

A note on convex characters and Fibonacci numbers

Steven Kelk

Department of Knowledge Engineering (DKE), Maastricht University, P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht, The Netherlands, steven.kelk@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Abstract. Given an unrooted, binary phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} on a set of $n \geq 2$ taxa, a closed expression for the number of convex characters on \mathcal{T} has been known since 1992, and this is independent of the exact topology of \mathcal{T} . Here we prove that this number is equal to the $(2n - 1)$ th Fibonacci number. Moreover, we show that the number of convex characters in which each state appears on at least *two* taxa, is also independent of topology, and equal to the $(n - 1)$ th Fibonacci number. We use this insight to give a simple but effective algorithm for the NP-hard *maximum parsimony distance* problem that runs in time $\Theta(\phi^n \cdot \text{poly}(n))$, where $\phi \approx 1.618\dots$ is the golden ratio. Finally, we give an explicit example demonstrating that topological neutrality no longer holds when counting the number of convex characters in which each state appears on at least *three* taxa.

1 Preliminaries

Phylogenetics is the science of accurately and efficiently inferring evolutionary trees given only information about contemporary species. For general background on mathematical phylogenetics we refer to [6]. An *unrooted binary phylogenetic X -tree* is an undirected tree $\mathcal{T} = (V(\mathcal{T}), E(\mathcal{T}))$ where every internal vertex has degree 3 and whose leaves are bijectively labelled by a set X , where X is often called the set of *taxa* (representing the contemporary species). We use n to denote $|X|$ and often simply write *tree* when this is clear from the context.

A *character* f on X is a surjective function $f : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ for some set \mathcal{C} of *states* (where a state represents some characteristic of the species e.g. number of legs). We say that f is an r -state character if $|\mathcal{C}| = r$. Each character naturally induces a partition of X and here we regard two characters as being equivalent if they both induce the same partition of X . An *extension* of a character f to $V(\mathcal{T})$ is a function $h : V(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that $h(x) = f(x)$ for all x in X . For such an extension h of f , we denote by $l_h(\mathcal{T})$ the number of edges $e = \{u, v\}$ such that $h(u) \neq h(v)$. The *parsimony score* of a character f on \mathcal{T} , denoted by $l_f(\mathcal{T})$, is obtained by minimizing $l_h(\mathcal{T})$ over all possible extensions h of f . We say that a character $f : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is *convex on \mathcal{T}* if $l_f(\mathcal{T}) = |\mathcal{C}| - 1$. Equivalently: a character $f : X \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is convex on \mathcal{T} if there exists an extension h of f such that, for each state $c \in \mathcal{C}$, the vertices of \mathcal{T} that are allocated state c (by h) form a connected subtree of \mathcal{T} . See Figure 1 for an example.

We write $g(\mathcal{T}, r)$ to denote the number of r -state convex characters on \mathcal{T} and $g_i(\mathcal{T}, r)$ ($i \geq 1$) to denote the number of those characters that have the additional property that each state used by the character appears on at least i taxa. It follows from the definition of character that $g_1(\mathcal{T}, r) = g(\mathcal{T}, r)$. We define:

$$g_i(\mathcal{T}) = \sum_{r=1}^n g_i(\mathcal{T}, r).$$

The value $g_1(\mathcal{T})$ is therefore equal to the total number of convex characters on \mathcal{T} . For the tree shown in Figure 1, $g(\mathcal{T}) = g_1(\mathcal{T}) = 233$ and $g_2(\mathcal{T}) = 8$. We adopt the standard convention that the binomial coefficient $\binom{n}{k}$ evaluates to 1 if $k = 0$, and 0 if $n < k$ and $k > 0$. In [7] it is proven that, for $n, r \geq 1$,

$$g(\mathcal{T}, r) = g_1(\mathcal{T}, r) = \binom{2n - r - 1}{r - 1}.$$

Hence,

$$g_1(\mathcal{T}) = \sum_{r=1}^n \binom{2n - r - 1}{r - 1}. \quad (1)$$




Fig. 1. For the given tree \mathcal{T} (on 7 taxa) there are 233 convex characters in total, but only 8 in which each state appears on at least 2 taxa, and these are shown above. 1 character uses exactly 1 state ($abcdefg$), so $g_2(\mathcal{T}, 1) = 1$, 4 characters use 2 states ($ab|cdefg$, $abc|defg$, $abcd|efg$ and $abcde|fg$), so $g_2(\mathcal{T}, 2) = 4$ and 3 characters use 3 states ($ab|cd|efg$, $abc|de|fg$ and $ab|cde|fg$), so $g_2(\mathcal{T}, 3) = 3$. For each character we have shown an extension verifying that the subtree induced by each state is connected i.e. that the character is convex.

As observed in [7], the expression for $g_1(\mathcal{T}, r)$ (somewhat surprisingly) does not depend on the topology of \mathcal{T} , only on the number of taxa n . Hence we can write $g(n)$, $g_1(n)$ and $g_1(n, r)$ without ambiguity.

2 Results

Theorem 1. *The value $g_2(\mathcal{T}, r)$ only depends on n (i.e. the topology of \mathcal{T} is not relevant) and for $n \geq 2, r \geq 1$ is given by the expression*

$$g_2(\mathcal{T}, r) = \binom{n-r-1}{r-1}.$$

Proof. We prove this by induction on n . For the base case note that for $n = 2, 3, 4$ there is only one tree topology (up to relabelling of taxa) possible on n taxa and that the expression correctly evaluates to 1 when $r = 1$ and, when $r \geq 2$, evaluates to 0 in all cases except $n = 4, r = 2$ when it correctly evaluates to 1.

Consider then $n \geq 5$, and let r be any value $2 \leq r \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. (For $r = 1$ the expression correctly evaluates to 1, and for $r > \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ the expression correctly evaluates to 0). Every tree on 4 or more taxa contains at least one *cherry*: two taxa x, y that have a common parent u where the third neighbour of u is an interior vertex. Fix such a cherry. (A similar technique is used in [7] and [8]). Observe that any convex character f on \mathcal{T} with the property that each state appears at least twice, has $f(x) = f(y)$. This follows from the connected-subtree definition of convexity. Now, let $\mathcal{T}' = \mathcal{T}|(X \setminus \{x\})$ and let $\mathcal{T}'' = \mathcal{T}|(X \setminus \{x, y\})$, where $\mathcal{T}|X'$ denotes the tree (on the set of taxa X') obtained from \mathcal{T} by taking the minimum subtree connecting the elements of X' and then suppressing vertices of degree 2.

There are two cases to distinguish. The first case is when the state $f(x) = f(y)$ does not appear on any other taxa. There are $g_2(\mathcal{T}'', r-1)$ such characters. The second case is when $f(x) = f(y)$ does appear on at least one other taxon. There are $g_2(\mathcal{T}', r)$ such characters. Hence,

$$g_2(\mathcal{T}, r) = g_2(\mathcal{T}'', r-1) + g_2(\mathcal{T}', r). \quad (2)$$

By the inductive hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned}
g_2(\mathcal{T}, r) &= \binom{(n-2) - (r-1) - 1}{(r-1) - 1} + \binom{(n-1) - r - 1}{r-1} \\
&= \binom{n-r-2}{r-2} + \binom{n-r-2}{r-1} \\
&= \binom{n-r-1}{r-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from the well-known identity known as Pascal's rule i.e. $\binom{n}{k} = \binom{n-1}{k} + \binom{n-1}{k-1}$, which holds for $1 \leq k \leq n$. This completes the proof. \square

Consequently, the total number of convex characters on a tree \mathcal{T} with each state appearing at least twice is independent of the topology of \mathcal{T} . Specifically, we have:

$$g_2(\mathcal{T}) = g_2(n) = \sum_{r=1}^n \binom{n-r-1}{r-1} = \sum_{r=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \binom{n-r-1}{r-1} \quad (3)$$

Corollary 1. For even n , $g_2(n) = g_1(n/2)$.

Proof. This is immediate by observing that Equation (3) can be obtained by substituting $n/2$ for n in Equation (1). \square

Let $F(n)$ denote the n th Fibonacci number. That is, $F(0) = 0$, $F(1) = 1$ and for $n \geq 2$, $F(n) = F(n-1) + F(n-2)$.

Theorem 2. For $n \geq 2$, $g_2(n) = F(n-1)$ and $g_1(n) = F(2n-1)$.

Proof. The following identity is classical ($n \geq 0$):

$$F(n+1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \binom{n-k}{k}.$$

If we index k from 1 rather than 0 we obtain,

$$F(n+1) = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1} \binom{n-(k-1)}{k-1}.$$

Now, if we replace n with $n-2$:

$$\begin{aligned}
F(n-1) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor (n-2)/2 \rfloor + 1} \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \binom{n-k-1}{k-1} \\
&= g_2(n).
\end{aligned}$$

The expression for $g_1(n)$ is then obtained by applying Corollary 1. \square

The question arises whether the values $g_3(\mathcal{T}, r)$ and/or $g_3(\mathcal{T})$ share the topological neutrality of their g_1 and g_2 counterparts. This is not the case: see Figure 2. Here $g_3(\mathcal{T}_1) = 5$, because $g_3(\mathcal{T}_1, 1) = 1$, $g_3(\mathcal{T}_1, 2) = 3$, $g_3(\mathcal{T}_1, 3) = 1$ and $g_3(\mathcal{T}_1, r) = 0$ (for $r > 3$). However, $g_3(\mathcal{T}_2) = 6$, because $g_3(\mathcal{T}_2, 1) = 1$, $g_3(\mathcal{T}_2, 2) = 4$, $g_3(\mathcal{T}_2, 3) = 1$ and $g_3(\mathcal{T}_2, r) = 0$ (for $r > 3$).




Fig. 2. The number of characters that are convex on \mathcal{T}_1 with each state appearing on at least 3 taxa, is not the same as the corresponding number for \mathcal{T}_2 i.e. $g_3(\mathcal{T}_1) \neq g_3(\mathcal{T}_2)$. This is because $g_3(\mathcal{T}_1, 2) = 3$ (the characters $abc|defghi, abcdef|ghi$ and $abcghi|def$) while $g_3(\mathcal{T}_2, 2) = 4$ (the characters $abc|defghi, abcd|efghi, abcde|fgh$ and $abcdef|ghi$). Hence topology does play a role here, contrasting with the situation for g_1 and g_2 .

3 An algorithmic application

One of the advantages of expressing $g_1(n)$ and $g_2(n)$ as Fibonacci numbers is that it allows us to give tight bounds on their rate of growth. This can be particularly useful when bounding the running time of algorithms. Consider the following classical, closed-form expression for the Fibonacci numbers ($n \geq 0$), where $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.618\dots$ is the *golden ratio*:

$$F(n) = \left\lfloor \frac{\phi^n}{\sqrt{5}} + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Combining with Theorem 2 we obtain

$$g_1(n) = \left\lfloor \frac{\phi^{2n-1}}{\sqrt{5}} + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor,$$

$$g_2(n) = \left\lfloor \frac{\phi^{n-1}}{\sqrt{5}} + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Using asymptotic notation, it is clear that there are $\Theta(\phi^{2n})$ convex characters and $\Theta(\phi^n)$ convex characters in which each state occurs at least twice.

Let $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ be two unrooted binary trees on the same set of taxa X . The value $d_{MP}(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ (the *maximum parsimony distance* of \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2) is defined as follows, where f ranges over all characters on X [3]:

$$d_{MP}(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2) = \max_f |l_f(\mathcal{T}_1) - l_f(\mathcal{T}_2)|$$

It is NP-hard to compute d_{MP} [5,3] and challenging to compute in practice.

Theorem 3. *Given two unrooted binary trees $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ on the same set of taxa X , where $|X| = n$, $d_{MP}(\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2)$ can be computed in time $\Theta(\phi^n \cdot \text{poly}(n))$, where $\phi \approx 1.618\dots$ is the golden ratio.*

Proof. In [5,3] it is proven that the optimum is achieved by some character f that is convex on \mathcal{T}_1 or \mathcal{T}_2 and where each state in the character occurs on at least two taxa. Hence simply looping through all the characters counted by $g_2(\mathcal{T}_1)$ and, separately, all the characters counted by $g_2(\mathcal{T}_2)$ is sufficient to locate an optimal character. (Note that $l_f(\cdot)$ can be computed in polynomial time using Fitch's algorithm [4] or dynamic programming. Hence, scoring each character f can easily be performed in polynomial time.) The only algorithmic question that remains is: how to *generate*

all the characters in time at most $\Theta(\phi^n \cdot \text{poly}(n))$? Observe that $g_2(\mathcal{T})$ is simply the summation of $g_2(\mathcal{T}, r)$ values, and in turn each $g_2(\mathcal{T}, r)$ value is defined by recurrence (2). There is no inclusion-exclusion involved. Hence, given any number $1 \leq k \leq g_2(n)$, it is easy to generate the k th character in $\text{poly}(n)$ time by imposing a canonical ordering on the characters and then recursively expanding the appropriate part of the summation/recurrence. One possible canonical ordering is: within the summation characters are ordered by increasing number of states, and within the recurrence the characters generated by the left side of the expression are deemed to be earlier in the ordering than those generated by the right side. \square

We have implemented the d_{MP} algorithm in Java (although we generate the characters in a slightly different, non-recursive way) and for an exponential-time algorithm the results are encouraging; the code is freely available at <http://skelk.sdf-eu.org/convexmpdist>. On a single 32-bit 1.66GHz Intel Atom (N450) processor the algorithm terminates for $n = 20, 25, 30$ in less than 1 second, 3 seconds and 51 seconds respectively. On a more powerful 64-bit 3.10GHz machine the Integer Linear Programming approach described in [5] took 70 seconds to terminate on 12 taxa, and stalled completely on trees with more than 16 taxa, even using state-of-the-art ILP software.

Finally, we note that the results in this article also give an easy (although somewhat crude) upper bound on the number of *agreement forests* of two unrooted binary trees $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ on n taxa (see [1] and recent articles such as [2] for background on agreement forests). In particular, every agreement forest induces a character that is convex on both \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 (although not all characters that are convex on both \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 correspond to agreement forests). Hence there are at most $O(\phi^{2n})$ agreement forests, which is $O(2.619^n)$.

References

1. B. Allen and M. Steel. Subtree transfer operations and their induced metrics on evolutionary trees. *Annals of Combinatorics*, 5:1–15, 2001.
2. J. Chen, J-H. Fan, and S-H. Sze. Parameterized and approximation algorithms for maximum agreement forest in multifurcating trees. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 562:496–512, 2015.
3. M. Fischer and S. Kelk. On the maximum parsimony distance between phylogenetic trees. *Annals of Combinatorics*, 2014. preliminary version arXiv preprint arXiv:1402.1553.
4. W. Fitch. Toward defining the course of evolution: minimum change for a specific tree topology. *Systematic Zoology*, 20(4):406–416, 1971.
5. S. Kelk and M. Fischer. On the complexity of computing mp distance between binary phylogenetic trees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.4076*, 2014.
6. C. Semple and M. Steel. *Phylogenetics*. Oxford University Press, 2003.
7. M. Steel. The complexity of reconstructing trees from qualitative characters and subtrees. *Journal of Classification*, 9(1):91–116, 1992.
8. M. Steel and Y. Fu. Classifying and counting linear phylogenetic invariants for the jukes–cantor model. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 2(1):39–47, 1995.