

# Reconstructing pedigrees: some identifiability questions for a recombination-mutation model

Bhalchandra D. Thatte

Department of Statistics, University of Oxford,  
Oxford OX1 3TG, United Kingdom

bdthatte@gmail.com

November 21, 2018

## Abstract

Pedigrees are directed acyclic graphs that represent ancestral relationships between individuals in a population. Based on a schematic recombination process, we describe two simple Markov models for sequences evolving on pedigrees - Model R (recombinations without mutations) and Model RM (recombinations with mutations). For these models, we ask an identifiability question: is it possible to construct a pedigree from the joint probability distribution of extant sequences? We present partial identifiability results for general pedigrees: we show that when the crossover probabilities are sufficiently small, certain spanning subgraph sequences can be counted from the joint distribution of extant sequences. We demonstrate how pedigrees that earlier seemed difficult to distinguish are distinguished by counting their spanning subgraph sequences.

Mathematics Subject Classifications: Primary: 60, 05, Secondary: 05C60,92D

Keywords: reconstructing pedigrees, identifiability, recombinations, mutations

## 1 Introduction

Phylogenetics is a study of how species are related to each other. Evolutionary relationships are most conveniently represented by rooted leaf-labelled trees, where the leaves represent extant species and the root represents their most recent common ancestral species. Similarly other internal vertices of evolutionary trees correspond to extinct ancestral species.

The arrival of DNA and protein sequence data in the last forty years led to explosive growth of phylogenetics. Many of the modern phylogenetic methods consider sequence data under probabilistic models of sequence evolution. For such models to be useful for phylogenetic inference, it is important to establish their *identifiability* (i.e., to show that

nonisomorphic trees or different model parameters cannot induce the same distribution on the sequences at the leaves under a given model of sequence evolution). Mathematical theory of phylogenetic trees, especially probabilistic models of sequence evolution, the associated questions of identifiability and statistical consistency (especially of the maximum likelihood methods) have been extensively studied [12, 5], giving a firm statistical foundation to the study of phylogenetic trees.

While phylogenetic trees represent relationships between species, population pedigrees represent how individuals within a population are related to each other. Communities all over the world have long been curious about knowing their ancestral histories, and have often kept detailed records of their family trees. In fact this curiosity goes back much further in the past than the interest in constructing evolutionary relationships between species. An example of a fairly detailed record of family histories is the Icelandic database Íslendingabó (The Book of Icelanders <http://www.islendingabok.is>) of genealogical records that covers almost the whole Icelandic population and goes back to nearly 1200 years. Such ancestral histories are often compiled from a variety of sources such as church records, birth and death records, obituaries etc. that are prone to ambiguities or missing data beyond a few generations in the past.

In the last several years large amounts of data on intra-population genetic variation have been recorded. For example, the Icelandic biomedical company deCode Genetics has compiled genomic, genealogical and health data of more than 100000 individuals (which is a significant proportion of the current Icelandic population). Such data offer promising opportunity to cross check and resolve ambiguities in historic genealogical records besides being useful for other studies such as, for example, genetic factors associated with medical conditions. Therefore, there is a renewed interest in accurately inferring pedigrees from genomic data. The statistical and combinatorial foundation for studying reconstruction problems for pedigrees has not been as developed as in phylogenetics. A purpose of this paper is to continue our earlier attempts to develop such a foundation for the problem of reconstructing pedigrees from observations (sequences) on extant individuals.

To develop such a foundation, we need to establish results along the following lines: developing a biologically realistic model for sequences undergoing mutations and recombinations, and identifiability results for such a model; statistical consistency results; and finally results that give estimates for the amount of genomic data necessary to reliably construct pedigrees. This paper is mainly about identifiability questions.

In the rest of this section, we discuss the above theoretical motivation in more detail. We begin by informally sketching some well known reconstruction and identifiability results for phylogenetic trees that not only motivate the work in this paper but also are crucially useful in the proof of the main identifiability result of this paper.

*Results of Zareckiř and Buneman.* It was shown in [20] that a leaf-labelled tree can be uniquely constructed from the pairwise distances between its leaves. The result was strengthened slightly as follows [3]. Suppose that  $f$  is an *additive function* on the family of subsets of cardinality 2 of the vertex set of a leaf-labelled tree. Here *additive* means that for any two vertices  $r$  and  $s$ , we have  $f(\{r, s\}) = \sum f(e)$ , where the summation is

over all edges  $e$  on the (unique) path from  $r$  to  $s$ . Buneman showed that knowing  $f$  on all pairs of leaves of a leaf-labelled tree without vertices of degree 2 is sufficient to uniquely construct the tree and the function. It is not surprising that these results are quite useful in phylogenetics, where observations on extant species (leaves of an evolutionary tree) are used to infer a suitably defined distance (or an additive function) between pairs of species, and then their phylogenetic tree is constructed uniquely.

*Results of Steel and Chang.* Now suppose the evolutionary process on a (rooted) tree is modelled as follows: first the root is assigned a random state from a finite alphabet  $\Sigma$  (e.g.,  $\Sigma$  may be  $\{A,T,G,C\}$  in the case of DNA sequences). Each state is assumed to have a nonzero probability of being assigned to the root. Each edge of the tree has associated with it a  $|\Sigma| \times |\Sigma|$  matrix of substitution probabilities. These substitution probabilities determine how the vertex-states evolve away from the root, and induce a distribution of states at the leaves of the tree. The model was formulated in [13] as described above, while a slightly more general formulation in terms of Markov random fields on unrooted trees was given in [4]. It was independently shown by Chang and Steel that when the matrices defining the substitution probabilities satisfy certain mild conditions, the (unrooted) tree can be uniquely recovered from the joint distribution of states at the leaves of the tree. In particular they showed that the negative logarithm of the determinant of the matrix of substitution probabilities between pairs of vertices is an additive function on the pairs of vertices, and can be computed from the probability distribution on extant sequences. It was further proved in [4] that the substitution matrices are also identifiable from the marginal distributions on triples of leaves of the tree. Special cases of these results for models more commonly used in phylogenetics were known in the phylogenetics literature earlier.

How far can we generalise such results if the underlying structure is more general than a tree? A recent result in this direction is due to [2] where it is shown that under some mild non-degeneracy conditions the dependency structure of a Markov random field can be obtained from sufficiently many independent samples.

In this paper we present simple models for recombinations and mutations for population pedigrees, and generalise phylogenetic identifiability results for them. One difference between reconstructing Markov random fields and reconstructing pedigrees is that for pedigrees we have observations only on the extant individuals (e.g., DNA sequences derived from living individuals). Moreover, in the problem of reconstructing pedigrees, the samples of data (e.g., columns in a sequence alignment) are not *i.i.d.* (independent and identically distributed) as a result of recombinations.

In [14, 15], we studied some purely combinatorial reconstruction problems motivated by Zareckiĭ's result, for example, the problem of reconstructing a pedigree from the pairwise distances between its extant individuals or from its subpedigrees (pedigrees of subsets of the extant population). In [15], we showed that a pedigree cannot in general be reconstructed from the collection of its proper subpedigrees. Such a result implies that knowing pairwise distances between extant vertices is in general not enough to reconstruct pedi-

grees.

In [16], we considered models for sequences evolving on pedigrees, and showed that for certain simple Markov models, pedigrees are not identifiable from the distribution of observed states at extant vertices. We did construct examples of processes for which pedigrees could be proved to be identifiable, but the processes lacked the Markovian property, which informally states that the state observed at a vertex depends only on the states of its parents. Moreover, it seems that pedigrees that are difficult to reconstruct in a purely combinatorial framework (e.g., from pairwise distances between extant vertices or from subpedigrees) are also likely to be difficult to reconstruct in a stochastic framework. For example, if a pedigree cannot be reconstructed from its proper subpedigrees, then the marginal distributions of extant sequences on proper subsets of the extant population might be insufficient to uniquely recover the pedigree. On the other hand, negative results in a combinatorial setting may not imply non-identifiability in a stochastic framework. It is therefore important to study combinatorial reconstruction problems (e.g., classification of pedigrees that may be difficult to reconstruct combinatorially), stochastic identifiability problems for idealised Markov models of recombination and mutation, and relationships between these problems.

Reconstruction problems of purely combinatorial nature are well known to combinatorialists, the foremost among such problems being the vertex reconstruction conjecture [18]. The conjecture states that all simple undirected unlabelled graphs can be constructed from their collection of unlabelled induced subgraphs. Combinatorial reconstruction problems have also been studied in phylogenetics, for example, problems of reconstructing phylogenetic trees from subtrees [1].

Steel and Chang proved their phylogenetic identifiability results in two parts: computation of the additive ‘log determinant’ function on pairs of leaves from the joint probability distribution on leaf states, and the combinatorial problem of reconstructing a tree from the additive function, which had been solved by Buneman and Zareckiĭ. Similarly the problem of reconstructing pedigrees under a recombination-mutation model may be solved in two parts: in the first part, we would like to reduce the identifiability question to an appropriate combinatorial reconstruction problem, and then in the second part we would like to show that the combinatorial reconstruction problem has a unique solution. To ensure the uniqueness of reconstruction, we will have to compute sufficiently strong combinatorial invariants of the pedigree from the joint distribution of extant sequences.

Although we noted that distances between extant vertices in a pedigree are not sufficient to reconstruct a pedigree, we sketch a heuristic argument given in [17] that shows how the distances between extant vertices in a discrete generation pedigree may be obtained from sequence data. Suppose  $a$  and  $b$  are two extant individuals in a pedigree. Suppose further that in the pedigree there are  $n := n(k : a, b)$  pairs of paths such that one of the paths in each pair ends on  $a$  and the other ends on  $b$ , and the two paths in each pair start at a common ancestor of  $a$  and  $b$  in the  $k$ -th generation, and the two paths in a pair do not share any other vertex. Now if sufficiently many short recombination-free homologous segments of DNA of  $a$  and  $b$  are compared, then we would expect about  $n/2^{2k}$  of them to have a common ancestor in the  $k$ -th generation. Thus it may be possible

to estimate  $n(k : a, b)$ . Such calculations are theoretically possible for small values of  $k$  assuming the population is large and the sequences are long. They then tried to use the numbers  $n(k : a, b)$  for all pairs  $\{a, b\}$  for all  $k$  to construct the pedigree. They computationally found many pairs of non-isomorphic pedigrees that have the same number of pairs of paths of each length. One such example is the pair of pedigrees shown in Figure 5, which was also mentioned in [14].

But a more detailed analysis of sequence similarities (between multiple sequences, if required) under simple recombination and mutation models may give us more information than just pairwise distances between living individuals. In the main theorem of this paper (Theorem 5.13), we show that the joint distribution on extant sequences determines a class of combinatorial invariants (e.g., certain types of subgraph sequences) that supersedes pairwise distances between extant sequences and subtrees (genealogical trees) in a pedigree. We then show that pedigrees, such as the ones in Figure 5, that earlier seemed difficult to distinguish due to their combinatorial similarities (including the non-reconstructible pedigrees constructed in [15]) are distinguished by the class of invariants.

This paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we define pedigrees, alignments and subgraph sequences. In Section 3, we give a schematic description of the recombination process, and formalise three models for sequences: Model R (a model in which there are recombinations but no mutations), Model RM (a model in which there are recombinations and mutations), and Model M (a model of mutations for sequences evolving on trees). We then formulate identifiability problems for these models. In Section 4, we analyse pedigrees with two generations under Model R. In Section 5, we prove the main theorem (Theorem 5.13) and demonstrate its applications. In the last section, we discuss a few open questions. A section on nomenclature follows the references where all symbols appearing in the paper and the number of the page on which they appear first are listed.

## 2 Pedigrees, alignments and subgraph sequences

We use the following notation for number systems and their subsets:  $\mathbb{Z}$  for the set of integers,  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  for the set of positive integers,  $\mathbb{N}$  for natural numbers,  $[m]$  for the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ . Depending on the context, we write  $[a, b]$  for the set of integers  $\{a, a + 1, \dots, b\}$  or real numbers  $a \leq x \leq b$  (and similarly  $(a, b)$ ,  $[a, b)$  and  $(a, b]$  for open or half-open intervals in integers and reals). The set of all  $k$ -tuples of elements of a set  $S$  is written as  $S^k := \{(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_k) \mid s_i \in S, i \in [k]\}$ . The set of all functions from  $X$  to  $S$  is written as  $S^X := \{f : X \rightarrow S\}$ .

Next we introduce some graph theoretic notation. The vertex set and the edge set of a graph  $G$  are denoted by  $V(G)$  and  $E(G)$ , respectively, and their cardinalities by  $v(G)$  and  $e(G)$ , respectively. The in-degree and the out-degree of a vertex  $u$  in a directed graph are denoted by  $d^-(u)$  and  $d^+(u)$ , respectively. The degree of a vertex  $u$  in an undirected graph (or the total degree in a directed graph) is denoted by  $d(u)$ . An arc from  $u$  to  $v$  in a directed graph and also an edge between  $u$  and  $v$  in an undirected graph is written

as  $uv$ , and it will be understood from the context whether  $uv$  is meant to be a (directed) arc or an (undirected) edge. When any two objects  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are isomorphic, we write  $G_1 \cong G_2$ . The isomorphism class of an object  $G$  is written as  $\|G\|$ . For a collection  $\mathcal{G}$  of labelled objects, we write  $\|\mathcal{G}\|$  for the set of isomorphism classes of objects in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let  $G$  and  $H$  be two directed or undirected graphs. We write  $G \leq H$  (or  $H \geq G$ ) if  $G$  is isomorphic to a subgraph of  $H$ , and this notation may be used when  $G$  or  $H$  is unlabelled (i.e., they are just isomorphism classes). We write  $G \subseteq H$  (or  $H \supseteq G$ ) when a labelled graph  $G$  is a subgraph (or a supergraph) of a labelled graph  $H$ .

**Definition 2.1 (General pedigrees).** A *general pedigree*  $P(X, Y, U, E)$  of a set  $X$  is a directed acyclic graph on a vertex set  $U \supseteq X \cup Y$  and a set of arcs  $E$  such that each vertex has in-degree 0 or 2. The set  $X$  is the set of vertices with out-degree 0. The set  $Y$  is the set of vertices with in-degree 0. The vertices in  $X$  are called the *extant vertices* (or the extant individuals in the population). The vertices in  $Y$  are called the *founder vertices* (or the founders of the population). The *order* of the pedigree is  $|X|$ . The *depth* of a pedigree is the length of (i.e., the number of arcs in) a longest path in the pedigree. Two pedigrees  $P(X, Y, U, E)$  and  $Q(X, Z, V, F)$  are said to be *isomorphic* if there is a one-one map  $\pi : U \rightarrow V$  such that  $uv$  is an arc in  $P$  if and only if  $\pi(u)\pi(v)$  is an arc in  $Q$ , and  $\pi(x) = x$  for all  $x \in X$ . We denote the natural partial order on  $U$  by  $\leq$ , i.e.,  $v \leq u$  if there is a directed path from  $u$  to  $v$  (or  $u = v$ ).

We define isomorphism only between pedigrees of the same set of extant individuals and require that it fixes all extant vertices because (informally speaking) we would like to treat extant vertices to be labelled and other vertices to be unlabelled. Throughout this paper, we will assume that all pedigrees have  $X$  as their set of extant vertices.

**Definition 2.2 (Diploid pedigrees).** Let  $P(X, Y, U, E)$  be a pedigree. Suppose that  $U$  can be partitioned into unordered pairs of vertices such that the following conditions hold: the extant vertices are paired with extant vertices and the founder vertices are paired with founder vertices; two non-extant vertices  $v$  and  $w$  are paired if and only if there are arcs  $vu$  and  $wu$  in  $E$ ; no two paired vertices have a common parent. Then  $P$  together with one such pairing is called a *diploid pedigree*.

Thus any general pedigree is a *haploid pedigree*; a diploid pedigree is a haploid pedigree with a pairing of its vertices (although not all pedigrees admit such a pairing). The pairing in a diploid pedigree is completely determined by the pairing of its extant vertices since all other pairs are determined by the definition. An advantage of a purely combinatorial definition of a diploid pedigree is that we can now assign just one sequence to each vertex. From this point of view, haploid pedigrees are pedigrees of sequences, not of individuals. Pedigrees of individuals are diploid pedigrees obtained by pairing sequences in a haploid pedigree. Figure 1 illustrates this point of view. When vertices (sequences)  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  are paired,  $A_j$  and  $B_j$  must be paired, since they are parents of  $A_i$ ; similarly,  $A_k$  and  $B_k$  must be paired.

**Definition 2.3 (Sequence alignments and characters).** Let  $\Sigma$  be a finite set (called an *alphabet*) and  $U$  a finite set. A *character* on  $U$  is a map  $C : U \rightarrow \Sigma$ . For  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ ,




Figure 1: Pairing vertices (sequences) of a haploid pedigree

an *alignment* of length  $L$  on  $U$  is a map  $A : U \rightarrow \Sigma^L$ . Equivalently, an alignment is an  $L$ -tuple  $(C_1, C_2, \dots, C_L)$  of characters on  $U$ , or a two dimensional array of symbols from  $\Sigma$ , with  $|U|$  rows and  $L$  columns. The rows of the array are called *sequences*, and are written as  $A(i)$ ,  $i = 1$  to  $|U|$ . Individual entries in the array are written as  $A(i, j)$ , where  $i = 1$  to  $|U|$  and  $j = 1$  to  $L$ . The columns of an alignment are called *sites*.

Usually  $U$  will be the set of vertices of a pedigree, and we will be interested in alignments restricted to the set  $X$  of extant vertices of the pedigree. The space of characters on  $X$  is  $\Sigma^X$ , which is also referred to as the space of *site patterns*. The set of alignments of length  $L$  on a set  $X$  is  $(\Sigma^X)^L$ , which we write as  $\Sigma^{XL}$ .

Let  $P(X, Y, U, E)$  be a pedigree and let  $A \in \Sigma^{UL}$  be an alignment on  $P$ . If the sequences in  $A$  have evolved under some process of recombination or mutation, then (regardless of the details of the model of recombination or mutation) we may suppose that each site in each sequence is inherited only from one of the two parent sequences. Therefore, for each  $u \in U$  and each  $j \in [L]$ , there is a unique directed path  $P_{uj}$  from some founder vertex  $y_{uj}$  to  $u$  that defines the genetic ancestry of  $A(u, j)$ . Therefore, each site  $j$  has associated with it a spanning forest  $G_j := \cup_{u \in U} P_{uj}$ , and each alignment of length  $L$  has an underlying (usually unknown) sequence  $(G_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, L)$  of spanning forests. Similarly, each site  $j$  has associated with it a *directed subforest* defined by  $T_j := \cup_{x \in X} P_{xj}$ , and we have a *directed subforest sequence*  $(T_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, L)$  of the alignment. Here we define these notions purely graph theoretically (without reference to alignments or models).

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $X$  be a finite set. A *directed  $X$ -forest*  $T$  is a directed forest that satisfies the following conditions: the set of vertices with out-degree 0 is  $X$ , and is called the *leaf set* of  $T$ ; each component has a single vertex of in-degree 0, called the *root vertex* of the component, and all other vertices have in-degree 1; all arcs are directed away from the root vertices. An *undirected  $X$ -forest* is an unrooted forest with leaf set  $X$ . Suppose  $T$  is a directed  $X$ -forest. It induces a natural partition of  $X$  into *maximal clusters*  $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k$  such that vertices in cluster  $X_i$  have a unique most recent common ancestor (MRCA)  $u_i$  in  $T$ . We construct a subgraph of  $T$  induced by  $u_i, i \in [k]$  and their descendants in  $T$ , and then replace its (directed) arcs by (undirected) edges. The resulting undirected

unrooted graph is called the *undirected  $X$ -forest* of  $T$ , written as  $T_u(T)$ . It is the maximal undirected  $X$ -forest contained in  $T$ .

In the above definition, the term  *$X$ -forest* is meant to be analogous to the term  *$X$ -tree* that is commonly used in phylogenetics [12]. In this paper we will adapt some of the phylogenetic identifiability results for undirected  $X$ -forests that appear as undirected graphs underlying subgraphs of pedigrees. Therefore, in the following definition, we specialise the terms for pedigrees.

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $P$  be a pedigree. A *spanning forest* of  $P$  is a spanning subgraph  $G$  of  $P$  such that the in-degree of each vertex in  $G$  is 1 unless it is a founder vertex in  $P$ . A *directed  $X$ -forest* of  $P$  is a subgraph  $T$  of  $P$  such that  $T$  is a directed  $X$ -forest and the root vertex of each component of  $T$  is a founder vertex in  $P$ . Each spanning forest  $G$  in  $P$  contains a unique directed  $X$ -forest of  $P$ , and we denote it by  $T_d(G)$ . An *undirected  $X$ -forest* in  $P$  is the unique undirected  $X$ -forest in any directed  $X$ -forest in  $P$ . Each spanning forest  $G$  in  $P$  contains a unique undirected  $X$ -forest of  $P$ , and we denote it by  $T_u(G)$ .

Note that we use the term *spanning forest* in a specific sense: a spanning forest is not any spanning forest in the graph theoretic sense. We illustrate these terms in Figure 2, which shows a pedigree and a spanning forest  $G$  with  $E(G) = \{da, a1, a2, eb, b3, fc\}$  (shown by bold arcs). In this example, the unique directed  $X$ -forest  $T_d(G)$  in  $G$  has the arc set  $\{da, a1, a2, eb, b3\}$ ; its clusters are  $X_1 = \{1, 2\}$  and  $X_2 = \{3\}$ , and the root vertices of its components are  $d$  and  $e$ . The unique undirected  $X$ -forest  $T_u(G)$  in  $G$  consists of vertex set  $\{1, 2, 3, a\}$  and edge set  $\{a1, a2\}$ . Note that vertex 3 is isolated in  $T_u(G)$  since it is the MRCA of its cluster, but we need it in our analysis.




Figure 2: A pedigree and a spanning forest, which is shown by bold arcs

**Definition 2.6.** Two (directed or undirected)  $X$ -forests  $T$  and  $T'$  are said to be *isomorphic* (written  $T \simeq T'$ ) if there is a graph theoretic isomorphism  $\pi$  from  $T$  to  $T'$  such that  $\pi(x) = x$  for all  $x$  in  $X$ . The isomorphism class of a directed or an undirected  $X$ -forest  $T$ , denoted by  $\|T\|$ , is the set of all  $X$ -forests  $T'$  that are isomorphic to  $T$ .



The set of all directed  $X$ -forests of  $P$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{T}_P$ . The set of isomorphism classes of directed  $X$ -forests of  $P$  (or the set of *distinct* directed  $X$ -forests in  $P$ ) is denoted by  $\|\mathcal{T}_P\|$ . The set of spanning forests of a pedigree  $P$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{G}_P$ . The set of undirected  $X$ -forests of  $P$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{U}_P$ . The set of isomorphism classes of undirected  $X$ -forests of  $P$  (or the set of *distinct* undirected  $X$ -forests in  $P$ ) is denoted by  $\|\mathcal{U}_P\|$ .

**Proposition 2.7.** *Each spanning forest of a pedigree  $P$  has  $e(P)/2$  arcs and contains exactly one directed  $X$ -forest. There are  $2^{e(P)/2}$  spanning forests. Each directed  $X$ -forest  $T$  is contained in  $2^{(e(P)-2e(T))/2}$  spanning forests.*

*Proof.* Each spanning forest of  $P$  is obtained by selecting one of the two arcs that point to each non-founder vertex. The unique directed  $X$ -forest  $T$  in a spanning forest  $G$  is the subgraph of  $G$  spanned by vertices in  $G$  that are ancestral in  $G$  to the extant vertices. Finally,  $e(P) - 2e(T)$  is the number of arcs not pointing to vertices in  $T$ , therefore,  $(e(P) - 2e(T))/2$  is the number of non-founder vertices outside  $T$ , at each of which we can choose one of the two incoming arcs to construct a spanning forest containing  $T$ .  $\square$

In any model of recombination, the number of recombination events is determined by the spanning forest sequence underlying an alignment, but we define it for all spanning forest sequences without reference to alignments or models.

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $P$  be a pedigree and let  $\mathbf{G} := (G_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, L)$  be a spanning forest sequence in  $P$ . If  $vu$  and  $wu$  are distinct arcs in  $P$  such that  $vu$  is in  $G_i$  and  $wu$  is in  $G_{i+1}$ , then we say that a recombination has occurred at site  $i$  at vertex  $u$  or that  $i$  is a recombining site. If  $vu$  is an arc in  $G_i$  and  $G_{i+1}$  then we say that there is no recombination at  $u$  at site  $i$ . We define the number of recombinations in  $\mathbf{G}$  to be

$$r(\mathbf{G}) := \sum_{i=1}^{L-1} |E(G_{i+1}) \Delta E(G_i)|/2,$$

where  $|E(G_{i+1}) \Delta E(G_i)|/2$  is the number of recombinations separating  $G_i$  and  $G_{i+1}$ . The number of points of no recombination is

$$s(\mathbf{G}) := \sum_{i=1}^{L-1} |E(G_{i+1}) \cap E(G_i)|.$$

The directed  $X$ -forest sequence of  $\mathbf{G}$  is the sequence  $\mathbf{T}_d := (T_d(G_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, L)$ , and the undirected  $X$ -forest sequence of  $\mathbf{G}$  is the sequence  $\mathbf{T}_u := (T_u(G_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, L)$ .

### 3 Models R and RM, and identifiability problems

We assume that in any reasonable model of sequence evolution, sequences are first assigned to the founder vertices, and then subsequent generations of individuals inherit their sequences from their parents' sequences subject to recombinations and mutations. We are then interested in the following types of *identifiability* questions.

**Problem 3.1.** Suppose sequences of equal length over a finite alphabet are assigned to the founder vertices of a pedigree. The sequences then evolve on the pedigree undergoing recombinations and mutations, giving a probability distribution on the space of alignments on the set of extant vertices. Can we determine the pedigree uniquely (i.e., up to isomorphism) - with or without the knowledge of the size or the depth of the pedigree or the various probability parameters defining the recombination and mutation processes, with or without restrictions such as discrete generations or constant population, and so on? In the case of diploid pedigrees, we will be given the distribution on alignments on the set of extant vertices along with a pairing of extant vertices.

In this paper, we study the above types of questions under two simple models of recombination and mutation. In *Model R*, we assume that sequences evolve on a pedigree under a process of recombinations without mutations. In *Model RM*, we assume that sequences evolving on a pedigree undergo recombinations and mutations. For convenience, we also formalise the mutation part of Model RM for the spanning forests of pedigrees and in general for directed  $X$ -forests, and call it *Model M*.

In all these models, we assume that first all the founder vertices of a pedigree (or the root vertices of a spanning forest or a directed  $X$ -forest) are assigned sequences. These sequences are independently selected from a uniform distribution on  $\Sigma^L$ , where  $\Sigma$  is a known finite alphabet. Then the sequences evolve on the pedigree (or a spanning forest or a directed  $X$ -forest) in a top-down manner, i.e., a vertex is assigned a sequence only after its parents have been assigned sequences.

We begin with a schematic description of the recombination process. Our description is largely based on Chapter 12 of [7]. Figure 3 schematically shows the process of gamete (sperm or egg) formation in eukaryotes. Initially there is a parent cell with one pair of homologous non-sex chromosomes. Each chromosome is then duplicated with the identical sister *chromatids* joined together at the *centromere*, forming a *four-strand bundle*. Then the two duplicated chromosomes exchange material between *chiasmata* (*recombination points*). In the diagram, there are three recombination events. The first recombination is between strands 1 and 3 (counted from top to bottom), the second is between strands 2 and 4, and the third is between strands 2 and 3. The four chromatids after the exchange of material are shown next. Then the cell undergoes two cell divisions to create four haploid gametes, each receiving one of the four chromosomes.

As shown in the diagram, at each recombination point a crossover occurs between one strand from the first pair and one strand from the second pair. At each crossover, a strand from the first pair and a strand from the second pair are chosen randomly with equal probability (independent of other chiasma). This independence property is known as the lack of *chromatid interference*.

Suppose that the locations of recombinations are modelled as a Poisson point process along the sequence (or on  $[0, \infty)$ ) with the rate  $\lambda$  or a Bernoulli process with probability  $p$  (so that a crossover occurs after a site on a sequence with probability  $p$  independently of other sites or sequences). Since exactly two of the four gametes - one from the first pair and one from the second pair - inherit any recombination, any given gamete inherits a recombination with probability  $1/2$ . Therefore, for the sequence of any fixed gamete,

the locations of recombinations are still modelled by a Poisson process, but with the rate  $\lambda/2$ , (or Bernoulli process with probability  $p/2$ ). Therefore, a model may be formalised with just two parent sequences instead of four. A Poisson process for the locations of chiasmata was first proposed in [6]. Based on the above description, we formalise models R and RM, in which we assume that crossovers in a finite sequence occur according to a Bernoulli process.




Figure 3: Schematic description of recombination for diploid cells - (A) two homologous chromosomes in a parent cell (B) each chromosome is duplicated and a 4-strand bundle is formed (C) the sister chromatids of the first chromosome exchange material with the sister chromatids of the second chromosome between recombination points 1,2,3 (D) four chromatids after the exchange of material (E) the four strands are inherited by four gametes

*Model R:* Consider three sequences  $A(i)$  of length  $L$  over alphabet  $\Sigma$ , where  $i \in \{u, v, w\}$  and  $v$  and  $w$  are parents of  $u$ . The sequence  $A(u)$  is obtained by recombining sequences  $A(v)$  and  $A(w)$  as follows. Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be a Markov chain on the state space  $\{v, w\}$  with transition probabilities  $p_{ij} = p$  if  $i \neq j$  for  $i, j \in \{v, w\}$ , and  $\Pr\{X_1 = v\} = \Pr\{X_1 =$

$w\} = 1/2$ . Then, for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, L$ ,  $A(u, k) \leftarrow A(i, k)$  if  $X_k = i$ . Thus  $X_{k+1} \neq X_k$  indicates a crossover from one sequence to the other. We refer to this model as *Model R*.

*Model RM*: Consider three sequences  $A(i)$  of length  $L$  over alphabet  $\Sigma$ , where  $i \in \{u, v, w\}$  and  $v$  and  $w$  are parents of  $u$ . The sequence  $A(u)$  is obtained from the sequences  $A(v)$  and  $A(w)$  by a process of recombinations and mutations as follows. Let  $X_1, X_2, \dots$  be a Markov chain on the state space  $\{v, w\}$  with transition probabilities  $p_{ij} = p$  if  $i \neq j$  for  $i, j \in \{v, w\}$ , and  $\Pr\{X_1 = v\} = \Pr\{X_1 = w\} = 1/2$ . Then if  $X_k = i$  and  $A(i, k) = r$ , then  $A(u, k)$  is assigned  $r$  with probability  $1 - (\Sigma - 1)\mu$ , and  $A(u, k)$  is assigned a state different from  $r$  with probability  $(\Sigma - 1)\mu$ . When a state different from  $r$  is assigned to  $A(u, k)$ , each state in  $\Sigma \setminus \{r\}$  has equal probability  $\mu$  of being assigned to  $A(u, k)$ . We refer to this process as *Model RM*.

*Model M*: This process is defined for spanning forests of a pedigree and directed  $X$ -forests. First each founder or the root vertex in each component of a directed  $X$ -forest is assigned independently and uniformly randomly a state from  $\Sigma$ . Suppose  $j$  is the parent vertex of  $i$  in a spanning forest of a pedigree or in a directed  $X$ -forest. Let  $A(i)$  and  $A(j)$  be the sequences of  $i$  and  $j$ , respectively, both of equal length  $L$  over alphabet  $\Sigma$ . Then for each  $k \in [L]$ ,  $A(i, k)$  is assigned the same state as  $A(j, k)$  with probability  $1 - (\Sigma - 1)\mu$ , and  $A(i, k)$  is assigned a state different from  $A(j, k)$  with probability  $(\Sigma - 1)\mu$ . When a state different from  $A(j, k)$  is assigned to  $A(i, k)$ , each state in  $\Sigma \setminus \{A(j, k)\}$  has equal probability  $\mu$  of being assigned to  $A(i, k)$ . We refer to this process as *Model M*.

Model M on a directed  $X$ -forest  $T$  is equivalent to a similarly formulated model on the undirected  $X$ -forest of  $T$ . We root each component of the undirected  $X$ -forest arbitrarily, and assign to it a state from  $\Sigma$  uniformly randomly, independent of the roots of other components. The state then evolves away from the root in each component. If a component itself is an isolated vertex, it is simply assigned a state from  $\Sigma$  uniformly randomly. Since the mutation model described here is reversible, the same distribution on the site patterns is observed on  $X$  in the undirected  $X$ -forest as in a directed  $X$ -forest for a given  $\mu$ . Therefore, when we try to construct a tree from the character distribution on its leaves, we cannot construct the directed  $X$ -forest, but we can at best construct the undirected  $X$ -forest in it. Therefore, we will consider Model M only on undirected  $X$ -forests.

Thus Model RM may be thought of as a synthesis of Models R and M so that the recombination-free segments of sequences evolving on a pedigree may be examined under Model M with phylogenetic methods.

Let  $P$  be a pedigree on  $X$ . For an alignment  $A \in \Sigma^{XL}$ , we denote by  $\Pr\{A \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$  the probability that sequences of length  $L$  evolving on the pedigree  $P$  under model  $RM(p, \mu)$  give an alignment  $A$  on  $X$ . We use analogous notation when the model  $RM(p, \mu)$  is replaced by the model  $R(p)$ , or when the pedigree  $P$  is replaced by a directed or an undirected  $X$ -forest  $T$  and the model under consideration is the mutation model  $M(\mu)$ . We denote the various probability spaces by  $(\Sigma^{XL} : P, RM(p, \mu))$ ,  $(\Sigma^{XL} : P, R(p))$ ,

$(\Sigma^{XL} : T, M(\mu))$ ,  $(\Sigma^X : T, M(\mu))$ , and so on. For pedigrees  $P$  and  $Q$ , we will write  $(\Sigma^{XL} : P, RM(p, \mu)) = (\Sigma^{XL} : Q, RM(p, \mu))$  when  $\Pr\{A \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\} = \Pr\{A \mid Q, RM(p, \mu)\}$  for all  $A \in \Sigma^{XL}$ , and analogously for other models.

As in the case of alignments, we treat the spaces of spanning forest sequences, directed  $X$ -forest sequences, and undirected  $X$ -forest sequences as probability spaces, and denote them by  $(\mathcal{G}^L : P, R(p))$ ,  $(\mathcal{T}^L : P, R(p))$ , and  $(\mathcal{U}^L : P, R(p))$ , respectively. The spanning forest sequences, and directed and undirected  $X$ -forest sequences, (and the corresponding sequences of isomorphism classes of spanning forests and directed and undirected  $X$ -forests) are defined by only the recombination events, therefore, the probability spaces are unchanged if  $R(p)$  is replaced by  $RM(p, \mu)$ . For a spanning forest sequence  $\mathbf{G} := (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_L)$ , we will write  $\Pr\{\mathbf{G} \mid P, R(p)\}$  for the probability of  $\mathbf{G}$  in the probability space  $(\mathcal{G}^L : P, R(p))$ . We will use analogous notation for other sequences and probability spaces. Unless stated otherwise, when we will refer to alignments or sequences of spanning forests or other objects, we will mean alignments or sequences of spanning forests or other objects, respectively, from the appropriate probability spaces that are clear in the context.

**Definition 3.2.** Nonisomorphic pedigrees  $P$  and  $Q$  in a class  $\mathcal{C}$  are said to be distinguished from each other under model  $RM(p, \mu)$  if  $(\Sigma^{XL} : P, RM(p, \mu)) \neq (\Sigma^{XL} : Q, RM(p, \mu))$  for some  $L$ , (i.e., for some  $L$ , there exists  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \Sigma^{XL}$  such that  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\} \neq \Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid Q, RM(p, \mu)\}$ ). A pedigree  $P$  in a class  $\mathcal{C}$  is said to be identifiable under model  $RM(p, \mu)$  if it is distinguished from every other pedigree  $Q$  in  $\mathcal{C}$ , (i.e., if there is a pedigree  $Q$  in  $\mathcal{C}$  such that  $(\Sigma^{XL} : P, RM(p, \mu)) = (\Sigma^{XL} : Q, RM(p, \mu))$  for all  $L \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , then  $Q$  is isomorphic to  $P$ ). Pedigrees in a class  $\mathcal{C}$  are said to be identifiable under model  $RM(p, \mu)$  if all pairs of pedigrees in  $\mathcal{C}$  are distinguished from each other under model  $RM(p, \mu)$ .

Similar terminology will be used for other models and for undirected  $X$ -forests. Stronger notions of identifiability may be defined, and correspondingly stronger variants of identifiability questions may be asked. The above definitions assume the model parameters to be fixed. But we may ask if there are nonisomorphic pedigrees  $P$  and  $Q$  and model parameters  $p, p', \mu, \mu'$  such that  $(\Sigma^{XL} : P, RM(p, \mu)) = (\Sigma^{XL} : Q, p', \mu')$  for all  $L \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Given the probability distribution a pedigree induces on the space of alignments, we may ask if the pedigree can be recognised to be in a class  $\mathcal{C}$ . We assume in all results in this paper that the model parameters and the class  $\mathcal{C}$  (typically defined by the size of a pedigree) to be fixed (but possibly unknown).

*Remark 3.3.* Pedigrees of order 1 are in general not identifiable since for all pedigrees of order 1, the extant sequence will be uniformly distributed. In fact for all pedigrees, all extant sequences will be uniformly distributed. But when there are more than one extant vertices, the joint distribution of extant sequences will contain some information about the pedigree on which they have evolved, because, for example, some vertices may have common ancestors, so their sequences will be correlated. We will therefore consider identifiability questions for pedigrees of order more than 1.

The models R and RM on a pedigree  $P$  with  $e(P) = 2e$  arcs may be interpreted as Hidden Markov Models with the set of hidden states  $\mathcal{G}_P$  and the set of observed states  $\Sigma^X$ .

This is illustrated in Figure 4. The initial probability for each hidden state is  $1/2^e$ . The probability of an observed state conditional on a given hidden state  $G \in \mathcal{G}_P$  can be easily computed (and actually depends only on  $T_u(G)$  and  $\mu$ ). The probability of transition from state  $G_i$  to  $G_j$  is given by

$$\Pr\{G_j \mid G_i\} = p^{|E(G_j) \Delta E(G_i)|/2} (1-p)^{|E(G_j) \cap E(G_i)|} \quad (3.1)$$

In most contexts in which HMMs are used, one assumes that the set of hidden states is known, but here we do not know the set  $\mathcal{G}_P$ . We also note that the sequence of  $X$ -forests is not a Markov chain. Consider directed  $X$ -forests  $T_j$  and  $T_{j+1}$  at sites  $j$  and  $j+1$ , respectively. Suppose a vertex  $u$  in  $V(T_{j+1}) \setminus V(T_j)$  has parents  $v$  and  $w$  in the pedigree. The probability that the arc  $vu$  is in  $T_{j+1}$  depends on the history before the  $j$ -th site. For example, if  $vu$  was in  $T_{j-1}$  then the probability that it would also be in  $T_{j+1}$  is  $(1-p)^2 + p^2$ . But if  $vu$  was not in  $T_{j-1}$  the probability that it would be in  $T_{j+1}$  is  $2p(1-p)$ . Therefore,  $T_1, T_2, \dots$  is not a Markov chain, i.e.,  $\Pr\{T_{j+1} \mid T_j, T_{j-1}, \dots, T_1, P, R(p)\}$  may not be the same as  $\Pr\{T_{j+1} \mid T_j, T'_{j-1}, \dots, T'_1, P, R(p)\}$  if the sequences  $T_{j-1}, \dots, T_1$  and  $T'_{j-1}, \dots, T'_1$  are different. Therefore, we cannot interpret the models as HMMs with directed or undirected  $X$ -forests as hidden states.




Figure 4: An observed sequence  $C_1, C_2, \dots$  of characters at the extant vertices of a pedigree  $P$ . Among the intermediate chains, only  $G_1, G_2, \dots$  is a Markov chain.

## 4 Analysis of some examples under Model R

In this section, we analyse diploid pedigrees and certain haploid pedigrees that obey many properties of diploid pedigrees under model  $R$ . We show that, with some exceptions and

mild conditions on  $p$  and  $|\Sigma|$ , diploid pedigrees of depth 2 are reconstructible from the probability distribution on the alignments on extant vertices. We use very basic techniques such as pairwise comparisons between extant sequences to exploit the correlation between them to reconstruct their pedigree.

Let  $P$  be a pedigree and let  $T$  be an undirected  $X$ -forest. We define  $n(G > T : P) := |\{G \in \mathcal{G}_P : T_u(G) \cong T\}|$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $P$  be a pedigree with  $e(P) = 2e$  arcs. Let  $C \in \Sigma^X$  be any character. Then the probability that the  $k$ -th character in an alignment is  $C$  is given by*

$$\Pr\{C_k = C \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\} = \sum_{T \in \|\mathcal{U}_P\|} \frac{n(G > T : P)}{2^e} \Pr\{C \mid T, M(\mu)\}. \quad (4.1)$$

*In particular, it does not depend on  $k$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $G_1, G_2, \dots$  be a spanning forest sequence. It is a time-homogeneous Markov chain on  $\mathcal{G}_P$ , with transition probabilities given by

$$\Pr\{G_{j+1} = G' \mid G_j = G\} = p^{|E(G') \Delta E(G)|/2} (1-p)^{|E(G') \cap E(G)|}.$$

It follows that  $\Pr\{G_k = G\} = 1/2^e$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ . Let  $C_1, C_2, \dots \in \Sigma^X$  be a sequence of characters. Then, under Model RM,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\{C_k = C \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\} & (4.2) \\ &= \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_P} \Pr\{C_k = C \mid G_k = G\} \Pr\{G_k = G \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^e} \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_P} \Pr\{C_k = C \mid G_k = G\} \\ &= \sum_{T \in \|\mathcal{U}_P\|} \frac{n(G > T : P)}{2^e} \Pr\{C \mid T, M(\mu)\}. \end{aligned}$$

A similar result holds when Model RM is replaced by Model R. □

The above proposition implies that if two pedigrees have the same number of undirected  $X$ -forests of each type and the same number of arcs, then the character frequencies in alignments alone are not sufficient to distinguish the two pedigrees. For example, pedigrees in Figure 5 cannot be easily distinguished.

But it turns out that, under Model R, most diploid pedigrees of depth 2 are easily distinguished by making pairwise comparisons between extant sequences and computing the probability that they agree at a site. The above proposition implies that the probability that two sequences in an alignment agree at a site  $k$  does not depend on  $k$  in Models R and RM. Moreover, such a probability can be computed easily under Model R. Any given undirected  $X$ -forest  $T$  of a pedigree induces a partition of its leaves so that the




Figure 5: Nonisomorphic haploid pedigrees

leaves within a component are in the same part. Under Model R, the probability that the sequences at two leaves  $i$  and  $j$  are in the same state at a site is 1 if they are in the same component of  $T$ . Otherwise, the probability is  $1/|\Sigma|$ . Under Model RM, the probability depends on  $\mu$  if they are in the same component, and is  $1/|\Sigma|$  otherwise.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $P$  be a diploid pedigree of depth 2. Let  $i, j \in X$ . Then the subpedigree of  $i$  and  $j$  is determined by the probability distribution induced on  $\Sigma^{\{i,j\}}$  under Model R.*

*Proof.* There are four possible ways in which any two vertices  $i$  and  $j$  are related in a diploid pedigree, which are shown in Figure 6. For each of them, we give the probability that the sequences  $A_i$  and  $A_j$  match at any site  $k$ . In the following, we set  $\delta := \frac{1}{16|\Sigma|}$ .




Figure 6: Four ways in which  $i$  and  $j$  may be related

*Case 1:* If  $i$  and  $j$  have the same parents, then  $\Pr\{A(i, k) = A(j, k)\} = 8\delta + (1/2)$ .

*Case 2:* If  $i$  and  $j$  have distinct pairs of parents but the same grand parents, then  $\Pr\{A(i, k) = A(j, k)\} = 12\delta + (1/4)$ .

*Case 3:* If  $i$  and  $j$  have distinct pairs of parents but exactly one pair of grand parents in common, then  $\Pr\{A(i, k) = A(j, k)\} = 14\delta + (1/8)$ .

*Case 4:* If  $i$  and  $j$  have no common parents or grand parents, then  $\Pr\{A(i, k) = A(j, k)\} = 16\delta$ .



Therefore, unless  $|\Sigma| = 1$ , the above cases are distinguished by the marginal joint distribution on  $\Sigma^{\{i,j\}}$  under Model R.  $\square$

*Remark 4.3.* The assumption that  $P$  is a diploid pedigree is essential. It implies that  $i$  and  $j$  are not related as in the haploid pedigree  $Q_1$  shown in Figure 5. We can verify that  $\Pr\{A(i, k) = A(j, k)\} = 12\delta + (1/4)$  for both  $P_1$  and  $Q_1$ , so they are indistinguishable by the above method, which was also pointed out as a consequence of Proposition 4.1.

*Remark 4.4.* The above probabilities do not depend on  $p$ , therefore, we have a slightly stronger identifiability statement: If diploid pedigrees  $P$  and  $Q$  of depth 2 and crossover probabilities  $p$  and  $p'$  are such that  $(\Sigma^X : P, R(p)) = (\Sigma^X : Q, R(p'))$  then their subpedigrees of order 2 are correspondingly isomorphic.

**Proposition 4.5.** *When  $|\Sigma| > 2$ , pedigrees of depth 2 in which no two vertices have exactly one common parent are identifiable under model R. In particular, when  $|\Sigma| > 2$ , diploid pedigrees of depth 2 are identifiable under model R.*

*Proof.* There are only 4 ways in which any two extant vertices  $i$  and  $j$  are related. They are illustrated in Figure 6. Each of the possible relationships is recognised by Proposition 4.2. We denote the 3rd and the 4th types of relationships by  $i \sim j$  and  $i \not\sim j$ , respectively.

Suppose that no two extant vertices  $i, j$  in a pedigree are related to each other as  $i \sim j$  or  $i \not\sim j$ . Then the pedigree is constructed by adding extant vertices one by one. On each step we add one extant vertex and join to previously added extant vertices as in Figure 6 - (i) or (ii), whichever is appropriate. Therefore, we assume that at least two extant vertices  $i, j$  are related as  $i \sim j$  or  $i \not\sim j$ .

Let  $Z$  be a (nonempty) maximal subset of  $X$  such that for any two distinct extant vertices  $i$  and  $j$  in  $Z$ , either  $i \sim j$  or  $i \not\sim j$ . Every other extant vertex  $k$  not in  $Z$  is related to some vertex in  $Z$  as in Figure 6 - (i) or (ii). Therefore, once the subpedigree of  $Z$  is constructed, there is only one way to extend it to the whole pedigree.

To construct the subpedigree of  $Z$ , we first construct an edge labelled graph with edge set  $Z$  in which edges  $i$  and  $j$  are incident if and only if  $i \sim j$ . This is a known problem in graph theory, namely, the problem of constructing an edge labelled graph from its line graph. It was proved [19] that there are only 4 pairs  $(G_i, H_i)$  of connected nonisomorphic edge labelled graphs that have the same line graphs. Edge labelled graphs that cannot be uniquely constructed from their line graphs must contain components isomorphic to  $G_i$  or  $H_i$ . We refer to [8] (in particular, Chapter 15, Problem 1) for discussion about reconstructing graphs from their line graphs, in particular, for the complete list of pairs  $(G_i, H_i)$ . The first pair is  $(K_{1,3}, K_3)$  (with edges of each of them labelled  $i, j, k$ ). Based on the example  $(K_{1,3}, K_3)$ , we construct pedigrees shown in Figure 7, in which all pairs of extant vertices are similarly related.

We distinguish the two pedigrees in Figure 7 by comparing the probabilities  $\Pr\{A(i, s) = A(j, s) = A(k, s) \mid P_2, R(p)\}$  and  $\Pr\{A(i, s) = A(j, s) = A(k, s) \mid Q_2, R(p)\}$  for any site  $s$ .

In  $P_2$ , there are 512 spanning forests. Among them there are 192 spanning forests in which two extant vertices have a common grandparent, giving the first term on the RHS




Figure 7: Pedigrees indistinguishable by site pattern probabilities

below. In the remaining 320 spanning forests, no two extant vertices have a common grandparent, which explains the second term on the RHS below. Therefore,

$$\Pr\{A(i, s) = A(j, s) = A(k, s) \mid P_2, R(p)\} = \frac{192}{512|\Sigma|} + \frac{320}{512|\Sigma|^2}.$$

In  $Q_2$ , there are 512 spanning forests. Among them there are 16 spanning forests in which  $i, j, k$  have a common grandparent (giving the first term on the RHS below), 144 spanning forests in which two extant vertices have a common grandparent at site  $s$  (giving the second term), and 352 spanning forests in which  $i, j, k$  have distinct grandparents at site  $s$  (giving the third term). Therefore,

$$\Pr\{A(i, s) = A(j, s) = A(k, s) \mid Q_2, R(p)\} = \frac{16}{512} + \frac{144}{512|\Sigma|} + \frac{352}{512|\Sigma|^2}.$$

Whenever  $|\Sigma| > 2$ ,  $\Pr\{A(i, s) = A(j, s) = A(k, s) \mid Q_2, R(p)\} > \Pr\{A(i, s) = A(j, s) = A(k, s) \mid P_2, R(p)\}$ , therefore,  $P_2$  and  $Q_2$  can be distinguished. The two expressions are equal when  $|\Sigma| = 2$ . Similarly, other pedigrees constructed from  $(G_i, H_i), i = 2, 3, 4$  are distinguished when  $|\Sigma| > 2$ .

Since there are only two types of site patterns for three sequences when  $|\Sigma| = 2$  (either the three sequences agree at a site or exactly two of them agree), the two cases cannot be distinguished by considering other site pattern probabilities.

In diploid pedigrees, no two vertices have exactly one common parent, therefore, when  $|\Sigma| > 2$ , they are identifiable under model R.  $\square$

We used only site pattern probabilities in the above proofs. But because of recombinations, consecutive sites in an alignment are not independent. We use the dependence between sites to eliminate the restriction  $|\Sigma| > 2$  when the crossover probability  $p$  is sufficiently small.

**Proposition 4.6.** *When  $|\Sigma| = 2$  and  $p$  is sufficiently small, haploid pedigrees  $P_2$  and  $Q_2$  (shown in Figure 7) are distinguished under model  $R(p)$ .*

*Proof.* We compute the probability that, in an alignment  $A$ , there are long runs of sites at which all the three sequences  $A_i$ ,  $A_j$  and  $A_k$  are equal. In particular, we compute bounds on  $\Pr\{A(i, m) = A(j, m) = A(k, m) \forall m \in [1, t + 1]\}$  on the two pedigrees.

For  $P_2$ , for any fixed  $m$ , if any two of the three sites  $A(i, m)$ ,  $A(j, m)$ ,  $A(k, m)$  are inherited from the same grand parent, then  $\Pr\{A(i, m) = A(j, m) = A(k, m)\} = 1/2$ , and if all of them are inherited from distinct grandparents, then  $\Pr\{A(i, m) = A(j, m) = A(k, m)\}$  is  $1/4$ . Therefore,

$$\Pr\{A(i, m) = A(j, m) = A(k, m) \forall m \in [1, t + 1] \mid P_2, R(p)\} \leq (1/2)^{t+1}.$$

For  $Q_2$ , the probability that the first site of all sequences is inherited from a common grand parent is  $1/32$ . The probability that at each successive site the three sequences have a common grand parent is  $(1 - p)^6 + p^3(1 - p)^3$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\{A(i, m) = A(j, m) = A(k, m) \forall m \in [1, t + 1] \mid Q_2, R(p)\} \\ & \geq \frac{((1 - p)^6 + p^3(1 - p)^3)^t}{32}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $p$  is sufficiently small and  $t$  is sufficiently large, the above probability for  $Q_2$  is more than that for  $P_2$ .  $\square$

We do not analyse other examples of pedigrees based on graphs that are not reconstructible from their line graphs (graphs  $G_i, H_i, i = 2, 3, 4$  mentioned in Proposition 4.5), but they may be analysed similarly.

## 5 Reconstructing pedigrees under Model RM

In this section we develop ideas from Section 4 (especially Proposition 4.6) in much more generality. Earlier we observed that parts of alignments that are free of recombination may be analysed with phylogenetic methods. Since we do not know where the recombinations have occurred in an alignment, we choose long segments of carefully chosen alignments (or sets of alignments) and show that they have higher probability of having evolved on one particular  $X$ -forest (or a sequence of  $X$ -forests) than any other  $X$ -forest (or a sequence of  $X$ -forests). For example, the method of Proposition 4.6 works because  $Q_2$  contains a tree in which  $i, j, k$  have a common ancestor and  $P_2$  does not contain such a tree. Therefore, a sufficiently long sequence of characters in which sequences  $A(i)$ ,  $A(j)$  and  $A(k)$  are in the same state will more likely have evolved on a pedigree such as  $Q_2$  than on a pedigree that does not contain such a tree. This argument may be generalised to count the number of  $X$ -forests of each type from the distribution of extant sequences. Such a generalisation requires identifiability results for phylogenetic trees, which we state in a form suitable for our application.

## 5.1 Identifiability and consistency results for $X$ -forests

In this section, we state known results on identifiability and statistical consistency of maximum likelihood reconstruction of phylogenetic trees. We need to adapt them slightly since the  $X$ -forests in a pedigree differ from phylogenetic trees in three respects - they may have vertices of degree 2, they may be unresolved (i.e., they may have vertices of degree more than 3), and they may be disconnected (two extant vertices may not have a common ancestor in a given directed  $X$ -forest in a pedigree). We address them in the following identifiability result, which was originally proved for phylogenetic trees in [10] in the  $|\Sigma| = 2$  case. Identifiability and statistical consistency of maximum likelihood reconstruction of phylogenetic trees were independently proved in full generality for all  $|\Sigma| \geq 2$  in [13, 4].

**Theorem 5.1.** *For all  $\mu \in (0, 1/|\Sigma|)$  and any two undirected  $X$ -forests  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  with bounded number of edges, if  $\Pr\{C \mid T_1, M(\mu)\} = \Pr\{C \mid T_2, M(\mu)\}$  for all characters  $C \in \Sigma^X$  then  $T_1 \cong T_2$ .*

*Proof.* The result follows from the analogous results in [13, 4] for phylogenetic  $X$ -trees, but we have to clarify three issues: unlike the phylogenetic  $X$ -trees, the  $X$ -forests as defined in this paper may be disconnected, unresolved, and may have vertices of degree 2.

*Connectivity:* Any two extant vertices  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  are in different components of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  if and only if  $\Pr\{C(i) = a \mid C(j) = b\} = 1/|\Sigma|$  for all  $a, b \in \Sigma$ , where  $C(i)$  is the state at the extant vertex  $i$  in a character  $C$ . If  $i$  and  $j$  are in the same component, then  $\Pr\{C(i) = a \mid C(j) = b\}$  cannot be arbitrarily close to  $1/|\Sigma|$  if the number of edges (and hence the distance between  $i$  and  $j$ ) is bounded. Therefore, we can consider the identifiability question for each component separately.

*Unresolved  $X$ -forests:* Given an unresolved phylogenetic tree, there are resolved phylogenetic trees with site pattern probabilities arbitrarily close to the site pattern probabilities for the unresolved tree. Therefore, even though unresolved phylogenetic  $X$ -trees are identifiable, statistical consistency of maximum likelihood methods requires that the substitution probabilities on the edges of a phylogenetic tree are bounded below by a positive real number. In our model, Corollary 5.3 below is possible because the substitution probability  $\mu$  is fixed on each edge.

*Vertices of degree 2:* Let  $u$  and  $v$  be any two vertices of an  $X$ -forest. Suppose that  $u$  and  $v$  are of degree 1 or more than 2. Suppose all internal vertices on the path between  $u$  and  $v$  have degree 2. Since  $\mu$  is fixed for all arcs, the distance between  $u$  and  $v$  on a tree is determined by the substitution probability on the  $uv$  path. The substitution probability on the  $uv$  path is determined by the distribution on the space of characters.  $\square$

*Remark 5.2.* In the above result, if  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  were directed  $X$ -forests, then we would be able to conclude that  $T_u(T_1) \cong T_u(T_2)$ .

Let  $N := |\Sigma|^{|X|}$ . Suppose that  $\Sigma^X := \{C_i, i \in N\}$ . We associate with each undirected  $X$ -forest  $T$  a vector  $\mathbf{p}(T, \mu) := (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N)$  in  $\mathbb{R}_+^N$ , where  $p_i := \Pr\{C_i \mid T, M(\mu)\}$ .

Therefore, the condition  $\Pr\{C \mid T_1, M(\mu)\} = \Pr\{C \mid T_2, M(\mu)\}$  for all characters  $C \in \Sigma^X$  may be equivalently written as  $\mathbf{p}(T_1, \mu) = \mathbf{p}(T_2, \mu)$ .

Given  $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and a point  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ , let the open ball of radius  $r$  centred at  $\mathbf{s}$  be denoted by  $\rho(\mathbf{s}, r)$ . Here the radius may be taken to be in the 1-norm (i.e., the distance between points  $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$  and  $\mathbf{y} := (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N)$  is defined by  $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_i^N |x_i - y_i|$ ). Let  $A$  be an alignment on  $X$ . We define a vector  $\mathbf{f}(A) := (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N)$ , where  $f_i$  are the *fractional site pattern frequencies*, i.e.,  $f_i$  is the fraction of columns of  $A$  of type  $C_i$ . Then the above identifiability result implies a statistical consistency result for maximum likelihood. It informally says that as the length of a random alignment  $A$  goes to infinity, we expect  $\mathbf{f}(A)$  to be arbitrarily close to  $\mathbf{p}(T, \mu)$  with probability approaching 1 if  $T$  is the true  $X$ -forest, and that the probability that  $\mathbf{f}(A)$  is arbitrarily close to  $\mathbf{p}(T, \mu)$  approaches 0 if  $T$  is not the true  $X$ -forest.

**Corollary 5.3.** *For all  $r_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  and  $\mu \in (0, 1/|\Sigma|)$ , there exists  $L := L(r_0, \epsilon, \mu) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for any two undirected  $X$ -forests  $T$  and  $T'$  such that  $T \not\cong T'$ , and an alignment  $A \in \Sigma^{XL}$ ,*

$$\Pr\{\mathbf{f}(A) \in \rho(\mathbf{p}(T, \mu), r_0) \mid T, M(\mu)\} > 1 - \epsilon$$

and

$$\Pr\{\mathbf{f}(A) \in \rho(\mathbf{p}(T, \mu), r_0) \mid T', M(\mu)\} < \epsilon.$$

We give bounds on the above probabilities in terms of  $L$ , which we prove using Bernstein's inequality.

**Lemma 5.4** (Bernstein's inequality). *Let  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots$  be i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with  $\Pr\{X = 1\} = p$ . Then for all  $r \geq 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ ,*

$$\Pr\left\{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n} - p \geq r\right\} \leq \exp\left\{\frac{-nr^2}{2p(1-p) + 2r/3}\right\},$$

and (equivalently)

$$\Pr\left\{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n} - p \leq -r\right\} \leq \exp\left\{\frac{-nr^2}{2p(1-p) + 2r/3}\right\}.$$

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $r_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\mu \in (0, 1/|\Sigma|)$ . Let  $A \in \Sigma^{XL}$ . Let  $T$  be an undirected  $X$ -forest. Then*

$$\Pr\{\mathbf{f}(A) \notin \rho(\mathbf{p}(T, \mu), r_0) \mid T, M(\mu)\} \leq 2|\Sigma|^{|X|} \exp\left\{\frac{-Lr_0^2}{\frac{|\Sigma|^{2|X|}}{2} + \frac{2r_0|\Sigma|^{|X|}}{3}}\right\}.$$

*Proof.* There are  $|\Sigma|^{|X|}$  distinct characters, with probabilities  $p_i := \Pr\{C_i \mid T, M(\mu)\}$ ,  $i = 1$  to  $|\Sigma|^{|X|}$ . If  $\mathbf{f}(A) \notin \rho(\mathbf{p}(T, \mu), r_0)$ , then  $|f_i - p_i| \geq r_0/|\Sigma|^{|X|}$  for some  $i$ . Therefore, we apply Bernstein's inequality to each distinct character, and write the probability that  $|f_i - p_i| \geq r_0/|\Sigma|^{|X|}$ . We then apply the union bound to get the result.  $\square$

If we set

$$r_0 = \frac{\min\{d(\mathbf{p}(T_i, \mu), \mathbf{p}(T_j, \mu)) : T_i, T_j \in \mathcal{U}, T_i \not\cong T_j\}}{2}, \quad (5.1)$$

it will ensure that the  $X$ -forests are *separated* by open balls of radius  $r_0$  in the space of site pattern probability vectors, i.e., the open balls  $\rho(\mathbf{p}(T_i, \mu), r_0)$  and  $\rho(\mathbf{p}(T_j, \mu), r_0)$  are non-intersecting whenever  $T_i$  and  $T_j$  are non-isomorphic. We will use this value of  $r_0$  unless specified otherwise.

Now for an undirected  $X$ -forest  $T_i$ , we define

$$\mathcal{A}_i := \mathcal{A}(T_i, r_0, L) := \{A \in \Sigma^{XL} : \mathbf{f}(A) \in \rho(\mathbf{p}(T_i, \mu), r_0)\}, \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$\epsilon_i := \epsilon(T_i) := 1 - \Pr\{\mathcal{A}_i \mid T_i, M(\mu)\}. \quad (5.3)$$

By selecting a sufficiently large value of  $L$  we can make  $\epsilon_i$  arbitrarily small as in Lemma 5.5. Moreover, if  $T_i \not\cong T_j$ , then

$$\epsilon_{ij} := \Pr\{\mathcal{A}_i \mid T_j, M(\mu)\} \leq 1 - \Pr\{\mathcal{A}_j \mid T_j, M(\mu)\} = \epsilon_j, \quad (5.4)$$

hence  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A}_i \mid T_j, M(\mu)\}$  can be made arbitrarily small as per Lemma 5.5. We set  $\epsilon_{max} = \max_i(\epsilon(T_i))$ , which depends on  $L$  and  $r_0$ .

In Theorem 5.13 (particularly in the proof of inequality 5.6) we require a concentration inequality similar to the inequality in Lemma 5.5 for the situation in which  $L$  sites of an alignment have evolved on an  $X$ -forest  $T_i$  and  $cL$  sites (for a small  $c \in (0, 1)$ ) have evolved on another  $X$ -forest  $T_j$ . (We will keep the notation simple by assuming that  $cL$  is an integer.) Therefore, we give the following variants of Lemmas 5.4 and 5.5.

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $X, X_1, X_2, \dots$  be i.i.d. Bernoulli random variables with  $\Pr\{X = 1\} = p$ . Let  $Y_1, Y_2, \dots$  be Bernoulli random variables. Let  $S_n := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i + \sum_{i=1}^{cn} Y_i$ , where  $c$  is a positive constant. Let  $r \geq 0$  and  $m := \max\{0, p - r\}$  and  $M := \min\{1, p + r\}$ . If  $r' := p - m(1 + c) \geq 0$  and  $r'' := M(1 + c) - (p + c) \geq 0$ , then*

$$\Pr \left\{ \left| \frac{S_n}{n(1+c)} - p \right| \geq r \right\} \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{-n(r')^2}{2p(1-p) + 2r'/3} \right\} + \exp \left\{ \frac{-n(r'')^2}{2p(1-p) + 2r''/3} \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \leq S_n \leq cn + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{S_n}{n(1+c)} - p \right| \geq r \\
\implies & \left( \frac{S_n}{n(1+c)} - p \leq -r \right) \text{ or } \left( \frac{S_n}{n(1+c)} - p \geq r \right) \\
\implies & \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n(1+c)} - p \leq -r \right) \text{ or } \left( \frac{cn + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n(1+c)} - p \geq r \right) \\
\implies & \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n(1+c)} \leq p - r \leq m \right) \text{ or } \left( \frac{cn + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n(1+c)} \geq p + r \geq M \right) \\
\implies & \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n(1+c)} - \frac{p}{1+c} \leq m - \frac{p}{1+c} \right) \text{ or } \left( \frac{cn + \sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n(1+c)} - \frac{p+c}{1+c} \geq M - \frac{p+c}{1+c} \right) \\
\implies & \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n} - p \leq -r' \right) \text{ or } \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n} - p \geq r'' \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we apply Bernstein's inequality (Lemma 5.6) to each term and obtain the desired bound.  $\square$

Let  $A$  be an alignment of length  $L(1+c)$ . Suppose that  $L$  characters of  $A$  evolved on an undirected  $X$ -forest  $T$  and the remaining characters evolved on undirected  $X$ -forests  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{cL}$ . The following lemma states that if  $c$  is sufficiently small, then  $\mathbf{f}(A)$  is concentrated near  $\mathbf{p}(T, \mu)$  for large  $L$ . Moreover, as in Lemma 5.5, if we require  $\mathbf{f}(A)$  to be sufficiently near  $\mathbf{p}(T, \mu)$  with probability at least  $1 - \epsilon_{max}$ , then the length of the alignment  $L(1+c)$  must be  $\Omega(\log(1/\epsilon_{max}))$ . In the following lemma, we do not specify the constants  $c, c_i, r'_i$  and  $r''_i$  precisely, but they can be chosen depending on  $r_0$ .

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $r_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\mu \in (0, 1/|\Sigma|)$ . Let  $A \in \Sigma^{XL(1+c)}$  for a suitably chosen positive constant  $c$ . Let  $T, T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{cL}$  be undirected  $X$ -forest. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Pr\{\mathbf{f}(A) \notin \rho(\mathbf{p}(T, \mu), r_0) \mid T^L, T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{cL}, M(\mu)\} \\
& \leq \sum_i^{|\Sigma|^{|\mathcal{X}|}} \left( \exp \left\{ \frac{-L(r'_i)^2}{2p_i(1-p_i) + 2r'_i/3} \right\} + \exp \left\{ \frac{-L(r''_i)^2}{2p_i(1-p_i) + 2r''_i/3} \right\} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $r'_i$  and  $r''_i$  are positive constants as in Lemma 5.6.

*Proof.* We apply Lemma 5.6 for each component of  $\mathbf{f}(A)$  and use the union bound as in the proof of Lemma 5.5. For each component, we use  $r := r_0/|\Sigma|^{|\mathcal{X}|}$  as before. Constants  $r'_i$  and  $r''_i$  (and  $c_i$ , which are implicit) depend on  $r_0$  and the probabilities  $p_i := \Pr\{C_i \mid T, M(\mu)\}$ ,  $i = 1$  to  $|\Sigma|^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ . The constant  $c$  may be taken to be the smallest among  $c_i, i = 1$  to  $|\Sigma|^{|\mathcal{X}|}$ .  $\square$

## 5.2 Identifying HMMs: a sketch of the ideas used to prove Theorem 5.13

A hidden Markov model (HMM) is defined by two sequences  $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  and  $\{Y_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  of random variables. The sequence  $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  takes values in  $[r]$  and is a stationary Markov chain with transition matrix  $A$  and initial distribution  $\pi(i), i = 1$  to  $r$ , which is also the stationary distribution of the Markov chain. The random variables  $\{Y_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  take values in  $[k]$ , and are independent and identically distributed conditional on  $\{X_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ . The distribution of  $Y_n$  depends only on  $X_n$ . Let  $B$  be the  $r \times k$  matrix of conditional probabilities  $\Pr\{Y_n = j \mid X_n = i\}$ , where  $i \in [r]$  and  $j \in [k]$ . The sequence  $\{Y_n\}_{n \geq 1}$  are the *observations*. Identifiable hidden Markov models were characterised in [11], where a precise description of conditions on  $A$  and  $B$  for which the probability distribution on observed sequences determines  $A$  and  $B$  (up to re-labelling of hidden states) was given. Here *identifiability up to a re-labelling of hidden states* means the following: If  $S$  is an  $r \times r$  permutation matrix, then the HMM with parameters  $(A, B, \pi)$  (where  $\pi$  is treated as a column vector of length  $r$ ) is equivalent to (induces the same distribution on the space sequences of observed states as) the HMM with parameters  $(S^{-1}AS, S^{-1}B, S^{-1}\pi)$ . Therefore, identifiability only means computing the matrices and the initial distribution up to equivalence. We denote the class of models equivalent to  $(A, B, \pi)$  by  $\|(A, B, \pi)\|$ .

Earlier we noted that Models R and RM for sequences evolving on a pedigree  $P(X)$  define a hidden Markov model with the spanning forests in  $P$  as hidden states and characters from  $\Sigma^X$  as observed states. We call it  $HMM(P, p, \mu)$  and denote its matrices by  $A(P, p)$  and  $B(P, \mu)$ . The initial distribution on hidden states is uniform: each spanning forest has the probability  $1/2^e$  if the pedigree has  $2e$  arcs. We informally look at some of the issues about its identifiability.

The transition matrix  $A(P, p)$  is defined by transition probabilities given in Equation (3.1). Therefore,  $A(P, p)$  will be identical (up to a permutation of rows and columns) for all pedigrees with the same number of arcs, for a fixed  $p$ . But the set of spanning forests (hidden states) is unknown.

We now describe at a high level how we compute the rows of  $B(P, \mu)$ . Suppose the pedigree contains an undirected  $X$ -forest  $T_i$ . There are  $n(G > T_i : P)$  spanning forests  $G$  of  $P$  that contain  $T_i$  as the unique undirected  $X$ -forest, and corresponding to each of them we have a row of  $B(P, \mu)$  that is equal to  $\mathbf{p}(T_i, \mu)$ . Now consider a set  $\mathcal{A}_i := \mathcal{A}(T_i, r_0, L)$  of sufficiently long alignments as defined in Equation 5.2. We compute the probability of  $\mathcal{A}_i$  (i.e., the probability that a random alignment is in  $\mathcal{A}_i$ ). Suppose that  $P_0$  is the probability that there are no recombination events. Thus  $P_0$  approaches 1 as  $p$  approaches 0. Then one of the terms in the expression for the probability of  $\mathcal{A}_i$  will be  $n(G > T_i : P)P_0(1 - \epsilon_i)/2^e$ , where  $n(G > T_i : P)/2^e$  is the probability that the first site evolved on a spanning forest  $G$  that contained  $T_i$  as the undirected  $X$ -forest. There will be terms for contributions from other undirected  $X$ -forests  $T_j \not\cong T_i$ , but they will be much smaller than the above term because they will contain factors  $\epsilon_j$  (as in Equation 5.4). There will also be terms to account for recombinations among the first  $L$  sites, but they will be small as well since they will contain  $p$  as a factor (in contrast to  $P_0$ , which is a power of  $(1 - p)$ ). So let us



say  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A}_i \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$  is  $n(G > T_i : P)P_0(1 - \epsilon_i)/2^e + (\text{terms of smaller order})$ . Therefore if  $p$  is sufficiently small and  $L$  is sufficiently large, then  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A}_i \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$  will be roughly equal to the dominating term  $n(G > T_i : P)P_0(1 - \epsilon_i)/2^e$ , which will uniquely determine  $n(G > T_i : P)$ . In other words, if  $Q$  is another pedigree such that  $n(G > T_i : P) \neq n(G > T_i : Q)$ , then  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A}_i \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$  and  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A}_i \mid Q, RM(p, \mu)\}$  will differ roughly by a multiple of  $P_0(1 - \epsilon_i)/2^e$ .

In the proof of Proposition 4.6, we used a similar idea: the pedigree  $Q_2$  contains a certain subtree  $T$  in which  $i, j, k$  have a common ancestor, while the pedigree  $P_2$  does not such a subtree. As a result, the alignments that are close to  $\mathbf{p}(T, \mu)$  are more likely to have evolved on  $Q_2$  than on  $P_2$ .

Suppose now that  $B(P, \mu)$  is identified and each of its rows is labelled by the corresponding unlabelled undirected  $X$ -forest. That is, the matrices  $B(P, \mu)$  that appear among the triples in the equivalence class  $\|(A, B, \pi)\|$  of HMMs are constructed. As pointed out above, the matrix  $A(P, p)$  and the initial distribution are also known up to relabelling of hidden states. But the equivalence class  $\|(A, B, \pi)\|$  is not known unless we are able to label the rows and the columns of  $A(P, p)$  by unlabelled undirected  $X$ -forests in a manner consistent with the labelling of rows of  $B(P, \mu)$ . In other words, for full identifiability of  $HMM(P, p, \mu)$ , we would like to construct an automaton with transition probabilities given by  $A(P, p)$  and with its states labelled by unlabelled undirected  $X$ -forests. Identifying the pedigree from the *labelled automaton* will then be a purely combinatorial problem.

In this paper we do not succeed in constructing matrix  $A(P, p)$  with rows and columns labelled by undirected  $X$ -forests, but we are able to count certain types of *walks* (to be described next) on the automaton with vertices labelled by undirected  $X$ -forests. Suppose that  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m$  is a sequence of undirected  $X$ -forests such that no two consecutive ones are isomorphic. Analogous to  $n(G > T : P)$ , we define  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P)$  as the number of sequences  $G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m$  of spanning forests in  $P$  such that  $G_i > T_i$ , where consecutive  $G_i$  are separated by just one recombination. (A single recombination at a site is more likely than multiple recombinations. Moreover, if there is a recombination at a site  $i$ , but the two spanning forests  $G_i$  and  $G_{i+1}$  contain isomorphic undirected  $X$ -forests, then such a recombination has no effect on the emitted characters. These are the reasons why we consider the sequences  $T_i$  and  $G_i$  as above.) We then consider a set  $\mathcal{A}$  of alignments of length  $mL$  (for a suitably large  $L$ ) obtained by concatenating alignments from  $\mathcal{A}_i$  for  $i = 1$  to  $m$ . We compute the probability of  $\mathcal{A}$  (as we described for  $n(G > T)$  above), and show that the dominating term is proportional to  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P)$ , and other terms are of smaller order of magnitude for small  $p$ . This allows us to compute  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P)$ .

A more visual description of the walks may be given as follows. Suppose the pedigree has  $2e$  arcs. We define a graph on the vertex set consisting of the spanning forests of the pedigree, with two spanning forests  $G_i$  and  $G_j$  being adjacent if there is exactly one recombination separating them (i.e.,  $|E(G_i) \Delta E(G_j)| = 2$ ). The graph is a hypercube. The hidden Markov chain on the set of spanning forests jumps on the vertices of the cube. If there is at most one recombination at any site (which is more likely than more than 1 recombinations at a site), then we have a walk on the edges of the cube. We

label each vertex  $G_i$  of the cube by the undirected  $X$ -forests  $T_u(G_i)$ . Our interest is to construct this object for a more complete understanding of the HMM. But problem is made difficult by the fact that the emission probabilities associated with  $G_i$  and  $G_j$  are identical if  $T_u(G_i) \cong T_u(G_j)$ . Therefore, we construct a weaker object, namely the number of walks of each length on the cube such that consecutive vertices have distinct labels.

### 5.3 The main results

**Definition 5.8.** Let  $P$  be a pedigree. For  $\mathbf{T} := (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m) \in \mathcal{U}_P^m$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P) & \\ := n(G_1 > T_1, G_2 > T_2, \dots, G_m > T_m : P) & \\ := |\{\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{G}_P^m : T_u(G_i) \cong T_i \forall i \in [m] \wedge |E(G_{i+1}) \Delta E(G_i)| = 2 \forall i \in [m-1]\}|, & \end{aligned}$$

where the second condition in the last line says that there is exactly one recombination event between consecutive  $G_i$ .

In the rest of this section, we show how invariants  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P)$  may be computed from the probability distribution on the space of alignments under Model RM. In the end, we demonstrate an application to pedigrees  $P_1$  and  $Q_1$  shown in Figure 5.

**Lemma 5.9.** *Let  $P$  be a pedigree with  $e(P) = 2e$  arcs. Let  $\mathbf{G} := (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m)$  be a sequence of spanning forests in  $P$ . Then under model  $R(p)$ , the probability that  $\mathbf{G}$  is a sequence of site-specific spanning forests is given by*

$$\Pr\{\mathbf{G} \mid P, R(p)\} = \frac{(1-p)^{s(\mathbf{G})} p^{r(\mathbf{G})}}{2^e},$$

where  $r(\mathbf{G})$  and  $s(\mathbf{G})$  are as in Definition 2.8.

*Proof.* We have a factor  $p$  for each recombination event and  $(1-p)$  whenever there is no recombination (i.e., an arc is contained in two consecutive spanning forests in the sequence). The probability that the first spanning forest is  $G_1$  is  $1/2^e$ .  $\square$

### Notation

Let  $A \in \Sigma^{XL}$  be an alignment of length  $L$ . For an interval  $[l_1, l_2] \subseteq [L]$ , we write  $A[l_1, l_2]$  for the part of the alignment between columns  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  (inclusive of columns  $l_1$  and  $l_2$ ). For a sequence of alignments  $A_i \in \Sigma^{Xl_i}, i \in [m]$ , let  $A := A_1 : A_2 : \dots : A_m$  denote the alignment obtained by concatenating alignments  $A_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$  (in that order). Let  $\mathcal{A}_i \subseteq \Sigma^{Xl_i}, i \in [m]$  be sets of alignments. We define

$$A := \mathcal{A}_1 : \mathcal{A}_2 : \dots : \mathcal{A}_m := \{A_1 : A_2 : \dots : A_m \mid A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i, i \in [m]\}.$$

**Lemma 5.10.** *Let  $P$  be a pedigree with  $e(P) = 2e$  arcs. The probability of an alignment  $A \in \Sigma^{XL}$  on  $P$  is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\{A \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^L \sum_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{G}_P^k} \frac{(1-p)^{e(L-k)+s(\mathbf{G})} p^{r(\mathbf{G})}}{2^e} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^k: \\ \sum_{i=1}^k l_i = L}} \prod_{i=1}^k \Pr\{A[L_{i-1} + 1, L_i] \mid T_u(G_i), M(\mu)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where  $L_0 := 0$ ,  $L_i := L_{i-1} + l_i$  and  $\mathbf{l} := (l_1, l_2, \dots, l_k) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^k$ , and the second summation is over  $\mathbf{G}$  such that consecutive spanning forests  $G_i$  and  $G_{i+1}$  are unequal for  $i \in [k-1]$ .

*Proof.* The probability of an alignment of length  $L$  is obtained by summing its probability over all spanning subgraph sequences of length  $L$ . Suppose that the recombinations in a spanning subgraph sequence occur only at sites  $L_i := L_{i-1} + l_i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ , where  $L_0 = 0$ . We write the spanning forest sequence of length  $L$  as  $(G_i^{l_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, k)$ . Then the probability of the alignment is written as a product of probabilities of its segments that have evolved on spanning forests  $G_i$  (i.e., effectively on  $T_u(G_i)$ ). This probability is summed over  $\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^k$  (with the constraint  $\sum_i l_i = L$ ),  $k \in [L]$  and  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{G}_P^k$ . For a fixed  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{G}_P^k$ , the probability of  $(G_i^{l_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, k)$  is given by Lemma 5.9.  $\square$

For  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \Sigma^{XL}$ , we will compute  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$  by summing (5.5) over  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . In such a calculation, we will sometimes use the following upper bound in evaluating the last summation in (5.5) for fixed values of  $k$ , and fixed  $\mathbf{l}$  and  $\mathbf{G}$ .

**Lemma 5.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \Sigma^{XL}$ . Let  $0 = L_0 < L_1 < \dots < L_k = L$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}_i := \{A[L_{i-1} + 1, L_i] : A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ ,  $i \in [k]$ . Then for any fixed  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{G}_P^L$*

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid \mathbf{G}, M(\mu)\} \leq \Pr\{\mathcal{A}_1 : \mathcal{A}_2 : \dots : \mathcal{A}_k \mid \mathbf{G}, M(\mu)\}.$$

We have equality if  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 : \mathcal{A}_2 : \dots : \mathcal{A}_k$ .

*Proof.* The claim follows from the observation that  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_1 : \mathcal{A}_2 : \dots : \mathcal{A}_k$ .  $\square$

The following lemma is used in the proof of Equation (5.8), and the reader may skip it until then.

**Lemma 5.12.** *Let  $\Omega$  be a finite set. Let  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  be two sequences in  $\Omega$ , each of length  $l$ , defined by*

$$\mathbf{T} := T_1^{\alpha_1} T_2^{\alpha_2} \dots T_m^{\alpha_m} := \overbrace{T_1, T_1, \dots, T_1}^{\alpha_1}, \overbrace{T_2, T_2, \dots, T_2}^{\alpha_2}, \dots, \overbrace{T_m, T_m, \dots, T_m}^{\alpha_m},$$

where  $\sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i = l$  and  $\alpha_i > 0 \forall i \in [m]$ , and

$$\mathbf{S} := S_1^{\beta_1} S_2^{\beta_2} \dots S_n^{\beta_n} := \underbrace{S_1, S_1, \dots, S_1}_{\beta_1}, \underbrace{S_2, S_2, \dots, S_2}_{\beta_2}, \dots, \underbrace{S_n, S_n, \dots, S_n}_{\beta_n},$$

where  $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i = l$  and  $\beta_i > 0 \forall i \in [n]$ . Suppose that  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  satisfy the constraints:  $T_i \neq T_{i+1} \forall i \in [m-1]$ ;  $S_i \neq S_{i+1} \forall i \in [m-1]$ ;  $n \leq m$ ; if  $n = m$ , then  $S_i \neq T_i$  for some  $i$ . Then there is at least one block  $T_i^{\alpha_i}$  of  $\mathbf{T}$  over which  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  mismatch everywhere; hence there are at least  $\min\{\alpha_i : i \in [m]\}$  mismatches between the two sequences.

*Proof.* Suppose that the claim is false; so in each block  $T_i^{\alpha_i}$  of  $\mathbf{T}$ , there is a matching symbol in  $\mathbf{S}$ . Therefore,  $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m$  is a subsequence of  $\mathbf{S}$  and  $n \geq m$ . This, together with  $T_i \neq T_{i+1} \forall i \in [m-1]$  and  $n \leq m$ , implies that  $n = m$  and  $S_i = T_i \forall i \in [m]$ , which contradicts the assumption that when  $n = m$ , there is some  $i$  for which  $S_i \neq T_i$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.13.** *Let  $P$  and  $Q$  be any two pedigrees with  $e(P) = e(Q) = 2e$  arcs. Let  $\mathbf{T} := (T_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$  be any sequence of undirected  $X$ -forests in which consecutive  $X$ -forests are non-isomorphic. Then for all  $\mu \in (0, 1/|\Sigma|)$ , there exists  $p_0 := p_0(e, m, \mu) \in (0, 1)$  such that for all  $p \in (0, p_0)$ , the following statement is true: if  $(\Sigma^{XL} : P, RM(p, \mu)) = (\Sigma^{XL} : Q, RM(p, \mu)) \forall L \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P) = n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : Q)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}_1^m : \mathcal{A}_2^m : \dots : \mathcal{A}_m^m$ , where  $\mathcal{A}_i := \mathcal{A}(T_i, r_0, L)$  and  $r_0$  are as defined in Equations (5.1) and (5.2), respectively. We will choose  $\epsilon_{max}$  (defined at the end of Section 5.1) and  $L$  (that depends on  $\epsilon_{max}$ ) suitably later. The probability of  $\mathcal{A}$  on  $P$  and  $Q$  is written by summing (5.5) over all  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ . But based on Theorem 5.1, Corollary 5.3 and Lemma 5.7, we can make the following qualitative and somewhat informal statement: If  $L$  is large enough, then  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$  will get significantly higher contribution from spanning forest sequences  $\mathbf{G} := (G_i^{l_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$  of length  $m^2L$  such that  $T_u(G_i) \cong T_i$  for all  $i \in [m]$  and  $l_i$  are all close to  $L$ , than from spanning forest sequences  $\mathbf{G} := (G_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, m^2L)$  for which there are many mismatches (in terms of isomorphism) between sequences  $(T_i^{mL}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$  and  $((T_u(G_i)), i = 1, 2, \dots, m^2L)$  or if they require more than  $m-1$  recombinations.

Let  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\} = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} P_k(P)$ , where  $P_k(P)$  is the joint probability of  $\mathcal{A}$  and the event that there are exactly  $k$  recombinations. Furthermore, we write  $P_{(m-1)}(P) = P_{(m-1)a}(P) + P_{(m-1)b}(P)$ , where  $P_{(m-1)a}(P)$  is the contribution from spanning forest sequences  $\mathbf{G} := (G_i^{l_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$  of length  $m^2L$  such that  $T_u(G_i) \cong T_i$  for all  $i \in [m]$ , and  $P_{(m-1)b}(P)$  is the remaining contribution to  $P_{m-1}$ , i.e., from spanning forest sequences  $\mathbf{G} := (G_i^{l_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, l+1)$  of length  $m^2L$  such that either  $l < m-1$  (i.e., the  $m-1$  recombinations occur at fewer than  $m-1$  sites), or  $l = m-1$  and  $T_u(G_i) \not\cong T_i$  for some  $i \in [m]$ .

We will show that only  $P_{(m-1)a}(P)$  makes a significant contribution to  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$ . In particular, we will show that the various contributions to  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$  take the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(m-1)a}(P) &= n(\mathbf{G} \geq \mathbf{T} : P) \Delta(\mathbf{T}) \\ \sum_{k < m-1} P_k(P) + P_{(m-1)b}(P) &< \delta_1 \\ \sum_{k \geq m} P_k(P) &< \delta_2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Delta(\mathbf{T})$  does not depend on the pedigree (but depends on the undirected  $X$ -forest sequence  $\mathbf{T}$ ). Moreover,  $\Delta(\mathbf{T})$ ,  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  depend on  $e, m, L, p$  and  $\epsilon_{max}$ . We will show that when  $p$  and  $\epsilon_{max}$  are sufficiently small and  $L$  is sufficiently large,  $\delta_1$  and  $\delta_2$  are very small compared to  $\Delta(\mathbf{T})$ . It will imply that for  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$  and  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid Q, RM(p, \mu)\}$  to be equal,  $n(\mathbf{G} \geq \mathbf{T} : P)$  and  $n(\mathbf{G} \geq \mathbf{T} : Q)$  must be equal. (Otherwise, there would be a difference between  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$  and  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid Q, RM(p, \mu)\}$  that is of the order of a multiple of  $\Delta(\mathbf{T})$ .)

*A lower bound on  $P_{(m-1)a}(P)$ .*

Since the consecutive  $X$ -forests in  $\mathbf{T}$  are nonisomorphic and  $T_u(G_i) \cong T_i$  for all  $i \in [m]$ , there is at least one recombination between consecutive spanning forests  $G_i$ . And since there are exactly  $m - 1$  recombinations, there must be exactly one recombination between consecutive spanning forests.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{(m-1)a}(P) &= n(\mathbf{G} \geq \mathbf{T} : P) \left( \frac{(1-p)^{e(m^2L-m)+(m-1)(e-1)} p^{m-1}}{2^e} \right) \\
&\quad \times \left( \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m: \\ \sum_{i=1}^m l_i = m^2L}} \prod_{i=1}^m \Pr\{A[L_{i-1} + 1, L_i] \mid T_u(G_i), M(\mu)\} \right) \\
&:= n(\mathbf{G} \geq \mathbf{T} : P) \Delta(\mathbf{T}), \tag{5.6}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $L_0 := 0$ ,  $L_i := L_{i-1} + l_i$ . The inner summation is evaluated for any fixed choice of  $\mathbf{G} := (G_i^{l_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$  such that  $T_u(G_i) \cong T_i$  for all  $i \in [m]$ , because for any fixed  $l_i, i \in [m]$ , and spanning forest sequences  $\mathbf{G} := ((G_i)^{l_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$  and  $\mathbf{G}' := ((G'_i)^{l_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ , if  $T_u(G_i) \cong T_u(G'_i)$  for all  $i \in [m]$ , then for each alignment  $A$ , we have  $\Pr\{A[L_{i-1} + 1, L_i] \mid G_i^{l_i}, M(\mu)\} = \Pr\{A[L_{i-1} + 1, L_i] \mid (G'_i)^{l_i}, M(\mu)\} = \Pr\{A[L_{i-1} + 1, L_i] \mid T_u(G_i), M(\mu)\}$ . Therefore, the RHS is a product of  $n(\mathbf{G} \geq \mathbf{T} : P)$  and a factor that does not explicitly depend on the pedigree, but only on  $\mathbf{T}$ .

We have

$$\Delta(\mathbf{T}) \geq \frac{(2cL)^{m-1} (1-p)^{em^2L-m-e+1} p^{m-1} (1-\epsilon_{max})^{(m^2)}}{2^e}. \tag{5.7}$$

To prove the lower bound, we sum (5.5) over spanning forest sequences of the type  $\mathbf{G} := (G_i^{l_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$  where  $T_u(G_i) \cong T_i$  for all  $i \in [m]$  and  $l_i$  are such that the  $m - 1$  recombinations occur at sites  $L_i \in [imL - cL, imL + cL], i = 1$  to  $m - 1$ , for a small positive constant  $c$ , (i.e., we ignore contributions from the spanning forest sequences in which some of the recombinations are not near the boundaries of the blocks  $\mathcal{A}_i^m$  of  $\mathcal{A}$ ). We can choose the recombination sites in  $(2cL)^{m-1}$  ways. Since  $s(\mathbf{G}) = em^2L - e - m + 1$

and  $r(\mathbf{G}) = m - 1$ , the probability of  $\mathbf{G}$  is  $(1 - p)^{em^2L - m - e + 1} p^{m-1} / 2^e$ . We write  $\mathbf{G} := (\mathbf{G}_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$ , where  $\mathbf{G}_i$  are blocks of  $\mathbf{G}$  of length  $mL$  each. Then we have

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{A}_i^m \mid \mathbf{G}_i, M(\mu)\} \geq (1 - \epsilon_{max})^m$$

for each  $\mathbf{G}$  and for all  $i$ , provided we choose  $c, L$  and  $\epsilon_{max}$  appropriately according to Lemma 5.7.

An upper bound on  $\sum_{k < m-1} P_k(P) + P_{(m-1)b}(P)$ .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k < m-1} P_k(P) + P_{(m-1)b}(P) \\ & \leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \frac{1}{2^e} \left( \sum_{l=0}^k n_{kl} \binom{m^2L - 1}{l} (\epsilon_{max})^{m-l} \right) p^k (1 - p)^{e(m^2L-1)-k} \\ & \leq c_2 L^{m-1} \epsilon_{max} := \delta_1, \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where  $n_{kl}$  is the number of spanning forest sequences  $(G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{l+1})$  in which  $k$  recombinations occur at  $l$  sites, and  $c_2 > 0$  is a constant that depends on  $e$  and  $m$ . We explain below how the bound is obtained.

We fix  $\mathbf{G} \in \mathcal{G}_P^{m^2L}$  such that  $r(\mathbf{G}) = k \leq m - 1$ . For  $k = m - 1$ , since we are only interested in the contribution  $P_{(m-1)b}$ , we fix  $\mathbf{G}$  with the additional restrictions in the definition of  $P_{(m-1)b}$ . Suppose that the  $k$  recombinations occur at  $l$  distinct sites  $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_l$ , where  $0 = L_0 < L_1 < L_2 < \dots < L_l < L_{l+1} = m^2L$ . So we write  $\mathbf{G} := (G_1^{L_1}, G_2^{(L_2-L_1)}, \dots, G_{l+1}^{(m^2L-L_l)})$ . There are  $n_{kl}$  choices for  $(G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{l+1})$ . For each choice of  $(G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{l+1})$ , there are  $\binom{m^2L-1}{l}$  choices for the recombining sites  $L_1, \dots, L_l$ . Each  $\mathbf{G}$  has a probability  $(1 - p)^{s(\mathbf{G})} p^{r(\mathbf{G})} / 2^e$ , where  $r(\mathbf{G}) = k$  and  $s(\mathbf{G}) = e(m^2L - 1) - k$ . We show that  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid \mathbf{G}, M(\mu)\}$  is bounded above by  $(\epsilon_{max})^{m-l}$  for each  $\mathbf{G}$  with  $l$  recombining sites that satisfies the above constraints.

Let  $\mathbf{G} := (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_{m^2L})$  be a spanning forest sequence of length  $m^2L$ . For  $i \in [m], j \in [m]$ , we refer to the subsequences  $\mathbf{G}_i := (G_k, k \in [(i-1)mL + 1, imL])$  as *blocks* of  $\mathbf{G}$ , and subsequences  $\mathbf{G}_{ij} := (G_k, k \in [((i-1)m + j - 1)L + 1, ((i-1)m + j)L])$  as *subblocks* of  $\mathbf{G}$ . We say that subblock  $\mathbf{G}_{ij}$  is *recombination-free* if there are no recombinations between any two sites of the subblock. (The subblock may have recombinations at its boundaries.)

By Lemma 5.12, there is at least one block, say the  $i$ -th block, over which the sequences  $\mathbf{T}$  and  $(T_u(G_1)^{L_1}, T_u(G_2)^{(L_2-L_1)}, \dots, T_u(G_{l+1})^{(m^2L-L_l)})$  mismatch everywhere. Since there are  $m$  subblocks in each block and  $l \leq m - 1$ , there are at least  $m - l$  recombination-free subblocks in the  $i$ -th block of  $\mathbf{G}$ . Let these subblocks be denoted by  $\mathbf{G}_{ijk} := (G_{ij_k})^L, k = 1, 2, \dots$ . We have  $T_i \not\cong T_u(G_{ij_k})$  for each of them. Therefore,

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid \mathbf{G}, M(\mu)\} \leq \prod_k \Pr\{\mathcal{A}_i \mid T_u(G_{ij_k}), M(\mu)\} \leq (\epsilon_{max})^{m-l}.$$

An upper bound on  $\sum_{k \geq m} P_k(P)$ .

We use the following fact about binomially distributed random variables: If  $X \sim \text{Bin}(n, p)$ , then  $\Pr\{X \geq k\} \leq \binom{n}{k} p^k$ . (This result is a consequence of the union bound.) Since there are  $e(m^2 L - 1)$  points at which a recombination can possibly occur, we have

$$\sum_{k \geq m} P_k(P) \leq \binom{e(m^2 L - 1)}{m} p^m \leq c_3 L^m p^m := \delta_2, \quad (5.9)$$

where  $c_3 > 0$  is a constant that depends on  $e$  and  $m$ .

We write similar bounds for  $Q$ .

Now suppose that  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\} = \Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid Q, RM(p, \mu)\}$  but  $n(\mathbf{G} \geq \mathbf{T} : P) \neq n(\mathbf{G} \geq \mathbf{T} : Q)$ . Therefore, Equations 5.6 and 5.7 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & |P_{(m-1)a}(P) - P_{(m-1)a}(Q)| \\ &= |n(\mathbf{G} \geq \mathbf{T} : P) - n(\mathbf{G} \geq \mathbf{T} : Q)| \Delta(\mathbf{T}) \\ &\geq \frac{(2cL)^{m-1} (1-p)^{(em^2 L - m - e + 1)} p^{(m-1)} (1 - \epsilon_{max})^{(m^2)}}{2^e}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

But that is impossible if we can choose  $\epsilon_{max}$ ,  $L$ , and  $p$  so that  $\delta_1 + \delta_2 < \Delta(\mathbf{T})$ , or

$$c_2 L^{m-1} \epsilon_{max} + c_3 (Lp)^m < \frac{(2cLp)^{m-1} (1-p)^{(em^2 L - m - e + 1)} (1 - \epsilon_{max})^{(m^2)}}{2^e}. \quad (5.11)$$

In other words, the discrepancy  $|P_{(m-1)a}(P) - P_{(m-1)a}(Q)|$  cannot be compensated for by the remaining terms in  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid P, RM(p, \mu)\}$  and  $\Pr\{\mathcal{A} \mid Q, RM(p, \mu)\}$ . Such a choice is possible. For example, we first choose  $\epsilon_{max} \in (0, 1)$ , let us say,  $\epsilon_{max} = 1/M$ , where  $M > 1$ . We then set  $L := L(M)$  and  $p := p(M)$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} (\epsilon_{max}/p^{m-1}) &\longrightarrow 0 & \text{as } M &\longrightarrow \infty, \\ Lp &\longrightarrow 0 & \text{as } M &\longrightarrow \infty, \text{ and} \\ (1-p)^{(em^2 L - m - e + 1)} (1 - \epsilon_{max})^{(m^2)} &\longrightarrow 1 & \text{as } M &\longrightarrow \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

The choice of  $L$  must guarantee phylogenetic consistency as in Corollary 5.3. Moreover, we must set  $L$  as small as possible so as to get a better bound on  $p$ . By Lemma 5.7,  $L$  is required to grow only logarithmically in  $1/\epsilon_{max}$ , so let  $L := c \log M$  for a suitable choice of  $c > 0$ . Now conditions (5.12) are satisfied for  $p := (\log M)^{-(1+\epsilon)}$  for  $\epsilon > 0$ . Then (5.11) is satisfied for sufficiently large  $M$ .  $\square$

## 5.4 Applications

In the following, we illustrate Theorem 5.13 with a general result on counting  $X$ -forests and a couple of specific examples.

**Corollary 5.14.** *If the conditions of Theorem 5.13 are satisfied, then  $P$  and  $Q$  have the same number of undirected  $X$ -forests of each type.*

*Proof.* We apply Theorem 5.13 for  $m = 1$ . Suppose that  $P$  is a pedigree with  $e(P) = 2e$  arcs. Let  $T$  be an undirected  $X$ -forest. Suppose that we want to count the number of copies  $n(T : P)$  of  $T$  in  $P$ . Let  $T_i, i = 1$  to  $n(T : P)$  be the distinct copies of  $T$  in  $P$ . For each  $T_i$ , let  $T_{ij}, j = 1, 2, \dots$  be the undirected  $X$ -forests in  $P$  that contain  $T_i$ . (To be precise, we have subgraphs  $S_i$  and  $S_{ij}$  in  $P$  such that when the (directed) arcs of  $S_i$  and  $S_{ij}$  are replaced by (undirected) edges, we get the undirected  $X$ -forests  $T_i$  and  $T_{ij}$ . But we do not make this distinction in the following.) Note that  $T_{ij}$  are all distinct  $X$ -forests. There are  $e - e(T_i)$  non-founder vertices in  $P$  at which we can choose one of the two incoming arcs to construct a spanning forest  $G$  that contains  $T_i$ . Therefore, for each  $T_i$  there are  $2^{e-e(T_i)} = 2^{e-e(T)}$  spanning forests that contain  $T_i$ . Therefore,

$$n(T : P)2^{e-e(T)} = \sum_i \sum_j |\{G \in \mathcal{G}_P : T_u(G) = T_{ij}\}|.$$

Now by grouping terms on the RHS by isomorphism classes of  $T_{ij}$ , we obtain

$$n(T : P)2^{e-e(T)} = \sum_{(T' \in \|\mathcal{U}_P\|) \wedge (T' \geq T)} n(G > T' : P).$$

Since  $n(G > T' : P) = n(G > T' : Q)$  for all undirected  $X$ -forests  $T'$ , we also have  $n(T : P) = n(T : Q)$  for all undirected  $X$ -forests  $T$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.15.** *The examples of non-reconstructible pedigrees given in [15] can be distinguished from the probability distribution on the space of alignments under Model RM.*

*Proof.* Pedigrees in these examples do not have the same number of  $X$ -forests of each type. For example, one pedigree in each pair contains a common ancestor of all extant vertices while the other does not. This may also be observed in the examples in Figure 7.  $\square$

But knowing the number of  $X$ -forests of each type is not always enough to distinguish pedigrees, as verified by pedigrees  $P_1$  and  $Q_1$  shown in Figure 5. They both have the same number of directed (therefore, also undirected)  $X$ -forests of each type: they have 4 directed  $X$ -forests in which 1 and 2 have a common ancestor. We denote their undirected  $X$ -forest by  $T_1$ , which is a path of length 4 with end vertices 1 and 2. There are 12 directed  $X$ -forests in which 1 and 2 do not have a common ancestor. We denote their undirected  $X$ -forest by  $T_2$ , which consists of two isolated vertices 1 and 2. Moreover,  $n(G > T_1 : P_1) = n(G > T_1 : Q_1) = 16$  and  $n(G > T_2 : P_1) = n(G > T_2 : Q_1) = 48$ . Also, for  $\mathbf{T} := (T_1, T_2)$  (and for  $\mathbf{T} := (T_2, T_1)$ ), we check by direct counting that  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P_1) = n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : Q_1) = 64$ . But  $P_1$  and  $Q_1$  can nevertheless be distinguished as shown below.

**Corollary 5.16.** *Pedigrees  $P_1$  and  $Q_1$  in Figure 5 are distinguished from the probability distribution on the space of alignments under Model RM provided the crossover probability is sufficiently small.*



*Proof.* Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be the  $X$ -forests as described above. We apply Theorem 5.13 for  $m = 3$  with  $\mathbf{T} := (T_1, T_2, T_1)$ . We can verify that  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P_1) = 112$  and  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : Q_1) = 104$ . Therefore,  $P_1$  and  $Q_1$  give different distributions on the space of alignments. In the following, we describe how  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P_1)$  and  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : Q_1)$  are counted.

Let  $T_a$  denote the directed  $X$ -forests in  $P_1$  and  $Q_1$  consisting of paths  $a \cdots 1$  and  $a \cdots 2$ . Similarly, we write  $T_b, T_c, T_d$  for other directed  $X$ -forests in  $P_1$  and  $Q_1$ , rooted at  $b, c$  and  $d$ , respectively. These are the 4 directed  $X$ -forests that have  $T_1$  as their undirected  $X$ -forest. All other directed  $X$ -forests have  $T_2$  as their undirected  $X$ -forest.

*Counting  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P_1)$ :* Since  $T_u(G_1) \cong T_u(G_3) \cong T_1$ , we count 16 different contributions to  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P_1)$  depending on the choices for  $T_d(G_1)$  and  $T_d(G_3)$  in  $\{T_a, T_b, T_c, T_d\}$ . Please refer to Figure 8.




Figure 8: Counting  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P_1)$  when  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_b$  (left), and when  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_c$  (right)

When  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_a$ : This is possible only if  $G_3 = G_1$ . There are 4 choices of  $G_1$ , and for each of them there are 4 choices for  $G_2$  depending on which arc of  $T_a$  is replaced to obtain  $G_2$ . Thus we have 16 sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  for which  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_a$ .

When  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_b$ : the dashed arcs  $bg$  and  $be$  in Figure 8 on the left must be obtained by replacing  $ag$  and  $ae$ , and there are two sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  that achieve this: either  $G_2 = G_1 - ae + be$  or  $G_2 = G_1 - ag + bg$ . Also, there are 4 possible ways to include arcs pointing to  $f$  and  $h$  in  $G_1$ . Therefore, there are 8 sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  such that  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_b$ .

When  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_c$ : there are only 2 sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  for which this is possible, since the arcs  $cf$  and  $cg$  (shown in bold in Figure 8 on the right) must already be in  $G_1$ .

When  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_d$ : this case is similar to the case  $T_d(G_3) = T_c$ .

Thus there are 28 choices of  $\mathbf{G}$  such that  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$ , and similarly 28 choices each for  $T_d(G_1) = T_b$ ,  $T_d(G_1) = T_c$ , and  $T_d(G_1) = T_d$ . Therefore, there are 112 sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  such that  $\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T}$ .

*Counting  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : Q_1)$ :* Again we count 16 different contributions to  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : Q_1)$  depending on the choices for  $T_d(G_1)$  and  $T_d(G_3)$  in  $\{T_a, T_b, T_c, T_d\}$ . Please refer to Figure 9.




Figure 9: Counting  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : Q_1)$  when  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_b$  (left), and when  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_d$  (right)

When  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_a$ : as in case of  $P_1$ , we have 16 sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  for which  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_a$ .

When  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_b$ : the dashed arcs  $be$  and  $h2$  in Figure 9 on the left must be obtained by replacing  $ae$  and  $g2$ , and arc  $bh$  must already be in  $G_1$ . There are two sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  that achieve this: either  $G_2 = G_1 - ae + be$  or  $G_2 = G_1 - g2 + h2$ . Also, there are 2 choices for arcs pointing to  $f$ , therefore, there are 2 choices for  $G_1$ . Therefore, there are 4 sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  such that  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_b$ .

When  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_c$ : this case is similar to the case in which  $T_d(G_3) = T_b$ , therefore, there are 4 sequences such that  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_c$ .

When  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$  and  $T_d(G_3) = T_d$ : in this case, the arcs  $df$  and  $dh$  must already be in  $G_1$ . Thus there are only two sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  that are counted depending on whether  $G_2 = G_1 - e1 + f1$  or  $G_2 = G_1 - g2 + h2$ .

Thus there are 26 choices of  $\mathbf{G}$  such that  $T_d(G_1) = T_a$ , and similarly 26 choices each for  $T_d(G_1) = T_b$ ,  $T_d(G_1) = T_c$ , and  $T_d(G_1) = T_d$ . Therefore, there are 104 sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  such that  $\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T}$ .

Thus we have verified that  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P_1)$  and  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : Q_1)$  are unequal for  $\mathbf{T} := (T_1, T_2, T_1)$ , implying that  $P_1$  and  $Q_1$  are distinguished by the probability distribution they induce on the extant sequences under model RM.  $\square$

## 6 Discussion and open questions

In this paper we have presented a rigorous mathematical framework for studying pedigree reconstruction problems under probabilistic models. We extended phylogenetic identifiability results to reconstruct pedigrees under an idealised model of recombination and mutation. The main result of this paper is the computation of a class of combinatorial invariants from the joint distribution of extant sequences. As a corollary, we were able to show that certain known examples of pedigrees that could not be distinguished from path lengths alone, could be distinguished by a more detailed analysis of subgraph sequences. Here we identify a few open problems and directions for future investigation.

*Identifiability of computationally tractable invariants:* The invariants of a pedigree  $P$  defined by  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P)$  may be quite difficult to apply in general. Theorem 5.13 may be difficult to use computationally for bigger pedigrees. Even for other reconstruction problems in graph theory, computational verifications are difficult. For example, Ulam's reconstruction conjecture has been computationally verified to be true only for graphs on at most 11 vertices [9]. Even on restricted classes of graphs, computational reconstruction experiments are difficult to perform. It will be useful to derive from  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P)$  (or independently) other identifiable invariants that may be easier to use in computational experiments.

Theorem 5.13 only states that if two pedigrees induce the same joint distribution on extant sequences under model RM, then they agree on the invariants  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T})$ . But it will be important to prove a converse or a result of the type: two pedigrees induce the same distribution on extant sequences under model RM if and only if they take the same value for a class of combinatorial invariants. Such a result would reduce the identifiability problem to a purely combinatorial problem of proving or disproving that the class of invariants is complete. Such a class of invariants may be  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T})$  or it may be somewhat stronger than  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T})$ . It may be possible to compute, by the methods of Theorem 5.13, other invariants, for example, spanning forest sequences in which consecutive spanning forests are not necessarily separated by just one recombination.

*Improving the bound on  $p$ :* In the lower bound on  $\Delta(\mathbf{T})$  in Equation (5.7), we have  $1/2^e$  in the denominator, while  $c_3$  is roughly  $e^m$ , where  $e$  is the number of arcs in a pedigree. Therefore, it is possible to obtain better bounds on  $p$  for the applicability of the main theorem for pedigrees with fewer arcs. Therefore, we would significantly improve the upper bound on  $p$  if we showed that a pedigree can be reconstructed from the collection of its subpedigrees (pedigrees of subsets of the extant population) of order  $k$  for some small  $k$ . In [15] we made a conjecture about how small  $k$  may be for pedigrees of order  $n$  in which the population remains constant over generations. Thus solving the purely combinatorial problem of reconstructing pedigrees from their subpedigrees, while important in its own right, will be useful for improving bounds on  $p$  in Theorem 5.13.

On the other hand it is also likely (although we do not conjecture) that Theorem 5.13 is valid without restrictions on  $p$ , or for all but finitely many values of  $p$ , or for all  $p$  except when  $|\Sigma|$  takes small values. But we do not have good intuition as to why Proposition 4.6 (with  $|\Sigma| = 2$ ) requires a more complicated argument and an upper bound on  $p$ .

*Maximum likelihood computation of the invariants  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T})$ :* It will be of interest to derive statistical consistency results and bounds on sequence lengths, analogous to Corollary 5.3 and Lemma 5.5, for computing the invariants  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T})$ . For example, we would like to make the following qualitative statement precise. Suppose  $P$  is a pedigree with  $e$  arcs. Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be given. Suppose  $\mathbf{T}$  is an undirected  $X$ -forest sequence of length  $m$  with no two consecutive  $X$ -forests isomorphic. Then there is a sufficiently large  $L_{\epsilon,m}$  such that if a collection of sequences of length  $L > L_{\epsilon,m}$  evolved on  $P$  giving an alignment  $A$ , then the likelihood ratio  $L(A | P)/L(A | Q)$  is large for all pedigrees  $Q$  such that  $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P) \neq n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : Q)$ . We expect that  $L_{\epsilon,m}$  would be of the order of  $m \log(1/\epsilon)$ .

In the model RM, we assumed that the founders are independently assigned sequences from a uniform distribution. This assumption may be relaxed or replaced by more realistic assumptions.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Jotun Hein and Mike Steel for many valuable comments and for pointing me to many useful references relevant to this work. In particular, Mike’s comments on and references to the literature on phylogenetic identifiability results and results on the consistency of ML were very useful. This project was funded by the grant “From complete genomes to global pedigrees” from EPSRC (Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council), U.K. I would like to thank Jotun Hein and EPSRC for supporting my postdoctoral stay at the University of Oxford under this grant. I am currently working on the project “Tree-graphs and incidence matrices: theory and applications” funded by CNPq, Brasil (Processo: 151782/2010-5) at the Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade de São Paulo, where I completed a significant revision of this paper and improvements on the bounds in the main theorem. I would also like to thank Yoshiharu Kohayakawa with whom I had very useful conversations during the revision of this paper.

## References

- [1] O.R.P. Bininda-Emonds. *Phylogenetic Supertrees: Combining Information To Reveal The Tree Of Life*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2004.
- [2] Guy Bresler, Elchanan Mossel, and Allan Sly. Reconstruction of markov random fields from samples: Some observations and algorithms. In A. Goel *et al.*, editor, *11th International Workshop, APPROX 2008, and 12th International Workshop, RANDOM 2008, LNCS 5171*, pages 343–356, Berlin Heidelberg, 2008. Springer-Verlag.
- [3] P. Buneman. The recovery of trees from measures of dissimilarity. In *Mathematics in the archaeological and historical sciences*, pages 387–395. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, 1971.
- [4] Joseph T. Chang. Full reconstruction of Markov models on evolutionary trees: identifiability and consistency. *Math. Biosci.*, 137(1):51–73, 1996.

- [5] Olivier Gascuel and Mike Steel, editors. *Reconstructing evolution*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007. New mathematical and computational advances.
- [6] J. B. S. Haldane. The combination of linkage values, and the calculation of distance between the loci of linked factors. *Journal of Genetics*, 8:299–309, 1919.
- [7] Kenneth Lange. *Mathematical and statistical methods for genetic analysis*. Statistics for Biology and Health. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2002.
- [8] László Lovász. *Combinatorial problems and exercises*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, second edition, 1993.
- [9] Brendan D. McKay. Small graphs are reconstructible. *Australas. J. Combin.*, 15:123–126, 1997.
- [10] J. Pearl and M. Tarsi. Structuring causal trees. *Journal of Complexity*, 2:60–77, 1986.
- [11] T. Petrie. Probabilistic functions of finite state markov chains. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 40:97–115, 1969.
- [12] Charles Semple and Mike Steel. *Phylogenetics*, volume 24 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.
- [13] Mike Steel. Recovering a tree from the leaf colourations it generates under a Markov model. *Appl. Math. Lett.*, 7(2):19–23, 1994.
- [14] Mike Steel and Jotun Hein. Reconstructing pedigrees: a combinatorial perspective. *J. Theoret. Biol.*, 240(3):360–367, 2006.
- [15] Bhalchandra D. Thatte. Combinatorics of pedigrees-I: Counterexamples to a reconstruction question. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 22(3):961–970, 2008.
- [16] Bhalchandra D. Thatte and Mike Steel. Reconstructing pedigrees: a stochastic perspective. *J. Theoretical Biology*, 251(3):440–449, 2008.
- [17] E. F. Torfason and J. I. Sveinbjörnsson. Combinatorial pedigree inference from genomic data. Technical report, School of Computer Science, Reykjavík University, 2008.
- [18] S. M. Ulam. *A collection of mathematical problems*. Interscience Tracts in Pure and Applied Mathematics, no. 8. Interscience Publishers, New York-London, 1960.
- [19] H. Whitney. Congruent graphs and the connectivity of graphs. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 54:160–168, 1932.
- [20] K. A. Zareckiĭ. Constructing a tree on the basis of a set of distances between the hanging vertices. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, 20(6):90–92, 1965.

# Nomenclature

$(\Sigma^{XL} : P, RM(p, \mu))$  the space of alignments on the extant vertices of  $P$  as a probability space under model  $RM(p, \mu)$ ; other probability spaces are denoted analogously, page 14

$[a, b], [a, b), \dots$  intervals in integers and reals, page 6

$[m]$  the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ , page 6

$\cong$  isomorphism between pedigrees,  $X$ -forests, graphs, etc., page 7

$\|\mathcal{T}_P\|, \|\mathcal{U}_P\|$  the sets of isomorphism classes of directed and undirected  $X$ -forests (or distinct directed or undirected  $X$ -forests) in a pedigree  $P$ , respectively, page 10

$\|S\|$  - isomorphism class of an object; if  $S$  is a class of objects, then it is the set of isomorphism classes of objects in the class, page 7

$\|T\|$  the isomorphism class of an  $X$ -forest  $T$ , page 10

$\mathbf{f}(A) := (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N)$  vector of fractional site pattern frequencies in an alignment  $A$ , page 23

$\mathbf{G} := (G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m)$  - a spanning forest sequence of length  $m$ , page 10

$\mathbf{p}(T, \mu) := (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_N)$  defined as  $p_i := \Pr\{C_i \mid T, M(\mu)\}$ , page 23

$\mathbf{T} := (T_1, T_2, \dots, T_m)$  - an  $X$ -forest sequence of length  $m$ , page 10

$\mathcal{A} := \mathcal{A}_1 : \mathcal{A}_2 : \dots : \mathcal{A}_m$  a set of alignments obtained by concatenating alignments from sets  $\mathcal{A}_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , page 29

$\mathcal{A}(T_i, r_0, L)$  the set of alignments of length  $L$  whose fractional site pattern frequencies are within a radius  $r_0$  from  $\mathbf{p}(T_i)$ , page 24

$\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}_i$  subsets of an alignment space such as  $\Sigma^{XL}$ , page 15

$\mathcal{G}_P$  the set of spanning forests in a pedigree  $P$ , page 10

$\mathcal{T}_P, \mathcal{U}_P$  the sets of directed and undirected  $X$ -forests in a pedigree  $P$ , respectively, page 10

$\mu$  the substitution probability in models  $RM(p, \mu)$  and  $M(\mu)$ , page 14

$\mathbb{N}$  the set of natural numbers, page 6

$\Pr\{.\}$  the probability of an event, page 15

$\rho(\mathbf{s}, r)$  a ball of radius  $r$  centred at  $\mathbf{s}$ , page 23

$\Sigma$  finite alphabet, page 8

$\Sigma^X$  the set of site patterns on  $X$ , page 8  
 $\Sigma^{XL}$  the set of alignments of length  $L$  on  $X$ , page 8  
 $\mathbb{Z}$  the set of integers, page 6  
 $\mathbb{Z}_+$  the set of positive integers, page 6  
 $A, A_i, \dots$  alignments on  $X$ , i.e., maps from  $X$  to  $\Sigma^L$  or elements of  $\Sigma^{XL}$ , page 8  
 $A := A_1 : A_2 : \dots : A_m$  an alignment obtained by concatenating alignments  $A_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , page 29  
 $C, C_i, \dots$  characters on  $X$ , i.e., maps  $C : X \rightarrow \Sigma$ , page 8  
 $d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  1-norm distance between  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ , page 23  
 $d^-(u), d^+(u), d(u)$  - in-degree, out-degree, degree (or total degree) of a vertex  $u$ , page 7  
 $G \cong H$  -  $G$  and  $H$  are isomorphic, page 7  
 $G \leq H$  or  $H \geq G$  - when used for graphs (or isomorphism classes of graphs)  $G$  and  $H$ , it means  $G$  is isomorphic to a subgraph of  $H$ , page 7  
 $G \subseteq H$  or  $H \supseteq G$  - when used for labelled graphs  $G$  and  $H$ , it means  $G$  is a subgraph of  $H$ , page 7  
 $G, G_i, \dots$  - spanning forests in a pedigree, page 10  
 $n(\mathbf{G} > \mathbf{T} : P)$  number of sequences  $\mathbf{G}$  of spanning forests in  $P$  for which  $T_u(G_i) \cong T_i$  for all  $G_i$  in  $\mathbf{G}$  and consecutive  $G_i$  are separated by exactly 1 recombination, page 29  
 $p$  the crossover probability in models  $R(p)$  and  $RM(p, \mu)$ , page 14  
 $P, Q, P(X, Y, U, E), \dots$  pedigrees, page 7  
 $r(\mathbf{G})$  the number of recombinations in  $\mathbf{G}$ , see Definition 2.8, page 11  
 $s(\mathbf{G})$  the number of points of no recombination in  $\mathbf{G}$ , see Definition 2.8, page 11  
 $S^k$  the set of  $k$ -tuples of elements of a set  $S$ , page 6  
 $S^X$  the set of all functions from  $X$  to  $S$ , page 6  
 $T, T_i, \dots$  -  $X$ -forests in a pedigree or  $X$ -forests, page 10  
 $T_d(G)$  - the unique directed  $X$ -forest in a spanning forest  $G$  in a pedigree, page 10  
 $T_u(G)$  - the unique undirected  $X$ -forest in a spanning forest  $G$  in a pedigree, page 10  
 $u \leq v$  - (for vertices  $u$  and  $v$  in a pedigree) there is a directed path from  $v$  to  $u$ , page 7

$V(G), E(G)$  - vertex and edge sets of a graph, respectively, page 7

$v(G), e(G)$  - cardinalities of vertex and edge sets of a graph, respectively, page 7

$X$  the set of extant vertices of a pedigree, page 7