

Cyber Apocalypse 2026 — Coding — Vow Engine

Challenge	Vow Engine
Category	Coding
Endpoint	<code>http://154.57.164.75:31818</code> (HTTP, Flask/Werkzeug judge)
Flag	<code>HTB{th3_b3ll_r1ngs_wr0ng_0n_purp0s3}</code>

1. Overview

Caldrin Vowmark's rite runs across Garran's *witness-chain*: an undirected graph whose vertices are witnesses and whose edges ("seal-marks") each carry a 6-bit *cadence key*. The weight of an oath carried from one witness to another is the **XOR of every cadence key along the path**.

Garran deliberately built the chain with redundant links, so a pair of witnesses may be joined by many paths — and those paths need not agree on a cadence value. For each of `Q` queries we must answer whether a given target cadence `T` is achievable on *some* path between witnesses `u` and `v`.

Input format

```
N M Q
u v w      × M      (undirected seal-mark u-v with cadence key w)
u v T      × Q      (is cadence T achievable on some path u-v?)
```

Print `YES` / `NO` per query.

Constraints

```
2 ≤ N ≤ 1500      0 ≤ w ≤ 63
1 ≤ M ≤ 2200      0 ≤ T ≤ 63
1 ≤ Q ≤ 1500      the witness-chain may contain redundant loops
```

The two facts that shape the whole solution are hiding in those bounds: weights are **6 bits**, and there is **no guarantee of connectivity or simplicity** (the graph may contain multi-edges and self-loops).

2. Recon

The "endpoint" is not a raw TCP socket — a plain socket connect returns nothing. It is an HTTP service:

```
$ curl -s -i http://154.57.164.75:31818/ | head -5
HTTP/1.1 200 OK
Server: Werkzeug/3.1.3 Python/3.14.0
Content-Type: text/html; charset=utf-8
```

The page is HTB's standard Monaco-editor coding judge. Scraping the inline JS reveals the single API endpoint and its shape:

```
fetch("/run", {
  method: "POST",
  headers: { "Content-Type": "application/json" },
  body: JSON.stringify({ code: code, language: "python" }),
})
// → { challengeCompleted: bool, flag: "...", result: {...} }
```

So the whole challenge is: submit a program that passes every hidden test case, and `/run` hands back the flag. No exploitation involved — this is a pure algorithms problem.

3. The key insight: XOR paths form a coset of the cycle space

Work over the vector space $\mathbf{GF}(2)^6$ (each cadence key is a 6-bit vector; XOR is vector addition).

Root a spanning tree in each connected component and let $d[v]$ be the XOR of weights on the tree path from the root to v . Then:

- The **tree path** from u to v has value $d[u] \oplus d[v]$. (The shared root-to-LCA prefix appears twice and cancels — this is why we don't need an LCA at all.)
- Every **non-tree edge** (a, b, w) closes exactly one fundamental cycle whose value is $c = d[a] \oplus d[b] \oplus w$.

Any walk from u to v decomposes into the tree path plus some subset of fundamental cycles. Conversely any subset of cycles can be appended to the tree path (walk out to the cycle, go around it, walk back — the out-and-back legs cancel because $x \oplus x = 0$). Therefore:

The set of achievable values from u to v is exactly the affine coset $(d[u] \oplus d[v]) \oplus \text{span}(C)$, where C is the set of fundamental cycle values of that component.

A query (u, v, T) is **YES** iff u and v are in the same component **and**

$$T \oplus d[u] \oplus d[v] \in \text{span}(C)$$

Membership is decided by maintaining a **linear basis** (Gaussian elimination in XOR form) over the 6 bits: reduce the residual against the basis and check whether it collapses to 0 .

Complexity

Building the tree, $d[]$ and the basis is one DFS: $O(N + M \cdot 6)$. Each query reduces a 6-bit value against a 6-element basis: $O(6)$. Total $O((N + M + Q) \cdot 6)$ — trivial for these bounds.

Sanity check on the provided example

Edges $0-1(3)$ $1-2(5)$ $2-3(4)$ $3-4(7)$ $0-2(10)$. DFS from 0 :

```
d[0]=0 d[1]=3 d[2]=6 d[3]=2 d[4]=5
```

The single non-tree edge $0-2(10)$ gives cycle value $0 \oplus 6 \oplus 10 = 12$, so $\text{span}(C) = \{0, 12\}$.

Query	$d[u] \oplus d[v]$	residual $T \oplus d[u] \oplus d[v]$	in span?	Answer
$0\ 3\ 2$	2	$2 \oplus 2 = 0$	yes (zero)	YES ✓
$0\ 3\ 5$	2	$5 \oplus 2 = 7$	no	NO ✓
$0\ 1\ 15$	3	$15 \oplus 3 = 12$	yes (= basis)	YES ✓
$0\ 4\ 4$	5	$4 \oplus 5 = 1$	no	NO ✓

All four match the expected output.

4. A subtlety worth pinning down: *simple path* or *walk*?

The coset argument above silently assumes **walks** are allowed (you may re-visit a witness in order to loop around a cycle). If the judge instead meant strictly **simple paths**, the answers genuinely differ. I checked this rather than assumed it.

Brute-forcing all simple paths on 400 random small graphs and comparing against the coset solution produced **93 disagreements out of 2304 queries** — e.g. with a self-loop or a doubled edge, $u = v$, $T = 37$ is **YES** under walk semantics (go around the loop) and **NO** under simple-path semantics.

Two things settle which interpretation the judge uses:

1. **Simple-path XOR-reachability is #P-hard**. Counting/enumerating simple paths at $N = 1500$, $M = 2200$ is hopeless, so no reference solution can be using it.
2. **The bounds $w, T \leq 63$ are a giveaway**. A 6-bit value domain is exactly what makes both feasible approaches work — the linear-basis solution and the alternative **(node, xor)** state-space BFS over $N \times 64$ states.

Those two feasible approaches must agree, and they do. Cross-checking the coset solution against a **(node, xor)** BFS on 500 random graphs — deliberately including **self-loops and multi-edges** — gave **0 mismatches over 4000 queries**:

```
$ python3 brute2.py
  trials=4000 mismatches_vs_walk_bfs=0
```

That is the confirmation that mattered: the implementation is right, self-loops and parallel edges included, under the only semantics the judge can afford.

Two edge cases fall out of the formula for free and were both verified:

- u and v in different components $\rightarrow$ **NO** (checked before the basis lookup; each component carries its own basis).
- $u = v$, $T = 0 \rightarrow$ residual 0 , so **YES** (the empty path), while a nonzero T at $u = v$ is **YES** only if T is itself a cycle value.

5. Solution

```
import sys

def main():
    data = sys.stdin.buffer.read().split()
    pos = 0
    out = []

    while pos + 3 ≤ len(data):
        try:
            n = int(data[pos]); m = int(data[pos + 1]); q = int(data[pos + 2])
        except ValueError:
            break
        pos += 3
        if n < 0 or m < 0 or q < 0:
            break

        # adjacency list
        head = [-1] * n
        nxt = [0] * (2 * m)
        to = [0] * (2 * m)
        wt = [0] * (2 * m)
        ec = 0
        for _ in range(m):
            u = int(data[pos]); v = int(data[pos + 1]); w = int(data[pos + 2])
            pos += 3
            to[ec] = v; wt[ec] = w; nxt[ec] = head[u]; head[u] = ec; ec += 1
            to[ec] = u; wt[ec] = w; nxt[ec] = head[v]; head[v] = ec; ec += 1

        comp = [-1] * n          # component id per witness
        dist = [0] * n          # XOR from component root
        # cycle-space basis per component, indexed by bit position (values are 6-bit)
        bases = []

        for src in range(n):
            if comp[src] ≠ -1:
                continue
            cid = len(bases)
            basis = [0] * 6
            bases.append(basis)
            comp[src] = cid
            dist[src] = 0
            stack = [src]
            while stack:
                u = stack.pop()
                du = dist[u]
                e = head[u]
                while e ≠ -1:
                    v = to[e]
                    nd = du ^ wt[e]
                    if comp[v] = -1:
                        comp[v] = cid
                        dist[v] = nd
                        stack.append(v)
                    else:
                        # back/cross edge → cycle value
                        cyc = nd ^ dist[v]
                        # insert into linear basis over GF(2)
                        for b in range(5, -1, -1):
                            if not (cyc >> b) & 1:
                                continue
```

```

        if basis[b] == 0:
            basis[b] = cyc
            break
        cyc ^= basis[b]
    e = nxt[e]

for _ in range(q):
    u = int(data[pos]); v = int(data[pos + 1]); t = int(data[pos + 2])
    pos += 3
    if comp[u] != comp[v]:
        out.append("NO")
        continue
    r = t ^ dist[u] ^ dist[v]
    basis = bases[comp[u]]
    for b in range(5, -1, -1):
        if (r >> b) & 1 and basis[b]:
            r ^= basis[b]
    out.append("YES" if r == 0 else "NO")

sys.stdout.write("\n".join(out) + ("\n" if out else ""))

main()

```

Implementation notes:

- An **iterative** DFS over a flat CSR-style adjacency list — no recursion limit risk, and no per-node Python list objects.
- The outer `while pos + 3 ≤ len(data)` loop makes the program agnostic to whether the judge feeds one test case per invocation or several concatenated on one stdin stream.
- Every non-tree edge is visited twice (once from each endpoint), inserting the same cycle value `c` and then `c ^ c = 0` — harmless, since inserting `0` reduces to nothing and is discarded.

Performance at maximum constraints (`N=1500`, `M=2200`, `Q=1500`):

```

$ time python3 sol.py < big.txt
python3 sol.py < big.txt 0.01s user 0.00s system 0.021 total

```

21 ms, comfortably inside any judge limit.

6. Getting the flag

```

$ python3 -c "
import json, urllib.request
code = open('sol.py').read()
req = urllib.request.Request('http://154.57.164.75:31818/run',
    data=json.dumps({'code': code, 'language': 'python'}).encode(),
    headers={'Content-Type': 'application/json'})
print(urllib.request.urlopen(req, timeout=120).read().decode())
"
{"challengeCompleted":true,"flag":"HTB{th3_b3ll_r1ngs_wr0ng_0n_purp0s3}","result":{}}

```

Flag

```
HTB{th3_b3ll_r1ngs_wr0ng_0n_purp0s3}
```

7. Takeaways

- **"XOR along a path" is almost always a cycle-space problem.** The reachable set is an affine coset $(d[u] \oplus d[v]) \oplus \text{span}(\text{cycles})$, never a single value. Redundant links in the story ("no single throat to cut") were the hint that the span is nontrivial.
- **Root-XOR distances remove the need for an LCA.** $d[u] \oplus d[v]$ cancels the shared prefix automatically, which is why this runs in $O(1)$ per query rather than $O(\log N)$.
- **Read the bounds as a spec.** $w, T \leq 63$ is not flavour text: the 6-bit domain is what makes both the linear-basis and the $(\text{node}, \text{xor})$ -BFS solutions viable, and it quietly rules out the simple-path reading of the problem.
- **When two readings of a problem disagree, decide it with a brute force, not a guess.** The walk-vs-simple-path ambiguity was real (93 disagreements on random inputs); cross-validating against an independent $(\text{node}, \text{xor})$ BFS is what turned the choice into a checked fact.