length k bound) cycle that is not detected by the algorithm is $AECBDA$.

In terms of the original paper, edge CB is the first so called *blocked* edge. Search stack AEC is not the first visit to node B , and the last visit before was with search stack AD during the second depth-first search yielding cycle $ADBECA$. Since this last visit before did successfully find a cycle, the second possibility in the proof of Lemma 2 applies. In that case, at the end of page 7 of [1], it is concluded that the path from v_{i+1} to s (BDA) of length 2 must have been successfully traversed during that last visit. But, this is not true, as node D was at this time already on the search stack AD and therefore blocked when the last visit hit B .

This establishes that Lemma 2 of [1] contains gaps.

6 Our Revised Algorithm

Our corrected algorithm does not employ parameter $blen$ in $RELAX_LOCKS$ of [1], but instead relaxes all locks immediately to infinity, as shown in the modified pseudocode below. We will show that this leads to a correct solution

and, subsequently, that it maintains the same order of time complexity. For ease of notation, we will use v_j to denote v_{i_j} .

```

1 function RELAX_LOCKS (u, k, blen)
2   if (Lock(u) < ∞) then
3     Lock(u) = ∞;
4     for (w ∈ Blist(u))
5       if (w ∉ Stack) RELAX_LOCKS (w, k, blen+1);
6     end for
7   end if
8 end RELAX_LOCKS

```

Figure 7: Modified *RELAX_LOCKS* function

To establish the correctness of our approach, we focus on function *CYCLE_SEARCH* in a graph G^s with a given origin s and length bound k , and re-prove Lemma 2 of [1]. This is the only lemma affected by the change of *blen* in *RELAX_LOCKS*.

Lemma 2. *Function CYCLE_SEARCH outputs every cycle of length k or less in sub-graph G^s starting at node s .*

Proof. By contradiction, initially guided by ideas from [1].

Assumption (Minimality): Assume that the lemma is not true. Then, among all valid cycles, there is a first one, in execution order of the algorithm, missed during *CYCLE_SEARCH*($G^s, s, k, 0$).

Let that cycle be $C_v = (s = v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_l, s)$ which has a length of $l + 1$.

Because C_v is a valid cycle, it holds that

$$l + 1 \leq k. \quad (1)$$

In a call *CYCLE_SEARCH*($G^s, s, v, k, flen$) the recursion to a descendant w of v is blocked, if and only if the condition on line 9 of *CYCLE_SEARCH* is not met.

Assume that (v_i, v_{i+1}) is the first (smallest index) blocking edge in C_v , i.e. the search with search stack $S_v = (s = v_0, v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i)$ arrives at v_i , but does not recurse to v_{i+1} . Node v_{i+1} cannot be s , because for s the if-condition in line 6 of *CYCLE_SEARCH* is true and the cycle would have been found immediately and not missed.

Therefore,

$$0 \leq i < l. \quad (2)$$

Consider the call *CYCLE_SEARCH*($G^s, v_i, k, flen$) which led to the blocking edge. Parameter *flen* is the recursion depth, which has for the current search stack S_v the value i .


Using Equation 1 and Equation 2, one gets $i < l < k$ and therefore the second clause $(flen + 1) < k$ of the blocking condition in line 9 of *CYCLE_SEARCH* is true. Thus, the first clause must be false and from that it follows that

$$i + 1 \geq Lock(v_{i+1}). \quad (3)$$

This means that $Lock(v_{i+1})$ is finite at search stack S_v , and, because all locks are initialized to infinity, node v_{i+1} must have been visited before.

Let $S_u = (s = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_j, v_{i+1})$ be the previous search stack which visited v_{i+1} last, before the current search stack S_v arrives at the blocking edge. Both stacks are not identical, but their node sets may overlap.

The situation is depicted in Figure 8.

Figure 8: Search stacks S_v and S_u .

Observation: the entire search rooted in S_u does not find any valid cycle. Otherwise, that visit to v_{i+1} would have called $RELAX_LOCKS(v_{i+1}, k)$ when finally backtracking to v_{i+1} , which would have reset $Lock(v_{i+1})$ back to infinity.

But, the previous search stack S_u has set $Lock(v_{i+1})$ to the finite value j , and by Equation 3 it follows that

$$i + 1 \geq j. \quad (4)$$

Now, consider the concatenation of that previous search stack S_u with the tail of the first cycle missed:

$$C_{uv} = (s = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_j, v_{i+1}, \dots, v_l, s).$$

C_{uv} is a cycle in G^s of length $j + (l - i)$. Using Equation 1 we get

$$j + (l - i) \leq i + 1 + (l - i) = l + 1 \leq k. \quad (5)$$

and thus C_{uv} has a valid length not greater than k .

If C_{uv} is a simple cycle, we have an immediate contradiction to the minimality of C_v and we are done. Therefore, we now assume that C_{uv} is not simple.

This means, there is some node u_h ($0 < h \leq j$) which is identical to some v_m ($i + 1 < m \leq l$). If there is more than one such u_h , we choose the one with minimal index h and the corresponding m .

Then, during $CYCLE_SEARCH$ at v_{m-1} along C_{uv} , the search did not recurse to v_m , because v_m is u_h and that node is already on the stack.

No cycle was found at v_{m-1} , and thus v_{m-1} was put on $Blist(v_m)$ in line 16 of $CYCLE_SEARCH$. In the same manner, while further backtracking along C_{uv} , every node v_{g-1} was put on the $Blist$ of its successor v_g as long as the cycle search rooted at node v_g did not find a valid cycle.

By the observation from above, $found$ must be false at least until the backtracking along C_{uv} reaches node v_{i+1} and v_{i+1} is put on the $Blist$ of its successor.

But, $found$ was true when the search further backtracked to node u_h , since the shortcut $(s = u_0, u_1, \dots, u_h = v_m, v_{m+1}, \dots, v_l, s)$ is a valid cycle, which is, by minimality of C_v , found by the algorithm.

As a consequence, $RELAX_LOCKS(u_h, k)$ was called when u_h was popped from the stack. Thus, $RELAX_LOCKS(u_h, k)$ eventually sets $Lock[v_{i+1}]$ back to infinity, possibly via recursive calls to itself along the $Blist$ path from $u_h = v_m$ back to v_{i+1} .

Node u_h must be popped from the stack before the search stack S_v reaches v_i again, because u_h is v_m and C_v is simple.

Thus, $Lock[v_{i+1}]$ is back at infinity when the search stack S_v considers edge (v_i, v_{i+1}) , and, contrary to the assumptions, that edge cannot be a blocking edge.

Summarizing, in either case we have a contradiction to the assumption that there is a first valid cycle which is not found during $CYCLE_SEARCH(G^s, s, k, 0)$, respectively, that there is a first blocking edge in that cycle.

Therefore, the lemma holds. □

7 Complexity Analysis

The time complexity analysis of the revised algorithm remains similar to that of the original algorithm presented in [1].

The lock of a node is relaxed to infinity at most once when a cycle is found. Later on, finite lock values are set to $flen$ (the length of the current search stack) which is always smaller than k . Finite lock values are possibly further decreased for each time the node is re-visited by another depth-first search with a smaller $flen$, but before the next cycle is found and the lock is relaxed again. Therefore, each lock can be decreased at most k times between two relaxations to infinity, i.e. at most k times per cycle found.

Thus, the overall time complexity of the revised algorithm is $O((c+1) \cdot k \cdot (n+e))$, where n is the number of nodes, e is the number of edges, and c is the number of simple cycles of length at most k in the directed graph G .

Finally, the important efficient application to sparse graphs with maximum node degree d remains the same as in the original algorithm.

8 Conclusions

We have demonstrated that the algorithm proposed in [1] does not reliably enumerate all bounded-length simple cycles in a directed graph. Additionally, we have identified the specific weaknesses in the proof provided in that work. Finally, we present a corrected algorithm that preserves the desirable property of having computational complexity sensitive to the specified cycle length.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Jochen Kerdels from HTW Berlin, Dept. of Computer Engineering, who independently implemented the algorithm in C++ and verified the counter-example.

A Appendix: Python Code demonstrating the Counter-Example

The functions *cycle_search* and *relax_locks* in Figure 9 below were adapted from [1] and implemented in Python.

```

1 import math
2 import networkx as nx
3
4 G = nx.parse_adjlist(['A D E', 'B D E', 'C A B', 'D A B', 'E C'], create_using=nx.DiGraph)
5
6 lock = {v : math.inf for v in G.nodes}
7 Blist = {v: set() for v in G.nodes}
8 stack = []
9
10 def relax_locks(v, k, blen):
11     if lock[v] < k-blen+1:
12         lock[v] = k-blen+1
13         for w in Blist[v]:
14             if w not in stack:
15                 relax_locks(w, k, blen+1)
16
17 def cycle_search(G, v, k, flen):
18     blen = math.inf
19     lock[v] = flen
20     stack.append(v)
21     for w in G.successors(v):
22         if w==stack[0]:
23             print(f"new cycle of length {flen+1}: {stack+[w]}")
24             blen = 1
25         elif (flen+1<lock[w]) and (flen+1<k):
26             blen = min(blen, 1+cycle_search(G, w, k, flen+1))
27     if blen < math.inf:
28         relax_locks(v, k, blen)
29     else:
30         for w in G.successors(v):
31             if v not in Blist[w]:
32                 Blist[w].add(v)
33     stack.pop()
34     return blen
35
36 cycle_search(G, 'A', 5, 0)

```

Figure 9: Python Program demonstrating the Counter-Example

References

- [1] Anshul Gupta and Toyotaro Suzumura. Finding all bounded-length simple cycles in a directed graph. *CoRR*, abs/2105.10094, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.10094>.
- [2] J. C. Tiernan. An efficient search algorithm to find the elementary circuits of a graph. *Communications of the ACM*, 13(12):722–726, 1970.
- [3] Donald B. Johnson. Finding all the elementary circuits of a directed graph. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 4(1):77–84, 1975. doi:10.1137/0204007. URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/0204007>.
- [4] R. E. Tarjan. Depth-first search and linear graph algorithms. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 1(2):146–160, 1972.
- [5] J. L. Szwarcfiter and P. E. Lauer. A search strategy for the elementary cycles of a directed graph. *BIT Numerical Mathematics*, 16(2):192–204, 1976.
- [6] E. Birmelé, R. A. Ferreira, R. Grossi, A. Marino, N. Pisanti, R. Rizzi, and G. Sacomoto. Optimal listing of cycles and st-paths in undirected graphs. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 2013)*, pages 1884–1896, 2013.
- [7] A. Conte, R. Grossi, A. Marino, and L. Versari. Listing k -subgraphs with bounded delay. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA 2017)*, pages 26:1–26:15, 2017.