

BOUNDS ON THE EXPECTED SIZE OF THE MAXIMUM AGREEMENT SUBTREE FOR A GIVEN TREE SHAPE

PRATIK MISRA, SETH SULLIVANT

ABSTRACT. We show that the expected size of the maximum agreement subtree of two n -leaf trees, uniformly random among all trees with the shape, is $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$. To derive the lower bound, we prove a global structural result on a decomposition of rooted binary trees into subgroups of leaves called *blobs*. To obtain the upper bound, we generalize a first moment argument from [1] for random tree distributions that are exchangeable and not necessarily sampling consistent.

1. INTRODUCTION



Rooted binary trees are used in evolutionary biology to represent the evolution of a set of species where the leaves denote the existing species and the internal nodes denote the unknown ancestors. Biologists believe that there exists a single tree which can describe the evolution of all living species. The study of methods to reconstruct evolutionary trees from biological data is the area called phylogenetics [3, 5]. Different tree reconstruction methods, and different datasets on the same set of species, can lead to the reconstruction of different trees. In such cases, it is important to measure the distance between different trees constructed. There are various distances between trees that are used including Robinson-Foulds distance, distances based on tree rearrangements, and the geodesic distance. This paper focuses on the *maximum agreement subtree* as a measure of discrepancy between trees.

If T is a rooted binary tree with n leaves leaf labeled by $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and S is a subset of $[n]$, then the *binary restriction tree* $T|_S$ is defined as the subtree of T obtained after deleting all the leaves that are not in S and suppressing the internal nodes of degree 2. The new tree $T|_S$ is rooted at the most recent common ancestor of the set S . If T_1 and T_2 are two trees leaf labeled by X , then a subset $S \subseteq X$ is said to be an agreement set of T_1 and T_2 if $T_1|_S = T_2|_S$. A *maximum agreement subtree* is a subtree that is obtained from an agreement set of T_1 and T_2 and is of maximal size. Figures 1 and 2 give an example of two trees and a maximum agreement subtree.

A maximum agreement subtree of a pair of binary trees can be computed in polynomial time in n [6]. Let $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)$ denote the number of leaves of a maximum agreement subtree of T_1 and T_2 . We know from [4] that if T_1 and T_2 are any unrooted binary trees with n leaves, then $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2) = \Omega(\sqrt{\log n})$. This contrasts with the rooted case where there can be pairs of rooted trees where $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2) = 2$. Martin and Thatte [4] also conjectured that if T_1 and T_2 are balanced rooted binary trees with n leaves, then $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2) \geq \sqrt{n}$.

For the purposes of hypothesis testing, it is important to understand the distribution of $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)$ for trees generated from reasonable distributions of random trees. Simulations by Bryant, McKenzie, and Steel [2] suggest that under the uniform and Yule Harding distribution on the rooted binary trees with n leaves, the expected size of $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)$ is of the order $\Theta(n^a)$ with $a \approx 1/2$. It is known that for any sampling consistent and exchangeable distribution on rooted binary trees with n leaves (including the uniform and Yule-Harding distributions),

Key words and phrases. maximum agreement subtree, exchangeability, sampling consistency.

FIGURE 1. Two rooted trees T_1 and T_2 FIGURE 2. A maximum agreement subtree for T_1 and T_2

the expected size of the maximum agreement subtrees is less than $\lambda\sqrt{n}$ (for some constant $\lambda > e\sqrt{2}$) [1]. Lower bounds of order cn^α are also shown in [1] for the Yule-Harding and the uniform distribution.

In this paper, we study the distribution of $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)$ where T_1 and T_2 are trees that are uniformly sampled from all trees with the same shape. In other words, T_2 is obtained from T_1 by applying a random permutation of the leaf labels. In this sense, this gives us a randomized version of Martin and Thatté's conjecture for the case of balanced trees. We prove that $\mathbb{E}[\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)] = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ in this case, which both provides evidence for Martin and Thatté's conjecture, and provides some further evidence towards the problems posed in [2] for random trees. Our proof of the lower bound is based on a structural result about general trees where we decompose arbitrary trees into substructures we call *blobs*. The proof of the upper bound is based on a strengthening of the previously mentioned result of [1]. We also show results of simulations that suggest that our ideas based on blobs could be used to improve lower bounds on the expected value of $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)$ for other distributions of random trees.

2. LOWER BOUND: BLOBIFICATION

In this section we derive a lower bound on the expected size of the maximum agreement subtree of two uniformly random trees on n leaves with same tree shape. We do this by dividing the trees into what we call as *blobs*, which helps us in constructing an agreement subtree between the two trees.

Let T be a rooted binary tree leaf-labeled by $[n]$. A *cherry blob* is a set of leaves in T consisting of all leaves below a vertex in the tree. Cherry blobs are also called clades in other phylogenetic contexts. An *edge blob* is a nonempty set of leaves of the form $C_1 \setminus C_2$ where C_1 and C_2 are two nonempty cherry blobs. A *blob* in T is either a cherry blob or an edge blob.

Definition 2.1. Given an integer k and a tree T , a k -blobification of T is a collection \mathcal{B} of blobs of T such that, for all distinct blobs $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ and for all $B \in \mathcal{B}$, $k \leq |B| \leq 2k - 2$.

Definition 2.2. Let T be a binary tree, and \mathcal{B} a k -blobification. Let S be a set of leaves consisting of one element from each of the blobs in \mathcal{B} . The *scaffold tree* of the blobification is the unlabelled tree T' obtained as the unlabelled version of the induced tree $T|_S$.

Let T be any rooted binary leaf-labeled tree with n leaves. We construct a k -blobification \mathcal{B} of T using the following greedy procedure.

First, throw in as many cherry blobs into \mathcal{B} as possible. Specifically, among all the cherry blobs C with $k \leq |C| \leq 2k - 2$, we can take the set \mathcal{C} to consist of all of those cherry blobs that are minimal, i.e. that do not contain any other cherry blobs that have between k and $2k - 2$ leaves.

The set of cherry blobs we have constructed \mathcal{C} induces a labeled tree that we call the *prescaffold tree*. This tree has as leaves all the elements of \mathcal{C} , and can be obtained as an (unlabeled version of the) induced subtree $T|_S$ where S is any set of leaves that contain exactly one leaf from each of the cherry blobs in \mathcal{C} . If the root of $T|_S$ is not the root of T , then we also add an edge onto the prescaffold tree at the root. This is illustrated in Figure 4. Now we can think about the tree T as consisting of all the leaves grouped into blobs of various sizes, each of which attaches somewhere onto the prescaffold tree. The leaves that are not part of any of the cherry blobs will belong to blobs of size $k - 1$ or less that connect onto the prescaffold tree.

On each edge of the prescaffold tree are some number of smaller blobs hanging off of size $k - 1$ or less. Working up from the bottom edges of the prescaffold, we can group small blobs together until they produce an edge blob of size between k and $2k - 2$. This is possible because each of the small blobs has size $< k$, so when we are grouping blobs together we have an edge blob with size $< k$ that we add $< k$ more elements to, we stop when we have formed an edge blob of size between k and $2k - 2$. Let \mathcal{E} be the resulting set of edge blobs that are produced, that all have size between k and $2k - 2$. This *greedy k -blobification algorithm* stops with a blobification $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{E}$ where on each edge of the scaffold tree there are leftover small blobs whose total number of leftover leaves is at most $k - 1$. The set $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{E}$ is called the *greedy k -blobification*.

Starting with the prescaffold tree T' and adding a leaf attached to an edge for each time an edge blob gets formed, we arrive at an unlabelled tree we call the scaffold tree.

Example 2.3. Consider the binary tree on 17 leaves pictured in Figure 3. We first consider the greedy 2-blobification. Note that the cherry blobs are exactly the cherries in this case. These are the sets $\{1, 2\}, \{7, 8\}, \{11, 12\}, \{13, 14\}$. The prescaffold tree is shown on the left of Figure 4. Note that there is an edge that hangs off the root. The edge blobs in this example are $\{3, 4\}, \{5, 6\}, \{15, 16\}$. The resulting scaffold tree is the tree on the right in Figure 4. Note that leaves 9, 10, and 17 do not end up in any blob.

On the other hand, consider the greedy 3-blobification of the same tree. There are two cherry blobs, $\{1, 2, 3\}$ and $\{11, 12, 13, 14\}$. The edge blobs are $\{4, 5, 6\}, \{7, 8, 9\}$, and $\{15, 16, 17\}$.

Proposition 2.4. Let T be a rooted binary leaf-labeled tree with n leaves. Then T has a k -blobification with at least $\frac{n}{4k}$ blobs.

Proof. We apply the k -blobification algorithm on T . Let the final collection \mathcal{B} of blobs contain a cherry blobs and b edge blobs. Since the prescaffold tree is a binary rooted tree with a leaves, there are at most $2a - 1$ edges (potentially there is a root edge). Taking everything at its most extreme, we see that the total number of leaves, n is at most

$$n \leq (a + b)(2k - 2) + (k - 1)(2a - 1) = (4a + 2b - 1)(k - 1) \leq (4a + 4b)k$$




FIGURE 3. A tree




FIGURE 4. Prescaffold and scaffold tree for the 2-blobification

where the first part comes from the contribution from each of the $a + b$ blobs, and the second term is the leftover leaves. The total number of blobs is $a + b$, which is greater than $n/4k$ from the above inequality. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let S_1 and S_2 be uniformly random subsets of $[n]$, each of size at least \sqrt{n} . The probability that $S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$ is at least $1 - e^{-1}$.*

Proof. The probability that $S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$ is clearly minimized when both S_1 and S_2 have \sqrt{n} elements. In this case, the probability that $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$ is given by the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\binom{n-\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{n}}}{\binom{n}{\sqrt{n}}} &= \prod_{i=1}^{\sqrt{n}} \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n-i+1}\right) \\ &\leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)^{\sqrt{n}} \\ &\leq e^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the probability that $S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$ is at least $1 - e^{-1}$. \square

Theorem 2.6. *Let T_1 and T_2 be two uniformly random trees on n leaves among all trees with the same tree shape (i.e. T_2 is a random leaf relabeling of T_1). Then the expected size of $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)$ is at least $\sqrt{n}(1 - e^{-1})/4$.*

Proof. Consider the \sqrt{n} -blobification of T_1 and T_2 , which we denote by \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 . Since the trees have the same tree shape, this blobification has the same scaffold tree T' . We can order

the blobs in $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{B_{11}, \dots, B_{1s}\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_2 = \{B_{21}, \dots, B_{2s}\}$ so that B_{1i} and B_{2i} correspond to the same leaf in the scaffold tree T' .

If for each i , we had that $B_{1i} \cap B_{2i} \neq \emptyset$, we could take one leaf $\ell_i \in B_{1i} \cap B_{2i}$, and let $S = \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_s\}$, we would have $T_1|_S = T_2|_S$ and this common agreement subtree would have the same shape as the scaffold tree T' .

Note that, since our trees are uniformly random among all trees with a given fixed shape, the probability that $B_{1i} \cap B_{2i} \neq \emptyset$ is at least $1 - e^{-1}$ by Lemma 2.5, so that the expected number of i where $B_{1i} \cap B_{2i} \neq \emptyset$ is at least $s(1 - e^{-1})$. This set of index positions gives an agreement subtree of expected size at least $s(1 - e^{-1})$, which will be isomorphic to an induced subtree of the scaffold tree. Since $s \geq \sqrt{n}/4$ by Proposition 2.4 we see that the expected size of $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)$ is at least $\sqrt{n}(1 - e^{-1})/4$. \square

The same argument can be used to show that if T_1 and T_2 are uniformly random trees among all trees that have the same \sqrt{n} -blobification, the expected value of $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)$ will also be at least $\sqrt{n}(1 - e^{-1})/4$.

3. UPPER BOUND: ELIMINATING SAMPLING CONSISTENCY

In this section we generalize the result obtained from [1] that if T_1 and T_2 are generated from any sampling consistent and exchangeable distribution on rooted binary trees with n leaves, the expected size of the MAST is less than $\lambda\sqrt{n}$ (for some constant $\lambda > e\sqrt{2}$). We show that the result holds true even if we remove sampling consistency as one of the conditions. Since the distribution of random trees with the same shape is exchangeable, this will prove an $O(\sqrt{n})$ bound on the expected size of the maximum agreement subtree for uniformly random trees with the same shape.

Let $RB(n)$ denote the set of all rooted binary trees with n leaves. For a set S let $RB(S)$ denote the set of all rooted binary trees with leaf label set S .

Definition 3.1. A distribution on $RB(n)$ is said to be *exchangeable* if any two trees which differ only by a permutation of leaves have the same probability.

For each $n = 1, 2, \dots$, we can consider a probability distribution P_n on $RB(n)$. We denote the probability of a tree $t \in RB(n)$ by $P_n[t]$. The notion of sampling consistency is concerned with a probability model for random trees that describes probability distributions for random trees for all n . For example, the uniform distribution on trees gives a probability distribution P_n for each n , where $P_n[t] = \frac{1}{(2n-3)!!}$ for all $t \in RB(n)$. The property of sampling consistency is one that concerns the entire family of probability distributions P_n , $n = 1, 2, \dots$

Definition 3.2. A distribution of random trees is said to satisfy *sampling consistency* if for all n , all $s < n$, all $S \subseteq [n]$ with $|S| = s$, and all $t \in RB(S)$,

$$P_s[t] = \sum_{T \in RB(n): T|_S = t} P_n[T].$$

In other words, in a sampling consistent distribution if we take a random tree T and restrict to a random subset of the leaves, the resulting tree has the same distribution as if we had just chosen a random tree on that subset of leaves, directly. Our goal in this section is to remove the restriction of sampling consistency for the following theorem from [1].

Theorem 3.3. *Consider an exchangeable and sampling consistent distribution on rooted binary trees. Then for any $\lambda > e\sqrt{2}$ there is a value m such that, for all $n \geq m$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)] \leq \lambda\sqrt{n}$$

where T_1, T_2 are sampled from this distribution.

Let P_n be an exchangeable distribution on $RB(n)$. Since we only consider a fixed value of n , we do not have sampling consistency. To prove an analogue of Theorem 3.3 without sampling consistency depends on defining some new probability distributions on $RB(s)$ for $s < n$. Specifically, for any $s < n$, and $t \in RB(s)$ we define

$$P_s[t] = \sum_{T \in RB(n): T|_{[s]} = t} P_n[T].$$

We can also use the notation $P_s[t] = P_n[T|_{[s]} = t]$ to denote this same probability.

Proposition 3.4. *Let P_n be an exchangeable distribution defined on $RB(n)$. Then for any $s < n$, P_s satisfies exchangeability property on $RB(s)$.*

Proof. Let t and t' be two trees in $RB(s)$ with same tree shape, and let $s < n$. By definition, $P_s[t] = P_n[T|_{[s]} = t]$ and $P_s[t'] = P_n[T|_{[s]} = t']$. We define a bijection $\phi : [s] \rightarrow [s]$ from $[s]$ to itself such that $\phi(t) = t'$ and extend the map $\phi : [n] \rightarrow [n]$ from $[n]$ to itself with $\phi(a) = a$, for all $a > s$.

So, for any two trees T, T' in $RB(n)$ with $T|_{[s]} = t$ and $T'|_{[s]} = t'$, we have

$$\phi(T)|_{[s]} = \phi(t) = t' \text{ and } \phi^{-1}(T)|_{\{1,2,\dots,s\}} = \phi^{-1}(t') = t.$$

Hence $T|_{[s]} = t$ if and only if $\phi(T)|_{[s]} = t'$ since any bijection from $[n]$ to $[n]$ induces a bijection from $RB(n)$ to $RB(n)$. Also, as T and $\phi(T)$ have the same tree shape and P_n is exchangeable, we have $P_n[T] = P_n[\phi(T)]$. Hence we can conclude that $P_s[t] = P_s[t']$. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that phylogenetic trees T_1 and T_2 in $RB(n)$ are randomly generated under a model that satisfies exchangeability. Then*

$$P[MAST(T_1, T_2) \geq s] \leq \psi_{n,s} = \binom{n}{s} \sum_{t \in RB(s)} P_s[t]^2,$$

where $P_s[t]$ is defined as $P_s[t] = P_n[T|_{[s]} = t]$ for $t \in RB(s)$.

Proof. This theorem can be proved exactly the way Lemma 4.1 of [2] is proved with the last equality following from the way we have defined $P_s[t]$ instead of using sampling consistency. The details are included here for completeness.

Given a subset S of $[n]$ let

$$X_S = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } T_1|_S = T_2|_S \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The number of agreement subtrees with s leaves for T_1 and T_2 is counted by

$$X^{(s)} = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]: |S|=s} X_S.$$

The event $MAST(T_1, T_2) \geq s$ is equivalent to the event $X^{(s)} \geq 1$, so

$$\begin{aligned} P[MAST(T_1, T_2) \geq s] &= P[X^{(s)} \geq 1] \\ &\leq E[X^{(s)}] \\ &= \sum_{S \subseteq [n]: |S|=s} E[X_S] \\ &= \sum_{S \subseteq [n]: |S|=s} P[X_S = 1] \\ &= \binom{n}{s} P[X_{[s]} = 1], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is by exchangeability. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 P[X_{[s]} = 1] &= P_n[T_1|_{[s]} = T_2|_{[s]}] \\
 &= \sum_{t \in RB(s)} P_n[T_1|_{[s]} = t \text{ and } T_2|_{[s]} = t] \\
 &= \sum_{t \in RB(s)} P_n[T_1|_{[s]} = t]^2 \\
 &= \sum_{t \in RB(s)} P_s[t]^2
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the way we have defined $P_s[t]$. Upon substituting back for this term, we obtain the upper bound as stated in the lemma. \square

We now state a proposition from [1].

Proposition 3.6. [1, Proposition 4.2] *Let P_s be any exchangeable distribution on rooted binary trees with s leaves. Then*

$$\sum_{t \in RB(s)} P_s(t)^2 \leq \frac{2^{s-1}}{s!}.$$

Now we can combine these results to deduce the strengthened version of Theorem 3.3 that does not require sampling consistency.

Theorem 3.7. *Then for any $\lambda > e\sqrt{2}$ there is a value m such that, for all $n \geq m$,*

$$E[\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)] \leq \lambda\sqrt{n}.$$

where T_1 and T_2 are sampled from any exchangeable distribution on $RB(n)$.

Proof. This theorem can be proved exactly the way as Theorem 4.3 in [1] is proved as we have already shown that P_s is exchangeable by Proposition 3.4.

We explore the asymptotic behaviour of the quantity $\phi_{n,s} = \binom{n}{s} \frac{2^{s-1}}{s!}$. Using the inequality $\binom{n}{s} \leq \frac{n^s}{s!}$ and Stirling's approximation, we have:

$$\phi_{n,s} \leq \frac{1}{4\pi s} \left(\frac{2e^2 n}{s^2} \right)^s \theta(s)$$

where $\theta(s) \sim 1$. Hence, $\phi_{n,s}$ tends to zero as an exponential function of n as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\phi_{n,s} \geq \psi_{n,s}$, we see that $P[\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2) \geq \lambda\sqrt{n}]$ tends to zero as an exponential function of n . Since $\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2) \leq n$, this implies that $E[\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)] \leq \lambda\sqrt{n}$. \square

Now we can deduce the main result for trees with the same shape.

Corollary 3.8. *Let T_1 and T_2 be generated from the uniform distribution on rooted binary trees with n leaves with same tree shape (that is, T_2 is a random leaf relabeling of T_1). Then for any $\lambda > e\sqrt{2}$ there is a value m such that, for all $n \geq m$,*

$$E[\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)] \leq \lambda\sqrt{n}.$$

Proof. This follows immediately from Theorem 3.7 since the uniform distribution on trees with the same shape is exchangeable. \square

Combining Theorem 2.6 and Corollary 3.8 we deduce the main result of the paper.

Theorem 3.9. *Let T_1 and T_2 be generated from the uniform distribution on rooted binary trees with n leaves with same tree shape (that is, T_2 is a random leaf relabeling of T_1). Then*

$$E[\text{MAST}(T_1, T_2)] = \Theta(\sqrt{n}).$$

4. SIMULATIONS WITH BLOBIFICATION

The blobification idea has the potential to be useful for proving lower bounds on the expected size of the maximum agreement subtree in other contexts. For example, suppose we have a model for random trees on n leaves and we can show that the scaffold tree of the \sqrt{n} -blobification of a random tree has depth $\geq f(n)$ with high probability $p > 0$ that does not depend on n . Then under this model, using Lemma 2.5, we see that two random trees will have an agreement subtree of expected size at least $f(n)(1 - e^{-1})p^2$. Such a tree would be obtained as a comb tree by comparing blobs that are matched along the path from the root to the deepest leaf in each scaffold tree. Hence, understanding the distribution of the depth of the scaffold trees in the \sqrt{n} -blobification could give improved lower bounds on the expected size of the maximum agreement subtree in some random tree models.

One specific application where this perspective might prove useful is for uniformly random trees. The current best lower bound for the expected size of the maximum agreement subtree for two uniformly random trees on n leaves is $\Omega(n^{1/8})$ [1]. To see if this blobification idea might be useful for improving the lower bound, we simulated a lower bound for the depth of the scaffold tree of a uniformly random tree using the following greedy procedure.

Algorithm 4.1 (Greedy Comb Scaffold).

Input: A binary tree T and an integer k .

Output: A scaffold tree in shape of a comb, whose leaves correspond to blobs of size $\geq k$.

- Set $u = ()$.
- While T has more than one leaf Do:
 - Let T_1 and T_2 be the left and right subtrees of the root in T .
 - Append $\min(\#(T_1), \#(T_2))$ to u .
 - Set T equal to the larger of T_1 and T_2 .
- Set $v = (0)$.
- While $u \neq ()$ do
 - If the last element of v is greater than or equal to k , append the last element of u to v .
 - * Else, add the last element of u to the last element of v .
 - Delete the last element of u .
- Output v , a vector of sizes of blobs in T , all except the last one having size $\geq k$, which have a scaffold that is a comb tree.

Note that the length of the vector v (or possibly the length minus 1) gives the number of leaves in the greedy comb scaffold where all blobs will have size greater than k .

We applied the greedy comb scaffold algorithm to uniformly random binary trees with $k = \sqrt{n}$ on 2^n leaves for $n = 4, \dots, 11$, with 1000 samples for each value of n . The results of these simulations are displayed in the log-log plot of Figure 5. The slope of the line of best fit is approximately .466. These data suggest that a strategy based on blobification could yield an $\Omega(n^{.466})$ lower bound on the size of the maximum agreement subtree for uniformly random trees. This would be a significant improvement on our estimates of the expected size of the maximal agreement subtree for uniformly random trees, given the current best known lower bound of $\Omega(n^{1/8})$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Daniel Irving Bernstein, Lam Si Tung Ho, Colby Long, Mike Steel, Katherine St. John and Seth Sullivant. Bounds on the expected size of the maximum agreement subtree. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **29** (2015), no. 4, 2065–2074.




FIGURE 5. Log-log plot of the simulated expected size of the greedy comb scaffold

- [2] David Bryant, Andy McKenzie, Mike Steel. The size of a Maximum agreement subtree for random binary trees. in BioConsensus, *DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **61**, AMS, Providence, RI, 2003, pp. 55–65.
- [3] Joseph Felsenstein, *Inferring Phylogenies*, Sinauer Associates, Inc., 2004
- [4] Daniel M. Martin and Bhalchandra. D. Thatte: The maximum agreement subtree problem. *Discrete Appl. Math.* **161** (2013):1805-1817.
- [5] Charles Semple and Mike Steel, *Phylogenetics*, Oxford University Press, 2003.
- [6] Mike Steel and Tandy Warnow. Kaikoura tree theorems: computing the maximum agreement subtree. *Information Processing Letters* **48** (1993):77-82

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY, RALEIGH, NC, USA,
E-mail address: smsulli2@ncsu.edu, pmisra@ncsu.edu