

# Extracting Conflict-free Information from Multi-labeled Trees<sup>\*</sup>

Akshay Deepak<sup>1</sup>, David Fernández-Baca<sup>1</sup>, and Michelle M. McMahon<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Computer Science, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011, USA

<sup>2</sup> School of Plant Sciences, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

**Abstract.** A multi-labeled tree, or MUL-tree, is a phylogenetic tree where two or more leaves share a label, e.g., a species name. A MUL-tree can imply multiple conflicting phylogenetic relationships for the same set of taxa, but can also contain conflict-free information that is of interest and yet is not obvious. We define the information content of a MUL-tree  $T$  as the set of all conflict-free quartet topologies implied by  $T$ , and define the maximal reduced form of  $T$  as the smallest tree that can be obtained from  $T$  by pruning leaves and contracting edges while retaining the same information content. We show that any two MUL-trees with the same information content exhibit the same reduced form. This introduces an equivalence relation in MUL-trees with potential applications to comparing MUL-trees. We present an efficient algorithm to reduce a MUL-tree to its maximally reduced form and evaluate its performance on empirical datasets in terms of both quality of the reduced tree and the degree of data reduction achieved.

## 1 Introduction

Multi-labeled trees, also known as MUL-trees, are phylogenetic trees that can have more than one leaf with the same label [4,6,8,13,18] (Fig. 1). MUL-trees arise naturally and frequently in data sets containing multiple genes or gene sequences for the same species [17], but they can also arise in bio-geographical studies or co-speciation studies where leaves represent individual taxa yet are labeled with their areas [5] or hosts [10].

MUL-trees, unlike singly-labeled trees, can contain conflicting species-level phylogenetic information due, e.g., to whole genome duplications [11], incomplete lineage sorting [16], inferential error, or, frequently, an unknown combination of several factors. However, they can also contain substantial amounts of conflict-free information. Here we provide a way to extract this information; specifically, we have the following results.

- We introduce a new quartet-based measure of the information content of a MUL-tree, defined as the set of conflict-free quartets the tree displays (Section 2).
- We introduce the concept of the maximally-reduced form (MRF) of a MUL-tree, the smallest MUL-tree with the same information content (Section 3), and show that any two MUL-trees with the same information content have the same MRF (Theorem 3).

---

<sup>\*</sup> This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant DEB-0829674.

- We present a simple algorithm to construct the MRF of a MUL-tree (Section 4); its running time is quadratic in the number of leaves and does not depend on the multiplicity of the leaf labels or the degrees of the internal nodes.
- We present computational experience with an implementation of our MRF algorithm (Section 5). In our test data, the MRF is often significantly smaller than the original tree, while retaining most of the taxa.

We now give the intuition behind our notion of information content, deferring the formal definitions of this and other concepts to the next section. Quartets (i.e., sets of four species) are a natural starting point, since they are the smallest subsets from which we can draw meaningful topological information. A singly-labeled tree implies exactly one topology on any quartet. More precisely, each edge  $e$  in a singly-labeled tree implies a bipartition  $(A, B)$  of the leaf set, where each part is the set of leaves on one the two sides of  $e$ . From  $(A, B)$ , we derive a collection of bipartitions  $ab|cd$  of quartets, such that  $\{a, b\} \subseteq A$  and  $\{c, d\} \subseteq B$ . Clearly, if one edge in a singly-labeled tree implies some bipartition  $q = ab|cd$  of  $\{a, b, c, d\}$ , then there can be no other edge that implies a bipartition, such as  $ac|bd$ , that is in conflict with  $q$ . Indeed, the quartet topologies implied by a singly-labeled tree uniquely identify it [20].

The situation for MUL-trees is more complicated, as illustrated in Fig. 1. Here, the presence of two copies of labels  $b$  and  $c$  —  $b(1)$  and  $b(2)$ , and  $c(1)$  and  $c(2)$  — leads to two conflicting topologies on the quartet  $\{b, c, d, e\}$ . Edge  $(u, v)$ , implies the bipartition  $bc|de$ , corresponding to the labels  $\{b(1), c(1), d, e\}$ , while edge  $(v, w)$  implies  $bd|ce$  corresponding to the leaves  $\{b(2), c(2), d, e\}$ . On the other hand, the quartet topology  $af|bc$ , implied by edge  $(t, u)$ , has no conflict with any other topology that the tree exhibits on  $\{a, b, c, f\}$ . We show that the set of all such conflict-free quartet topologies is compatible (Theorem 1). That is, for every MUL-tree  $T$  there exists a singly-labeled tree that displays all the conflict-free quartets of  $T$  — and possibly some other quartets as well. Motivated by this, we only view conflict-free quartet topologies as informative, and define the information content of a MUL-tree as the set of all conflict-free quartet topologies it implies.

A MUL-tree may have leaves that can be pruned and edges that can be contracted without altering the tree’s information content, i.e., without adding or removing conflict-free quartets. For example, in Fig. 1, every quartet topology that edge  $(v, w)$  implies is either in conflict with some other topology (e.g., for set  $\{b, c, d, e\}$ ) or is already implied by some other edge (e.g.,  $af|ce$  is also implied by  $(t, u)$ ). Thus,  $(v, w)$  can be contracted without altering the information




Fig. 1: A MUL-tree. Numbers in parenthesis next to labels indicate the multiplicity of the respective labels and are not part of the labels themselves.




Fig. 2: The MRF for the Mul-tree in Fig. 1.

content. In fact, the information content remains unchanged if we also contract  $(u, v)$  and remove the leaves labeled  $b(1)$  and  $c(1)$ . We define the MRF of a MUL-tree  $T$  as the MUL-tree that results from applying information-preserving edge contraction and leaf pruning operations repeatedly to  $T$ , until it is no longer possible to do so. For the tree in Fig. 1, the MRF is singly-labeled as shown in Fig. 2. Note that, in general, the MRF may not be singly-labeled (see the example in Section 4.4).

Since any two MUL-trees with the same information content have the same MRF, rather than comparing MUL-trees directly, we can instead compare their MRFs. This is appealing mathematically, because it focuses on conflict-free information content, and also computationally, since an MRF can be much smaller than the original MUL-tree; indeed, on our test data, the MRF was frequently singly-labeled. This reduction in input size is especially significant if the MUL-tree is an input to an algorithm whose running time is exponential in the label multiplicity, e.g., Ganapathy et al.’s algorithm to compute the contract-and-refine distance between two area cladograms [5] or Huber et al.’s algorithm to determine if a collection of “multi-splits” can they be displayed by a MUL-tree [7].

For our experiments, we also implemented a post-processing step, which converts the MRF to a singly-labeled tree, rendering it available for analyses that require singly-labeled trees, including supermatrix [3,22] and supertree methods [2,15,1,21]. On the trees in our data set, the combined taxon loss between the MRF computation and the postprocessing was much lower than it would have been had we simply removed all duplicate taxa from the original trees.

Previous work on MUL-trees has concentrated on finding ways to reduce MUL-trees to singly-labeled trees (typically in order to provide inputs to supertree methods) [18], and to develop metrics and algorithms to compare MUL-trees [5,14,12,9]. In contrast to our approach — which is purely topology-based and is agnostic with respect to the cause of label multiplicity —, the assumption underlying much of the literature on MUL-trees is that taxon multiplicity results from gene duplication. Thus, methods to obtain singly-labeled trees from MUL-trees usually work by pruning subtrees at putative duplication nodes. Although the proposed algorithms are polynomial, they are unsatisfactory in various ways. For example, in [18] if the subtrees are neither identical nor compatible, then the subtree with smaller information content is pruned, which seems to discard too much information. Further, the algorithm is only efficient for binary rooted trees. In [14] subtrees are pruned arbitrarily, while in [12] at each putative duplication node a separate analysis is done for each possible pruned subtree. Although the latter approach is better than pruning arbitrarily, in the worst case it can end up analyzing exponentially many subtrees.

## 2 MUL-Trees and Information Content

A *MUL-tree* is a triple  $(T, M, \psi)$ , where (i)  $T$  is an unrooted tree<sup>3</sup> with leaf set  $\mathcal{L}(T)$  all of whose internal nodes have degree at least three, (ii)  $M$  is a set of labels, and (iii)

<sup>3</sup> The results presented here can be extended to rooted trees, using triplets instead of quartets, exploiting the well-known bijection between rooted and unrooted trees [19, p. 20]. We do not discuss this further here for lack of space.

$\psi_T : \mathcal{L}(T) \rightarrow M$  is a surjective map that assigns each leaf of  $T$  a label from  $M$ . (Note that if  $\psi$  is a bijection,  $T$  is singly labeled; that is, singly-labeled trees are a special case of MUL-trees.) For brevity we often refer to a MUL-tree by its underlying tree  $T$ . In what follows, unless stated otherwise, by a tree we mean a MUL-tree.

An edge  $(u, v)$  in  $T$  is *internal* if neither  $u$  nor  $v$  belong to  $\mathcal{L}(T)$ , and is *pendant* otherwise. A *pendant node* is an internal node that has a leaf as its neighbor.

Let  $(u, v)$  be an edge in  $T$  and  $T'$  be the result of deleting  $(u, v)$  from  $T$ . Then  $T_u^{uv}$  ( $T_v^{uv}$ ) denotes the subtree of  $T'$  that contains  $u$  ( $v$ ).  $M_u^{uv}$  ( $M_v^{uv}$ ) denotes the set of labels in  $T_u^{uv}$  ( $T_v^{uv}$ ) but not in  $T_v^{uv}$  ( $T_u^{uv}$ ).  $C^{uv}$  is the set of labels common to both  $T_u^{uv}$  and  $T_v^{uv}$ . Observe that  $M_u^{uv}$ ,  $M_v^{uv}$  and  $C^{uv}$  partition  $M$ . For example, in Fig. 1,  $M_u^{uv} = \{a, f\}$ ,  $M_v^{uv} = \{e, d\}$ ,  $C^{uv} = \{b, c\}$ .

A (resolved) *quartet* in a MUL-tree  $T$  is a bipartition  $ab|cd$  of a set of labels  $\{a, b, c, d\}$  such that there is an edge  $(u, v)$  in  $T$  with  $\{a, b\} \in M_u^{uv}$  and  $\{c, d\} \in M_v^{uv}$ . We say that  $(u, v)$  *resolves*  $ab|cd$ . For example, in Fig. 1, edge  $(t, u)$  resolves  $af|bc$ .

The *information content of an edge*  $(u, v)$  of a MUL-tree  $T$ , denoted  $\Delta(u, v)$ , is the set of quartets resolved by  $(u, v)$ . An edge  $(u, v)$  in tree  $T$  is *informative* if  $|\Delta(u, v)| > 0$ ;  $(u, v)$  is *maximally informative* if there is no other edge  $(u', v')$  in  $T$  with  $\Delta(u, v) \subset \Delta(u', v')$ . The *information content of  $T$* , denoted  $\mathcal{I}(T)$ , is the combined information content of all edges in the tree; that is  $\mathcal{I}(T) = \bigcup_{(u,v) \in E} \Delta(u, v)$ , where  $E$  denotes the set of edges in  $T$ .

The next result shows that the quartets in  $\mathcal{I}(T)$  are conflict-free.

**Theorem 1.** *For every MUL-tree  $T$ , there is a singly labeled tree  $T'$  such that  $\mathcal{I}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(T')$ .*<sup>4</sup>

Note that there are examples where the containment indicated by the above result is proper.

To conclude this section, we give some results that are useful for the reduction algorithm of Section 4. In the next lemmas,  $(u, v)$  and  $(w, x)$  denote two edges in tree  $T$  that lie on the path  $P_{u,x} = (u, v, \dots, w, x)$  as shown in Fig. 3.

**Lemma 1.** *If  $|M_u^{uv}| = |M_w^{wx}|$  then  $M_u^{uv} = M_w^{wx}$ . Otherwise,  $M_u^{uv} \subset M_w^{wx}$ .*

Together with Lemma 1, the next result allows us to check whether the information content of an edge is a subset of that of another based solely on the cardinalities of the  $M_u^{uv}$ s.

**Lemma 2.**  $\Delta(u, v) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$  if and only if  $M_v^{uv} = M_x^{wx}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *Suppose  $\Delta(u, v) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$ . Then, for any edge  $(y, z)$  on  $P_{u,x}$  such that  $v$  is closer to  $y$  than to  $z$ ,  $\Delta(u, v) \subseteq \Delta(y, z) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$ .*




Fig. 3

<sup>4</sup> All proofs are in the Appendix. The Appendix will not be part of the final submission.

### 3 Maximally Reduced MUL-Trees

Our goal is to provide a way to reduce a MUL-tree  $T$  as much as possible, while preserving its information content. Our reduction algorithm uses the following operations.

**Prune( $v$ ):** Delete leaf  $v$  from  $T$ . If, as a result,  $v$ 's neighbor  $u$  becomes a degree-two node, connect the former two neighbors of  $u$  by an edge and delete  $u$ .

**Contract( $e$ ):** Delete an internal edge  $e$  and identify its endpoints.

A leaf  $v$  in  $T$  is *prunable* if the tree that results from pruning  $v$  has the same information content as  $T$ . An internal edge  $e$  in  $T$  is *contractible* if the tree that results from contracting  $e$  has the same information content as  $T$ .  $T$  is *maximally reduced* if it has no prunable leaf and no contractible internal edge.

**Theorem 2.** *Every internal edge in a maximally reduced tree  $T$  resolves a quartet that is resolved by no other edge.*

Note that a quartet  $ab|cd$  that is resolved by edge  $(u, v)$ , but by no other edge must have the form illustrated in Fig. 4.

Next, we show that the set of quartets resolved by a maximally reduced tree uniquely identifies the tree.

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $T$  and  $T'$  be two maximally reduced trees such that  $\mathcal{I}(T) = \mathcal{I}(T')$ . Then,  $T$  and  $T'$  are isomorphic.*

The *maximally reduced form* (MRF) of a MUL-tree  $T$  is the tree that results from repeatedly pruning prunable leaves and contracting contractible edges from  $T$  until this is no longer possible. Theorem 3 shows that we can indeed talk about “the” MRF of  $T$ .

**Corollary 1.** *Every MUL-tree has a unique MRF.*

**Corollary 2.** *Any two MUL-trees with the same information content have the same MRF.*

**Corollary 3.** *If a maximally reduced MUL-tree  $T$  is not singly-labeled, there does not exist a singly-labeled tree having the same information content as  $T$ .*

Fig 5 illustrates the last result. Any singly-labeled tree resolving the same set of quartets must be obtained by removing one of the leaves labeled with  $f$ . However, doing so will also introduce quartets that are not resolved by the maximally reduced MUL-tree.

**Corollary 4.** *The relation “sharing a common MRF” is an equivalence relation on the set of MUL-trees.*




Fig. 4: Quartet  $ab|cd$  is resolved only by edge  $(u, v)$ . Here,  $a \in M_i^{ui}$ ,  $b \in M_j^{uj}$ ,  $c \in M_k^{vk}$  and  $d \in M_l^{vl}$ .




Fig. 5: A maximally reduced MUL-tree

The last result implies that MUL-trees can be partitioned into equivalence classes, where each class consists of the set of all trees with the same information content. Thus, instead of comparing MUL-trees directly, we can compare their maximally reduced forms.

To end this section, we give some results that help to identify contractible edges and prunable leaves. The setting is the same as for Lemmas 2 and 3:  $(u, v)$  and  $(w, x)$  are two edges in tree  $T$  that lie on the path  $P_{u,x} = (u, v, \dots, w, x)$  (see Fig. 3). We say that subtree  $T_z^{yz}$  branches out from the path  $P$  if  $y \in P$  and  $z \notin P$ .

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $P_{v,w}$  denote the path  $(v, \dots, w)$  and suppose  $\Delta(u, v) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$  then*

- (i) *every internal edge on a subtree branching out from  $P_{v,w}$  is contractible, and*
- (ii) *if  $\Delta(u, v) = \Delta(w, x)$ , every leaf on a subtree branching out from  $P_{v,w}$  is prunable. Thus, the entire subtree can be deleted without changing the information content of the tree.*

## 4 The Reduction Algorithm

We now describe a  $O(n^2)$  algorithm to compute the MRF of an  $n$ -leaf MUL-tree  $T$ . In the previous section, the MRF was defined as the tree obtained by applying information-preserving pruning and contraction operations to  $T$ , in any order, until it is no longer possible. For efficiency, however, the sequence in which these steps are performed is important. Our algorithm has three distinct phases: a preprocessing step, redundant edge contraction, and pruning of redundant leaves. We describe these next and then give an example.

### 4.1 Preprocessing

For every edge  $(u, v)$  in  $T$ , we compute  $|M_u^{uv}|$  and  $|M_v^{uv}|$ . This can be done in  $O(n^2)$  time as follows. First, traverse subtrees  $T_u^{uv}$  and  $T_v^{uv}$  to count number of distinct labels  $n_u^{uv}$  and  $n_v^{uv}$  in each subtree. Then,  $|M_u^{uv}| = |M| - n_v^{uv}$  and  $|M_v^{uv}| = |M| - n_u^{uv}$ . We then contract non-informative edges; i.e., edges  $(u, v)$  where  $|M_u^{uv}|$  or  $|M_v^{uv}|$  is at most one.

### 4.2 Edge Contraction and Subtree Pruning

Next, we repeatedly find pairs of adjacent edges  $(u, v)$  and  $(v, w)$  such that  $\Delta(u, v) \subseteq \Delta(v, w)$  or vice-versa, and contract the less informative of the two. By Lemmas 1 and 2, we can compare  $\Delta(u, v)$  and  $\Delta(v, w)$  in constant time using the precomputed values of  $|M_u^{uv}|$  and  $|M_v^{uv}|$ . Lemma 4(i) implies that we should also contract all internal edges incident on  $v$  or in the subtrees branching out of  $v$ . Further, by Lemma 4(ii), if  $\Delta(u, v) = \Delta(v, w)$ , we can in fact delete these subtrees entirely, since their leaves are prunable. Lemma 3 implies that all such edges must lie on a path, and hence can be identified in linear time. The total time for all these operations is linear, since at worst we traverse every edge twice.

### 4.3 Pruning Redundant Leaves

The tree that is left at this point has no contractible edges; however, it can still have prunable leaves. We first prune any leaf with a label  $\ell$  that does not participate in any resolved quartet. Such an  $\ell$  has the property that for every edge  $(u, v)$ ,  $\ell \notin M_u^{uv}$  and  $\ell \notin M_v^{uv}$ . All such leaves can be found in  $O(n^2)$  time and  $O(n)$  space.

Next, we consider sets of leaves with the same label  $\ell$  that share a common neighboring pendant node. Such leaves can be found in linear time. For each such set, we delete all but one element.

After such leaves are removed, let  $T$  be the resulting tree. Now, the only kind of prunable leaf with a given label  $\ell$  that might remain are leaves attached to different pendant nodes. The next result identifies such redundant leaves in  $T$ .

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\ell$  be a multiply-occurring label in  $T$  and let  $T'$  be the minimal subtree that spans all the leaves labelled by  $\ell$ . Then, any leaf in  $T$  labeled  $\ell$  attached to a pendant node in  $T'$  of degree at least three is prunable.*

Thus, to identify and prune redundant leaf nodes of the latter type:

1. For each label  $\ell$ , consider the subgraph on the leaves labeled by it.
2. In this subgraph, delete any leaf not attached to a degree 2 pendant node as it is a redundant leaf.

This takes  $O(n)$  time per label and  $O(n^2)$  time total. The space used is  $O(n)$ . Hence, the overall time and space complexities are  $O(n^2)$  time and  $O(n)$ , respectively.

The resulting tree has no contractible edges nor prunable leaves. Therefore, it is the MRF of the original MUL-tree.

### 4.4 An Example

We illustrate the reduction of the unrooted MUL-tree shown in Fig. 6 to its MRF.




Fig. 6




Fig. 7

1. In the preprocessing step, we find that  $M_t^{tu} = \emptyset$ ,  $M_s^{su} = \emptyset$  and  $M_x^{wx} = \emptyset$ , so edges  $(t, u)$ ,  $(s, u)$  and  $(w, x)$  are uninformative. They are therefore contracted, resulting in the tree shown in Fig. 7.
2. Since  $\Delta(u, v) \subset \Delta(v, w)$ , contract  $(u, v)$ . The result is shown in Fig. 8.




Fig. 8

3. Since  $\Delta(v, w) = \Delta(w, y)$ , delete the subtree branching out at  $w$  from the path from  $v$  to  $y$  and contract  $(v, w)$ . The result is shown in Fig. 9.




Fig. 9

4. Prune taxon 6, which does not participate in any quartet, and all duplicate taxa at the pendant nodes. The result, shown in Fig. 10, is the MRF of the original tree.






Fig. 10


## 5 Evaluation

We implemented our MUL-tree reduction algorithm, as well as a second step that restricts the MRF to the set of labels that appear only once, which yields a singly-labeled tree. We tested our two-step program on a set of 110,842 MUL-trees obtained from the PhyLoTA database [10] (<http://phylota.net/>; GenBank eukaryotic nucleotide sequences, release 184, June 2011), which included a broad range of label-set sizes, from 4 to 1500 taxa.


There were 8,741 trees (7.8%) with essentially no information content; these lost all resolution either when reduced to their MRFs, or in the second step. The remaining trees fell into two categories. Trees in set  $A$  had a singly-labeled MRF; 65,709 trees (59.3%) were of this kind. Trees in set  $B$  were reduced to singly-labeled trees in the second step; 36,392 trees (32.8%) were of this kind. Reducing a tree to its MRF (step 1), led to an average taxon loss of 0.83% of the taxa in the input MUL-tree. The total taxon loss after the second step (reducing the MRFs in set  $B$  to singly-labeled trees), averaged 12.81%. This taxon loss is not trivial, but it is far less than the 41.27% average loss from the alternative, naïve, approach in which all mul-taxa (taxa that label more than one leaf) are removed at the outset. Note that, by the definition of MRFs, taxa removed in the first step do not contribute to the information content, since all non-conflicting quartets are preserved. On the other hand, taxa removed in the second step do alter the information content, since each such taxon participated in some non-conflicting quartet.

Taxon loss is sensitive to the number of total taxa and, especially, mul-taxa, as demonstrated in Figure 11a. The grey function shows the percentage of mul-taxa in the original input trees, which is the taxon loss if we had restricted the input MUL-trees to the set of singly-labeled leaves. The black function shows the percentage of mul-taxa lost after steps 1 and 2 of our reduction procedure.

In addition to the issue of taxon loss, we investigated the effect of our reduction on edge loss, i.e., the level of resolution within the resulting singly-labeled tree. Input MUL-trees were binary and therefore had more nodes than twice the number of taxa (Fig 11b, solid line), whereas a binary tree on singly labeled taxa would have approximately as many nodes as twice the number of taxa (Fig. 11b, dashed line). We found that, although there was some edge loss, the number of nodes in the reduced singly-labeled trees (Fig. 11b, dotted line) corresponded well to the total possible, indicating low levels of edge loss. Note that each point on the dotted or solid lines represents an average over all trees with the same number of taxa.



(a) Taxon loss in the second step



(b) Quality of reduced singly-labeled trees

Fig. 11: Experimental results

We have integrated our reduction algorithm into SearchTree (<http://searchtree.org/>), a phylogenetic tree search engine that takes a user-provided list of species names and finds matches with a precomputed collection of phylogenetic trees, more than half of which are MUL-trees, assembled from GenBank sequence data. The trees returned are ranked by a tree quality criterion that takes into account overlap with the query set, support values for the branches, and degree of resolution. We have added functionality to provide reduced singly-labeled trees as well as the MUL-trees based on the full leaf set.

## 6 Conclusion

We introduced an efficient algorithm to reduce a multi-labeled MUL-tree to a maximally reduced form with the same information content, defined as the set of non-conflicting quartets it resolves. We also showed that the information content of a MUL-tree uniquely identifies the MUL-tree's maximally reduced form. This has potential application in comparing MUL-trees by significantly reducing the number of comparisons. Our algorithm can easily be adapted to work for rooted trees.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Mike Sanderson for helping to motivate this work, for many discussions about the problem formulation, and for our ongoing collaboration in the SearchTree project. Sylvain Guillemot listened to numerous early versions of our proofs and offered many insightful comments.

## References

1. M. Bansal, J. G. Burleigh, O. Eulenstein, and D. Fernández-Baca. Robinson-Foulds supertrees. *Algorithms for Molecular Biology*, 5(1):18, 2010.
2. B. R. Baum. Combining trees as a way of combining data sets for phylogenetic inference, and the desirability of combining gene trees. *Taxon*, 41(1):pp. 3–10, 1992.
3. A. de Queiroz and J. Gatesy. The supermatrix approach to systematics. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 22(1):34–41, 2007.
4. M. Fellows, M. Hallett, and U. Stege. Analogs & duals of the mast problem for sequences & trees. *Journal of Algorithms*, 49(1):192 – 216, 2003. 1998 European Symposium on Algorithms.
5. G. Ganapathy, B. Goodson, R. Jansen, H. Le, V. Ramachandran, and T. Warnow. Pattern identification in biogeography. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Comput. Biol. Bioinformatics*, 3:334–346, 2006.
6. H. Grundt, M. Popp, C. Brochmann, and B. Oxelman. Polyploid origins in a circumpolar complex in draba (brassicaceae) inferred from cloned nuclear dna sequences and fingerprints. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 32(3):695 – 710, 2004.
7. K. Huber, M. Lott, V. Moulton, and A. Spillner. The complexity of deriving multi-labeled trees from bipartitions. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 15(6):639–651, 2008.
8. K. Huber and V. Moulton. Phylogenetic networks from multi-labelled trees. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, 52:613–632, 2006.
9. K. Huber, A. Spillner, R. Suchecki, and V. Moulton. Metrics on multilabeled trees: Interrelationships and diameter bounds. *Computational Biology and Bioinformatics, IEEE/ACM Transactions on*, 8(4):1029 –1040, july-aug. 2011.
10. K. Johnson, R. Adams, R. Page, and D. Clayton. When do parasites fail to speciate in response to host speciation? *Syst. Biol.*, 52:37–47, 2003.
11. M. Lott, A. Spillner, K. Huber, A. Petri, B. Oxelman, and V. Moulton. Inferring polyploid phylogenies from multiply-labeled gene trees. *BMC evolutionary biology*, 9(1):216, 2009.
12. M. Marcet-Houben and T. Gabaldón. Treeko: a duplication-aware algorithm for the comparison of phylogenetic trees. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 39:e66, 2011.
13. M. Popp and B. Oxelman. Inferring the history of the polyploid silene aegaea (caryophyllaceae) using plastid and homoeologous nuclear dna sequences. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 20(3):474 – 481, 2001.
14. P. Puigbò, S. Garcia-Vallvé, and J. McInerney. Topd/fmts: a new software to compare phylogenetic trees. *Bioinformatics*, 23(12):1556, 2007.
15. M. Ragan. Phylogenetic inference based on matrix representation of trees. *Molecular phylogenetics and evolution*, 1(1):53–58, 1992.
16. M. Rasmussen and M. Kellis. Unified modeling of gene duplication, loss, and coalescence using a locus tree. *Genome Research*, 22:755–765, 2012.
17. M. Sanderson, D. Boss, D. Chen, K. Cranston, and A. Wehe. The PhyLoTA browser: processing GenBank for molecular phylogenetics research. *Systematic Biology*, 57(3):335, 2008.

18. C. Scornavacca, V. Berry, and V. Ranwez. Building species trees from larger parts of phylogenomic databases. *Information and Computation*, 209(3):590 – 605, 2011. Special Issue: 3rd International Conference on Language and Automata Theory and Applications (LATA 2009).
19. C. Semple and M. Steel. *Phylogenetics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.
20. M. Steel. The complexity of reconstructing trees from qualitative characters and subtrees. *Journal of Classification*, 9(1):91–116, 1992.
21. M. Swenson, R. Suri, C. Linder, and T. Warnow. Superfine: fast and accurate supertree estimation. *Systematic biology*, 61(2):214–227, 2012.
22. J. J. Wiens and T. W. Reeder. Combining data sets with different numbers of taxa for phylogenetic analysis. *Systematic Biology*, 44(4):pp. 548–558, 1995.

## Appendix: Proofs

### Proofs for Section 2

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Repeat the following step until  $T$  has no multiply-occurring labels. Pick any multiply-occurring label  $\ell$  in  $T$ , select an arbitrary leaf labeled by  $\ell$ , and relabel every other leaf labeled by  $\ell$ , by a new, unique, label. The resulting tree  $T'$  is singly labeled, and all labels of  $T$  are also present in  $T'$ . Consider a quartet  $ab|cd$  in  $T$ , that is resolved by edge  $(u, v)$ . Assume that  $\{a, b\} \in M_u^{uv}$  and  $\{c, d\} \in M_v^{uv}$ . Thus,  $T_u^{uv}$  contains all the occurrences of label  $a$ . Clearly, this also holds for the only occurrence of  $a$  in  $T'$ . Similar statements can be made about labels  $b$ ,  $c$ , and  $d$ . Thus, the quartet  $ab|cd$  is resolved by edge  $(u, v)$  in  $T'$ , and, hence,  $T'$  displays all quartets of  $T$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 1.* Refer to Fig. 3. Since  $T_u^{uv}$  is a subtree of  $T_w^{wx}$ ,  $M_u^{uv} \subseteq M_w^{wx}$  by definition of  $M_u^{uv}$ . Thus, if  $|M_u^{uv}| = |M_w^{wx}|$ , we must have  $M_w^{wx} = M_u^{uv}$  and, if  $|M_u^{uv}| \neq |M_w^{wx}|$ , we must have  $M_u^{uv} \subset M_w^{wx}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 2. (Only if)* Suppose  $\Delta(u, v) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$ ; therefore,  $M_v^{uv} \subseteq M_x^{wx}$ . By definition,  $M_v^{uv} \supseteq M_x^{wx}$ ; hence,  $M_v^{uv} = M_x^{wx}$ .

*(If)* Suppose  $M_v^{uv} = M_x^{wx}$ . By definition,  $M_u^{uv} \subseteq M_w^{wx}$ , which implies that  $\Delta(u, v) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.* By Lemma 2, since  $\Delta(u, v) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$ , we have  $M_v^{uv} = M_x^{wx}$ . Now consider an edge  $(y, z)$  on  $P_{u,x}$ . By definition  $M_v^{uv} \supseteq M_z^{yz} \supseteq M_x^{wx}$ . But  $M_v^{uv} = M_x^{wx}$ , therefore  $M_v^{uv} = M_z^{yz} = M_x^{wx}$ . By definition  $M_u^{uv} \subseteq M_y^{yz} \subseteq M_w^{wx}$ . Hence, by Lemma 2,  $\Delta(u, v) \subseteq \Delta(y, z) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$ .  $\square$

### Proofs for Section 3

*Proof of Theorem 2.* We rely on two facts. First, every internal node in the tree has degree at least three. Second, every internal edge in the tree resolves a quartet; otherwise, the edge would be contractible and the tree would not be maximally reduced.

Consider any edge  $(u, v)$  in the tree. To prove that  $(u, v)$  resolves a unique quartet not resolved by any other edge, we need to show that there exists a quartet  $ab|cd$  of the form shown in Fig. 4. First, we describe how to select leaves  $a$  and  $b$ . Consider the following cases:

*Case 1.*  $u$  has at least two neighbors  $i$  and  $j$ , apart from  $v$ , that are internal nodes. Then, we select any  $a \in M_i^{ui}$  and any  $b \in M_j^{uj}$ .

*Case 2.*  $u$  has only one neighbor  $i \neq v$  that is an internal node. Then, at least one of  $u$ 's neighboring leaves must participate in a quartet that  $(u, v)$  resolves. Without such a leaf,  $(u, v)$  would resolve the same set of quartets as  $(u, i)$ , so one of these two edges would be contractible, contradicting the assumption that the tree is maximally reduced. We select this leaf as  $b$  and we select any  $a \in M_i^{ui}$ .


*Case 3.* All neighbors of  $u$ , except  $v$ , are leaves. Then, at least two of its neighbors must participate in a quartet, because  $(u, v)$  must resolve a quartet. We select the two neighbors as  $a$  and  $b$ .

In every case, we can select the desired leaves  $a$  and  $b$ . By a similar argument, we can also select the desired  $c$  and  $d$ . This proves the existence of the desired quartet  $ab|cd$ . Therefore, each internal edge of  $T$  uniquely resolve a quartet.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.* We need two lemmas.

**Lemma 6.** *There is a bijection  $\phi$  between the respective sets of internal edges of  $T$  and  $T'$  with the following property. Let  $(u, v)$  be an internal edge in  $T$  and let  $(u', v') = \phi(u, v)$ . Then,  $M_u^{uv} = M_{u'}^{u'v'}$  and  $M_v^{uv} = M_{v'}^{u'v'}$ . Therefore,  $\Delta(u, v) = \Delta(u', v')$ .*

*Proof.* Consider an edge  $(u, v)$  in  $T$ . By Theorem 2,  $(u, v)$  must resolve a unique quartet  $ab|cd$  as shown in Fig. 4. We claim that this quartet must be resolved uniquely by an edge  $(u', v')$  in  $T'$ . Suppose not. Using arguments similar to those in the proof of Lemma 3, we can show that all edges that resolve  $ab|cd$  in  $T'$  form a path  $(u', x', \dots, w', v')$ , where possibly  $x' = w'$ , as shown in Fig. 12. Here,  $\{a, b\} \subseteq M_{u'}^{u'x'}$  and  $\{c, d\} \subseteq M_{v'}^{w'v'}$ .



Since  $(w', v')$  resolves a unique quartet, by Theorem 2 there exists a label  $\ell$  as shown, where  $\ell \in M_m^{w'm}$ . Since  $ab|\ell d$  is a quartet in  $T'$  and  $\mathcal{I}(T) = \mathcal{I}(T')$ , it must be true that  $\ell \in M_v^{uv}$  in  $T$ . Clearly,  $T$  does not resolve the quartet on  $\{a, \ell, d, c\}$  in the same way,  $a\ell|cd$ , as  $T'$ . This contradicts the assumption that  $\mathcal{I}(T) = \mathcal{I}(T')$ . Thus,  $(u', v')$  must be an edge. Moreover, only one such edge exists in  $T'$  as it uniquely resolves the quartet  $ab|cd$ .

Now consider any label  $f \in M_u^{uv}$  such that  $f \notin \{a, b, c, d\}$ . Label  $f$  must be in  $M_{u'}^{u'v'}$ ; otherwise,  $T$  and  $T'$  would resolve the quartet  $\{a, f, c, d\}$  differently. Similarly, any such  $f \in M_{u'}^{u'v'}$  must be in  $M_u^{uv}$  as well. Thus  $M_u^{uv} = M_{u'}^{u'v'}$ . In the same way, we can prove that  $M_v^{uv} = M_{v'}^{u'v'}$ . Thus,  $\Delta(u, v) = \Delta(u', v')$ .

We have shown that there is a one-to-one mapping  $\phi$  from edges in  $T$  to edges of  $T'$  such that  $\Delta(e) = \Delta(\phi(e))$ . To complete the proof, we show that  $\phi$  is onto. Suppose that for some edge  $e'$  in  $T'$  there is no edge  $e$  in  $T$  such that  $\phi(e) = e'$ . But then  $e'$  must resolve a unique quartet that cannot be in  $\mathcal{I}(T)$ , contradicting the assumption that  $\mathcal{I}(T) = \mathcal{I}(T')$ .  $\square$

Let  $\phi$  be the bijection between the edge sets of  $T$  and  $T'$  from the preceding lemma.

**Lemma 7.** Let  $(u, v)$  and  $(v, x)$  be any two neighboring internal edges in  $T$ , and let  $(p, q) = \phi(u, v)$  and  $(r, s) = \phi(v, x)$  be the corresponding edges in  $T'$  such that  $M_u^{uv} = M_p^{pq}$  and  $M_v^{vx} = M_r^{rs}$ . Then,  $(p, q)$  and  $(r, s)$  are neighbors in  $T'$  with  $q = r$ .

*Proof.* Since  $(u, v)$  and  $(v, x)$  are neighbors, and each resolves a unique quartet that is not resolved by the other,  $M_u^{uv} \subset M_v^{vx}$  and  $M_v^{vx} \supset M_u^{uv}$ . By Lemma 6, this implies that  $M_p^{pq} \subset M_r^{rs}$  and  $M_q^{pq} \supset M_s^{rs}$ . Thus, the only way  $(p, q)$  and  $(r, s)$  can exist in  $T'$  is as part of the path  $P_{ps} = (p, q, \dots, r, s)$ . If  $q \neq r$ , then consider the edge  $(t, r)$  on  $P_{ps}$  such that  $p$  is closer to  $t$  than to  $r$ . Then, the following must hold:

$$M_p^{pq} \subset M_t^{tr} \subset M_r^{rs} \quad (1)$$

and

$$M_q^{pq} \supset M_r^{tr} \supset M_s^{rs} \quad (2)$$

Let  $(z, w) = \phi^{-1}(t, r)$  be the edge in  $T$  corresponding to  $(t, r)$ . Irrespective of the position of  $(z, w)$  in  $T$ , (1) and (2) cannot be simultaneously true with respect to edges  $(u, v)$ ,  $(v, x)$  and  $(z, w)$  in  $T$ . Therefore,  $q = r$ , which proves the desired result.  $\square$

Lemmas 6 and 7 show that  $T$  and  $T'$  are isomorphic with respect to their internal edges. It remains to show a one-to-one correspondence between their leaf sets. For this, we match up the leaves attached at every pendant node in  $T$  and  $T'$ . We start with pendant nodes that have only one internal edge attached to them. For example, consider an internal edge  $(u, v)$  in  $T$  such that  $v$  is a pendant node and  $T_v^{uv}$  has only leaves. Let  $(u', v') = \phi(u, v)$  be the corresponding edge in  $T'$  such that  $M_u^{uv} = M_{u'}^{u'v'}$ . By Lemma 6,  $C^{uv} = C^{u'v'}$ . Moreover, neither  $T$  nor  $T'$  have prunable leaves. Thus, the same set of leaves must be attached at  $v$  and  $v'$  respectively. In subsequent steps, we select an internal edge  $(u, v)$  in  $T$  such that  $v$  is a pendant node and all the other pendant nodes in  $T_v^{uv}$  have already been matched up in previous iterations. Again, let  $(u', v') = \phi(u, v)$  such that  $M_u^{uv} = M_{u'}^{u'v'}$ . Using similar arguments, the same set of leaves must be attached at  $v$  and  $v'$  respectively. Proceeding this way, each pendant node in  $T$  can be paired with the corresponding pendant node in  $T'$ , and be shown to have the same set of leaves attached to them. This shows that  $T$  and  $T'$  are isomorphic, as claimed.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.* Refer to Fig. 13.

- (i) Consider any edge  $(a, b)$  in a subtree branching out of  $P_{v,w}$ , as shown. We claim that  $M_a^{ab} \cup C^{ab} = M$ ; i.e., all the labels in  $M$  appear in  $T_a^{ab}$ . This means that  $M_b^{ab} = \emptyset$ , so  $(a, b)$  is uninformative.

To prove the claim, observe first that, by definition,  $M_u^{uv} \cup C^{uv} \cup M_v^{uv} = M$ . By Lemma 2, since  $\Delta(u, v) \subseteq \Delta(w, x)$ , we have  $M_x^{wx} = M_v^{uv}$ , so

$$M_u^{uv} \cup C^{uv} \cup M_x^{wx} = M. \quad (3)$$

Now,  $M_u^{uv} \cup C^{uv}$  is the set of labels on the leaves of  $T_u^{uv}$ , while every label in  $M_x^{wx}$  appears in  $T_x^{wx}$ . Hence,  $T_u^{uv}$  and  $T_x^{wx}$  jointly contain every label in  $M$ . Since  $T_u^{uv}$  and  $T_x^{wx}$  are subtrees of  $T_a^{ab}$ , this completes the proof of the claim.




Fig. 13

(ii) Suppose  $\Delta(u, v) = \Delta(w, x)$ . By an argument similar to the one used in the proof of Lemma 3, we can show that any edge  $(y, z)$  on  $P_{v,w}$  (see Fig. 13) satisfies  $M_v^{uv} = M_z^{yz} = M_x^{wx}$  and  $M_u^{uv} = M_y^{yz} = M_w^{wx}$ . Consider a leaf  $c$  as shown; let  $\ell$  be its label. Then,  $\ell$  appears in  $T_x^{wx}$ , for else  $M_y^{yz} \neq M_w^{wx}$ , a contradiction. Similarly,  $\ell$  appears in  $T_u^{uv}$ . Now, let  $S$  be the tree obtained after pruning leaf  $c$ .

- (a)  $\mathcal{I}(T) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(S)$ : Suppose pruning  $c$  removes a quartet from  $\mathcal{I}(T)$ . If such a quartet exists in  $T$ , it must be resolved by an edge  $(j, k) \in T_u^{uv}$  (say). But then  $(j, k)$  still resolves the same quartet in  $S$  because  $\ell \in M_x^{wx}$ , and the labels in  $T_x^{wx}$  are a subset of those in  $T_k^{jk}$ . This is a contradiction.
- (b)  $\mathcal{I}(S) \subseteq \mathcal{I}(T)$ : Suppose pruning  $c$  adds a quartet to  $\mathcal{I}(S)$  that is not in  $\mathcal{I}(T)$ . Such a quartet in  $S$  must be resolved by an edge  $(j, k)$  in  $S_u^{uv}$  (say), that before pruning satisfied  $\ell \in C^{jk}$ , but now has  $\ell \notin M_k^{jk}$ . However  $\ell \in M_x^{wx}$ ; therefore we still have  $\ell \in C^{jk}$  and the edge still cannot resolve the quartet, a contradiction.

Hence,  $c$  is prunable. □

*Proof of Lemma 5.* Refer to Fig. 14. Consider any pendant node  $v$  of degree at least three in  $T'$  attached to a leaf labeled  $\ell$ . Clearly deleting the leaf does not change the information content of any edge in  $T_u$  or  $T_y$ . Now consider an edge  $(w, x)$  in  $T'$  as shown. Note that  $\ell \in C^{wx}$ , so  $\ell$  does not contribute to  $\Delta(w, x)$ . After deleting the leaf, we still have  $\ell \in C^{wx}$ , so  $\Delta(w, x)$  remains unchanged. Therefore, the leaf is prunable. □




Fig. 14: Illustration for the proof of Lemma 5. The leaves attached to pendant nodes  $u$ ,  $v$ , and  $y$  are labeled by  $\ell$ , and the subtrees indicated by  $T_u$  and  $T_y$  do not contain a leaf labeled with  $\ell$ . Nodes  $u$  and  $y$  have degree two in  $T'$ , while  $v$  has degree three.