

TREE SPLIT PROBABILITIES DETERMINE THE BRANCH LENGTHS

BENNY CHOR AND MIKE STEEL

ABSTRACT. The evolution of aligned DNA sequence sites is generally modeled by a Markov process operating along the edges of a phylogenetic tree. It is well known that the probability distribution on the site patterns at the tips of the tree determines the tree and its branch lengths. However, the number of patterns is typically much larger than the number of edges, suggesting considerable redundancy in the branch length estimation. In this paper we ask whether the probabilities of just the ‘edge-specific’ patterns (the ones that correspond to a change of state on a single edge) suffice to recover the branch lengths of the tree, under a symmetric 2-state Markov process. We first show that this holds provided the branch lengths are sufficiently short, by applying the inverse function theorem. We then consider whether this restriction to short branch lengths is necessary, and show that for trees with up to four leaves it can be lifted. This leaves open the interesting question of whether this holds in general.

1. BACKGROUND

When a discrete character evolves on a tree under a Markov process, the probability distribution on site patterns at the leaves of the tree is determined by the tree and its branch lengths [3, 9]. What is less obvious is that this process is invertible for many models – that is, the probability distribution on site patterns at the leaves uniquely identifies both the tree and its branch lengths.

This fundamental property underlies all statistical approaches for inferring evolutionary relationships from aligned genetic sequence data. In this setting, the ‘discrete character’ refers to the pattern of nucleotides across the species at each site, and the frequency of this pattern across the sequences provides some estimate of the probability of that pattern. In this paper we are interested in what the probability distribution says about the branch lengths of the underlying tree (we will assume this topology is known). Notice that the number of site patterns grows exponentially with the number n of leaves, yet the number of branches of the tree (for which the branch lengths are being estimated) grows linearly with n .

This suggests a basic question — do we need all the site pattern probabilities to infer the branch lengths? More precisely, if a tree has k edges (branches), are there k site patterns whose probabilities under the model might identify the lengths of these branches?

One motivation for this question is that in practice many site patterns will simply never occur (indeed most will not, if our sequence length grows at most polynomially with n , since the number of site patterns grow exponentially with n). And this is a problem if we try to estimate pattern probabilities from their relative frequency.

Key words and phrases. phylogenetic tree reconstruction, evolutionary model, Markov process, Hadamard transform, systems of polynomial equations, inverse function theorem.

Benny Chor: School of Computer Science, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel. benny@cs.tau.ac.il

Mike Steel: Mathematics and Statistics Dept., University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. mike.steel@canterbury.ac.nz.

There is an natural candidate for a particular choice of k site patterns – for each edge we take the site pattern in which all the leaves on one side of the edge are in one state, and all the leaves on the other side of the edge are in a different state – we refer to such a site pattern as a *tree split* for this edge. From a practical perspective, the tree splits are patterns that are likely to be observed in the data, since they require just one change of state in the tree. They also correspond to the primary divisions of the species into two groups (e.g. vertebrates vs invertebrates) and so have a clear phylogenetic meaning.

The question of whether the tree split probabilities determine the branch lengths is a delicate one - we prove that for the 2-state symmetric model, answer is yes for 4-leaf binary trees and for n -leaf star trees, and we conjecture that it holds true for arbitrary phylogenetic trees. Our approach exploits the Hadamard representation for the 2-state model [4, 5], as well as computational (symbolic) algebraic analysis tools.

2. MODEL AND NOTATIONS

In the Neyman 2-state model [8], each character admits one out of two states, e.g., purines and pyrimidines. Without loss of generality, we denote these states by 0 and 1. We use the symmetric Poisson model, where for each edge e of the tree T , there is a corresponding probability p_e ($0 \leq p_e < 1/2$) that the character states at the two incident vertices of e differ, and this probability is independent of the state at the initial vertex. The probability p_e is the probability of having an odd (1, 3, 5) number of substitutions per site across the edge e . The expected number of substitutions per site across the edge e equals $q_e = -\frac{1}{2} \ln(1 - 2p_e)$. The value $q(e)$ is referred to the (*branch*) *length* (or *weight*) of edge e . Measuring the tree edges by q_e ($0 \leq q_e < \infty$), we get an additive measure on the tree, namely, the expected number of substitutions between each pair of leaves (because expected values are additive). Such a weighted phylogenetic tree is a probabilistic model that emits any given pattern of states at its leaves with a well defined probability. Notice that the limits $q(e) \rightarrow 0$ and $q(e) \rightarrow \infty$ correspond to the limits $p(e) \rightarrow 0$ and $p(e) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$, respectively.

The observed sequences at the leaves can be represented by a matrix, ψ , where the number of rows equals the number of species ($m = 4$ in our case), and the number of columns equals the common length of the sequences (n in our case). For 2-state characters, it is convenient to “summarize” the observed data ψ by a vector of observed frequencies of splits, \hat{s} . This vector simply counts how many sites share any specific pattern. Under a fully symmetric 2-state model, the probability of a pattern is equal to that of its complement (where all 0 and 1 are interchanged). We make the following convention about indexing the patterns obtained in the sequences over $m = 4$ species, labelled 1, 2, 3, and 4, with the sequences $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \{0, 1\}^n$: We identify a site pattern by the subset of species 1, 2, 3 whose character at that site is different from that of species 4. More generally (i.e. for any value of m) for every $\alpha \subseteq \{1, \dots, m - 1\}$, an α -*split pattern* is a pattern where all taxa in the subset α have one character (0 or 1), and the taxa in the complement subset have the second character (there are two such patterns). The value \hat{s}_α equals the number of times that α -split patterns appear in the data. For $m = 4$ there are $2^3 = 8$ possible patterns, and the vector of observed sequence frequencies is $\hat{s} = [\hat{s}_\emptyset, \hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \hat{s}_{12}, \hat{s}_3, \hat{s}_{13}, \hat{s}_{23}, \hat{s}_{123}]$.

3. THE TREE SPLIT PROBABILITIES DETERMINE THE BRANCH LENGTHS LOCALLY

In this section, we show that the multivariate inverse function theorem implies that branch lengths can be recovered from tree split probabilities provided the branch lengths are not too large.

Theorem 3.1. *Let T be any phylogenetic tree, on any number of leaves, such that the degree of any internal vertex of T is greater than 2. In the 2-state symmetric model, the probabilities of the tree splits determine the branch lengths of T in some neighborhood of the origin. That is, there exist some $\eta > 0$, such that if the branch lengths all lie within $[0, \eta)$, then they can be uniquely recovered from the tree split probabilities.*

Proof. To simplify notation in this section, given a phylogenetic tree T with N edges, label the edges e_1, e_2, \dots, e_N . For each $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, let α_i denote the tree split corresponding to e_i ; let s_i be the probability of generating the pattern α_i on T under the symmetric 2-state model; let q_i be the branch length of edge e_i , and let $p_i = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \exp(-2q_i))$, which is the probability of a change of state on edge $e_i = (v_1^i, v_2^i)$. Consider the two subtrees of T which result from removing the edge e_i (but not the nodes v_1^i, v_2^i). Let T_1, T_2 denote the resulting subtrees, rooted at v_1^i, v_2^i , respectively. Let Q_i^1 be the probability of the event “all leaves of T_1 are in the same state as v_1^i ”, and Q_i^2 be the probability of the event “all leaves of T_2 are in the same state as v_2^i ”. Let R_i^1 denote the probability of the event “all leaves of T_1 are in the same state and they differ from the state of v_1^i ”, and R_i^2 denote the probability of the event “all leaves of T_2 are in the same state and they differ from the state of v_2^i ”. We note that under the 2-state symmetric model, changes of state on different edges are independent events. By considering whether or not there is a change of state on edge e_i , the following identity holds for all i :

$$(1) \quad s_i = p_i Q_i^1 Q_i^2 + (1 - p_i)(Q_i^1 R_i^2 + R_i^1 Q_i^2),$$

Note that $Q_i^1, Q_i^2, R_i^1, R_i^2$ involve only p_j values for $j \neq i$, and that when all the p_j values are zero we have:

$$(2) \quad R_i^1|_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{0}} = R_i^2|_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{0}} = 0, \text{ and } Q_i^1|_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{0}} = Q_i^2|_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{0}} = 1.$$

Now, consider the Jacobian matrix

$$\mathbf{J} = \left[\frac{\partial s_i}{\partial p_j} \right].$$

From Eqn. (1) and the fact that p_i does not appear in Q_i^1, Q_i^2 and R_i^1, R_i^2 we have:

$$\frac{\partial s_i}{\partial p_i} = Q_i^1 Q_i^2 - (Q_i^1 R_i^2 + R_i^1 Q_i^2)$$

and from Eqn. (2) this equals 1 when $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$.

Similarly, for $j \neq i$, Eqn. (1) gives:

$$\frac{\partial s_i}{\partial p_j} = p_i \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} Q_i^1 Q_i^2 + (1 - p_i) \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} (Q_i^1 R_i^2 + R_i^1 Q_i^2),$$

and so, when $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$ the first term on the right vanishes (since $p_i = 0$) and we have:

$$\frac{\partial s_i}{\partial p_j}|_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{0}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} (Q_i^1 R_i^2 + R_i^1 Q_i^2)|_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{0}}.$$

Now, notice that $Q_i^1 R_i^2 + R_i^1 Q_i^2$ is a multinomial polynomial of the variables p_k , $k \neq i$. We argue that this polynomial has no term of the form cp_j for a constant $c \neq 0$. Suppose otherwise, then setting $p_j = \frac{1}{4}$ and $p_k = 0$ for all $k \neq j$, Eqn. (1) shows that the pattern α_i occurs with probability $\frac{1}{4}c \neq 0$ under such an edge probability assignment. However,

since there is no vertex of degree 2 in T , edge e_i is the only edge for which α_i has positive probability when all but one p -value is set to zero. This contradicts the assumption that we are in the setting where $j \neq i$. Since $Q_i^1 R_i^2 + R_i^1 Q_i^2$ has no term of the form cp_j ($c \neq 0$) it follows that:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p_j}(Q_i^1 R_i^2 + R_i^1 Q_i^2)|_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{0}} = 0.$$

Summarizing, we have $\frac{\partial s_i}{\partial p_i}|_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{0}} = \delta_{ij}$ (Kronecker delta), and so at $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$, \mathbf{J} is the $N \times N$ identity matrix. Since the map $\mathbf{p} \mapsto (s_1, \dots, s_N)$ is a polynomial map, and therefore continuously differentiable, and since the Jacobian of this map is invertible at $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$, the conditions for the multivariate Inverse Function Theorem apply at this point. Thus, for some neighborhood neighborhood of $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{0}$, the function $(p_1, \dots, p_N) \mapsto (s_1, \dots, s_N)$ is invertible. Finally, observe that the map from $[0, \infty)^N$ onto $[0, 1/2)^N$ defined by $(q_1, \dots, q_N) \mapsto (p_1, \dots, p_N)$ is invertible, and so the theorem now follows. \square

Theorem 3.1 begs the question: how large can η be in order for invertibility to hold? In the next section we show that we can obtain invertibility with $\eta = \infty$ for trees with at most four leaves.

4. EXACT ANALYSIS FOR SMALL TREES

For phylogenetic trees with two and three leaves it is easily verified that the tree splits determine the branch lengths with no restriction required on the size of these branch lengths. Thus we will consider trees with four leaves, of which there are two types - the resolved binary tree, and the star tree. We will show that the probability distribution on tree splits determines the branch lengths of the binary tree for all strictly positive branch lengths, and then establish that the same holds for the star tree.

A useful tool in this analysis is the Hadamard representation of the 2-state symmetric model, which we first recall.

4.1. Hadamard representation. Given a tree T with m leaves and edge probabilities $\mathbf{p} = [p_e]_{e \in E(T)}$ ($0 \leq p_e < \frac{1}{2}$), the probability of generating an α -split pattern ($\alpha \subseteq \{1, \dots, m-1\}$) is determined (and is equal for all sites). Denote this probability by $\mathbf{s}_\alpha = Pr(\alpha\text{-split} | T, \mathbf{p})$.

Using the same indexing scheme as above, when $m = 4$, we define the vector of pattern generation probabilities $\mathbf{s} = [s_\emptyset, s_1, s_2, s_{12}, s_3, s_{13}, s_{23}, s_{123}]$. This vector is termed the expected sequence spectrum in [5], where the indexing scheme is explained as well.




FIGURE 1. Example of a resolved tree with four leaves

Even though in principle, the edge lengths $q_e = [q_e]_{e \in E(T)}$ determine the vector \mathbf{s} of pattern generation probabilities, it is not obvious how to actually compute this vector, given the edge lengths. This is where the Hadamard conjugation [5, 6] comes in. This transformation yields a powerful tool, which greatly simplifies and unifies the analysis of phylogenetic

data.

Definition: A *Hadamard matrix* of order ℓ is an $\ell \times \ell$ matrix A with ± 1 entries such that $A^t A = \ell I_\ell$, where I_ℓ is the identity $\ell \times \ell$ matrix.

We will use a special family of Hadamard matrices, whose sizes, ℓ , are powers of 2 [7], defined inductively for $m \geq 0$ by $H_0 = [1]$ and $H_{m+1} = \begin{bmatrix} H_m & H_m \\ H_m & -H_m \end{bmatrix}$. It is convenient to index the rows and columns of H_m by lexicographically ordered subsets of $\{1, \dots, m\}$. Denote by $h_{\alpha\gamma}$ the (α, γ) entry of H_m , then $h_{\alpha\gamma} = (-1)^{|\alpha \cap \gamma|}$. This implies that H_m is symmetric, namely $H_m^t = H_m$, and thus by the definition of Hadamard matrices $H_m^{-1} = 2^{-m} H_m$.

Proposition 4.1. [5] *If $\mathbf{p} < \mathbf{1}/2$ then $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{q}) = H^{-1} \exp(H\mathbf{q})$ where $H = H_{m-1}$, namely for $\alpha \subseteq \{1, \dots, m-1\}$,*

$$\mathbf{s}_\alpha = 2^{-(m-1)} \sum_{\gamma} h_{\alpha\gamma} \left(\exp \left(\sum_{\delta} h_{\gamma\delta} q_\delta \right) \right).$$

We note that the transformation is reversible, so if $H\mathbf{s} > \mathbf{0}$ (all entries are positive) then $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{q}(\mathbf{s}) = H^{-1} \ln(H\mathbf{s})$. Thus, when $m = 4$, the eight components in the expected sequence spectrum uniquely determine the five edge weights of the corresponding four taxa tree.

The question we explore is if the five components that correspond to splits in the tree, namely $s_1, s_2, s_{12}, s_3, s_{123}$ also determine the five edge weights $q_1, q_2, q_{12}, q_3, q_{123}$. In other words, is the mapping $(q_1, q_2, q_{12}, q_3, q_{123}) \mapsto (s_1, s_2, s_{12}, s_3, s_{123})$ one to one?

4.2. Resolved Tree on Four Leaves. In this case, the tree has five edges with positive lengths, $0 \leq q_\alpha < \infty$. To describe the mapping $(q_1, q_2, q_{12}, q_3, q_{123}) \mapsto (s_1, s_2, s_{12}, s_3, s_{123})$, let us first denote

$$a_1 = e^{-2q_1}, a_2 = e^{-2q_2}, a_{12} = e^{-2q_{12}}, a_3 = e^{-2q_3}, a_{123} = e^{-2q_{123}},$$

where the a_α are in the interval $(0, 1]$ (corresponding to edge lengths $0 \leq q_\alpha < \infty$). Then by the Hadamard transform (with the 8-by-8 matrix, H_3),

$$\begin{aligned} s_1 &= a_{123}a_3 - a_1a_2 + a_{12}a_2a_3 + a_{12}a_{123}a_2 - a_1a_{12}a_3 - a_1a_{12}a_{123} - a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 + 1 \\ s_2 &= a_{123}a_3 - a_1a_2 - a_{12}a_2a_3 - a_{12}a_{123}a_2 + a_1a_{12}a_3 + a_1a_{12}a_{123} - a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 + 1 \\ s_{12} &= a_{123}a_3 + a_1a_2 - a_{12}a_2a_3 - a_{12}a_{123}a_2 - a_1a_{12}a_3 - a_1a_{12}a_{123} + a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 + 1 \\ s_3 &= -a_{123}a_3 + a_1a_2 - a_{12}a_2a_3 + a_{12}a_{123}a_2 - a_1a_{12}a_3 + a_1a_{12}a_{123} - a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 + 1 \\ s_{123} &= -a_{123}a_3 + a_1a_2 + a_{12}a_2a_3 - a_{12}a_{123}a_2 + a_1a_{12}a_3 - a_1a_{12}a_{123} - a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 + 1 \end{aligned}$$

To show that the mapping $(q_1, q_2, q_{12}, q_3, q_{123}) \mapsto (s_1, s_2, s_{12}, s_3, s_{123})$ is indeed one to one, it suffices to show the following: For any assignment in the interval $(0, 1]$ of the ten variables

satisfying $(a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}), (a'_1, a'_2, a'_{12}, a'_3, a'_{123})$, if

$$\begin{aligned} s_1(a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}) &= s_1(a'_1, a'_2, a'_{12}, a'_3, a'_{123}), \\ s_2(a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}) &= s_2(a'_1, a'_2, a'_{12}, a'_3, a'_{123}), \\ s_{12}(a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}) &= s_{12}(a'_1, a'_2, a'_{12}, a'_3, a'_{123}), \\ s_3(a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}) &= s_3(a'_1, a'_2, a'_{12}, a'_3, a'_{123}), \\ s_{123}(a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}) &= s_{123}(a'_1, a'_2, a'_{12}, a'_3, a'_{123}), \end{aligned}$$

then we have $(a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}) = (a'_1, a'_2, a'_{12}, a'_3, a'_{123})$. As the mapping from $(q_1, q_2, q_{12}, q_3, q_{123})$ to $(a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123})$ is clearly one to one, this will establish the desired uniqueness.

To simplify the polynomial system, we first preprocess it by computing a few linear combinations of the s_α (we remark that the preprocessing leads to a substantial saving subsequently).

$$\begin{aligned} (s_1 + s_2)/2 &= -a_1 a_{123} a_2 a_3 - a_1 a_2 + a_{123} a_3 + 1 \\ (s_1 - s_3)/2 &= -a_1 a_{12} a_{123} + a_{12} a_2 a_3 - a_1 a_2 + a_{123} a_3 \\ (s_2 + s_{12})/2 &= -a_{12} a_{123} a_2 - a_{12} a_2 a_3 + a_{123} a_3 + 1 \\ (s_1 + s_2 + s_3 + s_{123})/4 &= -a_1 a_{123} a_2 a_3 + 1 \end{aligned}$$

These equalities give rise to the following set of five polynomial equations in ten variables.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(eq1)} \quad & a_{123} a_3 - a_1 a_2 + a_{12} a_2 a_3 + a_{12} a_{123} a_2 - a_1 a_{12} a_3 - a_1 a_{12} a_{123} - a_1 a_{123} a_2 a_3 \\ & = a'_{123} a'_3 - a'_1 a'_2 + a'_{12} a'_2 a'_3 + a'_{12} a'_{123} a'_2 - a'_1 a'_{12} a'_3 - a'_1 a'_{12} a'_{123} - a'_1 a'_{123} a'_2 a'_3 \\ \text{(eq2)} \quad & -a_1 a_{123} a_2 a_3 - a_1 a_2 + a_{123} a_3 = -a'_1 a'_{123} a'_2 a'_3 - a'_1 a'_2 + a'_{123} a'_3 \\ \text{(eq3)} \quad & -a_1 a_{12} a_{123} + a_{12} a_2 a_3 - a_1 a_2 + a_{123} a_3 = -a'_1 a'_{12} a'_{123} + a'_{12} a'_2 a'_3 - a'_1 a'_2 + a'_{123} a'_3 \\ \text{(eq4)} \quad & -a_{12} a_{123} a_2 - a_{12} a_2 a_3 + a_{123} a_3 = -a'_{12} a'_{123} a'_2 - a'_{12} a'_2 a'_3 + a'_{123} a'_3 \\ \text{(eq5)} \quad & -a_1 a_{123} a_2 a_3 = -a'_1 a'_{123} a'_2 a'_3 \end{aligned}$$

Even after the simplification, this system is too involved to solve manually. However, it is amenable to being solved using symbolic computer algebra packages. Specifically, we employed the mathematical symbolic package Maple. We express the system as a system in 5 variables, $a'_1, a'_2, a'_{12}, a'_3, a'_{123}$, so Maple tries to solve for these, viewing $a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}$ as given.

```
> with(SolveTools):
```

```
> Sols := PolynomialSystem([eq1, eq2, eq3, eq4, eq5],
    {a1', a2', a12', a3', a123'}, domain = real):
```

Maple (version 17) produced 5 sets of solutions to this system. The first solution,

$$\{a'_1 = a_1, a'_{12} = a_{12}, a'_{123} = a_{123}, a'_2 = a_2, a'_3 = a_3\},$$

is exactly what we are looking for. Still, we have to show that the other four solutions are illegal, namely at least one of the variables is out of the interval $(0, 1]$.

The 2nd, 3rd, and 4th solutions are

$$\begin{aligned} \{a'_1 = a_1, a'_{12} = a_{12}, a'_{123} = -a_{123}, a'_2 = a_2, a'_3 = -a_3\}, \\ \{a'_1 = -a_1, a'_{12} = -a_{12}, a'_{123} = a_{123}, a'_2 = -a_2, a'_3 = a_3\}, \\ \{a'_1 = -a_1, a'_{12} = a_{12}, a'_{123} = -a_{123}, a'_2 = -a_2, a'_3 = -a_3\}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. It is clear that each of these solutions has at least one negative variable (given that all a_α are positive). The 5th solution, however, is more involved, and it is not

immediately clear if any of the individual variables is out of the interval $(0, 1]$ for all choices of $a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}$. Yet, we show that the product of two of the resulting variables is always negative:

> eval(a1'·a2', Sols[5]);

$$-a_{123}a_3$$

Namely the product of the values assigned to the two variables, $a'_1 a'_2$, equals $-a_{123}a_3$ ¹. This establishes the claim that only the first solution is legal. This means that, within our domain, for given $a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}$, there is only solution for the set of equations, and the solution is these $a_1, a_2, a_{12}, a_3, a_{123}$ themselves. So, for $0 \leq q_1, q_2, q_{12}, q_3, q_{123} < \infty$, the mapping $(q_1, q_2, q_{12}, q_3, q_{123}) \mapsto (s_1, s_2, s_{12}, s_3, s_{123})$ is indeed one to one, as desired. \square

4.3. The Resolved Tree: Explicit Solutions. The result in the previous subsection is *existential*. It says that for any $(s_1, s_2, s_{12}, s_3, s_{123})$ in the relevant range there is a unique $(q_1, q_2, q_{12}, q_3, q_{123})$, but provides no *explicit* method to produce the q_α . Here, we employ the Hadamard transform to derive quadratic invariants that enable such construction. The drawback of this approach is that the number of possible solutions is greater than 1, and can be up to 4. We know that only one will be in the relevant range, but a-priori do not know which one it is.

The Hadamard transformation $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{q}) = H^{-1} \exp(H\mathbf{q})$ is one-to-one, so it can also be expressed as a mapping from \mathbf{s} to \mathbf{q} . This allows us to express each q_α in terms of the 7 values $(s_1, s_2, s_{12}, s_3, s_{13}, s_{23}, s_{123})$ (s_\emptyset equals 1 minus the sum of these 7 s_α). For the tree T of Fig. 1, two splits are not realized by any edge of T and this corresponds to the identities $q_{13} = q_{23} = 0$. This gives rise to two invariants involving the 7 s_α . After some manipulation and simplification, we derive the following two invariants [1]:

$$0 = 1 - 2s_1 - 2s_2 - 2s_3 - 2s_{123} \\ - (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2 + 2s_{13} + 2s_{23})(-1 + 2s_3 + 2s_{13} + 2s_{23} + 2s_{123})$$

$$0 = (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_{12} + 2s_{13} + 2s_{123})(-1 + 2s_2 + 2s_{12} + 2s_3 + 2s_{13}) \\ - (-1 + 2s_2 + 2s_{12} + 2s_{23} + 2s_{123})(-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_{12} + 2s_3 + 2s_{23})$$

From the first equation, we get a quadratic equation for $x = s_{13} + s_{23}$,

$$0 = 1 - 2s_1 - 2s_2 - 2s_3 - 2s_{123} \\ - (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2 + 2x)(-1 + 2s_3 + 2s_{123} + 2x)$$

Once we obtain a solution for $x = s_{13} + s_{23}$, the second invariant can be rewritten as a quadratic equation in $y = s_{13} - s_{23}$, where all coefficients are known

$$0 = (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_{12} + 2s_{123} + x + y) \\ \cdot (-1 + 2s_2 + 2s_{12} + 2s_3 + x + y) \\ - (-1 + 2s_2 + 2s_{12} + 2s_{123} + x - y) \\ \cdot (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_{12} + 2s_3 + x - y) .$$

In summary, we have up to two solutions for $x = s_{13} + s_{23}$, and for each of them up to 2 solutions for $y = s_{13} - s_{23}$. Once s_{13}, s_{23} are determined, we find s_\emptyset using the invariant

$$s_\emptyset + s_1 + s_2 + s_{12} + s_3 + s_{13} + s_{23} + s_{123} = 1 .$$

¹The two components of this solution that establish the result above can be found in the appendix in full details.

4.4. The Star Tree on Four Leaves. The star tree is a special case of the resolved tree on four nodes, where the internal edge q_{12} is of length 0. However, the uniqueness result we have for the resolved tree does *not* directly imply a similar one for the star, as we obtained one fewer observed pattern probability. We want to show that in this case, the mapping $(q_1, q_2, q_3, q_{123}) \mapsto (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_{123})$ is one to one. While this does not directly follow from the previous result, a similar algebraic approach does work here as well.

$$\begin{aligned} s_1 &= a_{123}a_3 - a_1a_2 + a_2a_3 + a_{123}a_2 - a_1a_3 - a_1a_{123} - a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 + 1 \\ s_2 &= a_{123}a_3 - a_1a_2 - a_2a_3 - a_{123}a_2 + a_1a_3 + a_1a_{123} - a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 + 1 \\ s_3 &= -a_{123}a_3 + a_1a_2 - a_2a_3 + a_{123}a_2 - a_1a_3 + a_1a_{123} - a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 + 1 \\ s_{123} &= -a_{123}a_3 + a_1a_2 + a_2a_3 - a_{123}a_2 + a_1a_3 - a_1a_{123} - a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 + 1 \end{aligned}$$

Again, we preprocess the system by computing a few linear combinations of the s_α .

$$\begin{aligned} (s_1 + s_2)/2 &= -a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 - a_1a_2 + a_{123}a_3 + 1 \\ (s_1 + s_3)/2 &= -a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 - a_1a_3 + a_{123}a_2 + 1 \\ (s_1 + s_2 + s_3 + s_{123})/4 &= -a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 + 1 \end{aligned}$$

The resulting system of four polynomial equations (of degree 4 though, as before) is now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(eq1)} \quad & a_{123}a_3 - a_1a_2 + a_2a_3 + a_{123}a_2 - a_1a_3 - a_1a_{123} - a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 \\ & = a'_{123}a'_3 - a'_1a'_2 + a'_2a'_3 + a'_{123}a'_2 - a'_1a'_3 - a'_1a'_{123} - a'_1a'_{123}a'_2a'_3 \\ \text{(eq2)} \quad & -a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 - a_1a_2 + a_{123}a_3 = -a'_1a'_{123}a'_2a'_3 - a'_1a'_2 + a'_{123}a'_3 \\ \text{(eq3)} \quad & -a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 - a_1a_3 + a_{123}a_2 = -a'_1a'_{123}a'_2a'_3 - a'_1a'_3 + a'_{123}a'_2 \\ \text{(eq4)} \quad & -a_1a_{123}a_2a_3 = -a'_1a'_{123}a'_2a'_3 \end{aligned}$$

> with(SolveTools):

> Sols := PolynomialSystem({eq1, eq2, eq3, eq4},
{a1', a2', a3', a123'}, domain = real):

Maple (version 17) produced 12 sets of solutions to this system. Again, the first solution,

$$\{a'_1 = a_1, a'_{123} = a_{123}, a'_2 = a_2, a'_3 = a_3\},$$

is exactly what we are looking for. For the other sets of solutions, each either has a variable assigned to a negative value, *e.g.*

> eval(a3', Sols[2]);

$$-a_3$$

or it is a root of a quadratic equation, *e.g.*

> eval(a3', Sols[6]);

$$\text{RootOf}(a_1z^2 + a_{123}a_2a_3),$$

namely the solution of $a_1z^2 + a_{123}a_2a_3 = 0$, which is not a real number. Therefore, all other solutions are illegal (not in the $(0,1]$ interval). \square

4.5. The Star Tree: Explicit Solutions. In case of the star tree on $m = 4$ leaves, only the four edges with pendant leaves, q_1, q_2, q_3, q_{123} , could have non-zero lengths. The splits corresponding to internal edges are not present and in this tree and this leads to the identities: $q_1, q_2, q_3 = 0$. Expressing these edges in terms of \mathbf{s} , slightly manipulating and simplifying the expressions, we get the following three quadratic invariants:

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2 + 2s_3 + 2s_{123}) \\ & = (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_{12} + 2s_{13} + 2s_{123}) \cdot (-1 + 2s_2 + 2s_{12} + 2s_3 + 2s_{13}) . \end{aligned}$$

$$(2) \quad (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2 + 2s_3 + 2s_{123}) \\ = (-1 + 2s_2 + 2s_{12} + 2s_{23} + 2s_{123}) \cdot (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_{12} + 2s_3 + 2s_{23}) .$$

$$(3) \quad (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2 + 2s_3 + 2s_{123}) \\ = (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2 + 2s_{13} + 2s_{23}) \cdot (-1 + 2s_3 + 2s_{13} + 2s_{23} + 2s_{123}) .$$

Let $x = s_{12} + s_{13}$, $y = s_{12} + s_{23}$, and $z = s_{13} + s_{23}$. Note that $x + y + z = 2s_{12} + 2s_{13} + 2s_{23}$. The three equations (1)–(3) become three quadratic equations, each in one of these variables, which can therefore be solved separately. Recall that s_1, s_2, s_3, s_{123} are known.

$$(1) \quad (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2 + 2s_3 + 2s_{123}) \\ = (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_{123} + 2x) \cdot (-1 + 2s_2 + 2s_3 + 2x) .$$

$$(2) \quad (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2 + 2s_3 + 2s_{123}) \\ = (-1 + 2s_2 + 2s_{123} + 2y) \cdot (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_3 + 2y) .$$

$$(3) \quad (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2 + 2s_3 + 2s_{123}) \\ = (-1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2 + z) \cdot (-1 + 2s_3 + 2s_{123} + z) .$$

4.6. The star tree and the Inverse Function Theorem. Let T_m denote the star tree on m leaves. If p_i denotes the probability of a state change (0 to 1 or visa versa) on the edge incident with leaf i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, then the probability s_i of the obtaining the tree split pattern that separates leaf i from the other leaves (i.e. the probability that leaf i has a different state to all the other leaves) is given, in terms of p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 ($0 \leq p_i < 1/2$) by:

$$(3) \quad s_i = p_i \prod_{j \neq i} (1 - p_j) + (1 - p_i) \prod_{j \neq i} p_j .$$

This formula is easily verified by observing that there are two way to obtain the tree split that separates leaf i from the other leaves – either there is a change on the edge incident with leaf i , and no changes on any of the other edges (the first term), or there is no change on the leaf incident with leaf i but there are changes on all the other edges (the second term).

In the special case with $m = 4$, the 4-by-4 Jacobian matrix

$$\mathbf{J} = \left[\frac{\partial s_i}{\partial p_j} \right]_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4} .$$

Suppose \mathbf{J} is invertible (the determinant is non zero) in a certain domain, and the underlying functions (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4 in our case) are differentiable. Then by the multivariate inverse function theorem, these functions are locally invertible.

We used Maple to compute the Jacobian and its determinant. It turns out that the determinant can be expressed as a product of three simple multivariate polynomials:

$$\det(\mathbf{J}) = (2p_1 p_2 - p_1 + 1 - p_2 - p_3 + 2p_3 p_4 - p_4) \\ \cdot (2p_1 p_3 - p_1 + 1 - p_2 - p_3 + 2p_2 p_4 - p_4) \\ \cdot (2p_1 p_4 - p_1 + 1 - p_2 + 2p_2 p_3 - p_3 - p_4)$$

Each factor has a similar structure, and can be represented as follows:

$$(2p_1 p_2 - p_1 + 1 - p_2 - p_3 + 2p_3 p_4 - p_4) \\ = \frac{1}{2}(2p_1 - 1) \cdot (2p_2 - 1) + \frac{1}{2}(2p_3 - 1) \cdot (2p_4 - 1) .$$

It is clear that if all p_i are in the range $0 \leq p_i < 1/2$, then each factor is strictly positive, so the determinant is positive, as desired. So by the multivariate inverse function theorem, under these conditions, the functions are locally invertible for any neighborhood in the domain $0 \leq p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 < 1/2$. By contrast, the invertibility results in section 4.4 are global.

5. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

We have made the first steps towards settling the question of whether the probability distribution of tree splits suffices to determine the branch lengths in the 2-state symmetric model. We have shown that this holds in two cases:

- for any tree if the branch lengths are sufficiently short, and
- the branch lengths are strictly positive and the tree has at most four leaves.

We conjecture that invertibility holds for any phylogenetic tree (with any number of leaves) and across the space of all non-negative branch lengths, however a proof will require a different or modified approach. The algebraic approach may be extended to slightly larger numbers of taxa, but the underlying complexity of solving such systems of polynomial equations is quite prohibitive as the number of taxa grows. For the approach employing the inverse function theorem to be applicable, it will be required to show global, rather than just local, invertibility.

Note that a related but simpler question asks if any k linear combinations of the site pattern probabilities identifies the branch lengths. In this case, the answer is ‘yes’ for any number of leaves (and any tree) and this can be seen by combining three observations that apply for a wide range of substitution models (not just on two states): (i) the expected probability that any pair of i, j differ in state is a sum of certain pattern probabilities, (ii) this expected probability can be transformed to give the sum of the branch lengths between i and j in the tree [3], and (iii) k such (carefully selected) pairs of path distances suffice to recover the length of all the k edges [2].

Notice also that if instead of branch lengths we parameterize by the vector of probabilities of state changes on edges, $\mathbf{p} = [p_e]_{e \in E(T)}$ then for invertibility to hold in $[0, \eta']^{E(T)}$ it is necessary that $\eta' < \frac{1}{2}$. To see this, consider any phylogenetic tree for which one edge e has $p_e = x \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, while for all other edges $f \neq e$ we have $p_f = \frac{1}{2}$. Then for every edge of the tree, the tree split that corresponds to that edge has probability 2^{1-m} where m is the number of leaves of the tree. Since this distribution is invariant to variation in x we see that invertibility fails in this case. Thus the invertibility conjecture is more straightforward to state when phrased within the context of branch lengths than probabilities of state changes on edges.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was initiated while B.C. was on a sabbatical visit at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. M.S. thanks the Allan Wilson Centre for Molecular Ecology and Evolution for funding support. The work of B.C. was not supported by the ISF (Israeli Science Foundation) or any other funding agency.

REFERENCES

- [1] Chor, B, Hendy, M.D., Holland, B.R., and Penny, D. (2000), Multiple maxima of likelihood in phylogenetic trees: an analytic approach. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 17 (10), 1529-1541.
- [2] Dress, A.W.M., Huber, K.T. and Steel, M. (2012). ‘Lassoing’ a phylogenetic tree I: Basic properties, shellings, and covers. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 65(1): 77–105.
- [3] Felsenstein, J. (2004). *Inferring phylogenies*, Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Mass.
- [4] Hendy, M.D. and Penny D. (1989). A framework for the quantitative study of evolutionary trees. *Systematic Biology* 38 (4), 297–309.
- [5] Hendy, M. D., and Penny, D. (1993). Spectral analysis of phylogenetic data. *J. Classif.* 10:524.
- [6] Hendy, M. D., Penny, D., and Steel, M.A. (1994). Spectral analysis of phylogenetic data. *J. Classif.* 10:524.
- [7] MacWilliams, F. and Sloane, N. (1977). *The theory of error-correcting codes*. Amsterdam, North-Holland, Elsevier Science Publishers.
- [8] Neyman J. (1971). Molecular studies of evolution: a source of novel statistical problems. In: Gupta S.S, Yackel J, editors. *Statistical decision theory and related topics*. Academic Press; New York, NY. pp. 1–27.
- [9] Semple, C. and Steel, M. (2003). *Phylogenetics*, Oxford Univ. Press.

APPENDIX

Details of the 5th Solution for the Resolved Tree:

We obtained

$$\begin{aligned}
 a'_1 &= \text{RootOf} \left((a_1 a_2 - a_{12} a_{123} a_2 - a_{12} a_2 a_3 + a_{123} a_3) _Z^2 + a_1 a_{123} a_2 a_3 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - a_1 a_{12} a_{123}^2 a_3 - a_1 a_{12} a_3^2 a_{123} + a_{123}^2 a_3^2 \right) , \\
 a'_2 &= -a_{123} a_3 \text{RootOf}^{-1} \left((-a_{12} a_{123} a_2 - a_{12} a_2 a_3 + a_1 a_2 + a_{123} a_3) _Z^2 \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - a_1 a_{12} a_{123}^2 a_3 - a_1 a_{12} a_{123} a_3^2 + a_1 a_{123} a_2 a_3 + a_{123}^2 a_3^2 \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

where the root in both expressions correspond to the same value. Multiplying the two solutions, we conclude that $a'_1 a'_2 = -a_{123} a_3$.

An alternative approach. We present here an alternative strategy for deriving the quadratic invariants in the case of the resolved tree on 4 leaves. We use the five tree split probabilities to determine the probabilities of the remaining three patterns since, once we have all eight pattern probabilities, the branch lengths can be easily recovered. Such a strategy looks plausible since we have three equations involving the 8 split probabilities, the linear invariant $\sum_{\alpha} s_{\alpha} = 1$ together with two quadratic invariants of the form $p_1(\mathbf{s}) = 0$ and $p_2(\mathbf{s}) = 0$, which we describe shortly.

We can proceed as follows. Firstly, to find s_{\emptyset} let E be the event that leaf x_1 is in the same state as leaf x_2 , and let F be the event that leaf x_3 is in the same state as leaf x_4 . Under the symmetric 2-state model (or indeed any group-based model on any number of states [9]) E and F are independent, and so

$$p_1(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbb{P}(E \& F) - \mathbb{P}(E)\mathbb{P}(F) = 0.$$

Now, notice that E and F each occur for just four patterns, and these patterns are either tree splits or the pattern $\alpha = \emptyset$ (where all leaves are in the same state). Similarly $E \& F$ occurs for just two patterns, namely the tree split corresponding to the central edge, and $\alpha = \emptyset$. Thus the equation $p_1(\mathbf{s}) = 0$ provides a quadratic equation for s_{\emptyset} whose other terms involve just tree split probabilities. Thus s_{\emptyset} can then be expressed in terms of (just) the tree split probabilities [Minor technical point to check: a quadratic has two solutions - check only one of them is viable for $0 \leq p_e < 1/2$ - e.g. s_{\emptyset} must be greater than any tree split probability].

Specifically, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(E \& F) &= s_\emptyset + s_{12}, \\ \mathbb{P}(E) &= s_\emptyset + s_{12} + s_{123} + s_3 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(F) = s_\emptyset + s_{12} + s_1 + s_2.\end{aligned}$$

Thus if we set $a = s_{123} + s_3$, $b = s_1 + s_2$ (both of which are ‘known’ since they are sums of probabilities of trees splits) then we obtain the quadratic equation for $\theta := s_\emptyset + s_{12}$.

$$\theta = (\theta + a)(\theta + b).$$

Thus,

$$s_\emptyset = -s_{12} + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - a - b \pm \sqrt{(1 - a - b)^2 - 4ab} \right).$$

Once we have s_\emptyset we can calculate the probability of the sum s' of the two non-tree splits by the linear invariant $\sum_\alpha s_\alpha = 1$ to obtain:

$$s' = 1 - S - s_\emptyset,$$

where $S = s_1 + s_2 + s_3 + s_{123} + s_{12}$ is the sum of the five tree splits.

Let $x = s_{13}$. Then $s_{23} = s' - x$, and provided we can calculate x (using the tree splits, and the new values we have derived from them, namely s_\emptyset and s') then we are done.

To calculate x we consider a second quadratic invariant

$$(4) \quad p_2(\mathbf{s}) = (1 - 2p_{13})(1 - 2p_{24}) - (1 - 2p_{14})(1 - 2p_{23}) = 0,$$

where p_{ij} is the sum of the pattern probabilities for which leaf x_i is in a different state to leaf x_j .

The justification of Eqn. 4 follows immediately from observing that $(1 - 2p_{ij}) = \exp(-q_{ij})$ where q_{ij} is the sum of the (additive) edge lengths on the path connecting the leaves i and j in T .

Notice that x contributes to each term in Eqn. (4) in the first product for $p_2(\mathbf{s})$ via $s_{23} = s' - x$ and it appears directly in both terms of the second product in $p_2(\mathbf{s})$ and so $p_2(\mathbf{s}) = 0$ gives us a quadratic equation for x in terms of quantities that are either known (the tree split probabilities) or have been determined (s_α and s').

Specifically, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}p_{13} &= s_1 + s_3 + s_{12} + s_{23}; \quad p_{24} = s_2 + s_{12} + s_{23} + s_{123}; \\ p_{14} &= s_{12} + s_{13} + s_{123} + s_1; \quad p_{23} = s_2 + s_3 + s_{12} + s_{13}.\end{aligned}$$

So if we write Eqn. (4) as:

$$p_{13} + p_{24} - p_{14} - p_{23} = 2(p_{13}p_{24} - p_{14}p_{23})$$

and since the left-hand side is $2(s_{23} - s_{13})$ we obtain:

$$s' - 2x = p_{13}p_{24} - p_{14}p_{23}.$$

where each term on the right-hand side of this equation also involves x linearly (and so we obtain a quadratic equation for x).