

# Tree-based phylogenetic network (TBN) の構造定理が導く色々な高速アルゴリズム

早水 桃子 モデリング研究系 助教

## Glossary (Informal)

**'Phylogenetic network'**

- ✓ **Generalisation of phylogenetic trees**
  - The origin of all species
  - Estimated ancestors
  - Vertices of in-degree 2 are allowed!
  - Present-day species
- ✓ **Useful to represent...**
  - Noises in the data
    - Data (dissimilarities)
  - Uncertainty in the histories
    - Incompatible data
- ✓ **Drawback:** Flexible, but there are many NP-hard problems!

## Glossary (Informal)

**'Tree-based phylogenetic network (TBN)'**

- ✓ Subclass of phylogenetic networks [Francis & Steel, 2015]
- ✓ Studied by many combinatorialists and theoretical computer scientists

Phylogenetic network

- Too general (Many NP-hard problems)
- Still biologically meaningful
- Mathematical / computational properties: **not clear yet!**
- Too restrictive (Oversimplified model)

Tree-based phylogenetic network (TBN)

Phylogenetic tree

## Abstract

- **Goal of this study**
  - To develop a **framework** for solving various important problems on TBNs
  - To derive many fast algorithms **in a unified manner**
- **Results**

**Main theorem**

Structural characterisation of TBNs

**Algorithms for various problems**

Decision/search	← Linear time
Counting	← Linear time
Enumeration	← Linear time delay
Optimisation	← Linear time

Preprint M. Hayamizu: 'A structure theorem for tree-based phylogenetic networks', arXiv:1811.05849 [math.CO]

## Notation & definitions

- **Terminology**
  - **Graph / Network** ... All refer to **finite, simple, directed acyclic** graphs.
  - For a graph  $G$ ,  $V(G)$ : its vertex-set,  $A(G)$ : its arc-set
  - A graph with a set  $V$  of vertices and a set  $A$  of arcs is denoted by  $(V, A)$ .

For each arc (directed edge) of  $G$

$tail(a)$   $head(a)$

$(u, v)$   $a$

For each vertex  $v$  of  $G$

$indeg_G(v) :=$  # arcs of  $G$  whose head is  $v$

$outdeg_G(v) :=$  # arcs of  $G$  whose tail is  $v$

- A vertex  $v$  of a graph  $G$  is called a **leaf** of  $G$  if  $(indeg_G(v), outdeg_G(v)) = (1, 0)$  holds.
- A graph  $G$  is said to be **binary** if for each internal vertex  $v$  of  $G$ ,  $(indeg_G(v), outdeg_G(v)) = (1, 2)$  holds.

Leaves

## Notation & definitions

- **Arc-induced subgraph**
  - For a graph  $G$ ,  $A' \subseteq A(G)$  is said to **induce the subgraph**  $G[A'] := (V(A'), A')$  of  $G$ , where  $V(A')$  denotes the set of all ends of the arcs in  $A'$ .
- **Decomposition of a graph**
  - Given a graph  $G$  and a partition  $\{A_1, \dots, A_k\}$  of  $A(G)$ , the collection  $\{G[A_1], \dots, G[A_k]\}$  of arc-induced subgraphs of  $G$  is called a **decomposition** of  $G$ .

## Notation & definitions

- $X$ : a non-empty finite set  $\{1, \dots, n\}$
- **A rooted binary phylogenetic X-network** is defined to be a DAG that satisfies:
  - ✓  $\exists!$  root (or)
  - ✓ each internal vertex is
  - ✓  $X$  = the set of leaves
- A rooted binary phylogenetic X-tree is the special case when  $\nexists$ .

For short...

- $\mathcal{T}_X$ : a collection of all rooted binary phylogenetic X-trees
- $\mathcal{N}_X$ : a collection of all rooted binary phylogenetic X-networks

## Notation & definitions

- **Tree-based phylogenetic network (TBN)** [Francis & Steel, 2015]
  - **Intuition:** a phylogenetic tree with additional arcs
  - **Definition:**  $N \in \mathcal{N}_X$  is called a TBN if  $N$  can be obtained by the following procedure:
    - Start with an arbitrary element of  $\mathcal{T}_X$
    - Subdivide each arc zero or more times
    - Place vertex-disjoint arcs between new vertices
    - Smooth all  $v$  with  $indeg(v) = outdeg(v) = 1$
- **Equivalent definition** [H, 2018]
  - A **subdivision tree of  $N$**  is defined to be a spanning tree  $T$  of  $N$  s.t.  $T$  is a subdivision of some element of  $\mathcal{T}_X$
  - $N \in \mathcal{N}_X$  is a **TBN** if  $N$  has one or more subdivision trees.

## Problem description

[Francis and Steel (2015)]

- **① Decision/search problem** [Francis & Steel, 2015]
  - Given a rooted binary phylogenetic X-network  $N \in \mathcal{N}_X$ , find a subdivision tree of  $N$  if  $N$  is a TBN, and report that ' $N$  is not a TBN' otherwise.
- **Motivation**
  - Biologist often wish to discover an underlying tree  $T$  of  $N$ ; however, such a tree  $T$  might not exist for some  $N$ . (i.e., TBNs form a 'proper' subclass of  $\mathcal{N}_X$ )
- **Known results**
  - $\exists$  a linear time algorithm for this decision/search problem ( $\because$  It can be formulated as the 2-SAT problem)
  - Alternatively, from Hall's marriage theorem [Zhang, 2016]

## Problem description

[Francis and Steel (2015)]

- **② Counting problem**
  - Given a rooted binary phylogenetic X-network  $N \in \mathcal{N}_X$ , determine the number  $\alpha(N)$  of subdivision trees of  $N$ .
- Francis & Steel (2015) conjectured that counting  $\alpha(N)$  'might be hard'. (because counting # of solutions of 2-SAT is #P-complete.)
- **Motivation**
  - $\alpha(N)$  may be useful to quantify the **structural complexity** of  $N$ .

## Problem description

[Francis and Steel (2015)]

- **③ Enumeration problem**
  - Given a rooted binary phylogenetic X-network  $N \in \mathcal{N}_X$ , list all subdivision trees  $T_1, \dots, T_{\alpha(N)}$  of  $N$ .
- **Motivation**
  - Useful for **uniform sampling** of subdivision trees of  $N$
- **Known results**
  - The number  $\alpha(N)$  of solutions can be exponential in size of  $N$  (but details are unclear)

## Problem description

[H (2018)]

- **④ Optimisation problem**
  - Given a rooted binary phylogenetic X-network  $N \in \mathcal{N}_X$  associated with a weighting function  $w: A(T) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , find a subdivision tree  $T^*$  of  $N$  that maximises the value of  $f = \sum_{a \in A(N)} w(a)$ .
- **Motivation**
  - Estimation of the 'most likely' tree within the input  $N$ 
    - ✓  $w(a)$ : probability of each arc  $a \in A(N)$
    - ✓  $f(T)$ : the likelihood of a subdivision tree  $T$
- **Known results**
  - Recall: the number  $\alpha(N)$  of subdivision trees can be exponential. ( $\Rightarrow$  Exhaustive search takes exponential time! Any efficient method?)

## Useful result

[Francis & Steel (2015)]

**Definition**

Given a rooted binary phylogenetic X-network  $N$  and a subset  $S \subseteq A(N)$ ,  $S$  is called an **admissible subset of  $A(N)$**  if  $S$  satisfies the following conditions:

- **Condition ①**  $indeg_N(v) = 1 \vee outdeg_N(u) = 1 \Rightarrow S$  contains  $(u, v)$
- **Condition ②**  $head(a_1) = head(a_2) \Rightarrow S$  contains exactly one arc in  $\{a_1, a_2\}$
- **Condition ③**  $tail(a_1) = tail(a_2) \Rightarrow S$  contains at least one arc in  $\{a_1, a_2\}$ .

**Theorem**

Given a rooted binary phylogenetic X-network  $N$  and its (spanning) subtree  $T$ ,  $T$  is a subdivision tree of  $N$  if and only if  $A(T)$  is an **admissible subset of  $A(N)$** .

The collection of subdivision trees of  $N$   $\mathcal{T} := \{T_1, \dots, T_{\alpha(N)}\}$   $\leftrightarrow$  The family of admissible subsets of  $A(N)$   $\mathcal{A} = \{A(T_1), \dots, A(T_{\alpha(N)})\}$

## Key ideas

- **Def. (Maximal zig-zag trail)**
  - A subgraph  $Z$  of  $N$  with  $m \geq 1$  arcs is called a **zig-zag trail** in  $N$  if there exists a permutation  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$  of  $A(Z)$  such that for any  $i \in [1, m-1]$ , either  $head(a_i) = head(a_{i+1})$  or  $tail(a_i) = tail(a_{i+1})$  holds.
  - $Z$  is **maximal** if  $Z$  is not a proper subgraph of another zig-zag trail in  $N$ .
- **The four types of maximal zig-zag trails**
  - Crown
  - W-fence
  - N-fence
  - M-fence

## Key ideas

- **Decomposition lemma** [H, 2018]
  - For any rooted binary phylogenetic X-network  $N$ , there exists a **unique** decomposition  $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_k\}$  of  $N$  s.t. each  $Z_i$  is a maximal zig-zag trail in  $N$ .
- **Structural analogue of Francis & Steel's theorem**
  - $S \subseteq A(N)$  is an admissible subset of  $A(N) \Leftrightarrow \forall$  maximal zig-zag trail  $Z_i$  in  $N$ ,  $S \cap A(Z_i)$  is an admissible subset of  $A(Z_i)$ .

## Main result

- **Structure theorem for TBNs** [H, 2018]
  - $N$ : a rooted binary phylogenetic X-network
  - $Z = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_k\}$ : an (arbitrarily) ordered set of the maximal zig-zag trails of  $N$ .
  - $N$  is a TBN  $\Leftrightarrow$  No element  $Z_i$  of  $Z$  is a W-fence.
  - $N$  is a TBN  $\Rightarrow$  The family of admissible subsets of  $A(N)$  is characterised by the direct product of  $\mathcal{S}(Z_i)$ , where
 
$$\mathcal{S}(Z_i) := \begin{cases} \{(10)^{m_i/2}, (01)^{m_i/2}\} & \text{if } Z_i \text{ is a crown;} \\ \{(101)^{m_i-1/2}\} & \text{if } Z_i \text{ is an N-fence;} \\ \{(101)^p(10)^q \mid p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, p+q = (m_i-2)/2\} & \text{if } Z_i \text{ is an M-fence.} \end{cases}$$

## Corollaries

- **Algorithms** [H, 2018]
  - $\alpha(N) = \alpha(Z_1) \times \dots \times \alpha(Z_k)$ , where
 
$$\alpha(Z_i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } Z_i \text{ is a W-fence;} \\ 1 & \text{if } Z_i \text{ is an N-fence;} \\ 2 & \text{if } Z_i \text{ is a crown;} \\ |A(Z_i)|/2 & \text{if } Z_i \text{ is an M-fence.} \end{cases}$$
  - $\therefore$  The **counting problem** can be solved in  $O(|A(N)|)$  time. (We can solve the **decision/search problem** simultaneously.)
  - Similarly, the **enumeration problem** can be solved in  $O(k|A(N)|)$  time, where  $k$  is the number of solutions we want to list.
  - Moreover, the **optimisation problem** can be solved in  $O(|A(N)|)$  time. ( $\because$  we can automatically get the global optima by gathering local optima.)

## Numerical example

- **Quantifying the complexity of  $N$  by counting  $\alpha(N)$**
- **Maximal zig-zag trail decomposition**
  - ✓ # maximal N-fences: 21
  - ✓ # maximal M-fences: 7
  - $\alpha(N) = 7 \cdot 6 \cdot 5 \cdot 4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 1 = 5040$
- **Advantage of exact computation**
  - Compare the above number with a trivial upper bound  $2^{21} = 2097152$ .
- **How complex is  $N$ ?**
  - The above number is still smaller than # of the rooted binary phylogenetic X-trees, given by  $(2|X|-3)!! = 13 \cdot 11 \cdot \dots \cdot 5 \cdot 3 \cdot 1 = 135135$ .
  - $\therefore N$  is not complex enough to cover all possible evolutionary scenarios.

## Summary

Problem	Input	Output	Time complexity	Potential applications
Decision/Search	$N$ : phylogenetic network	Whether or not $N$ is tree-based If $N$ is tree-based, find a tree inside $N$	Linear [Francis & Steel, 2015] (Proof based on 2-SAT) [Zhang, 2016] (Proof based on Hall's marriage theorem) [H, 2018] (Proof based on a structure theorem for TBNs)	Checking whether the data can be explained by a phylogenetic tree + additional arcs
Counting	$N$ : phylogenetic network	# of all possible trees	Linear [H, 2018] (Proof based on a structure theorem for TBNs)	Quantifying the structural complexity of $N$
Enumeration (Listing)	$N$ : phylogenetic network	Set of all possible trees	Linear-delay [H, 2018] (Proof based on a structure theorem for TBNs)	Uniform sampling of trees inside $N$
Optimisation	$N$ : phylogenetic network $w$ : associated weighting ( $>0$ ) (e.g., probability)	Tree to maximise a prescribed objective function $f$ (e.g., likelihood)	Linear [H, 2018] (Proof via a structure theorem for TBNs)	Estimating the 'best-fit' tree inside $N$