

# Finding a perfect phylogeny from mixed tumor samples<sup>\*</sup>

Ademir Hujdurović<sup>1,2</sup>, Urša Kačar<sup>2</sup>, Martin Milanič<sup>1,2</sup>, Bernard Ries<sup>3,4</sup>, and Alexandru I. Tomescu<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Primorska, UP IAM, Koper, Slovenia  
{ademir.hujdurovic,martin.milanic}@upr.si

<sup>2</sup> University of Primorska, UP FAMNIT, Koper, Slovenia  
ursa.kacar@student.upr.si

<sup>3</sup> PSL, Université Paris-Dauphine, France  
bernard.ries@dauphine.fr

<sup>4</sup> CNRS, LAMSADE UMR 7243

<sup>5</sup> Helsinki Institute for Information Technology HIIT,  
Department of Computer Science, University of Helsinki, Finland  
tomescu@cs.helsinki.fi

**Abstract.** Recently, Hajirasouliha and Raphael (WABI 2014) proposed a model for deconvoluting mixed tumor samples measured from a collection of high-throughput sequencing reads. This is related to understanding tumor evolution and critical cancer mutations. In short, their formulation asks to split each row of a binary matrix so that the resulting matrix corresponds to a perfect phylogeny and has the minimum number of rows among all matrices with this property. In this paper we disprove several claims about this problem, including an NP-hardness proof of it. However, we show that the problem is indeed NP-hard, by providing a different proof. We also prove NP-completeness of a variant of this problem proposed in the same paper. On the positive side, we obtain a polynomial time algorithm for matrix instances in which no column is contained in both columns of a pair of conflicting columns.

## 1 Introduction

Tumor progression is assumed to follow a phylogenetic evolution in which each tumor cell passes its somatic mutations to its daughter cells as it divides, with new mutations being accumulated over time. It is important to discover what tumor types are present in the sample, at what evolutionary stage the tumor is in, or what are the “founder” mutations of the tumor, mutations that trigger an uncontrollable growth of the tumor. These can lead to better understanding of cancer [2, 17], better diagnosis, and more targeted therapies [16].

DNA sequencing is one method for discovering the somatic mutations present in each tumor sample. The most accurate possible observation would come from sampling and sequencing every single cell. However, because of single-cell sequencing limitations, and the sheer number of tumor cells, one usually samples populations of cells. Even though the samples are taken spatially and morphologically apart, they can still contain millions of different cancer cells. Moreover, this mixing is not consistent across different collections of samples. Therefore, studying only these mixed samples poses a serious challenge to understanding tumors, their evolution, or their founding mutations.

Solutions for overcoming this limitation can come from a computational approach, as one could deconvolute each sample by exploiting some properties of the tumor progression. One common assumption is that all mutations in the parent cells are passed to the descendants. Another one, called the “infinite sites assumption”, postulates that once a mutation occurs at a particular site, it does not occur again at that site. These two assumptions give rise to the so-called *perfect phylogeny* evolutionary model. Hajirasouliha and Raphael proposed in [8] a model for deconvoluting each sample into a set of tumor types so that the *multi-set* of all resulting tumor types forms a perfect phylogeny, and is minimum with this property. Even

---

<sup>\*</sup> This work was supported in part by the Slovenian Research Agency (I0-0035, research program P1-0285, research projects N1-0032, J1-5433, J1-6720, and J1-6743), by the bilateral project BI-FR/15–16–PROTEUS–003, and by the Academy of Finland, grant 274977.

though this model has some limitations, for example it assumes no errors, and only single nucleotide variant mutations, it is a fundamental problem whose understanding can lead to more practical extensions.

Other major approaches for deconvoluting tumor heterogeneity include methods based on somatic point mutations, such as PyClone [19], SciClone [15], PhyloSub [11], and methods based on somatic copy number alterations, such as THetA [18], TITAN [7] and MixClone [14].

In this paper we show that several claims from [8] about this problem are incorrect, including an NP-hardness proof of it. However, we show that the problem is indeed intractable, by providing a different proof. We also adapt this NP-completeness proof to a variant of the problem also proposed in [8] but whose complexity was left open. This problem asks to minimize the *set* (instead of multi-set) of all tumor types of the perfect phylogeny.

Moreover, we obtain a polynomial time algorithm for a collection of instances of the former problem, which can be biologically characterized as follows. Say that two mutations  $i$  and  $j$  are *exclusive* if  $i$  is present in a sample in which  $j$  is absent, and  $j$  is present in a sample in which  $i$  is absent. Observe that exclusive mutations cannot both be present in the same vertex of a perfect phylogeny. Thus, we say that a sample is a *mixture* at exclusive mutations  $i$  and  $j$  if both  $i$  and  $j$  are present in that sample. The instances for which we can solve the problem in polynomial time are such that for any two exclusive mutations  $i$  and  $j$ , no mutation is present only in the samples mixed at  $i$  and  $j$ .

*Paper outline.* In Section 2 we give all formal definitions and review the approach of [8]. In Section 3 we give a complete characterization of a class of graphs considered in [8]. The complexity results are presented in Section 4, and the above-mentioned polynomial time algorithm is given in Section 5. A preliminary version of this paper has been accepted for publication in the proceedings of WABI 2015.

## 2 Problem formulation

As mentioned in the introduction, we assume that we have a set of sequencing reads from each tumor sample, and that based on these reads we have discovered the sample variants with respect to a reference (e.g., by using a somatic mutation caller such as VarScan 2 [13]). This gives rise to an  $m \times n$  matrix  $M$  whose  $m$  rows are the different samples, and whose  $n$  columns are the genome loci where a mutation was observed with respect to the reference. The entries of  $M$  are either 0 or 1, with 0 indicating the absence of a mutation, and 1 indicating the presence of the mutation. We assume that the matrix has no row whose all entries are 0.

Under ideal conditions, e.g., each mutation was called without errors, and the samples do not contain reads from several leaves of the perfect phylogeny,  $M$  corresponds to a perfect phylogeny matrix. Such matrices are characterizable by a simple property, called *conflict-freeness*.

**Definition 1.** *Two columns  $i$  and  $j$  of a binary matrix  $M$  are said to be in conflict if there exist three rows  $r, r', r''$  of  $M$  such that  $M_{r,i} = M_{r,j} = 1$ ,  $M_{r',i} = M_{r',j} = 0$ , and  $M_{r'',i} = M_{r'',j} = 1$ . A binary matrix  $M$  is said to be conflict-free if no two columns of  $M$  are in conflict.*

It is well known that the rows of  $M$  are leaves of a perfect phylogenetic tree if and only if  $M$  is conflict-free (see [3, 6]). Moreover, if this is the case, then the corresponding phylogenetic tree can be retrieved from  $M$  in time linear in the size of  $M$  [5].

However, in practice, each tumor sample is a mixture of reads from several tumor types, and thus possibly  $M$  is not conflict-free. If we are not allowed to edit the entries of  $M$  as done e.g. by methods such as [21], [20], Hajirasouliha and Raphael proposed in [8] to turn  $M$  into a conflict-free matrix  $M'$  by splitting each row  $r$  of  $M$  into some rows  $r_1, \dots, r_k$  such that  $r$  is the bitwise OR of  $r_1, \dots, r_k$ ; that is, for every column  $c$ ,  $M_{r,c} = 1$  if and only if  $M_{r_i,c} = 1$  for at least one  $r_i$ . The rows  $r_1, \dots, r_k$  can be seen as the deconvolution of the mixed sample  $r$  into samples from single vertices of a perfect phylogeny. One can then build the perfect phylogeny corresponding to  $M'$  and carry further downstream analysis. Let us make this row split operation precise.

**Definition 2.** Given a binary matrix  $M \in \{0, 1\}^{m \times n}$  with rows labeled  $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m$ , we say that a binary matrix  $M' \in \{0, 1\}^{m' \times n}$  is a row split of  $M$  if there exists a partition of the set of rows of  $M'$  into  $m$  sets  $R'_1, R'_2, \dots, R'_m$  such that for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ ,  $r_i$  is the bitwise OR of the binary vectors given by the rows of  $R'_i$ . The set  $R'_i$  of rows of  $M'$  is said to be a set of split rows of row  $r_i$ .

Observe that a simple strategy for obtaining a conflict-free row split of  $M$  is to split every row  $r$  into as many rows as there are 1s in  $r$ , with a single 1 per row. While this might be an informative solution for some instances (cf. also Corollary 2 on p. 11), Hajirasouliha and Raphael proposed in [8] as criterion for obtaining a meaningful conflict-free row split  $M'$  the requirement that the number of rows of  $M'$  is minimum among all conflict-free row splits of  $M$ .

In this paper we consider the following problem, which we call MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem. For a binary matrix  $M$ , we denote by  $\bar{\gamma}(M)$  the minimum number of rows in a conflict-free row split  $M'$  of  $M$ . This notation is in line with notation  $\gamma(M)$  used in [8] to denote the minimum number of *additional* rows in a conflict-free row split  $M'$  of  $M$ , that is,  $\gamma(M) = \bar{\gamma}(M) - m$ , where  $m$  is the number of rows of  $M$ .

MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT:

**Input:** Binary matrix  $M$ , an integer  $k$ .

**Question:** Is it true that  $\bar{\gamma}(M) \leq k$ ?

The optimization version of the above problem (in which only a given subset of rows needs to be split) was called the Minimum-Split-Row problem in [8], however, all results from [8] deal with the variant of the problem in which all rows need to be split (some perhaps trivially by setting  $R'_i = \{r_i\}$ ), which is equivalent to the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem.

Given a binary matrix  $M$  and a row  $r$  of  $M$ , the *conflict graph* of  $(M, r)$  is the graph  $G_{M,r}$  defined as follows: with each entry 1 in  $r$ , we associate a vertex in  $G_{M,r}$ , and two vertices in  $G_{M,r}$  are connected by an edge if and only if their corresponding columns in  $M$  are in conflict. Denoting by  $\chi(G)$  the chromatic number of a graph  $G$ , Hajirasouliha and Raphael proved in [8] the following lower bound on the value of  $\bar{\gamma}(M)$ :

**Lemma 1.** [8] Let  $M$  be a binary matrix  $M$  with a conflict-free row split  $M'$ . Then, for every row  $r_i$  of  $M$  with a set  $R'_i$  of split rows of  $M'$ , we have  $|R'_i| \geq \chi(G_{M,r_i})$ .

**Corollary 1.** For every binary matrix  $M$ , we have  $\bar{\gamma}(M) \geq \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$ .

Hajirasouliha and Raphael also claimed in [8] the following hardness result.

**Theorem 1.** [8] The MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem is NP-hard.

To recall their approach for proving Theorem 1, we need one more definition. We denote the fact that two graphs  $G$  and  $H$  are isomorphic by  $G \cong H$ .

**Definition 3.** A graph  $G$  is a row-conflict graph if there exists a binary matrix  $M$  and a row  $r$  of  $M$  such that  $G \cong G_{M,r}$ .

The proof of Theorem 1 was based on a reduction from the chromatic number problem in graphs and relied on three ingredients: the lower bound given by Corollary 1, Theorem 4 from [8] stating that every graph is a row-conflict graph, and an algorithm based on graph coloring, also proposed in [8], for optimally solving the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem by constructing a conflict-free row split of  $M$  with exactly  $\sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$  rows. In particular, their results would imply that the lower bound on  $\bar{\gamma}(M)$  given by Corollary 1 is always attained with equality.

Contrary to what was claimed in [8], we show that there exist graphs that are not row-conflict graphs. In fact, we give a complete characterization of row-conflict graphs, showing that a graph is a row-conflict graph

if and only if its complement is transitively orientable (see ??). Using a reduction from 3-edge-colorability of cubic graphs, we show that it is NP-complete to test whether a given binary matrix  $M$  has a conflict-free row split  $M'$  with a number of rows achieving the lower bound given by Corollary 1 (see ??). This implies that there exist infinitely many matrices for which this bound is not achieved.

A corollary of our characterization of row-conflict graphs is that the chromatic number is polynomially computable for this class of graphs. This fact with the assumption that  $P \neq NP$ , as well as the existence of matrices  $M$  with  $\bar{\gamma}(M) > \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$ , each individually imply that the claimed NP-hardness proof of the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem given in [8] is flawed. Nevertheless, our NP-completeness proof (see Theorem 3) implies that Theorem 1 is correct.

On the positive side, we give a polynomial time algorithm for the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem on input matrices  $M$  in which no column is contained in both columns of a pair of conflicting columns (see Theorem 5).

We also consider a variant of the problem, also proposed in [8], in which we are only interested in minimizing the number of *distinct* rows in a conflict-free row split of  $M$ . This problem is similar to the Minimum Perfect Phylogeny Haplotyping problem [1], in which we need to explain a set of genotypes with a minimum number of haplotypes admitting a perfect phylogeny. For a binary matrix  $M$ , we denote by  $\bar{\eta}(M)$  the minimum number of *distinct* rows in a conflict-free row split  $M'$  of  $M$ . We establish NP-completeness of the following problem (see Theorem 4), which was left open in [8].

MINIMUM DISTINCT CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT:

**Input:** Binary matrix  $M$ , an integer  $k$ .

**Question:** Is it true that  $\bar{\eta}(M) \leq k$ ?

### 3 A characterization of row-conflict graphs

**Definition 4.** Given a binary matrix  $M$  and two columns  $i$  and  $j$  of  $M$ , column  $i$  is said to be contained in column  $j$  if  $M_{k,i} \leq M_{k,j}$  holds for every  $k$ . The undirected containment graph  $H_M$  is the undirected graph whose vertices correspond to the columns of  $M$  and in which two vertices  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $i \neq j$ , are adjacent if and only if the column corresponding to vertex  $i$  is contained in the column corresponding to vertex  $j$  or vice-versa.

Recall that an *orientation* of an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  is a directed graph  $D = (V, A)$  such that for every edge  $uv \in E$ , either  $(u, v) \in A$  or  $(v, u) \in A$ , but not both. An orientation is said to be *transitive* if the presence of the directed edges  $(u, v)$  and  $(v, w)$  implies the presence of the directed edge  $(u, w)$ . A graph is said to be *transitively orientable* if it has a transitive orientation. The *complement* of a graph  $G$  is a graph  $\bar{G}$  with the same vertex set as  $G$  in which two distinct vertices are adjacent if and only if they are non-adjacent in  $G$ . Transitively orientable graphs appeared in the literature under the name of *comparability graphs* (and their complements under the name of *co-comparability graphs*). Transitively orientable graphs and their complements form a subclass of the well known class of perfect graphs [4]. Therefore, odd cycles of length at least 5 and their complements are examples of graphs that are not transitively orientable.

**Observation 1.** For every binary matrix  $M$ , the graph  $H_M$  is transitively orientable.

*Proof.* We say that column  $i$  is *properly contained* in column  $j$  if  $i$  is contained in  $j$  and  $M_{k,i} < M_{k,j}$  for some  $k$ . Fix an ordering  $\{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$  of the columns of  $M$ . Let us define a binary relation  $\sqsubset$  on the set of columns on  $M$  by setting, for every two columns  $c_i$  and  $c_j$  of  $M$ ,  $c_i \sqsubset c_j$  if and only if either  $c_i$  is properly contained in  $c_j$ , or  $i < j$  and each of  $c_i$  and  $c_j$  is contained in the other one (that is, as binary vectors they are the same). Observe that for a pair of columns  $c_i$  and  $c_j$  with  $c_i c_j \in E(H_M)$  we have either  $c_i \sqsubset c_j$  or  $c_j \sqsubset c_i$  but not both. The binary relation  $\sqsubset$  defines an orientation of  $H_M$ , by orienting each edge  $c_i c_j$  as going from  $c_i$  to  $c_j$  if and only if  $c_i \sqsubset c_j$ . This orientation can be easily verified to be transitive.  $\square$

In the next theorem, we characterize row-conflict graphs (cf. Definition 3).

**Theorem 2.** *A graph  $G$  is a row-conflict graph if and only if  $\overline{G}$  is transitively orientable.*

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Let  $M$  be an arbitrary binary matrix,  $r$  an arbitrary row of  $M$ , and let  $G = G_{M,r}$ . Let  $N$  be the submatrix of  $M$  consisting of the columns of  $M$  that have 1 in row  $r$ . It is now easy to see that  $G_{M,r} \cong G_{N,r}$ . Moreover, any two columns of  $N$  are either in conflict or their corresponding vertices are adjacent in  $H_N$ . Therefore,  $H_N \cong \overline{G_{N,r}}$ . Since  $H_N$  is transitively orientable (by Observation 1), it follows that  $\overline{G}$  is transitively orientable as well.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) We follow the strategy of the proof of Theorem 4 in [8] (which works for complements of transitively orientable graphs). For the sake of completeness, we include here a short proof of this implication. Let  $G$  be a graph such that  $H = \overline{G}$  is transitively orientable, with a transitive orientation  $\overrightarrow{H}$ . It can be easily seen that  $\overrightarrow{H}$  is acyclic, thus we may assume that vertices of  $G$  are topologically ordered as  $V(G) = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ , that is, for every directed edge  $(v_i, v_j)$  in  $\overrightarrow{H}$ , we have  $i < j$ . Let  $E(G) = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_m\}$ . We construct a matrix  $M$  with  $n$  columns and  $2m + 1$  rows, such that  $G_{M,1} \cong G$ . The first row of  $M$  is defined to have all entries equal to 1. For every edge  $e_k = v_i v_j$ ,  $i < j$ , of  $G$ , the  $2k$ -th row of  $M$  has entry 0 in the column corresponding to vertex  $v_i$ , and entry 1 in the column corresponding to  $v_j$ . Additionally, the  $(2k + 1)$ -st row of  $M$  has entry 1 in the column corresponding to vertex  $v_i$ , and entry 0 in the column corresponding to  $v_j$ . Since the first row has all entries equal to 1, after filling in these entries of  $M$ , the two columns corresponding to  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , respectively, are in conflict.

We need to fill in the remaining entries of  $M$  so that we do not introduce any new conflicts. For every  $i$ , we fill in the remaining entries so that whenever  $(v_i, v_j)$  is a directed edge in  $\overrightarrow{H}$ , the column corresponding to the vertex  $v_i$  is contained in the column corresponding to the vertex  $v_j$ . This can be achieved by examining the columns one by one, following the topological order  $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$  of  $\overrightarrow{H}$ , and filling each unfilled entry with a 0, unless this would violate the above containment principle.

At the end of this procedure, there are no conflicts between columns corresponding to vertices  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ , whenever  $(v_i, v_j)$  is a directed edge in  $\overrightarrow{H}$ . Therefore,  $G_{M,1} \cong G$ .  $\square$

Theorem 2 implies that odd cycles of length at least 5 and their complements are not row-conflict graphs. The reader not familiar with transitively orientable graphs might find it useful to verify that the cycle of length 5 cannot be transitively oriented.

## 4 Complexity results

**Theorem 3.** *The following two problems are NP-complete:*

- The MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem.
- Given a binary matrix  $M$ , is it true that  $\overline{\chi}(M) = \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$ ?

*Proof.* The MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem is in NP, since testing if a given binary matrix  $M'$  with at most  $k$  rows, equipped with a partition of its rows into  $m$  sets, satisfies the condition in the definition of a row split, as well as the conflict-freeness, can be done in polynomial time. To argue that the second problem is in NP, we proceed similarly as above, performing an additional test checking that the number of rows of  $M'$  equals  $\sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$ . (In this case, we will have  $\overline{\chi}(M) \leq \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$  and equality will follow from Corollary 1.) The value of  $\sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$  can be computed in polynomial time, since each graph  $G_{M,r}$  is the complement of a transitively orientable graph (by Theorem 2), and the chromatic number of complements of transitively orientable graphs can be computed in polynomial time (see, e.g., [4]).

We prove hardness of both problems at once, making a reduction from the following NP-complete problem [9]: Given a simple cubic graph  $G = (V, E)$ , is  $G$  3-edge-colorable? (A graph is *cubic*, or *3-regular*, if every vertex is incident with precisely three edges. A *matching* in a graph is a set of pairwise disjoint edges. A graph is *3-edge-colorable* if its edge set can be partitioned into 3 matchings.)

Given a simple cubic graph  $G = (V, E)$ , we construct an instance  $(M, k)$  of the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem as follows:

–  $M$  is a  $(|V| + 3) \times (|E| + 3)$  binary matrix, with rows indexed by  $V \cup \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$ , columns indexed by  $E \cup \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ , and entries defined as follows (see Fig. 1 for an example):


- For every row indexed by a vertex  $v \in V$  and every column indexed by an edge  $e$ , we have

$$M_{v,e} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } v \text{ is an endpoint of } e; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- For every row indexed by a vertex  $v \in V$  and every column indexed by some  $c \in \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ , we have  $M_{v,c} = 1$ .
- For every row indexed by some  $r \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$  and every column indexed by an edge  $e \in E$ , we have  $M_{r,e} = 0$ .
- For every row indexed by some  $r_i \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$  and every column indexed by some  $c_j \in \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ , we have

$$M_{r_i,c_j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

–  $k = 3|V| + 3$ .



**Fig. 1.** An example construction of  $(M, k)$  from  $G$ .

Note that for each row indexed by a vertex  $v \in V$ , the graph  $G_{M,v}$  is isomorphic to the disjoint union of two complete graphs with three vertices each, hence  $\chi(G_{M,v}) = 3$ . For each row indexed by some  $r \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$ , the graph  $G_{M,r}$  consists in a single vertex, thus  $\chi(G_{M,r}) = 1$ . It follows that  $k = \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$  and therefore  $M$  is a yes instance to the second problem (“Given a binary matrix  $M$ , is  $\bar{\gamma}(M) = \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$ ?”) if and only if  $(M, k)$  is a yes instance for the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem. Hardness of both problems will therefore follow from the following claim, which we prove next:  *$G$  is 3-edge-colorable if and only if  $\bar{\gamma}(M) \leq k$ .*

Suppose first that  $G$  is 3-edge-colorable, and let  $E = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$  be a partition of  $E$  into 3 matchings. We obtain a row split  $M'$  of  $M$  by replacing each row of  $M$  indexed by a vertex  $v \in V$  with three rows and keeping each row of  $M$  indexed by some  $r \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$  unchanged. Clearly, this will result in a matrix with  $k$  rows. For every  $v \in V$ , we replace the row of  $M$  indexed by  $v$  as follows. Vertex  $v$  is incident with precisely three edges in  $G$ , say  $e_1, e_2, e_3$ . Since  $E_1, E_2, E_3$  are matchings partitioning  $E$ , we may assume, without loss of generality, that  $e_i \in E_i$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . The three rows replacing in  $M'$  the row of  $M$  indexed by  $v$  are indexed by  $v^1, v^2, v^3$  and defined as follows: for every  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  and every column  $c \in E \cup \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ , we have

$$M'_{v^i,c} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } c = e_i \text{ or } c = c_i; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By construction,  $M'$  is a row split of  $M$  with  $k$  rows. We claim that  $M'$  is conflict-free. No pair of columns indexed by two edges in  $E$  agree on value 1 in any row, hence they cannot be in conflict. The same holds for any pair of columns indexed by two elements of  $\{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ . Consider now two columns, one indexed by an edge  $e \in E$  and one indexed by  $c_i \in \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $e \in E_1$ .

There are only two rows in which the column indexed by  $e$  has value 1, namely the rows indexed by copies of the endpoints of  $e$ , say  $u^1$  and  $v^1$  (with  $u, v \in V$ ). The values of  $M'$  in column  $c_i$  at rows  $u^1$  and  $v^1$  are both 1 (if  $i = 1$ ), otherwise they are both 0. Consequently, the two columns cannot be in conflict. Since  $M'$  is a conflict-free row split of  $M$  with  $k$  rows, this establishes  $\bar{\gamma}(M) \leq k$ .

For the converse direction, let  $M'$  be a conflict-free row split of  $M$  with at most  $k$  rows. Let  $\{R'_i \mid i \in V'\}$  be a partition of the set of rows of  $M'$  into  $|V| + 3$  sets indexed by the set  $V' = V \cup \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$  such that for all  $i \in V'$ , the row of  $M$  indexed by  $i$  is the bitwise OR of the rows of  $R'_i$ . Since  $k$  is a lower bound on  $\bar{\gamma}(M)$ , matrix  $M'$  has exactly  $k$  rows. This fact and Corollary 1 imply that each row in  $M$  indexed by a vertex  $v \in V$  has  $|R'_v| = 3$  and each row indexed by some  $r \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$  has  $|R'_r| = 1$ .

We must have that for all  $i \in V'$ , the row of  $M$  indexed by  $i$  is the bitwise *sum* of the rows of  $R'_i$ , that is, for every column  $c \in E \cup \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ , we have  $M_{i,c} = \sum_{r \in R'_i} M'_{r,c}$ . Indeed, if for some  $i \in V'$  and some column  $c \in E \cup \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ , we have that  $\sum_{r \in R'_i} M'_{r,c} > 1$ , then  $i$  is a vertex of  $G$ . Furthermore, since  $|R'_i| = 3$ , there are either two edges of  $G$ , say  $e$  and  $f$ , incident with  $i$  such that for some  $r \in R'_i$ , we have  $M'_{r,e} = M'_{r,f} = 1$ , or there are two distinct elements  $e, f \in \{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$  with the same property. In the former case, considering the rows replacing the rows of  $M$  indexed by the endpoints of  $e$  and  $f$  other than  $i$ , respectively, we find two distinct rows  $r'$  and  $r''$  of  $M$  such that  $M'_{r',e} = M'_{r'',f} = 1$  and  $M'_{r'',e} = M'_{r',f} = 0$ , which contradicts the fact that  $M'$  is conflict-free. In the latter case, the argument is similar.

By permuting the rows of  $M'$  if necessary, we may assume that each set of the form  $R'_v$  is ordered as  $R'_v = \{v^1, v^2, v^3\}$  so that

$$M'_{v^i, c_j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We claim that for every edge  $e = uv \in E$  and every  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , we have that  $M'_{u^i, e} = M'_{v^i, e}$ . If this was not the case, then we would have  $M'_{u^i, e} = M'_{v^j, e} = 1$  for a distinct pair  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . But then the columns of  $M'$  indexed by  $e$  and  $c_i$  would both agree in value 1 in row indexed by  $u^i$  and disagree (in opposite directions) in rows indexed by  $v^j$  and  $v^i$ . Thus, they would be in conflict, contrary to the fact that  $M'$  is conflict-free.


Since for every edge  $e = uv \in E$  and every  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , we have that  $M'_{u^i, e} = M'_{v^i, e}$ , we can partition the edges of  $E$  into three pairwise disjoint sets  $E_1, E_2, E_3$  by placing every edge  $e = uv \in E$  into  $E_i$  if and only if  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  is the unique index such that  $M'_{u^i, e} = M'_{v^i, e} = 1$ . We claim that each  $E_i$  is a matching in  $G$ . This will imply that  $G$  is 3-edge-colorable and complete the proof. If some  $E_i$  is not a matching, then there exist two distinct edges, say  $e, f \in E_i$  with a common endpoint. Let  $e = xy$  and  $f = xz$ . The columns of  $M'$  indexed by  $e$  and  $f$  agree in value 1 at row indexed by  $x^i$ , while they disagree (in opposite directions) in rows indexed by  $y^i$  and  $z^i$ . Thus, they are in conflict, contrary to the conflict-freeness of  $M'$ .  $\square$

Hajirasouliha and Raphael proposed in [8] an algorithm based on graph coloring for optimally solving the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem by constructing a conflict-free row split of  $M$  with exactly  $\sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$  rows. Since there are infinitely many cubic graphs that are not 3-edge-colorable (see, e.g., [10]), the proof of Theorem 3 implies that there exist infinitely many matrices  $M$  such that  $\bar{\gamma}(M) > \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$ . On such instances, the algorithm from [8] will not produce a valid (that is, conflict-free) solution.

Since the smallest cubic 4-edge-chromatic graph is the Petersen graph, the smallest matrix  $M$  with  $\bar{\gamma}(M) > \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$  that can be obtained using the construction given in the proof of Theorem 3 is of order  $13 \times 18$ . A smaller matrix  $M$  for which the bound from Corollary 1 is not tight can be obtained by applying a similar construction starting from the complete graph of order 3 (which is a 2-regular 3-edge-chromatic graph):

$$M = \left( \begin{array}{ccc|ccc} 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ \hline 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & \\ \hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \end{array} \right).$$

We leave it as an exercise for the reader to verify that  $\sum_r \chi(G_{M,r}) = 8$  and  $\bar{\gamma}(M) \geq 9$  (in fact,  $\bar{\gamma}(M) = 9$ ). Let us also remark that in [12, Section 4.2.1] a binary matrix  $M$  is given with  $\bar{\gamma}(M) = \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r})$ , on which the algorithm from [8] fails to produce a conflict-free solution.



**Fig. 2.** An example construction of  $(\overline{M}, \overline{k})$  from  $G$ .

We conclude this section with another hardness result.

**Theorem 4.** *The MINIMUM DISTINCT CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem is NP-complete.*

*Proof.* Membership in NP of the MINIMUM DISTINCT CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem can be argued similarly as for the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem. It suffices to argue that there is a polynomially-sized conflict-free matrix  $M'$  such that  $M'$  is a row split of  $M$  with at most  $k$  distinct rows. We may assume that for a partition  $R'_1, \dots, R'_m$  of rows of  $M'$  into  $m$  sets satisfying the condition in the definition of a row split, the rows within each  $R'_i$  are pairwise distinct. Recall from e.g. [6] that a conflict-free matrix with  $d$  distinct rows and  $n$  columns corresponds to a perfect phylogenetic rooted tree  $T$  such that:  $T$  has  $d$  leaves (the rows of the matrix), all internal vertices of  $T$  are branching, and all edges from a vertex to its children are injectively labeled with a column of  $M$ , with the exception of at most one edge which is unlabeled. Thus  $T$  has at most  $2n$  edges, and we infer that  $d \leq 2n$ . Therefore, the total number of rows of  $M'$  does not exceed  $2nm$ , where  $m$  and  $n$  are the numbers of rows and columns of  $M$ , respectively.

The hardness proof is based on a slight modification of the reduction used in the proof of Theorem 3. (See Fig. 2 for an example.) Given a cubic graph  $G = (V, E)$ , we map it to  $(\overline{M}, \overline{k})$  where

- $\overline{M}$  is the binary matrix obtained from the binary matrix  $M$  described in the proof of Theorem 3 by adding to it three columns  $d_1, d_2, d_3$ , which on the rows indexed by  $V$  equal 0, and on the rows indexed by  $r_1, r_2, r_3$ , each  $d_i$  equals  $c_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ .
- $\overline{k} = |E| + 3$ .

We claim that  $(\overline{M}, \overline{k})$  is an instance of the MINIMUM DISTINCT CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem such that  $G$  is 3-edge-colorable if and only if  $\overline{\eta}(\overline{M}) \leq \overline{k}$ .

Suppose that  $G$  is 3-edge-colorable. Given a partition of  $E$  into three matchings  $E = E_1 \cup E_2 \cup E_3$ , we construct the same matrix  $M'$  as described in the proof of Theorem 3, to which we append the three columns indexed by  $d_1, d_2, d_3$  which are all 0s on the rows indexed by vertices, and which are the same as in  $\overline{M}$  on the rows  $r_1, r_2, r_3$ . By the same argument given in the proof of Theorem 3,  $M'$  is conflict-free. Each row  $r_i$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , is distinct from all other rows of  $M'$ . Let  $v^i$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , be a row corresponding to a vertex  $v$  and suppose  $M'_{v^i, e} = 1$ , where  $e = uv$  is one of the three edges incident to  $v$ , and  $e \in E_i$ . By construction, the only other row having a 1 in column  $e$  is  $u^i$ . Thus, row  $v^i$  is different from all other rows, except  $u^i$ . In fact, we can see that row  $v^i$  is identical to row  $u^i$ , since they have no other entry 1 on the columns indexed by edges. Additionally, they both have 1 in column  $c_i$ , since  $e \in E_i$ , and 0 in the other five columns in  $\{c_1, c_2, c_3, d_1, d_2, d_3\} \setminus \{c_i\}$ . Hence, the number of distinct rows of  $M'$  is at most  $3|V|/2 + 3 = |E| + 3 = \overline{k}$ , since  $G$  is cubic, and thus  $\overline{\eta}(\overline{M}) \leq \overline{k}$ .

For the converse direction, suppose that  $M'$  is a conflict-free row split of  $\overline{M}$  with at most  $\overline{k} = |E| + 3$  distinct rows. Let  $\{R'_i \mid i \in V'\}$  be a partition of the set of rows of  $M'$  into  $|V| + 3$  sets indexed by the set  $V' = V \cup \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$  such that for all  $i \in V'$ , the row of  $\overline{M}$  indexed by  $i$  is the bitwise OR of the rows of  $R'_i$ . We will prove that (1) the number of pairwise distinct rows in  $R'_v$  is 3 for all  $v \in V$ , and that (2) the number of pairwise distinct rows in  $R_r$  is 1 for all  $r \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$ . Apply the same approach as in the proof of Theorem 3 will then imply that  $G$  is 3-edge-colorable.



As argued in the proof of Theorem 3, no row in  $R'_v$  has two 1s on two columns indexed by two edges, say  $e$  and  $f$ , because each of  $e$  and  $f$  has an endpoint which is not an endpoint of the other edge (and thus a row with two 1s on two columns indexed by two edges would imply a conflict in  $M'$ ). Similarly, no row in  $R'_v$  has two 1s on two columns indexed by  $c_1, c_2, c_3$ .

Let us associate with each row of  $M'$  belonging to some  $R'_i$  with  $i \in V$  the edge column where it has a 1 (if there is any). Since each edge column contains a 1 and no row has two 1s on the columns indexed by edges, the number of pairwise distinct rows of  $M'$  indexed by a vertex is at least  $|E|$ . Since in each  $R'_{r_i}$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , we must have at least one row distinct from all other rows of  $M'$  (because of the 1s in columns  $d_1, d_2, d_3$ ), and  $M'$  has at most  $|E| + 3$  pairwise distinct rows, the number of distinct rows of  $M'$  is exactly  $|E| + 3$ . This directly implies (2), more precisely, that each  $R_r$  consists only of a row identical to the corresponding row of  $\overline{M}$ .

In order to prove property (1), suppose now that there is a row of  $\overline{M}$  indexed by a vertex  $v$  such that  $R'_v$  contains at least 4 pairwise distinct rows. Observe first that there is no row in  $R'_v$  having a 1 only in one column among  $\{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$  (and only 0s in the columns indexed by edges). Indeed, besides being distinct from the row in each  $R'_r$ ,  $r \in \{r_1, r_2, r_3\}$ , it would also be distinct from each of the set of at least  $|E|$  rows of  $M'$  having a 1 on a column indexed by an edge. Thus this would contradict the fact that  $M'$  has at most  $|E| + 3$  pairwise distinct rows. This implies that there are two distinct rows  $v'$  and  $v''$  in  $R'_v$  such that  $v'$  and  $v''$  both contain a 1 on the same column indexed by an edge, say  $e$ , but on a column among  $\{c_1, c_2, c_3\}$ , say  $c_i$ ,  $v'$  contains 1 and  $v''$  contains 0. This shows that there is a conflict in  $M'$ , since  $M'_{r_i, e} = 0$  and  $M'_{r_i, c_i} = 1$ , a contradiction.  $\square$

## 5 An algorithm for the case when no column is contained in both columns of a pair of conflicting columns

In this section we consider the binary matrices in which no column is contained in both columns of a pair of conflicting columns, and derive a polynomial time algorithm for the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem on such matrices. The main idea behind the algorithm is the fact that on such matrices the lower bound from Corollary 1 is achieved, and the bound can be expressed in terms of parameters of a set of derived digraphs, the so-called directed containment graph (see Definition 5 below).

Let  $M$  be a binary matrix such that no column of  $M$  is contained in two or more conflicting columns. If there are duplicated columns in  $M$ , then we form a new matrix where we take just one copy of the columns that are duplicated. Since an optimal solution of the reduced instance can be mapped to an optimal solution of the original instance (by duplicating the columns corresponding to the copies of the duplicated columns in  $M$  kept by the reduction), we may assume that there are no duplicated columns in  $M$ .


**Definition 5.** Given a binary matrix  $M$  with distinct columns  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  and a row  $r$  of  $M$ , the directed containment graph of  $(M, r)$  is the graph  $\vec{H}_{M,r}$  whose vertex set is the set of columns of  $M$  having a 1 in row  $r$ , in which there is a directed edge from  $c_i$  to  $c_j$  if and only if  $i \neq j$  and  $c_i$  is contained in  $c_j$ .

We will use the notation  $c_i \sqsubset_r c_j$  as a shorthand for the fact that  $(c_i, c_j)$  is a directed edge of  $\vec{H}_{M,r}$ . We say that  $c_i$  is a *source* of  $\vec{H}_{M,r}$  if  $c_i \in V(\vec{H}_{M,r})$  and there is no  $c_j$  with  $c_j \sqsubset_r c_i$ . Let  $\sigma(M, r)$  denote the number of sources in  $\vec{H}_{M,r}$ .

**Lemma 2.** *If there are no duplicated columns in  $M$ , then  $\sigma(M, r) \leq \chi(G_{M,r})$  holds for any row  $r$  of  $M$ .*

*Proof.* Observe that the underlying undirected graph of  $\vec{H}_{M,r}$  is equal to the complement of  $G_{M,r}$ . The set of all sources of  $\vec{H}_{M,r}$  forms an independent set in its underlying undirected graph. This set corresponds to a clique in  $G_{M,r}$ . Therefore  $\sigma(M, r) \leq \omega(G_{M,r}) \leq \chi(G_{M,r})$  (where  $\omega(G_{M,r})$  denotes the maximum size of a clique in  $G_{M,r}$ ).  $\square$

Our algorithm is the following one (see also Fig. 3 for an example).



**Fig. 3.** An example of a matrix  $M$  in which no column is contained in both columns of a pair of conflicting columns ( $c_1, c_2$  and  $c_3, c_4$  are conflicting). The rows  $r'_1, r'_2, r'_3$  constructed by the algorithm corresponding to row  $r$  of  $M$  are shown in the center. On the right, the directed containment graph of  $(M, r)$ .

**Input:** An  $m \times n$  binary matrix  $M$  with columns  $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n$ , without duplicated columns, and such that no column of  $M$  is contained in a pair of conflicting columns.

**Algorithm:**

Define the new matrix  $M'$  with columns  $c'_1, c'_2, \dots, c'_n$ ;

For each row  $r$  of  $M$ , add the rows  $r'_1, \dots, r'_{\sigma(M,r)}$  to  $M'$ , defined as:

let  $c_{r,1}, \dots, c_{r,\sigma(M,r)}$  denote the sources of  $\vec{H}_{M,r}$ ;

$$M'_{r'_i, c'_j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } c_{r,i} = c_j \text{ or } c_{r,i} \sqsubset_r c_j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases}$$

Return  $M'$ .

**Theorem 5.** For any  $m \times n$  binary matrix  $M$  such that no column of  $M$  is contained in a pair of conflicting columns, it holds that  $\bar{\gamma}(M) = \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r}) = \sum_r \sigma(M, r)$ . Moreover, a conflict-free row split  $M'$  of  $M$  with  $\bar{\gamma}(M)$  rows can be constructed in polynomial time.

*Proof.* As argued above, we may assume that  $M$  has no duplicated columns. We claim that the matrix  $M'$  produced by the above algorithm is a conflict-free row split of  $M$  with a number of rows equal to  $\bar{\gamma}(M)$ .

It is clear that  $M'$  is a row split of  $M$ . Let us prove that  $M'$  is conflict-free. Suppose the contrary, that is, let  $c'_i$  and  $c'_j$  be two columns of  $M'$  which are in conflict. Then, there exists a row  $r'_k$  of  $M'$  (obtained by splitting a row  $r$  of  $M$ ) which has 1 in columns  $c'_i$  and  $c'_j$ .

We will first show that  $c_i$  is contained in  $c_j$  or viceversa. Assume for a contradiction that this is not the case, and suppose first that  $c_{r,k} \notin \{c_i, c_j\}$ . Since  $r'_k$  has 1 in columns  $c'_i$  and  $c'_j$  it follows that  $c_{r,k} \sqsubset_r c_i$  and  $c_{r,k} \sqsubset_r c_j$ . This implies that column  $c_{r,k}$  is contained in both column  $c_i$  and column  $c_j$ . By the assumption on  $M$ ,  $c_i$  and  $c_j$  cannot be in conflict, hence, one of them is contained in the other one. This violates our first assumption, and thus  $c_{r,k} \in \{c_i, c_j\}$ . If  $c_{r,k} = c_i$  (resp.  $c_{r,k} = c_j$ ) then  $c_i \sqsubset_r c_j$  (resp.  $c_j \sqsubset_r c_i$ ) and therefore column  $c_i$  is contained in column  $c_j$  (resp.  $c_j$  is contained in  $c_i$ ).

Thus, we may assume without loss of generality that  $c_i$  is contained in  $c_j$ . Since  $c'_i$  and  $c'_j$  are in conflict it follows that there exists a row  $w'_\ell$  of  $M'$  which has 1 in column  $c'_i$  and 0 in column  $c'_j$ . This implies that the corresponding row  $w$  of  $M$  has 1 in column  $c_i$ , and consequently also in  $c_j$ , since  $c_i$  is contained in  $c_j$ . Therefore, both  $c_i$  and  $c_j$  are vertices of  $\vec{H}_{M,w}$ . If  $c_i = c_{w,\ell}$ , then  $w'_\ell$  has value 1 in column  $c'_j$  (since  $c_i$  is contained in  $c_j$ ), which contradicts the choice of  $w'_\ell$ . Thus,  $c_i \neq c_{w,\ell}$  and  $c_{w,\ell} \sqsubset_w c_i$ . However, since  $c_i$  is contained in  $c_j$  and  $\vec{H}_{M,w}$  is transitive, it follows that  $c_{w,\ell} \sqsubset_w c_j$ . This implies that row  $w'_\ell$  has value 1 in column  $c'_j$ , which again contradicts the choice of  $w'_\ell$ . This finally shows that  $M'$  is conflict-free.

Since the number of rows in  $M'$  is  $\sum_r \sigma(M, r)$  and  $M'$  is conflict free, we have  $\bar{\gamma}(M) \leq \sum_r \sigma(M, r)$ . By Corollary 1 and Lemma 2 we have  $\sum_r \sigma(M, r) \leq \sum_r \chi(G_{M,r}) \leq \bar{\gamma}(M)$ . This implies equality. Clearly, the algorithm can be implemented to run in polynomial time.  $\square$

Observe that when the input matrix satisfies the stronger property that no column is contained in another one, Theorem 5 implies that the naive solution obtained by splitting each row  $r$  into as many 1s as it contains always produces an optimal solution. This is true since all vertices of  $\vec{H}_{M,r}$  are sources. We obtain:

**Corollary 2.** *For any binary  $m \times n$  matrix  $M$  such that no column of  $M$  is contained in another one, it holds that  $\bar{\gamma}(M) = m'$ , where  $m'$  equals the number of 1s in  $M$ . Moreover, a conflict-free row split  $M'$  of  $M$  of size  $m' \times n$  can be constructed in time  $O(m'n)$ .*

## 6 Discussion

In this paper we gave a polynomial time algorithm for instances of the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem where no column is contained in both columns of a pair of conflicting columns. It remains to be verified if real instances satisfy this property. More general tractable instances could be found by inspecting further dependencies between column containment and conflictness. For example, it remains open whether the MINIMUM CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem is tractable on matrices in which no pair of conflicting columns is contained in both columns of a pair of conflicting columns. It is also interesting to identify polynomially solvable cases of the MINIMUM DISTINCT CONFLICT-FREE ROW SPLIT problem and to explore variations of the problems in which we are also allowed to edit the entries of the input matrix. Finally, observe that in [8] it was assumed that the matrices have no duplicated columns, which was not necessary in this paper.

**Note added in proof.** After the final version of this paper was due, it has come to the authors' knowledge that Hajirasouliha and Raphael mentioned during their WABI 2014 talk that their claim about every graph being a row-conflict graph (Theorem 4 in [8]) contained a flaw and proposed a correction stating that for every binary matrix  $M$  with with an all-zeros row and an all-ones row, the complement of  $G_{M,r}$  (for any row  $r$  of  $M$ ) is transitively orientable (cf. Theorem 2 above).

## References

1. Bafna, V., et al.: A note on efficient computation of haplotypes via perfect phylogeny. *Journal of Computational Biology* **11**(5) (2004) 858–866
2. Campbell, P.J., et al.: Subclonal phylogenetic structures in cancer revealed by ultra-deep sequencing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105**(35) (2008) 13081–13086
3. Estabrook, G.F., et al.: An idealized concept of the true cladistic character. *Mathematical Biosciences* **23**(3-4) (1975) 263–272
4. Golumbic, M.C.: *Algorithmic Graph Theory and Perfect Graphs*. Second edn. Volume 57 of *Annals of Discrete Mathematics*. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam (2004)
5. Gusfield, D.: Efficient algorithms for inferring evolutionary trees. *Networks* **21**(1) (1991) 19–28
6. Gusfield, D.: *Algorithms on Strings, Trees and Sequences: Computer Science and Computational Biology*. Cambridge University Press (1997)
7. Ha, G., et al.: Titan: inference of copy number architectures in clonal cell populations from tumor whole-genome sequence data. *Genome Research* **24**(11) (2014) 1881–1893
8. Hajirasouliha, I., Raphael, B.J.: Reconstructing mutational history in multiply sampled tumors using perfect phylogeny mixtures. In: *Algorithms in Bioinformatics - 14th International Workshop, WABI 2014*. Volume 8701 of LNCS, Springer (2014) 354–367
9. Holyer, I.: The NP-completeness of edge-coloring. *SIAM J. Comput.* **10**(4) (1981) 718–720
10. Isaacs, R.: Infinite families of nontrivial trivalent graphs which are not Tait colorable. *Amer. Math. Monthly* **82** (1975) 221–239
11. Jiao, W., et al.: Inferring clonal evolution of tumors from single nucleotide somatic mutations. *BMC Bioinformatics* **15** (2014) 35
12. Kačar, U.: *Problemi popolne filogenije (Perfect Phylogeny Problems)*. Final project paper. University of Primorska, Faculty of Mathematics, Natural Sciences and Information Technologies, Koper, Slovenia, 2015. Available online at [http://www.famnit.upr.si/sl/izobrazevanje/zakljucna\\_dela/view/276](http://www.famnit.upr.si/sl/izobrazevanje/zakljucna_dela/view/276).
13. Koboldt, D.C., et al.: VarScan 2: Somatic mutation and copy number alteration discovery in cancer by exome sequencing. *Genome Research* **22** (2012) 568–576

14. Li, Y., Xie, X.: Mixclone: a mixture model for inferring tumor subclonal populations. *BMC Genomics* **16**(S-2) (2015) S1
15. Miller, C.A., et al.: SciClone: Inferring Clonal Architecture and Tracking the Spatial and Temporal Patterns of Tumor Evolution. *PLoS Comput Biol* **10**(8) (August 2014) e1003665+
16. Newburger, D.E., et al.: Genome evolution during progression to breast cancer. *Genome Research* **23**(7) (2013) 1097–1108
17. Nik-Zainal, S., et al.: The life history of 21 breast cancers. *Cell* **149**(5) (2012) 994–1007
18. Oesper, L., et al.: THetA: inferring intra-tumor heterogeneity from high-throughput DNA sequencing data. *Genome Biology* **14**(7) (2013) R80+
19. Roth, A., et al.: PyClone: statistical inference of clonal population structure in cancer. *Nature methods* **11**(4) (April 2014) 396–398
20. Salari, R., et al.: Inference of tumor phylogenies with improved somatic mutation discovery. *Journal of Computational Biology* **20**(11) (2013) 933–944
21. van Rens, K.E., et al.: SNV-PPILP: Refined SNV calling for tumor data using perfect phylogenies and ILP. *Bioinformatics* **31**(7) (2015) 1133–1135