

# An algebraic analysis of the two state Markov model on tripod trees

Steffen Klaere<sup>a,\*</sup>, Volkmar Liebscher<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand*

<sup>b</sup>*Institut für Mathematik und Informatik, Universität Greifswald, Germany*

---

## Abstract

Methods of phylogenetic inference use more and more complex models to generate trees from data. However, even simple models and their implications are not fully understood.

Here, we investigate the two-state Markov model on a tripod tree, inferring conditions under which a given set of observations gives rise to such a model. This type of investigation has been undertaken before by several scientists from different fields of research.

In contrast to other work we fully analyse the model, presenting conditions under which one can infer a model from the observation or at least get support for the tree-shaped interdependence of the leaves considered.

We also present all conditions under which the results can be extended from tripod trees to quartet trees, a step necessary to reconstruct at least a topology. Apart from finding conditions under which such an extension works we discuss example cases for which such an extension does not work.

*Keywords:* Phylogenetics, Identifiability, Invariant, Two-State-Model

---

## 1. Introduction

In phylogeny, one assumes that the relationship of a set of taxonomic units (or taxa) can be visualised by a (binary) tree. The aim is to derive this tree from the observations at the taxa. From a stochastic modelling point of view, one assigns the taxa to the leaves of a (binary) tree, and assumes that the observations (which are usually considered to be i.i.d. over different sites) are the end results of a Markov process along the tree. The goal is to derive the best combination of tree and Markov model to explain the observations.

This work regards the identifiability problem of this inference. It essentially asks whether it is possible that infinite data sets are able to uniquely identify the transitions on the tree and the tree completely. Note that in the present context, identifiability

---

\*sklaere@maths.otago.ac.nz

12 readily leads to consistency of various methods of estimating the parameters of the  
13 model [see 1, Section 2.2 for an overview].

14 However, usually one only has an estimate of the leaf distribution such a process  
15 induces. This leads to the question of whether one can find (simple) conditions to  
16 determine whether a taxon distribution comes from a Markov process. In other words,  
17 we ask whether we can validate the model, at least if there are infinitely many data  
18 points available.

19 To approach this problem, we consider a very simple model. We assume that our  
20 process can take only one of two states for every site, and that the tree is a tripod tree.

21 Under these restrictions, we can completely describe the map from the taxon  
22 distribution to the parameters of the model, including necessary and sufficient  
23 conditions on positivity of the parameters. Thereby, no conditions for reversibility of  
24 the processes on the edges are needed. The analysis of the model on tripod trees has  
25 immediate consequences for quartet trees. We derive these conditions to exemplify the  
26 shortcomings of an extension from tripods to quartets.

27 Technically, the generic part of this work is already well-known. Initial work on  
28 the two state model from psychology can be found in Lazarsfeld and Henry [3]. Pearl  
29 and Tarsi [4] used these results in artificial intelligence to algorithmically identify the  
30 whole tree behind two-state Markov models. Note that identifiability of Markov models  
31 especially in phylogeny was studied in Allman et al. [5], Allman and Rhodes  
32 [6, 7], Baake [8], Chang [2]. We add to those results the analysis of the degenerate  
33 cases, together with a complete analysis of the quartet tree model.

34 The typical tool (for multi-state models) to identify a subspace of taxon  
35 distributions which might come from a Markovian tree model are phylogenetic  
36 invariants [6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12]. Those invariants are polynomials in the taxon distribution  
37 which are zero for those distributions that are derived from the model of interest.

38 Sumner et al. [13] discuss another very interesting set of invariants, the so-called  
39 Markov invariants. These are invariants whose value on a tree scales with the  
40 determinants of the Markov matrices on the edges. Thus, Markov invariants indicate  
41 simple relations between the observations (the distribution of leaf states) and the model  
42 (described by the Markov matrices), and provide conditions on the observations based  
43 on properties of the model. We will make use of this property in this work.

44 In the two-state tripod case there is only one, the trivial invariant. But, not all  
45 leaf distributions are derived from the Markov model. In fact, we derive polynomials  
46 that vanish on distributions which satisfy the trivial invariant but are not identifiable  
47 under the Markov model. To accommodate this observation we suggest incorporating  
48 these polynomials into the set of invariants but with the addition that these  
49 polynomials do not vanish for identifiable distributions. We discuss degenerate  
50 distributions to describe this observation.

51 Although most of the leaf distributions allow for complex solutions of the model  
52 equations, in order for the solution of the algebraic equation to be parameters of a  
53 Markov model additional inequalities must be fulfilled [15, 16, 17]. The approach of

54 Matsen is restricted to the Cavender-Farris-Neyman model [CFN 18, 19, 20] to  
55 accommodate the Hadamard approach [21, 22]. Yang [17] investigated the CFN model  
56 to explore conditions to obtain solutions for different optimisation problems in  
57 phylogeny. Extending our approach we recover the inequalities presented in Pearl and  
58 Tarsi [4].

59 As a final step we investigate how the results for tripod trees extend to trees of  
60 four leaves. The results provide a glimpse at what we can expect from the  
61 reconstruction from tripods when we have no knowledge of the identifiability of the  
62 given taxon distribution.

63 The structure of this work is as follows: In Section 2 we describe the general  
64 mutation model on a tree, with specialisation to tripod trees coming in Section 3.  
65 Section 4 deals with the complete solution of the two-state tripod tree model. Then, in  
66 Section 5 we use these results to analyse the general two-state Markov model on quartet  
67 trees. Section 6 discusses the relation between our work and the concept of Markov  
68 invariants, and possible extensions of this work. ] For the sake of readability, proofs are  
69 presented in Appendix A.

## 70 2. The Markov model of mutation along a tree

71 In this section we introduce the general Markov model and its properties. Pearl  
72 and Tarsi [4] nicely motivate this model in the following way. Assume, one is given a set  
73  $L$  of taxa and a set of observations from a Markov process  $X : L \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ . From these  
74 observations one deduces a correlation between the taxa. The assumption is that this  
75 correlation can be explained by an underlying (binary) tree  $T = (V, E)$  and an  
76 extension  $Y : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  of  $X$  such that for any pair of taxa there is an interior node  
77 such that given the state at the interior node the two taxa are independent. See Fig.  
78 A.1 for a depiction of this.

79 [Figure 1 about here.]

80 Let us look closer at the process  $Y$ . The independence of pairs of taxa given an  
81 interior node on the path between them corresponds to the so-called *directed local*  
82 *Markov property* [e.g., 23, Chapter 2]. For this property one has to identify a node  
83  $\zeta \in V$  as the root of the tree and direct all edges away from  $\zeta$ . Thus, our tree becomes  
84 a directed acyclic graph, and for every node  $\beta \in V \setminus \{\zeta\}$  there is a parent node  $\alpha \in V$   
85 (with respect to the root), such that  $(\alpha, \beta) \in E$ . Further, for each node  $\beta \in V$  one  
86 defines the set its descendants as those nodes  $\alpha$  for which the path from the root to  $\alpha$   
87 passes through  $\beta$ . The non-descendants are then the nodes that are neither descendants  
88 nor parents.

89 The directed local Markov property states that conditioned on the state of its  
90 parent node the state of a node  $\alpha \in V$  is independent of the states of its

91 non-descendants. With this property the joint distribution  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^Y$  has the *factorisation*  
 92 *property*, i.e. for the joint state  $\boldsymbol{\chi} \in \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}^{|V|}$  we get

$$\tilde{p}_{\boldsymbol{\chi}}^Y = \Pr[Y_{\zeta} = \chi_{\zeta}] \prod_{(\alpha, \beta) \in E} \Pr[Y_{\beta} = \chi_{\beta} | Y_{\alpha} = \chi_{\alpha}] = q_{\chi_{\zeta}}^{\zeta} \prod_{(\alpha, \beta) \in E} M_{\chi_{\alpha} \chi_{\beta}}^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (1)$$

93 Here, the marginal distribution  $\mathbf{q}^{\zeta}$  corresponds to the initialisation of the process, i.e.  
 94  $q_z^{\zeta}$  is the probability that the process attains state  $z \in \{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}\}$  at the root. The transition  
 95 matrices  $(\mathbf{M}^e)_{e \in E}$  describe the way the process progresses along an edge. E.g., for an  
 96 edge  $(\alpha, \beta) \in E$  the term  $M_{ab}^{\alpha\beta}$  is the probability that the character  $a$  at node  $\alpha$  is  
 97 mutated into character  $b$  at node  $\beta$ .

98 In summary, the joint probability distribution  $\tilde{\mathbf{p}}^Y$  is given by the marginal  
 99 distribution  $\mathbf{q}^{\zeta}$  and the transition matrices  $(\mathbf{M}^e)_{e \in E}$ , and thus such a Markov process is  
 100 completely characterised by these parameters. We will call  $\mathbf{q}^{\zeta}$  and  $(\mathbf{M}^e)_{e \in E}$  the *process*  
 101 *parameters*.

102 In general, the actual position of the root node  $\zeta$  is not important for (1), i.e.  $\zeta$   
 103 can be chosen arbitrarily from  $V$ , including a leaf [e.g., 7].

104 We only have partial knowledge on the realisations of the process  $Y$  through the  
 105 process  $X$  on the leaves. The joint distribution  $\mathbf{p}^X$  of  $X$  can then be inferred from (1)  
 106 using the law of total probability. Let  $\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{|L|}$  denote the joint state at the leaves.  
 107 Then

$$p_{\mathbf{x}}^X = \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\chi} \in V \\ \boldsymbol{\chi}|_L = \mathbf{x}}} \tilde{p}_{\boldsymbol{\chi}}^Y = \sum_{\substack{\boldsymbol{\chi} \in V \\ \boldsymbol{\chi}|_L = \mathbf{x}}} q_{\chi_{\zeta}}^{\zeta} \prod_{(\alpha, \beta) \in E} M_{\chi_{\alpha} \chi_{\beta}}^{\alpha\beta}. \quad (2)$$

108 Note that under the assumption that  $X$  comes from a reversible Markov process  $Y$   
 109 Chang [2] proved that all process parameters can be recovered from all the distributions  
 110 of the restrictions of  $X$  to arbitrary triples of taxa.

111 If we find process parameters for a joint taxon distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  then we call  $\mathbf{p}$  *tree*  
 112 *decomposable*. If the obtained process parameters are unique (up to model-specific  
 113 symmetries), we call  $\mathbf{p}$  *algebraically identifiable*, and if further the process parameters  
 114 are marginal and transition probabilities, then  $\mathbf{p}$  is called *stochastically identifiable*.  
 115 Clearly, any stochastically identifiable distribution is also algebraically identifiable.

116 Looking at (2) we realise that verifying the tree decomposability of a distribution  
 117  $\mathbf{p}$  is equivalent to solving a polynomial equation system of  $2^{|L|} - 1$  independent  
 118 equations in  $4|L| - 5$  variables. We observe that the Markov equations are  
 119 overdetermined for  $|L| > 3$ , i.e. the space of tree decomposable distributions is a proper  
 120 subspace of the space of all distributions. From this we conclude, that there are  
 121 conditions that define a tree decomposable distribution. These conditions are generally  
 122 known as *invariants*, polynomials in  $2^{|L|} - 1$  variables whose roots are distributions that  
 123 are tree decomposable. One example of an invariant is

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{|L|}} p_{\mathbf{x}} = 1, \quad (3)$$

124 i.e. all probabilities sum to one. This is fittingly called the *trivial invariant*. Allman  
 125 and Rhodes [6] provide a complete set of invariants for trees of arbitrary size under a  
 126 two-state-model, and observe that for complete identification the knowledge of the  
 127 restrictions to six taxa are necessary.

128 However, as pointed out in multiple publications [e.g., 4, 16] such invariants are  
 129 not sufficient to guarantee tree identifiability. In particular, additional inequalities are  
 130 needed.

131 Here, we are not only interested in recapturing invariants and inequalities. In  
 132 addition, we also investigate those distributions that are not algebraically identifiable or  
 133 not tree decomposable at all to discuss their impact on invariant-based inference.

### 134 3. General properties of a Markov model on a tripod tree

135 The starting point of our analysis is the tripod tree  $T$  with taxa  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ , interior  
 136 node  $\zeta$  and edges  $(\zeta, \alpha)$ ,  $(\zeta, \beta)$ ,  $(\zeta, \gamma)$  (see Fig. A.2). This is the only labeled topology  
 137 for three taxa. Hence any inference will be process- and not topology-related. Allman  
 138 and Rhodes [7] select a taxon as the root for their approach. We will place the root at  
 139 the interior node for the symmetry this provides in the tree equations.

140 [Figure 2 about here.]

141 As stated in the previous section, if the joint distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  of  $X_\alpha, X_\beta, X_\gamma$  comes  
 142 from a Markov process then there are parameters  $q^\zeta, \mathbf{M}^\alpha, \mathbf{M}^\beta, \mathbf{M}^\gamma$  such that the  
 143 Markov equations (2) are satisfied. On a tripod tree these equations are the *tripod*  
 144 *equations*

$$p_{abc} = q_1^\zeta M_{1a}^\alpha M_{1b}^\beta M_{1c}^\gamma + (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{0a}^\alpha M_{0b}^\beta M_{0c}^\gamma, \quad a, b, c \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (4)$$

145 As before we call  $\mathbf{p}$  *tree decomposable*, if there are parameters, *algebraically identifiable*,  
 146 when the parameters are unique (up to some symmetries discussed later), and  
 147 *stochastically identifiable* if the parameters are unique and proper marginal and  
 148 transition probabilities.

149 The works of Lazarsfeld and Henry [3] and Pearl and Tarsi [4] were mainly  
 150 interested in inferring conditions under which a triplet distribution is stochastically  
 151 identifiable. While recovering their results we also investigate tree decomposability and  
 152 algebraic identifiability in order to describe their impact on invariant-based inference.

153 For three taxa the only invariant is the trivial invariant. Thus, one could expect  
 154 that all triplet distributions are tree decomposable. As we will see later, this is not the  
 155 case. In fact, we will present polynomials whose roots satisfy the trivial invariant but  
 156 are not tree decomposable.

157 *3.1. Statistics for binary models*

158 Following Pearl and Tarsi [4] we identify the symbols 0 and 1 with their actual  
 159 integer counterparts. This permits us to introduce a set of terms that are very helpful  
 160 for later steps of the analysis. We start by introducing the following abbreviations:

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} &:= \mathbb{E}X_\alpha X_\beta X_\gamma = \Pr[X_\alpha = 1, X_\beta = 1, X_\gamma = 1] = p_{111}, \\ \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} &:= \mathbb{E}X_\alpha X_\beta = \Pr[X_\alpha = 1, X_\beta = 1] = p_{11\Sigma} = p_{110} + p_{111}, \\ \varepsilon_\alpha &:= \mathbb{E}X_\alpha = \Pr[X_\alpha = 1] = p_{1\Sigma\Sigma} = p_{100} + p_{101} + p_{110} + p_{111}.\end{aligned}$$

161 The symbols  $p_{11\Sigma}$  and its modifications  $p_{1\Sigma 1}$  etc. are direct consequences of the  
 162 application of the law of total probability to the equation system (4). These terms are  
 163 also known as *marginalisations* leading to a removal of a random variable from  
 164 consideration by summing over its states. This linear modification means we can study  
 165 the tripod equations (4) also in terms of its marginalisations.

166 In the case of the binary model the above symbols  $\varepsilon_A$  for all  $A \in L$  correspond to  
 167 the joint mean of the random variables for the taxa in  $A$ . Using these definitions we can  
 168 introduce simple terms which correspond to the covariances between the set of random  
 169 variables:

$$\tau_{\alpha\beta} := \text{Cov}[X_\alpha, X_\beta] = \mathbb{E}X_\alpha X_\beta - \mathbb{E}X_\alpha \mathbb{E}X_\beta,$$

170 with equivalent definitions for  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma}$  and  $\tau_{\beta\gamma}$ . Of further interest are the following terms  
 171 ( $c \in \{0, 1\}$ )

$$\tau_{\alpha\beta|c} := p_{11c}p_{\Sigma\Sigma c} - p_{1\Sigma c}p_{\Sigma 1c},$$

172 with equivalent definitions for  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma|b}$ ,  $b \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\tau_{\beta\gamma|a}$ ,  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ . These terms are  
 173 actually multiples of the conditional covariances,  $\text{Cov}[X_\alpha, X_\beta | X_\gamma = c] = \tau_{\alpha\beta|c}/p_{\Sigma\Sigma c}$ .  
 174 Finally, we also introduce the three-way covariances

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} &:= \text{Cov}[X_\alpha, X_\beta, X_\gamma] = \mathbb{E}(X_\alpha - \mathbb{E}X_\alpha)(X_\beta - \mathbb{E}X_\beta)(X_\gamma - \mathbb{E}X_\gamma) \\ &= \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \varepsilon_\alpha \varepsilon_{\beta\gamma} - \varepsilon_\beta \varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma} - \varepsilon_\gamma \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} + 2\varepsilon_\alpha \varepsilon_\beta \varepsilon_\gamma.\end{aligned}$$

175 For a review on covariance for more than two random variables see e.g. Rayner and Beh  
 176 [24]. The term  $\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  describes the interactions of the three leaves considered. Sumner  
 177 et al. [13] call this term a *stangle*, a stochastic tangle, highlighting its relation to  
 178 entangled states of qbits in quantum mechanics. The three-way covariances are zero in  
 179 the case of symmetric models like CFN, which also reflects the findings in Baake [8].  
 180 However, for more complex models the three-way covariances are needed as indicated  
 181 by the findings of Chang [2].

182 Since covariances are a measure of interdependence of random variables, and  
 183 because the identification of a tree and a Markov model is an interpretation of the  
 184 interdependence in terms of hidden variables and conditional independence, looking at  
 185 these covariances is a very logical way to verify whether or not such an interpretation is  
 186 admissible. Using these terms we can immediately propose a useful property.

187 **Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathbf{p}$  denote the joint probability for binary random variables  $X_\alpha$ ,  $X_\beta$  and*  
 188  *$X_\gamma$ . If we flip the state in one taxon, then we flip the signs in its pairwise covariances.*  
 189 *E.g., if  $X_\alpha \mapsto 1 - X_\alpha$ , then  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} \mapsto -\tau_{\alpha\beta}$ ,  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma} \mapsto -\tau_{\alpha\gamma}$   $\tau_{\beta\gamma} \mapsto \tau_{\beta\gamma}$ .*

190 One immediate consequence of this observation is that the product  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma}$   
 191 always has the same sign no matter how much we flip states.

### 192 3.2. Tree properties

193 In this section we assume that  $\mathbf{p}$  is tree decomposable and regard some immediate  
 194 consequences. We will later see that these conditions are necessary for identifiability  
 195 but not sufficient. Nevertheless, these conditions provide some immediate insights for it.

196 **Lemma 2.** 1. *If a triplet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  is tree decomposable on  $T$  with  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ , then*  
 197 *also  $\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 0$  and  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma} = 0$  or  $\tau_{\beta\gamma} = 0$ .*  
 198 2. *If a triplet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  is stochastically identifiable then the product  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma}$  is*  
 199 *non-negative.*

200 The non-negativity of the product has already been verified by Lazarsfeld and  
 201 Henry [3]. With Lemma 1 it is not complicated to derive that on a star tree (with  
 202 arbitrary number of leaves) there always is a state flipping such that all pairs of leaves  
 203 are positively correlated.

204 **Corollary 3.** *Suppose we are given a stochastically identifiable distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  on a tree*  
 205 *with finite leaf set  $L$  such that the pairwise covariances do not vanish, i.e.,  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$  for*  
 206 *all  $\alpha, \beta \in L$ . Then there exists a set of leaves  $L_0 \subset L$  such that flipping the states of the*  
 207 *leaves in  $L_0$  yields all covariances  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}$ ,  $\alpha, \beta \in L$ , being positive.*

208 Lemma 2(1) occurs exactly if  $X_\alpha$  or  $X_\beta$  is independent of the remaining random  
 209 variables. It also implies the following:

210 **Corollary 4.** *A triplet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  with  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} = 0$  but  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma} \neq 0$  and  $\tau_{\beta\gamma} \neq 0$  is not tree*  
 211 *decomposable.*

212 Thus we already see, that the trivial invariant does not characterise tree  
 213 decomposable distributions in this setting. The following example shows that such cases  
 214 can be easily constructed.

215 **Example 1.** Triplet distributions of type

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p} &= (p_{000}, p_{001}, p_{010}, p_{011}, p_{100}, p_{101}, p_{110}, p_{111}) \\ &= (4 - x, x, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)/16, \quad x \in [0, 4] \setminus \{2\}, \end{aligned}$$

216 yield  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} = 0$  but  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma} = \tau_{\beta\gamma} = (2 - x)/32$  and hence are not tree decomposable. In fact,  
 217 for binary variables a much more complicated graphical model with more “inner” nodes  
 218 and edges is needed to explain these covariances.

219 **4. Solving the tripod equations**

220 In this section we are given a triplet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  and infer conditions under  
 221 which it is algebraically identifiable. For each case we will present an example.

222 *4.1. The algebraic solution*

223 As has been pointed out multiple times, the only invariant in the tripod case is  
 224 the trivial invariant. In other words, the “set” of invariants for a tripod tree is satisfied  
 225 by all triplet distributions. However, as we have seen in Corollary 4 there are triplet  
 226 distributions that are not tree decomposable even though they satisfy the trivial  
 227 invariant. Thus executing the actual decomposition, i.e. finding a solution for the  
 228 tripod equations not only provides complete forms for the parameters but is also helpful  
 229 to identify further cases. The first task is to clarify up to which level of uniqueness the  
 230 decomposition of a triplet distribution can be attained. To do this we look at the  
 231 implications of a state-flip at the root.

232 **Lemma 5.** *If a triplet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  is tree decomposable with parameters*  
 233  *$\mathbf{q}^\zeta, \mathbf{M}^\alpha, \mathbf{M}^\beta, \mathbf{M}^\gamma$  then it is also tree decomposable for parameters  $\tilde{\mathbf{q}}^\zeta, \tilde{\mathbf{M}}^\alpha, \tilde{\mathbf{M}}^\beta, \tilde{\mathbf{M}}^\gamma$*   
 234 *with  $\tilde{q}_z^\zeta = q_{1-z}^\zeta, \tilde{M}_{za}^\alpha = M_{(1-z)a}^\alpha, \tilde{M}_{zb}^\beta = M_{(1-z)b}^\beta, \tilde{M}_{zc}^\gamma = M_{(1-z)c}^\gamma$ .*

235 Hence, except for the case where everything is equal to 1/2, there will always be  
 236 at least two sets of parameters that decompose a triplet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$ . In terms of  
 237 molecular evolution one can view these solutions as having either few mutations  
 238 ( $M_{z(1-z)}^\delta < M_{zz}^\delta, \delta$  leaf) or many mutations ( $M_{z(1-z)}^\delta > M_{zz}^\delta, \delta$  leaf) for the other. Chang  
 239 [2] addressed the problem of symmetric solutions by introducing matrix categories that  
 240 are *reconstructible from rows*. One such class consists of diagonally dominant matrices,  
 241 i.e.  $M_{zz}^\delta > M_{z(1-z)}^\delta$  for all leaves and  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ . If only these two sets of parameters exist  
 242 then we will regard the associated distribution as algebraically identifiable. It should be  
 243 noted that the set of symmetric solutions increases with the number of parameters, i.e.  
 244 each possible permutation of the states at the root yields a new solution. This fact has  
 245 also been observed by Chang [2] in the case of the time-continuous Markov model.

246 Next, we present conditions under which  $\mathbf{p}$  is algebraically identifiable and present  
 247 the closed form for the parameters.

248 **Theorem 6.** *Let  $\mathbf{p}$  denote a triplet distribution and assume*

$$249 \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} \neq 0, \quad \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} \neq -\left(\frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}{2}\right)^2. \quad (5)$$

249 *Then  $\mathbf{p}$  is algebraically identifiable. The associated parameters have the following form:*

$$\begin{aligned} q_1^\zeta &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}{2\sqrt{\chi}}, \\ M_{01}^\alpha &= \varepsilon_\alpha + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \sqrt{\chi}}{2\tau_{\beta\gamma}}, \quad M_{01}^\beta = \varepsilon_\beta + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \sqrt{\chi}}{2\tau_{\alpha\gamma}}, \quad M_{01}^\gamma = \varepsilon_\gamma + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \sqrt{\chi}}{2\tau_{\alpha\beta}}, \\ M_{11}^\alpha &= \varepsilon_\alpha + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \sqrt{\chi}}{2\tau_{\beta\gamma}}, \quad M_{11}^\beta = \varepsilon_\beta + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \sqrt{\chi}}{2\tau_{\alpha\gamma}}, \quad M_{11}^\gamma = \varepsilon_\gamma + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \sqrt{\chi}}{2\tau_{\alpha\beta}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$



250 where  $\chi = \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2 + 4\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma}$ .

251 Note that Pearl and Tarsi [4] presented a similar solution for the parameters.  
 252 Looking at the parameters in (6) we see that algebraically the conditions in (5) prevent  
 253 division by zero. Together with the trivial invariant we can thus claim that the space of  
 254 algebraically identifiable triplet distributions is given by  $\mathcal{S} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_0 \cup \mathcal{S}_1)$  with

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S} &:= \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^8 : p_{000} + \dots + p_{111} = 1\}, \\ \mathcal{S}_0 &:= \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{S} : \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} = 0\}, \\ \mathcal{S}_1 &:= \{\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{S} : \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2 + 4\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} = 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

255 Considering (5) and Lemma 2(2) we see that triplet distributions with  
 256  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} < 0$  are only algebraically, but not stochastically identifiable. In fact, for  
 257  $-\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2 < 4\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} < 0$  we get real-valued parameters, and for  $4\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} < -\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2$  we  
 258 get a set of complex-valued parameters.

259 The following example presents such distributions.

260 **Example 2.** Regard the distributions

$$\mathbf{p}_1 = (6, 7, 2, 1, 1, 1, 4, 5)/27, \quad \mathbf{p}_2 = (6, 7, 1, 2, 1, 1, 4, 5)/27, \quad \mathbf{p}_3 = (6, 6, 2, 2, 1, 1, 4, 5)/27.$$

261 All three distributions satisfy the conditions (5), i.e. they are algebraically identifiable.  
 262 For  $\mathbf{p}_1$  the covariance  $\tau_{\beta\gamma}$  is negative and the other two positive, while for  $\mathbf{p}_2$  we have  
 263  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma}$  negative and the other two positive. The distribution  $\mathbf{p}_3$  has only positive pairwise  
 264 covariances.

265 The parameters for  $\mathbf{p}_1$  are real-valued, the parameters for  $\mathbf{p}_2$  are complex-valued  
 266 and  $\mathbf{p}_3$  is stochastically identifiable.

267 Though this example is artificial it indicates just how sensitive the model is to  
 268 misreads in alignments. E.g., the difference between  $\mathbf{p}_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_3$  could be seen as reading  
 269 the pattern 011 under  $\mathbf{p}_3$  as pattern 001 under  $\mathbf{p}_1$ .

#### 270 4.2. Stochastically identifiable distributions

271 The next step is to determine conditions under which a distribution satisfying (5)  
 272 is stochastically identifiable. These conditions should correspond to the conditions  
 273 given by Pearl and Tarsi [4, Theorem 1].

274 Example 2 dealt with  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} < 0$ . However, as the following example shows,  
 275 positivity of the product does not necessarily yield stochastic identifiability.

276 **Example 3.** The tripod distribution

$$\mathbf{p} = (68, 0, 20, 12, 20, 12, 17, 51)/200$$

277 yields positive covariances for all three pairs but also  $M_{01}^\gamma = -1/20$ , i.e. not a  
 278 probability.

279 The example contains a pattern of expected zero occurrence. From the tripod  
 280 equations we conclude that a stochastically identifiable distribution is strictly positive,  
 281 thus this example is slightly contrived. However, as Example 1 showed, a strictly  
 282 positive triplet distribution is not necessarily stochastically identifiable either.

283 In order to get necessary and sufficient conditions on a triplet distribution to be  
 284 stochastically identifiable we need to go back to the parameters in (6) and bound them  
 285 accordingly. This yields:

286 **Theorem 7.** *A triplet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  is stochastically identifiable if and only if after*  
 287 *suitable state flips the following inequalities hold*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\alpha\beta} &> 0, & \tau_{\alpha\beta|0} &\geq 0, & \tau_{\alpha\beta|1} &\geq 0, \\ \tau_{\alpha\gamma} &> 0, & \tau_{\alpha\gamma|0} &\geq 0, & \tau_{\alpha\gamma|1} &\geq 0, \\ \tau_{\beta\gamma} &> 0, & \tau_{\beta\gamma|0} &\geq 0, & \tau_{\beta\gamma|1} &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

288 In other words, the direction of the correlation between a pair of leaves shall not  
 289 be influenced by the third leaf. With this we can summarise that a triplet distribution  
 290 is stochastically identifiable if it is in  $\mathcal{S} \setminus (\mathcal{S}_0 \cup \mathcal{S}_1)$  and there is a state flip such that (7)  
 291 is satisfied.

292 **Example 4.** The tripod distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  from Example 3 has positive pairwise and  
 293 conditional covariances except for  $\tau_{\alpha\beta|1} = -9/2500$ . Thus it does not satisfy (7).

#### 294 4.3. Non-identifiable cases

295 The above considerations dealt with cases where a given triplet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  is  
 296 algebraically identifiable. The final step of the tripod analysis is to regard those  
 297 distributions that violate the conditions (5). Corollary 4 already discussed the case  
 298 where one pairwise covariance is zero while the other two are not and we found that  
 299 they were not tree decomposable. In the following we look at the remaining cases.

300 **Proposition 8.** *Assume that a triplet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  obeys  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} = -(\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}/2)^2$  but*  
 301  *$\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} \neq 0$ . Then  $\mathbf{p}$  is not tree decomposable.*

302 In other words, we found another set of triplet distributions that are not tree  
 303 decomposable.

304 **Example 5.** The distribution

$$\mathbf{p} = (16, 5, 8, 15, 14, 5, 2, 15)/80$$

305 yields  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} = -1/80$ ,  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma} = 1/40$  and  $\tau_{\beta\gamma} = 1/8$  but  $\chi = 0$  and hence has no factorisation  
 306 in the sense of (4). As in Example 1 we point out here that there seems to be no simple  
 307 graphical structure which explains the observed covariances adequately. On the other  
 308 hand, similarly to Example 2 the simple act of moving  $1/80$  from pattern 100 to pattern  
 309 110 yields algebraic identifiability. This indicates the level of care required when  
 310 inferring meaning from observed covariances.

311 Together with Corollary 4 this covers the distributions that are not tree  
 312 decomposable. The remaining cases are triplet distributions that are tree decomposable  
 313 but not algebraically identifiable.

314 **Proposition 9.** *Let  $\mathbf{p}$  be a triplet distribution with  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} = 0$  and  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma} = 0$ . Then  $\mathbf{p}$  is tree*  
 315 *decomposable with infinitely many parameter sets.*

316 *The parameter sets are identified by one of the following compositions:*

317 (i)  $\tau_{\beta\gamma} \neq 0$ . Then  $M_{0a}^\alpha = M_{1a}^\alpha = p_{a\Sigma\Sigma}$ ,  $a \in \{0, 1\}$ , and for any  $u, b, c \in \{0, 1\}$ :

$$q_1^\zeta = \frac{p_{\Sigma\Sigma c} - M_{1c}^\gamma}{M_{0c}^\gamma - M_{1c}^\gamma}, \quad M_{ub}^\beta = \frac{p_{\Sigma bc} - p_{\Sigma b\Sigma} M_{(1-u)c}^\gamma}{p_{\Sigma\Sigma c} - M_{(1-u)c}^\gamma} \quad (8)$$

318 *with free parameters  $M_{0c}^\gamma \neq M_{1c}^\gamma$ .*

319 (ii)  $\tau_{\beta\gamma} = 0$ . Then for all  $a, b, c, \in \{0, 1\}$  the free parameters can be distributed as  
 320 follows:

321 (a)  $M_{0a}^\alpha = M_{1a}^\alpha = p_{a\Sigma\Sigma}$ ,  $M_{0b}^\beta = M_{1b}^\beta = p_{\Sigma b\Sigma}$  and

$$q_1^\zeta = \frac{p_{\Sigma\Sigma c} - M_{0c}^\gamma}{M_{1c}^\gamma - M_{0c}^\gamma}, \quad (9)$$

322 *with free parameters  $M_{0z}^\gamma \neq M_{1z}^\gamma$ .*

323 (b)  $M_{0a}^\alpha = M_{1a}^\alpha = p_{a\Sigma\Sigma}$ ,  $M_{0b}^\beta = M_{1b}^\beta = p_{\Sigma b\Sigma}$ ,  $M_{0c}^\gamma = M_{1c}^\gamma = p_{\Sigma\Sigma c}$  with free  
 324 parameter  $q_1^\zeta$ .

325 (c)  $q_1^\zeta = 0$ ,  $M_{0a}^\alpha = p_{a\Sigma\Sigma}$ ,  $M_{0b}^\beta = p_{\Sigma b\Sigma}$ ,  $M_{0c}^\gamma = p_{\Sigma\Sigma c}$  with free parameters  
 326  $M_{1a}^\alpha, M_{1b}^\beta, M_{1c}^\gamma$ .

327 In other words, the distribution is tree decomposable because process parameters  
 328 exist but it is not algebraically identifiable because we have no means to recover the  
 329 true parameters or more precisely, there are infinitely many parameters that yield the  
 330 same distribution.

331 **Example 6.** The triplet distribution

$$\mathbf{p} = (2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2)/16$$

332 yields complete independence of the leaves  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} = \tau_{\alpha\gamma} = \tau_{\beta\gamma} = 0$ , i.e. the case (ii) in  
 333 Proposition 9 is to be regarded here. It is not too surprising that such a distribution  
 334 yields an infinite number of solutions since the state at the root is completely  
 335 undetermined.

336 Looking again at the cases listed above, we see that  $X_\alpha$  is not only pairwise  
 337 independent from  $(X_\beta, X_\gamma)$  (induced by  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} = \tau_{\alpha\gamma} = 0$ ), but even completely  
 338 independent. Then the multiple solutions come from the fact that we can place the root  
 339 arbitrarily between  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ .

340 The good news is, that the non-identifiable cases form a small subset among all  
 341 triplet distributions. In fact:

342 **Proposition 10.** *Non-identifiable triplet distributions, i.e. distributions violating the*  
 343 *conditions (5) form a Lebesgue zero set in the set of all possible triplet distributions.*

344 This concludes our analysis of the tripod case. We identified the subset of triplet  
 345 distributions that are uniquely algebraically and stochastically identifiable, and those  
 346 that are tree decomposable but not algebraically identifiable, or not tree decomposable  
 347 at all.

## 348 5. Extension to quartet trees

349 In this section we will explore the implications of extending the results for three  
 350 taxa to four taxa. For this section we look at the quartet tree  $Q = (V, E)$  with

$$V = \{\zeta, \psi, \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta\}, \quad E = \{(\zeta, \psi), (\zeta, \alpha), (\zeta, \beta), (\psi, \gamma), (\psi, \delta)\}.$$

351 Fig. A.3 provides an illustration including the four tripod restrictions  
 352  $\bar{T} = T_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ ,  $\tilde{T} = T_{\alpha\beta\delta}$ ,  $\hat{T} = T_{\alpha\gamma\delta}$  and  $\check{T} = T_{\beta\gamma\delta}$ .

353 Regard the quartet distribution  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_{abcd})_{a,b,c,d \in \{0,1\}}$  describing the joint  
 354 distribution for  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$  and  $\delta$ . If  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is stochastically identifiable and reversible then it  
 355 can be reconstructed from the *marginalisations* on its four tripods [2], i.e. computing  
 356 the parameters for all tripods will immediately return the full process. However, the  
 357 converse is not necessarily true. As Example 7 below shows, there are cases where each  
 358 tripod marginalisation is stochastically identifiable but no quartet tree can be  
 359 reconstructed.

360 [Figure 3 about here.]

361 Pearl and Tarsi [4] presented an algorithm to reconstruct the topology for an  
 362 arbitrary number of taxa. Their algorithm employs the condition that tripods that  
 363 share an interior node in the (unknown) tree topology must have the same marginal  
 364 distribution at this interior node. Their approach yields an invariant, which for  $Q$   
 365 amounts to

$$f_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}) = \tau_{\alpha\delta}\tau_{\beta\gamma} - \tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\delta}. \quad (10)$$

366 This invariant is related to the four-point-condition [e.g., 26, p. 146] and thus  
 367 topologically informative, i.e. it is particular to topology  $Q$ . If a distribution  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is from  
 368 another tree than  $f_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}) \neq 0$ .

369 To reconstruct the process parameters as well, more invariants are needed. In  
 370 particular, for  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  to be algebraically identifiable on  $Q$  the parameters obtained from the  
 371 tripod marginalisations must satisfy the following properties:

- 372 1. The parameters for edges  $(\zeta, \alpha)$ ,  $(\zeta, \beta)$  and  $q^\zeta$  obtained from triplet distributions  
 373  $\bar{\boldsymbol{p}}$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{p}}$ , respectively, must be equal.
- 374 2. The parameters for edges  $(\psi, \gamma)$ ,  $(\psi, \delta)$  and  $q^\psi$  obtained from triplet distributions  
 375  $\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}$  and  $\check{\boldsymbol{p}}$ , respectively, must be equal.

376 3. The parameters  $\mathbf{M}^\psi$  for the interior edge  $(\zeta, \psi)$  are obtained from the equations

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{M}_{01}^\gamma &= (1 - M_{01}^\psi)\widehat{M}_{01}^\gamma + M_{01}^\psi\widehat{M}_{11}^\gamma, \\ \overline{M}_{11}^\gamma &= (1 - M_{11}^\psi)\widehat{M}_{01}^\gamma + M_{11}^\psi\widehat{M}_{11}^\gamma.\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

377 These equations must hold equivalently when  $\gamma$  is replaced by  $\delta$  and the  
378 parameters come from tripod  $\widetilde{T}$  instead of  $\widehat{M}$ .

379 These conditions imply further restrictions on  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ . An indicator for the minimal  
380 number of such conditions is the observation that a quartet distribution  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  has 15  
381 degrees of freedom, but there are only 11 process parameters on  $Q$ , two for each edge  
382 and one for the root distribution. Thus we need at least four additional conditions or  
383 rather invariants. We will use the above observations to derive an equivalent set of  
384 invariants.

385 **Proposition 11.** *A quartet distribution  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  is algebraically identifiable on  $Q$  if its tripod*  
386 *marginalisations satisfy conditions (5) and the following invariants vanish on  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ :*

$$\begin{aligned}f_0(\boldsymbol{\pi}) &= \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma} - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma\delta} + \varepsilon_\gamma\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma\delta} + \varepsilon_\alpha\varepsilon_{\gamma\delta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma}\varepsilon_{\gamma\delta}, \\ f_1(\boldsymbol{\pi}) &= \tau_{\alpha\delta}\tau_{\beta\gamma} - \tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\delta}, \\ f_2(\boldsymbol{\pi}) &= \tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma\delta} - \tau_{\beta\gamma}\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta}, \\ f_3(\boldsymbol{\pi}) &= \tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\alpha\beta\delta} - \tau_{\alpha\delta}\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}.\end{aligned}$$

387 *The parameters unique up to state flip at the interior nodes are then given by Theorem*  
388 *6 and*

$$\begin{aligned}M_{01}^\psi &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\delta}\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta} - \tau_{\alpha\delta}\sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}}{2\tau_{\alpha\beta}\sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}}, \\ M_{11}^\psi &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\delta}\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta} + \tau_{\alpha\delta}\sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}}{2\tau_{\alpha\beta}\sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}}.\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

389 The existence of these invariants means that tree decomposable quartet  
390 distributions form a Lebesgue zero set in the set of all quartet distributions for the  
391 same reason that the non-identifiable sets are a Lebesgue zero set in the set of all tree  
392 decomposable distributions.

393 Invariant  $f_1$  comes from the equality of the marginal distributions at the interior  
394 nodes, as proposed by Pearl and Tarsi [4]. Invariants  $f_2$  and  $f_3$  come from the equality  
395 of edge transition matrices. Hence, distributions for which  $f_1$ ,  $f_2$  and  $f_3$  vanish will  
396 uniquely identify topology  $Q$ . Therefore,  $f_1$  to  $f_3$  are topologically informative.

397 However, only distributions for which  $f_0$  vanishes will be subject to the inferred  
398 parameters. In other words, in the set of zero points for  $f_1$  to  $f_3$  there is a set of  
399 distributions that returns the same set of parameters for  $Q$ , but only for one of these  
400 distributions  $f_0$  vanishes. It would be interesting to investigate how this distribution

401 relates to the set it projects from, e.g. if it is related to the possible maximum  
 402 likelihood optimum.

403 Despite the fact that  $f_1$  to  $f_3$  are sufficient to infer a topology,  $f_0$  is also  
 404 topologically informative in that it will not vanish for distributions coming from  
 405 another tree.

406 In the case of the CFN model, all triplet covariances vanish. Hence, only  
 407 invariants  $f_0$  and  $f_1$  are of interest in that case. Therefore, either invariant is sufficient  
 408 to identify the associated tree topology.

409 The parameters for the interior edge do not add more non-identifiable cases.  
 410 However, as in the tripod case, further conditions are needed to guarantee quartet  
 411 identifiability.

412 **Proposition 12.** *A quartet distribution is stochastically identifiable if and only if every*  
 413 *triplet marginalisations satisfies both Theorem 7 and the following inequalities*

$$\tau_{\alpha\delta}\sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\beta\gamma}} - \tau_{\alpha\beta}\sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\gamma\delta}} \leq \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta} - \tau_{\alpha\delta}\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \leq \tau_{\alpha\beta}\sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\gamma\delta}} - \tau_{\alpha\delta}\sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}. \quad (13)$$

414 All other relations are covered due to the fact that the quartet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$   
 415 needs to satisfy the invariants  $f_0 - f_3$ . The following example provides a very nice case  
 416 in which reconstruction is not possible but offers a very interesting challenge.

417 **Example 7.** Chor et al. [27] discussed several examples of distributions with multiple  
 418 maxima of the likelihood function. These examples relate to the CFN model, i.e.,  
 419  $p_{abcd} = p_{(1-a)(1-b)(1-c)(1-d)}$  so that the Hadamard approach can be used. Regard the  
 420 symmetric distribution

$$\mathbf{p} = (14, 0, 0, 3, 0, 2, 1, 0, 0, 1, 2, 0, 3, 0, 0, 14)/40. \quad (14)$$

421 Retrieving the statistics yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\alpha\beta} = 7/40 = \tau_{\gamma\delta}, \quad \tau_{\alpha\gamma} = 3/20 = \tau_{\beta\delta}, \quad \tau_{\alpha\delta} = 1/8 = \tau_{\beta\gamma}, \\ \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \tau_{\alpha\beta\delta} = \tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta} = \tau_{\beta\gamma\delta} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

422 The last equality immediately shows, that the above distribution will trivially satisfy  
 423 invariants  $f_2$  and  $f_3$ . However, we get  $f_1 = -11/1600$  and  $f_0 = -23/375$ , i.e. our  
 424 observations do not come from the quartet tree defined by the bipartition  $\alpha\beta|\gamma\delta$ .  
 425 Looking at the alternative invariants for  $f_1$ , i.e. at

$$\begin{aligned} f_1^{\alpha\delta|\beta\gamma} &= \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\gamma\delta} - \tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\delta} = 13/1600, \\ f_1^{\alpha\gamma|\beta\delta} &= \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\gamma\delta} - \tau_{\alpha\delta}\tau_{\beta\gamma} = 3/200, \end{aligned}$$

426 we see that this distribution comes from none of the available quartet trees.

427 Nevertheless, we shall have a look at the parameters. Note that the symmetry of  
 428 the distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  implies  $M_{01}^\alpha = 1 - M_{11}^\alpha =: \overline{M}_\alpha$ . Looking at the numerical values for  
 429 the parameters for every tripod tree we find surprising similarities:

430

[Table 1 about here.]

431

These parameters permit us to infer parameters  $M_\zeta = 1/14$  and  $M_\psi = 1/7$  such that e.g. the parameters for  $\alpha$  on the tripod trees  $\alpha\beta\delta$  and  $\alpha\gamma\delta$  can be obtained from the parameter for tripod tree  $\alpha\beta\gamma$  by

432

433

$$\widetilde{M}_\alpha = M_\zeta(1 - \overline{M}_\alpha) + (1 - M_\zeta)\overline{M}_\alpha, \quad \widehat{M}_\alpha = M_\psi(1 - \overline{M}_\alpha) + (1 - M_\psi)\overline{M}_\alpha,$$

434

with analogue assignments for the other leaves. These computations can be visualised by the network in Fig. A.4. The assignment of probabilities for each split permits to justify the observations for each of the four tripod trees. However, the visualisation is misleading because the factorisation of the system does not follow the edges in the network [e.g., ? ? 28].

435

436

437

438

439

[Figure 4 about here.]

440

## 6. The connection with Markov invariants

441

442

443

444

445

This section investigates the connection between the work presented here and the concept of Markov invariants as coined by Sumner et al. [13]. To show these relations we will look back at our covariances and investigate their relationship with the parameters.

Following Allman and Rhodes [6] one can write the three-way-probabilities as a  $2 \times 2 \times 2$  tensor  $\mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  such that

$$\mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta|0} = \begin{pmatrix} p_{000} & p_{010} \\ p_{100} & p_{110} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta|1} = \begin{pmatrix} p_{001} & p_{011} \\ p_{101} & p_{111} \end{pmatrix}.$$

446

447

448

With this as a basis we easily infer our pairwise covariances in terms of determinants of dimensional restrictions of  $\mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ . E.g., a marginalisation over  $\gamma$  corresponds to  $\mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta\Sigma} = \mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta|0} + \mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta|1}$ . The determinant of this matrix then corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} \det \mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta\Sigma} &= p_{00\Sigma}p_{11\Sigma} - p_{01\Sigma}p_{10\Sigma} \\ &= p_{11\Sigma}(p_{00\Sigma} + p_{11\Sigma} + p_{01\Sigma} + p_{10\Sigma}) - (p_{10\Sigma} + p_{11\Sigma})(p_{01\Sigma} + p_{11\Sigma}) \\ &= p_{11\Sigma} - p_{1\Sigma\Sigma}p_{\Sigma 1\Sigma} = \tau_{\alpha\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

449

450

451

Thus, we have invariably obtained an alternative way to compute the covariances. In a similar fashion, if we take the determinant of the conditional kernels  $\mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta|c}$ ,  $c \in \{0, 1\}$ , we arrive at the (not normalised) conditional covariance  $\tau_{\alpha\beta|c}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \det \mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta|c} &= p_{00c}p_{11c} - p_{01c}p_{10c} \\ &= p_{11c}(p_{\Sigma\Sigma c} - p_{01c} - p_{10c} - p_{11c}) - (p_{\Sigma 1c} - p_{11c})(p_{1\Sigma c} - p_{11c}) \\ &= p_{11c}p_{\Sigma\Sigma c} - p_{\Sigma 1c}p_{1\Sigma c} = \tau_{\alpha\beta|c}. \end{aligned}$$

452 It must be noted that the determinant has been used earlier in connection with LogDet  
 453 families [e.g., 25]. In order to relate these findings to the process parameter, let us  
 454 denote by  $\mathbf{\Pi} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{q}^\zeta)$  the diagonal matrix of the marginal distribution at the root,  
 455 and with

$$\mathbf{M}^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} M_{00}^\alpha & M_{01}^\alpha \\ M_{10}^\alpha & M_{11}^\alpha \end{pmatrix}$$

456 the transition matrix for leaf  $\alpha$ . Then the marginalisation of Equation (2) can be  
 457 written as

$$\mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta\Sigma} = (\mathbf{M}^\alpha)^\top \overline{\mathbf{\Pi}} \mathbf{M}^\beta, \quad (15)$$

458 where  $\overline{\mathbf{\Pi}}$  is the marginal distribution at the most recent common ancestor of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .  
 459 If  $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}$  is defined as the set of edges connecting the root of the tree and the most recent  
 460 common ancestor of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  then we compute  $\overline{\mathbf{\Pi}}$  by

$$\overline{\mathbf{\Pi}} = \mathbf{\Pi} \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}} \mathbf{M}^e.$$

461 If we take the determinant on both sides of Eq. (15) we get

$$\det \mathbf{P}^{\alpha\beta\Sigma} = \det \mathbf{M}^\alpha \det \mathbf{M}^\beta \det \mathbf{\Pi} \prod_{e \in \mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}} \det \mathbf{M}^e.$$

462 We further observe that the determinant in the two-state-case is equal to

$$\det \mathbf{M}^\alpha = 1 - M_{00}^\alpha - M_{11}^\alpha = -(M_{11}^\alpha - M_{01}^\alpha).$$

463 Going back to a tripod tree under the two-state-model this yields the relation

$$\tau_{\alpha\beta} = (M_{11}^\alpha - M_{01}^\alpha)(M_{11}^\beta - M_{01}^\beta)q_1^\zeta(1 - q_1^\zeta). \quad (16)$$

464 This relation has been observed in Steel [25] and forms the basis for LogDet inference.  
 465 The covariances  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}$  also form the simplest form of *Markov invariants*. Sumner et al.  
 466 [13] define these terms in general by:

$$f(\mathbf{p}) = g(\widehat{\mathbf{p}}) \prod_{e \in E} (\det \mathbf{M}^e)^{k_e}, \quad (17)$$

467 with  $k_e \in \mathbb{Z}$  denoting the exponent for edge  $e \in E$ . The term  $g(\widehat{\mathbf{p}})$  describes a function  
 468 depicting the relationship of a reduced structure in the tree. Sumner et al. [13] give one  
 469 example of such a reduced structure as the tree for which the pendant edges have been  
 470 reduced to length zero. In the case of the tripod tree this reduced structure corresponds  
 471 to the interior node  $\zeta$ , and hence the distribution  $\widehat{\mathbf{p}}$  is equivalent to  $\mathbf{q}^\zeta$  only. In this  
 472 setting, Markov invariants are one-dimensional “representations” of the stochastic



473 models used for inference, such that the complex structure of these models is retained  
 474 [14].

475 In our framework, we rediscover more Markov invariants of type (17) when  
 476 investigating how the remaining covariances are related to the process parameters under  
 477 the tripod equations (4). In fact, we find:

$$\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = (M_{11}^{\alpha} - M_{01}^{\alpha})(M_{11}^{\beta} - M_{01}^{\beta})(M_{11}^{\gamma} - M_{01}^{\gamma})q_1^{\zeta}(1 - q_1^{\zeta})(1 - 2q_1^{\zeta}), \quad (18)$$

$$\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} = (M_{11}^{\alpha} - M_{01}^{\alpha})^2(M_{11}^{\beta} - M_{01}^{\beta})^2(M_{11}^{\gamma} - M_{01}^{\gamma})^2(q_1^{\zeta})^3(1 - q_1^{\zeta})^3, \quad (19)$$

$$\chi = (M_{11}^{\alpha} - M_{01}^{\alpha})^2(M_{11}^{\beta} - M_{01}^{\beta})^2(M_{11}^{\gamma} - M_{01}^{\gamma})^2(q_1^{\zeta})^2(1 - q_1^{\zeta})^2. \quad (20)$$

478 with equivalent terms for the other covariances. These equivalences permit a different  
 479 way to prove Theorem 6 from the one we present in Appendix A.

480 It should be noted that our interpretation of the above Markov invariants as  
 481 covariances only works for the two state model. On the other hand, the form of the  
 482 Markov invariants stays valid, even though they might not be as immediately apparent  
 483 from the model as in the cases discussed here. However, in the case of the two-state  
 484 model using the notion of covariance permits a good interpretation of the findings.

485 We observe for the (not normalised) conditional covariances

$$\tau_{\alpha\beta|c} = (M_{11}^{\alpha} - M_{01}^{\alpha})(M_{11}^{\beta} - M_{01}^{\beta})M_{0c}^{\gamma}M_{1c}^{\gamma}q_1^{\zeta}(1 - q_1^{\zeta}), \quad (21)$$

486 i.e., the transition matrix for leaf  $\gamma$  shall be included into the term  $g(\hat{\mathbf{p}})$  for (17) to be  
 487 valid. On the other hand, remember that we did not use these covariances to solve the  
 488 tripod equations (4). We need them only to formulate the positivity constraints in  
 489 Theorem 7. This property is beyond the purely algebraic framework.

490 In summary, Markov invariants are very useful when investigating properties of  
 491 and conditions on leaf distributions  $\mathbf{p}$ . Especially, they explore the relationship of  
 492 process parameters and leaf distribution such that phylogenetic invariants like  $f_1$  to  $f_3$   
 493 from Proposition 11 can be easily extracted. We will employ these relationships to  
 494 prove the results of Section 3.

## 495 7. Discussion

496 *Acknowledgements.* We thank Elizabeth S. Allman and John A. Rhodes for stimulating  
 497 the finalization of the manuscript as well as for sharing their thoughts on this subject  
 498 with us. Further, we owe much to the discussions with David Bryant, Mike Steel, and  
 499 Arndt von Haeseler. Suggestions from Jessica Leigh and three anonymous referees are  
 500 greatly appreciated.

## 501 References

- 502 [1] David Bryant, Nicolas Galtier, and Marie-Anne Poursat. Likelihood calculation in  
 503 molecular phylogenetics. In Olivier Gascuel, editor, *Mathematics of Evolution and*  
 504 *Phylogeny*, chapter 2, pages 33–62. Oxford University Press, 2005.

- 505 [2] Joseph T. Chang. Full reconstruction of Markov models on Evolutionary Trees:  
506 Identifiability and consistency. *Math. Biosci.*, 137:51–73, 1996. URL  
507 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564\(96\)00075-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564(96)00075-2).
- 508 [3] Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Neil W. Henry. *Latent Structure Analysis*. Houghton,  
509 Mifflin, New York, 1968.
- 510 [4] Judea Pearl and Michael Tarsi. Structuring causal trees. *J. Complexity*, 2:60–77,  
511 1986. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0885-064X\(86\)90023-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0885-064X(86)90023-3).
- 512 [5] Elizabeth S. Allman, Catherine Matias, and John A. Rhodes. Identifiability of  
513 parameters in latent structure models with many observed variables. *Ann. Stat.*, 37  
514 (6A):3099–3132, 2009. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/09-AOS689>.
- 515 [6] Elizabeth S. Allman and John A. Rhodes. Phylogenetic ideals and varieties for the  
516 general Markov model. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, 40(2):127–148, 2008. URL  
517 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aam.2006.10.002>.
- 518 [7] Elizabeth S. Allman and John A. Rhodes. Phylogenetic invariants for the general  
519 Markov model of sequence mutation. *Math. Biosci.*, 186(2):113–144, December  
520 2003. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2003.08.004>.
- 521 [8] Ellen Baake. What can and what cannot be inferred from pairwise sequence  
522 comparisons? *Math. Biosci.*, 154(1):1–21, 1998. URL  
523 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564\(98\)10044-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0025-5564(98)10044-5).
- 524 [9] Bernd Sturmfels and Seth Sullivant. Toric ideals of phylogenetic invariants. *J.*  
525 *Comput. Biol.*, 12(4):457–481, 2005. URL  
526 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/cmb.2005.12.457>.
- 527 [10] James A. Lake. A rate-independent technique for analysis of nucleic acid  
528 sequences: evolutionary parsimony. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 4(2):167–191, 1987. URL  
529 <http://mbe.oxfordjournals.org/content/4/2/167.abstract>.
- 530 [11] James A. Cavender and Joseph Felsenstein. Invariants of phylogenies in a simple  
531 case with discrete states. *J. Classif.*, 4:57–71, 1987. URL  
532 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01890075>.
- 533 [12] Steven N. Evans and Terrence P. Speed. Invariants of some probability models  
534 used in phylogenetic inference. *Ann. Stat.*, 21(1):355–377, 1993. URL  
535 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176349030>.
- 536 [13] Jeremy G. Sumner, Michael A. Charleston, Lars S. Jermin, and Peter D. Jarvis.  
537 Markov invariants, plethysms, and phylogenetics. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 253:601–615,  
538 2008. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2008.04.001>.

- 539 [14] Jeremy G. Sumner, and Peter D. Jarvis. Markov invariants and the isotropy  
540 subgroup of a quartet tree. *J. Theor. Biol.*, 258:302–310, 2009. URL  
541 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2009.01.021>.
- 542 [15] Piotr Zwiernik and Jim Q. Smith. Tree-cumulants and the identifiability of  
543 bayesian tree model. arXiv:1004.4360v1, 2010. URL  
544 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1004.4360>.
- 545 [16] Frederick A. Matsen. Fourier transform inequalities for phylogenetic trees. *IEEE*  
546 *ACM T. Comput. Bi.*, 6(1):89–95, 2009. URL  
547 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TCBB.2008.68>.
- 548 [17] Ziheng Yang. Complexity of the simplest phylogenetic estimation problem. *Proc.*  
549 *Royal Soc. B*, 267:109–116, 2000. URL  
550 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2000.0974>
- 551 [18] James A. Cavender. Taxonomy with confidence. *Math. Biosci.*, 40:271–280, 1978.  
552 URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564\(78\)90089-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0025-5564(78)90089-5).
- 553 [19] James S. Farris. A probability model for inferring evolutionary trees. *Syst. Zool.*,  
554 22(3):250–256, 1973. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2412305>.
- 555 [20] Jerzy Neyman. Molecular studies of evolution: A source of novel statistical  
556 problems. In S. dasGupta and J. Yackel, editors, *Statistical Decision Theory and*  
557 *Related Topics*, pages 1–27. Academic Press, New York, 1971.
- 558 [21] Michael D. Hendy and David Penny. A framework for the quantitative study of  
559 evolutionary trees. *Syst. Zool.*, 38(4):297–309, 1989. URL  
560 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2992396>.
- 561 [22] László Székely, Mike A. Steel, and Peter L. Erdős. Fourier calculus on evolutionary  
562 trees. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, 14(2):200–210, 1993. URL  
563 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/aama.1993.1011>
- 564 [23] Steffen L. Lauritzen. *Graphical Models*. Oxford Stastical Science Series. Clarendon  
565 Press, Oxford, 1996. ISBN 0-19-852219-3. URL  
566 <http://ukcatalogue.oup.com/product/9780198522195.do>.
- 567 [24] J. C. W. Rayner and Eric J. Beh. Towards a better understanding of correlation.  
568 *Stat. Neerl.*, 63(3):324–333, 2009. URL  
569 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9574.2009.00425.x>.
- 570 [25] Mike A. Steel. Recovering a tree from the leaf colourations it generates under a  
571 Markov model. *Appl. Math. Letter*, 7(2), 19–23, 1994. URL  
572 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0893-9659\(94\)90024-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0893-9659(94)90024-8).

- 573 [26] Charles Semple and Mike Steel. *Phylogenetics*. Oxford Lectures Series in  
574 Mathematics and its Applications. Oxford University Press, 2003. ISBN  
575 0-19-850942-1.
- 576 [27] Benny Chor, Michael D Hendy, Barbara R Holland, and David Penny. Multiple  
577 maxima of likelihood in phylogenetic trees: An analytic approach. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*,  
578 17(10):1529–1541, 2000. URL  
579 <http://mbe.oxfordjournals.org/content/17/10/1529.full>.
- 580 [28] David Bryant. Extending tree models to splits networks. In *Algebraic Statistics for*  
581 *Computational Biology*, chapter 17, pages 320–332. Cambridge University Press,  
582 2005.

## 583 Appendix A. Proofs

584 *Proof of Lemma 1.* A state flip replaces the probabilities at leaf  $\alpha$  implies a “new”  
585 distribution  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}$  with  $\hat{p}_{abc} = p_{(1-a)bc}$ ,  $a, b, c \in \{0, 1\}$ . This has the following implications to  
586 the covariances.

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{\alpha\beta} &= p_{11\Sigma} - p_{1\Sigma\Sigma}p_{\Sigma 1\Sigma} = (p_{\Sigma 1\Sigma} - p_{01\Sigma}) - p_{1\Sigma\Sigma}p_{\Sigma 1\Sigma} \\ &= -p_{01\Sigma} + p_{\Sigma 1\Sigma}(1 - p_{1\Sigma\Sigma}) = -(p_{01\Sigma} - p_{0\Sigma\Sigma}p_{\Sigma 1\Sigma}) \\ &= -(\hat{p}_{11\Sigma} - \hat{p}_{1\Sigma\Sigma}\hat{p}_{\Sigma 1\Sigma}) = -\hat{\tau}_{\alpha\beta}.\end{aligned}$$

587 and analogously  $\hat{\tau}_{\alpha\gamma} = -\tau_{\alpha\gamma}$  and  $\hat{\tau}_{\beta\gamma} = \tau_{\beta\gamma}$ . Thus, if  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}$  and  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma}$  are smaller than zero,  
588 then a state flip produces positive covariances and the sign for the overall product  
589 remains the same.  $\square$

590 *Proof of Lemma 2.* Using the Markov invariants from Section 6 we immediately see,  
591 that if  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} = 0$  due to  $M_{01}^\alpha - M_{11}^\alpha = 0$  then also  $\tau_{\alpha\gamma} = 0$  and  $\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = 0$ . If  $q_1^\zeta \in \{0, 1\}$  then  
592 all four covariances are zero.

593 For point 2 regard (19). But this term will be non-negative as long as  $q_1^\zeta$  is a  
594 probability, which is a model condition. This completes the proof.  $\square$

595 *Proof of Corollary 3.* Select one leaf  $\alpha \in L$  and define  $L_0 = \{\beta : \tau_{\alpha\beta} < 0\}$ . Flipping the  
596 states in  $L_0$  gives us  $\tau_{\alpha\beta} > 0$  for all  $\beta \in L, \beta \neq \alpha$  by Lemma 1. Fix now  
597  $\beta \neq \beta' \in L \setminus \{\alpha\}$ . Then  $\alpha, \beta, \beta'$ , together with the root  $\zeta$  of the tree, define uniquely a  
598 tripod tree and the restriction of  $\mathbf{p}$  to  $\alpha, \beta, \beta'$  must obey the tripod equations. Using  
599 Lemma 2(2), on this tripod tree shows now that  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\beta'}\tau_{\beta\beta'} > 0$ . This implies that  $\tau_{\beta\beta'}$   
600 is positive, too.  $\square$

601 *Proof of Corollary 4.* A triplet distribution  $\mathbf{p}$  for which only one covariance is zero does  
602 not satisfy Lemma 2(1) and hence is not tripod decomposable. Further, by looking at  
603 (16) we see that there is also no real- or complex-valued parameter set that would yield  
604 only one zero covariance. Hence, such a triplet distribution would also not be  
605 algebraically decomposable.  $\square$

606 *Proof of Lemma 5.* We insert the refined parameters into the tripod equations to get:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{abc} &= q_1^\zeta M_{1a}^\alpha M_{1b}^\beta M_{1c}^\gamma + (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{0a}^\alpha M_{0b}^\beta M_{0c}^\gamma \\
&= \widehat{q}_0^\zeta \widehat{M}_{0a}^\alpha \widehat{M}_{0b}^\beta \widehat{M}_{0c}^\gamma + (1 - \widehat{q}_0^\zeta) \widehat{M}_{1a}^\alpha \widehat{M}_{1b}^\beta \widehat{M}_{1c}^\gamma \\
&= (1 - \widehat{q}_1^\zeta) \widehat{M}_{0a}^\alpha \widehat{M}_{0b}^\beta \widehat{M}_{0c}^\gamma + \widehat{q}_1^\zeta \widehat{M}_{1a}^\alpha \widehat{M}_{1b}^\beta \widehat{M}_{1c}^\gamma,
\end{aligned}$$

607 i.e. the tripod equations are recovered with flipped parameters. This completes the  
608 proof.  $\square$

609 *Proof of Theorem 6.* We derive the parameters from the tripod equations. As  
610 mentioned in Section 3.1 there is a linear relationship between  $\mathbf{p}$  and its  
611 marginalisations. Thus, finding a solution for the tripod equations is equivalent to  
612 finding the solution for the following set of equations

$$\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\alpha M_{11}^\beta M_{11}^\gamma + (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\alpha M_{01}^\beta M_{01}^\gamma, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} = q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\alpha M_{11}^\beta + (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\alpha M_{01}^\beta, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma} = q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\alpha M_{11}^\gamma + (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\alpha M_{01}^\gamma, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\varepsilon_{\beta\gamma} = q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\beta M_{11}^\gamma + (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\beta M_{01}^\gamma, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\varepsilon_\alpha = q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\alpha + (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\alpha, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\varepsilon_\beta = q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\beta + (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\beta, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$\varepsilon_\gamma = q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\gamma + (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\gamma. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

613 Equations (A.5)-(A.7) yield

$$(1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\alpha = \varepsilon_\alpha - q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\alpha, \quad (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\beta = \varepsilon_\beta - q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\beta, \quad (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\gamma = \varepsilon_\gamma - q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\gamma. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

614 Inserting (A.8) into (A.2) returns

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - q_1^\zeta) \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} &= q_1^\zeta (1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{11}^\alpha M_{11}^\beta + (\varepsilon_\alpha - q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\alpha) (\varepsilon_\beta - q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\beta) \\
&= q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\alpha M_{11}^\beta + \varepsilon_\alpha \varepsilon_\beta - q_1^\zeta (\varepsilon_\alpha M_{11}^\beta + \varepsilon_\beta M_{11}^\alpha),
\end{aligned}$$

615 and in consequence

$$q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\beta (M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha) = \tau_{\alpha\beta} + q_1^\zeta (\varepsilon_\beta M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$q_1^\zeta M_{11}^\gamma (M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha) = \tau_{\alpha\gamma} + q_1^\zeta (\varepsilon_\gamma M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma}). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

616 We insert (A.9)-(A.10) back into (A.8)

$$\begin{aligned}
(1 - q_1^\zeta) M_{01}^\beta (M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha) &= \varepsilon_\beta (M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha) - \tau_{\alpha\beta} - q_1^\zeta (\varepsilon_\beta M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}) \\
&= (1 - q_1^\zeta) (\varepsilon_\beta M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}).
\end{aligned}$$

617 In the case of  $q_1^\zeta = 1$  we get from (A.5) and (A.2) that  $M_{11}^\alpha = \varepsilon_\alpha$  and  $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} = \varepsilon_\alpha\varepsilon_\beta$ . Hence,  
 618 we remove  $1 - q_1^\zeta$  from the above equation without destroying equality. Thus, we get

$$M_{01}^\beta(M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha) = \varepsilon_\beta M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$M_{01}^\gamma(M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha) = \varepsilon_\gamma M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma}. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

619 We insert (A.8) in (A.1) to get

$$M_{11}^\alpha \varepsilon_{\beta\gamma} - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = M_{01}^\beta M_{01}^\gamma (M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha).$$

620 Applying (A.11) and (A.12) to this gives us

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (M_{11}^\alpha \varepsilon_{\beta\gamma} - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma})(M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha) - (\varepsilon_\beta M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta})(\varepsilon_\gamma M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma}) \\ &= (M_{11}^\alpha)^2 \tau_{\beta\gamma} - M_{11}^\alpha (\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + 2\varepsilon_\alpha \tau_{\beta\gamma}) + \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \varepsilon_\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

621 We can apply the solution formula for quadratic equations provided  $\tau_{\beta\gamma} \neq 0$ , i.e. our  
 622 condition (5) is satisfied. In that case we get

$$\begin{aligned} (M_{11}^\alpha)_\pm &= \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + 2\varepsilon_\alpha \tau_{\beta\gamma}}{2\tau_{\beta\gamma}} \pm \frac{\sqrt{(\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + 2\varepsilon_\alpha \tau_{\beta\gamma})^2 - 4(\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \varepsilon_\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} \varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma}) \tau_{\beta\gamma}}}{2\tau_{\beta\gamma}} \\ &= \varepsilon_\alpha + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \pm \sqrt{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2 + 4\tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma} \tau_{\beta\gamma}}}{2\tau_{\beta\gamma}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

623 Thus we have established the term for  $M_{11}^\alpha$ . The next step is to derive  $q_1^\zeta$ . We insert  
 624 (A.9)-(A.12) into (A.4) and get

$$\begin{aligned} q_1^\zeta (M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha)^2 \varepsilon_{\beta\gamma} &= (\tau_{\alpha\beta} + q_1^\zeta (\varepsilon_\beta M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta})) (\tau_{\alpha\gamma} + q_1^\zeta (\varepsilon_\gamma M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma})) \\ &\quad + q_1^\zeta (1 - q_1^\zeta) (\varepsilon_\beta M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}) (\varepsilon_\gamma M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma}) \\ &= (1 - q_1^\zeta) \tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma} + q_1^\zeta \varepsilon_\beta \varepsilon_\gamma (M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha)^2 \end{aligned}$$

625 and hence we get the quadratic relation

$$0 = (1 - q_1^\zeta) \tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma} - q_1^\zeta \tau_{\beta\gamma} (M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha)^2 \quad (\text{A.14})$$

626 We insert (A.13) and get

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma} &= q_1^\zeta (\tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma} + \tau_{\beta\gamma} (M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha)^2), \\ 4\tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma} \tau_{\beta\gamma} &= q_1^\zeta \left( 4\tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma} \tau_{\beta\gamma} + (\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \sqrt{\chi})^2 \right), \\ 4\tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma} \tau_{\beta\gamma} &= 2q_1^\zeta \sqrt{\chi} (\sqrt{\chi} + \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}). \end{aligned}$$

627 We use the equality

$$4\tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma} \tau_{\beta\gamma} = \chi - \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2 = (\sqrt{\chi} + \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma})(\sqrt{\chi} - \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma})$$

628 and the observation that  $\sqrt{\chi}(\sqrt{\chi} - \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}) = 0$  if and only if the conditions in (5) are  
 629 violated to get

$$q_1^\zeta = \frac{\sqrt{\chi} - \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}{2\sqrt{\chi}} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}{2\sqrt{\chi}}, \quad (\text{A.15})$$

630 thus inferring the proposed term for  $q_1^\zeta$ . Next we infer the term for  $M_{01}^\alpha$ . To this end we  
 631 insert (A.13) and (A.15) into (A.8):

$$\begin{aligned} -q_1^\zeta(M_{11}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha) &= (1 - q_1^\zeta)(M_{01}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha), \\ (\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \sqrt{\chi})(\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \sqrt{\chi}) &= 2\tau_{\beta\gamma}(\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \sqrt{\chi})(M_{01}^\alpha - \varepsilon_\alpha), \\ M_{01}^\alpha &= \varepsilon_\alpha + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \sqrt{\chi}}{2\tau_{\beta\gamma}}, \end{aligned}$$

632 thus inferring the proposed term. The remaining terms are inferred analogously. This  
 633 completes the proof.  $\square$

634 *Proof of Theorem 7.* We bound the parameters from (6) between 0 and 1:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}{2\sqrt{\chi}} \leq 1, \\ -\sqrt{\chi} &\leq \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \leq \sqrt{\chi}, \\ 0 &\leq \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

635 With (5) this yields positivity for the unconditional covariances. Next we look at  $M_{01}^\alpha$   
 636 and  $M_{11}^\alpha$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \varepsilon_\alpha + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \sqrt{\chi}}{2\tau_{\beta\gamma}} \leq 1, \\ -2\varepsilon_\alpha\tau_{\beta\gamma} &\leq \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \sqrt{\chi} \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon_\alpha)\tau_{\beta\gamma}, \\ \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - 2(1 - \varepsilon_\alpha)\tau_{\beta\gamma} &\leq \sqrt{\chi} \leq \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + 2\varepsilon_\alpha\tau_{\beta\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

637 and

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \varepsilon_\alpha + \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \sqrt{\chi}}{2\tau_{\beta\gamma}} \leq 1, \\ -2\varepsilon_\alpha\tau_{\beta\gamma} &\leq \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \sqrt{\chi} \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon_\alpha)\tau_{\beta\gamma}, \\ -(2\varepsilon_\alpha\tau_{\beta\gamma} + \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}) &\leq \sqrt{\chi} \leq 2(1 - \varepsilon_\alpha)\tau_{\beta\gamma} - \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

638 Squaring both inequalities reduces the four inequalities to the following two:

$$\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2 + 4\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} \leq (2\varepsilon_\alpha\tau_{\beta\gamma} + \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma})^2, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

$$\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2 + 4\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} \leq (2(1 - \varepsilon_\alpha)\tau_{\beta\gamma} - \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma})^2. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

639 We look first at inequality (A.16) and get

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} &\leq \varepsilon_\alpha^2\tau_{\beta\gamma}^2 + \varepsilon_\alpha\tau_{\beta\gamma}\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}, \\ 0 &\leq \varepsilon_\alpha(\varepsilon_\alpha\tau_{\beta\gamma} + \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}) - \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}, \\ 0 &\leq \varepsilon_\alpha\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma} = \tau_{\beta\gamma|1}.\end{aligned}$$

640 Set  $\widehat{\varepsilon}_\alpha := (1 - \varepsilon_\alpha) = p_{0\Sigma\Sigma}$  and look at (A.17):

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} &\leq \widehat{\varepsilon}_\alpha^2\tau_{\beta\gamma}^2 - \widehat{\varepsilon}_\alpha\tau_{\beta\gamma}\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}, \\ 0 &\leq \widehat{\varepsilon}_\alpha(\widehat{\varepsilon}_\alpha\tau_{\beta\gamma} - \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}) - \tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}, \\ 0 &\leq p_{000}p_{011} - p_{001}p_{010} = \tau_{\beta\gamma|0}.\end{aligned}$$

641 Hence, we have derived the proposed inequalities.  $\square$

642 *Proof of Proposition 8.* The tripod equations (4) imply:

$$\chi = \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2 + 4\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} = (M_{11}^\alpha - M_{01}^\alpha)^2(M_{11}^\beta - M_{01}^\beta)^2(M_{11}^\gamma - M_{01}^\gamma)^2(1 - q_1^\zeta)^2(q_1^\zeta)^2$$

643 Together with (18) and (16) we see that there is no set of real or complex parameters  
644 such that  $\chi = 0$  but  $\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma} \neq 0$ .  $\square$

645 *Proof of Proposition 9.* The cases are easily verified by looking at Equation (16) and  
646 inserting the selected parameters back into (4).  $\square$

647 *Proof of Proposition 10.* The function  $\chi : \mathbb{C}^8 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a nonconstant polynomial  
648 mapping. Thus the set  $\{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \chi(\mathbf{p}) = 0\}$  is a Lebesgue zero set. The same holds for  
649 the set

$$\{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{R}^8 : \tau_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{p}) = 0 \text{ or } \tau_{\alpha\gamma}(\mathbf{p}) = 0 \text{ or } \tau_{\beta\gamma}(\mathbf{p}) = 0\}.$$

650 This completes the proof.  $\square$

651 *Proof of Proposition 11.* We recover  $\mathbf{M}^\psi$  by inserting the parameters from (6) into  
652 (11). To infer the invariants we first look at the equality conditions. We do this  
653 representatively by looking at  $\overline{\mathbf{M}}^\alpha = \widetilde{\mathbf{M}}^\alpha$ . In particular we look at

$$\overline{M}_{11}^\alpha - \overline{M}_{01}^\alpha = \widetilde{M}_{11}^\alpha - \widetilde{M}_{01}^\alpha, \quad \overline{M}_{11}^\alpha + \overline{M}_{01}^\alpha = \widetilde{M}_{11}^\alpha + \widetilde{M}_{01}^\alpha,$$

654 and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}}{\tau_{\beta\gamma}} &= \frac{\sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\beta\delta}}}{\tau_{\beta\delta}}, \quad \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}{\tau_{\beta\gamma}} = \frac{\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}{\tau_{\beta\delta}}, \\ \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}^2 + 4\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\gamma}\tau_{\beta\gamma}}{\tau_{\beta\gamma}^2} &= \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\delta}^2 + 4\tau_{\alpha\beta}\tau_{\alpha\delta}\tau_{\beta\delta}}{\tau_{\beta\delta}^2}, \quad \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}{\tau_{\beta\gamma}} = \frac{\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}{\tau_{\beta\delta}}, \\ \frac{\tau_{\alpha\gamma}}{\tau_{\beta\gamma}} &= \frac{\tau_{\alpha\delta}}{\tau_{\beta\delta}}, \quad \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}{\tau_{\beta\gamma}} = \frac{\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}{\tau_{\beta\delta}}, \\ \frac{\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}{\tau_{\alpha\beta\delta}} &= \frac{\tau_{\beta\gamma}}{\tau_{\beta\delta}} = \frac{\tau_{\alpha\gamma}}{\tau_{\alpha\delta}}.\end{aligned}$$



655 Looking at  $\overline{\mathbf{M}}^\beta = \widetilde{\mathbf{M}}^\beta$  yields the same equalities. Reproducing the calculations for  
 656  $\widehat{\mathbf{M}}^\gamma = \widetilde{\mathbf{M}}^\gamma$  yields the invariants  $f_1$  to  $f_3$ .

657 For the inference of  $f_0$  observe that the equation system (2) can be written in a  
 658 marginalised form, i.e. one replaces the equations in  $(p_{abcd})_{a,b,c,d \in \{0,1\}}$  by the linear  
 659 transforms  $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\delta}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma\delta}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\beta\gamma\delta}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\alpha\gamma}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\alpha\delta}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\beta\gamma}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\beta\delta}$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\gamma\delta}$ ,  $\varepsilon_\alpha$ ,  $\varepsilon_\beta$ ,  $\varepsilon_\gamma$  and  $\varepsilon_\delta$ .

660 We immediately see that all terms but  $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$  are covered by our investigation of  
 661 the tripod case. We insert the parameters obtained in (6) and (12) into the equation for  
 662  $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$  to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} &= (1 - q_1^\zeta) \overline{M}_{01}^\alpha \overline{M}_{01}^\beta ((1 - M_{01}^\psi) \widehat{M}_{01}^\gamma \widehat{M}_{01}^\delta + M_{01}^\psi \widehat{M}_{11}^\gamma \widehat{M}_{11}^\delta) \\ &\quad + q_1^\zeta \overline{M}_{11}^\alpha \overline{M}_{11}^\beta ((1 - M_{11}^\psi) \widehat{M}_{01}^\gamma \widehat{M}_{01}^\delta + M_{11}^\psi \widehat{M}_{11}^\gamma \widehat{M}_{11}^\delta). \end{aligned}$$

663 Reordering and restructuring this equation eventually yields invariant  $f_0$ . This  
 664 completes the proof. □

665 *Proof of Proposition 12.* Theorem 7 covers the first part of the Proposition. The  
 666 remaining inequalities are obtained by bounding (12) between 0 and 1 and use the fact  
 667 that the covariances are always positive with Lemma 2(1):

$$\begin{aligned} -1 &\leq \frac{\tau_{\alpha\delta} \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta} - \tau_{\alpha\delta} \sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}}{\tau_{\alpha\beta} \sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}} \leq 1, \\ \tau_{\alpha\beta} (\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta} - \sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}) &\leq \tau_{\alpha\delta} (\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}) \leq \tau_{\alpha\beta} (\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta} + \sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}), \\ -1 &\leq \frac{\tau_{\alpha\delta} \tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} - \tau_{\alpha\beta} \tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta} + \tau_{\alpha\delta} \sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}}{\tau_{\alpha\beta} \sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}} \leq 1, \\ \tau_{\alpha\beta} (\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta} - \sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}) &\leq \tau_{\alpha\delta} (\tau_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + \sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}) \leq \tau_{\alpha\beta} (\tau_{\alpha\gamma\delta} + \sqrt{\chi_{\alpha\gamma\delta}}), \end{aligned}$$

668 □

669 **List of Figures**

670	A.1	A binary tree with six leaves. Gray lines and nodes describe the hidden part of the process. . . . .	27
671			
672	A.2	The tripod tree $T$ . . . . .	28
673	A.3	The quartet tree $Q$ with its tripod restrictions $\bar{T}$ , $\tilde{T}$ , $\hat{T}$ and $\check{T}$ . Again, gray lines and vertices indicate the hidden or unknown variables of the approach presented here. . . . .	29
674			
675			
676	A.4	Assignment of mutation probability from the symmetric distribution in (14). The black lines indicate the triplet $\alpha\beta\gamma$ . Assigned branch lengths are rounded values. . . . .	30
677			
678			




Figure A.1: A binary tree with six leaves. Gray lines and nodes describe the hidden part of the process.




Figure A.2: The tripod tree  $T$ .




Figure A.3: The quartet tree  $Q$  with its tripod restrictions  $\bar{T}$ ,  $\tilde{T}$ ,  $\hat{T}$  and  $\check{T}$ . Again, gray lines and vertices indicate the hidden or unknown variables of the approach presented here.




Figure A.4: Assignment of mutation probability from the symmetric distribution in (14). The black lines indicate the triplet  $\alpha\beta\gamma$ . Assigned branch lengths are rounded values.

679 **List of Tables**

680 A.1 The parameters for each triplet. . . . . 32

triplet	$M_{01}^\alpha$	$M_\beta$	$M_\gamma$	$M_\delta$	$q_\zeta$
$\alpha\beta\gamma$	0.0417424	0.118119	0.172673	0	0.5
$\alpha\beta\delta$	0.118119	0.0417424	0	0.172673	0.5
$\alpha\gamma\delta$	0.172673	0	0.0417424	0.118119	0.5
$\beta\gamma\delta$	0	0.172673	0.118119	0.0417424	0.5

Table A.1: The parameters for each triplet.