

CHERRY PICKING IN FORESTS: A NEW CHARACTERIZATION FOR THE UNROOTED HYBRID NUMBER OF TWO PHYLOGENETIC TREES

KATHARINA T. HUBER, SIMONE LINZ, AND VINCENT MOULTON

ABSTRACT. Phylogenetic networks are a special type of graph that generalize phylogenetic trees and that are used to model non-treelike evolutionary processes such as recombination and hybridization. In this paper, we consider *unrooted* phylogenetic networks, i.e. simple, connected graphs $\mathcal{N} = (V, E)$ with leaf set X , for X some set of species, in which every internal vertex in \mathcal{N} has degree three. One approach used to construct such phylogenetic networks is to take as input a collection \mathcal{P} of phylogenetic trees and to look for a network \mathcal{N} that contains each tree in \mathcal{P} and that minimizes the quantity $r(\mathcal{N}) = |E| - (|V| - 1)$ over all such networks. Such a network always exists, and the quantity $r(\mathcal{N})$ for an optimal network \mathcal{N} is called the *hybrid number of \mathcal{P}* . In this paper, we give a new characterization for the hybrid number in case \mathcal{P} consists of two trees. This characterization is given in terms of a *cherry picking sequence* for the two trees, although to prove that our characterization holds we need to define the sequence more generally for two forests. Cherry picking sequences have been intensively studied for collections of *rooted* phylogenetic trees, but our new sequences are the first variant of this concept that can be applied in the unrooted setting. Since the hybrid number of two trees is equal to the well-known *tree bisection and reconnect distance* between the two trees, our new characterization also provides an alternative way to understand this important tree distance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Phylogenetic networks are a special type of graph that generalize phylogenetic trees and that are used to model non-treelike evolutionary processes such as recombination and hybridization [10]. There are several classes of phylogenetic networks (see e.g. [19] for a recent review), but in this paper, we shall restrict our attention to *unrooted* phylogenetic networks (see e.g. [11]). Such a network is a simple, connected graph $\mathcal{N} = (V, E)$ with leaf set X , where X is some set of species, such that every internal vertex in \mathcal{N} has degree three. The *reticulation number* $r(\mathcal{N})$ of \mathcal{N} is defined as $|E| - (|V| - 1)$. If $r(\mathcal{N}) = 0$, then \mathcal{N} has no cycles, in which case it is called an (*unrooted binary*) *phylogenetic tree* on X . An example of a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} with leaf set $X = \{1, \dots, 6\}$ and $r(\mathcal{N}) = 1$ is given in the left of Figure 1

Date: July 25, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05C05; 92D15.

Key words and phrases. phylogenetic network; forest; TBR distance; cherry picking sequence; hybrid number.

The second author thanks the New Zealand Marsden Fund for their financial support.




FIGURE 1. Left: A phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} with leaf set $X = \{1, \dots, 6\}$. Middle: A forest \mathcal{F} that contains a single phylogenetic tree. Right: A forest \mathcal{F}' comprising two components. Both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' are displayed by \mathcal{N} ; the way in which \mathcal{F}' is displayed by \mathcal{N} is indicated in bold.

(the tree in the centre of this figure is a phylogenetic tree); formal definitions are given in the next section.

One approach commonly used to construct an unrooted phylogenetic network is to take as input a set \mathcal{P} of phylogenetic trees and to infer a network that embeds or ‘displays’ [12, 15] each tree in \mathcal{P} (see Figure 1 for an example of a phylogenetic tree displayed in a network). Such a network always exists since, for example one can be constructed using the so-called display graph [4] for all trees in \mathcal{P} and subsequently resolving the vertices of that graph whose degree is greater than three. From an optimization viewpoint, it is of interest to not reconstruct some unrooted phylogenetic network that displays each element in \mathcal{P} , but one whose reticulation number is minimized over all such networks. This is known as the *Unrooted Hybridization Number* problem [12]. If \mathcal{N} is an unrooted phylogenetic network that displays each tree in \mathcal{P} and whose reticulation number is minimized over all such networks, then $r(\mathcal{N})$ is denoted by $h(\mathcal{P})$ and is called the *hybrid number of \mathcal{P}* .

Intriguingly, in [12, Theorem 3] it is shown that, if \mathcal{P} contains only two phylogenetic trees \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' on the same leaf set, then $h(\mathcal{P})$ is in fact equal to the *tree bisection and reconnect (TBR) distance* between \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' (see e.g. [1] and also [22]). Informally, this distance is defined as the minimum number of so-called tree bisection and reconnect moves required to convert \mathcal{T} into \mathcal{T}' , where such a move on a phylogenetic tree is essentially the process of cutting an edge in that tree and then reconnecting the resulting two trees by introducing a new edge between two edges, one from each of the two trees. The TBR distance has been studied for several years, and is still a topic of current research [5, 16, 18, 21, 23]. Furthermore, computing this distance is an NP-hard optimization problem [1]. Hence, gaining a better understanding of the hybrid number of two phylogenetic trees is not only of interest for constructing phylogenetic networks but also for shedding new light on computing the TBR distance between them.

In this paper, we establish a new characterization for the hybrid number of two phylogenetic trees (Theorem 4.1) and, therefore the TBR distance (Theorem 4.2). Our approach is motivated by the concept of a *cherry picking sequence* that was introduced in [9] in the context of two *rooted* (binary) phylogenetic trees. A *cherry*

in such a tree is a pair of leaves that are adjacent to the same vertex. Roughly speaking, for a pair of rooted phylogenetic trees \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' on the same leaf set X , a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' is an ordering or sequence of the elements in X , say (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) , $n = |X|$, such that each x_i , $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, is a leaf in a cherry in the phylogenetic trees obtained from \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' by pruning off x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1} . In [9] it is shown that a cherry picking sequence for two rooted phylogenetic trees \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' exists precisely if \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' can be embedded in a *rooted*, binary phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} on X that satisfies certain structural properties (namely it is ‘time consistent’ and ‘tree-child’). The number of elements x_i in σ with $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for which the two trees obtained from \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' by pruning off x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1} have cherries $\{x_i, y_i\}$ and $\{x_i, y'_i\}$ such that $y_i \neq y'_i$ is called the *weight* of σ . In addition, it is shown in the same paper that the minimum weight over all cherry picking sequences for \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' equates to the minimum number of reticulations (vertices with in-degree two and out-degree one) that are required to display \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{R}' by a rooted phylogenetic network that is time consistent and tree-child. Since the publication of [9], cherry picking sequences have been extensively studied and generalized, and analogous results have been proven for other classes of rooted phylogenetic networks and arbitrarily large collections of rooted phylogenetic trees (see e.g. [3, 14, 20]).

In this paper, we shall introduce an analogue of a cherry picking sequences for two unrooted phylogenetic trees \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' on the same leaf set. In particular, the main result of this paper (Theorem 4.1) proves that the hybrid number and, consequently, the TBR distance of \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' can be given in terms of the minimum weight of a cherry picking sequence using an alternative weight to the rooted setting, and the minimum is again taken over all such sequences for \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' . Interestingly, to obtain this result we found that it was necessary to define a cherry picking sequence for two *forests* on the same leaf set (a forest is a collection of phylogenetic trees – see e.g. Figure 1 on the right), and then apply such a sequence to the special case where the two forests are both phylogenetic trees. Intuitively, this is the case because, instead of only pruning leaves of cherries as in the rooted case that is described in the previous paragraph, a cherry picking sequence whose weight characterizes the hybrid number of \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' allows for operations that split a phylogenetic tree into two smaller phylogenetic trees by deleting edges that are not necessarily pendant. It is also interesting to note that our definition of a cherry picking sequence has some similarity with certain data reduction rules which have been recently introduced for establishing parameterized algorithms to compute the TBR distance [18].

We now summarize the contents of the rest of this paper. In Section 2, we present some preliminaries. Subsequently, in Section 3, we introduce the main concept of a cherry picking sequence for two forests, and show that such a sequence always exists for any pair of forests. In Section 4, we show that if σ is a cherry picking sequence for two forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' on X , then there is an unrooted phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} on X that displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' such that $r(\mathcal{N})$ is at most the weight of σ (Theorem 4.3). In Section 5, we prove two technical lemmas that are concerned with how forests are displayed in networks. These lemmas allow us to complete the proof of our main result (Theorem 4.1) in Section 6, where we prove that if \mathcal{N} is a phylogenetic network that displays two forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' on X , then there is a cherry

picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' whose weight is at most $r(\mathcal{N})$ (Theorem 6.1). We conclude in Section 7 with a brief discussion of some future directions of research.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we present some basic notation and definitions.

Graphs. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is an ordered pair consisting of a set of vertices $V = V(G)$ and a (multi-)set of edges $E = E(G)$. All graphs G considered in this paper are undirected *multi-graphs*, that is, they do not have loops but might contain vertices u and v such that there is more than one edge in G joining u and v . We call such edges of G *multi-edges*. In case there is a single edge in G joining two vertices u and v we denote it by $\{u, v\}$; if there is at most one edge between any pair of vertices, then $E(G)$ is a set. An edge e of a graph G is called a *cut-edge* of G if the deletion of e disconnects G . If e is a cut-edge that contains a vertex of G of degree one then we call e a *trivial cut-edge*. A *subdivision* of G is a graph obtained from G by replacing edges in G by paths containing at least one edge. If G has two edges $\{u, v\}, \{v, w\}$, $u, v, w \in V(G)$ and v has degree two, the process of replacing these two edges by a single edge $\{u, w\}$ and removing v is called *suppressing* the vertex v . If G has a multi-edge between two vertices u and v in $V(G)$, the process of replacing the edges by a single edge $\{u, v\}$ is called *suppressing* the multi-edge. A *leaf* of G is a vertex in $V(G)$ with degree one or the vertex v in case $V(G) = \{v\}$; the set of leaves of G is denoted by $L(G)$.

Phylogenetic trees and networks. Assume for the remainder of the paper that X is a finite set, with $n = |X| \geq 1$, where we think of X as a set of species.

A *phylogenetic network* \mathcal{N} on X is a simple, connected graph (V, E) , with leaf set $X \subseteq V$ and such that all non-leaf vertices have degree 3 [12]. Note that this type of graph is sometimes called a *binary* phylogenetic network. Also note that if $X = \{x\}$, then we shall regard the graph consisting of the single vertex x as being a phylogenetic network, and will denote it by x . If \mathcal{N} is a tree, that is, it contains no cycles, then we call \mathcal{N} a *phylogenetic tree (on X)*. Suppose \mathcal{T} is a phylogenetic tree on X and $Y \subseteq X$ is a non-empty subset. We denote by $\mathcal{T}(Y)$ the minimal subtree of \mathcal{T} that connects the elements in Y . Note that $\mathcal{T}(Y)$ need not be a phylogenetic tree on Y because it might contain vertices that have degree two. We therefore denote the phylogenetic tree obtained by suppressing all vertices in $\mathcal{T}(Y)$ of degree two by $\mathcal{T}|Y$ and refer to this as being the *restriction* of \mathcal{T} to Y .

Suppose that \mathcal{T} is a phylogenetic tree and that \mathcal{N} is a phylogenetic network. We call \mathcal{T} a *pendant subtree* of \mathcal{N} if either \mathcal{N} equals \mathcal{T} or there is a cut-edge e in \mathcal{N} so that \mathcal{T} results from suppressing the degree two vertices (if any) from one of the connected components obtained by removing e from \mathcal{N} . In the latter case, we shall also refer to \mathcal{T} as being a *proper* pendant subtree of \mathcal{N} , and we denote the cut-edge e that gives rise to \mathcal{T} by $e_{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{N}}$ or just $e_{\mathcal{T}}$ if \mathcal{N} is clear from the context. If \mathcal{T}' is a phylogenetic tree, and \mathcal{T} is a proper pendant subtree of \mathcal{T}' , we let $\mathcal{T}' - \mathcal{T}$ denote the phylogenetic tree on $X - L(\mathcal{T})$ obtained by deleting \mathcal{T} and $e_{\mathcal{T}}$ from \mathcal{T}' and suppressing the resulting degree 2 vertices (in case there are any).

An edge of \mathcal{N} that contains a leaf x of \mathcal{N} is called a *pendant edge* in \mathcal{N} (so that, in particular, x is a proper pendant subtree of \mathcal{N} and e_x is the pendant edge of x). In case \mathcal{N} has at least two leaves, a *cherry* of \mathcal{N} consists of two leaves x and y of \mathcal{N} such that either \mathcal{N} is the edge $\{x, y\}$ of \mathcal{N} or x and y are adjacent to a common vertex (so that, in particular, in the latter case the phylogenetic tree $\{x, y\}$ is a proper pendant subtree of \mathcal{N}). We shall denote a cherry consisting of leaves x and y by (x, y) , where the order of x, y is unimportant. We call \mathcal{N} *pendantless* if it contains no proper pendant subtree with at least two leaves (e.g. for the phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} in Figure 1, since the subtree \mathcal{T} with leaf set $\{5, 6\}$ is a cherry of \mathcal{N} , it follows that \mathcal{N} is not pendantless). We also need notation for two further special cases. Suppose \mathcal{T} is a pendant subtree of \mathcal{N} . If \mathcal{T} has leaf set $\{x, y, z\} \subseteq X$ and \mathcal{T} is a proper pendant subtree of \mathcal{N} such that (x, y) is a cherry of \mathcal{N} , then we denote \mathcal{T} by $((x, y), z)$ (for brevity, if $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{N}$, then we shall also denote it by $((x, y), z)$ although the choice of the cherry (x, y) is unimportant). In addition, if \mathcal{T} has leaf set $\{x, y, z, w\} \subseteq X$ and $(x, y), (z, w)$ are both cherries in \mathcal{N} , then we denote \mathcal{T} by $((x, y), (z, w))$.

Forests. A *forest* \mathcal{F} on X is a set of phylogenetic trees whose collective leaf set equals X . Abusing notation, we will consider a phylogenetic tree as also being a forest (i.e. the singleton set that consists of the tree). A pair (x, y) with $x, y \in X$ distinct is called a *cherry* of a forest \mathcal{F} if it is a cherry in one of the trees in \mathcal{F} . In addition, if $Y \subseteq X$ is a non-empty subset of X and $\mathcal{F}' \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ is such that $L(\mathcal{T}) \cap Y \neq \emptyset$ for all $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}'$, then we refer to the set $\{\mathcal{T} | (L(\mathcal{T}) \cap Y) : \mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}'\}$ as the *restriction* of \mathcal{F} to Y and denote it by $\mathcal{F}|Y$.

For an edge e in a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} on X we denote by $\mathcal{T} - e$ the forest obtained from \mathcal{T} by deleting e and suppressing degree two vertices (if any) in the resulting trees. If \mathcal{F} is a forest on X , $|X| \geq 2$, and $x \in X$, then we let \mathcal{T}_x denote the tree in \mathcal{F} which contains x in its leaf set. We denote by $\mathcal{F} - x$ the forest obtained from \mathcal{F} by removing \mathcal{T}_x from \mathcal{F} in case $|L(\mathcal{T}_x)| = 1$ and replacing \mathcal{T}_x by $\mathcal{T}_x - x$ otherwise. Also, for e an edge in \mathcal{F} we let \mathcal{T}_e denote the tree in \mathcal{F} with e in its edge set, and denote by $\mathcal{F} - e$ the forest obtained by replacing \mathcal{T}_e by $\mathcal{T}_e - e$. For example, referring to Figure 1 for $x = 4$, the tree \mathcal{T}_x in \mathcal{F}' is $((2, 4), (5, 6))$ and $\mathcal{F}' - x$ is the forest comprising the cherry $\{1, 3\}$ and $((5, 6), 2)$. For e the pendant edge for 4, the tree \mathcal{T}_e in \mathcal{F}' is again $((2, 4), (5, 6))$ and $\mathcal{F} - e$ is the forest comprising the cherry $\{1, 3\}$, the isolated vertex 4, and $((5, 6), 2)$.

Displaying phylogenetic trees and forests. Suppose \mathcal{N} is a phylogenetic network on X , and that \mathcal{T} is a phylogenetic tree on some subset $Y \subseteq X$. Then we say that \mathcal{T} is *displayed* by \mathcal{N} if \mathcal{T} can be obtained from a subtree $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}]$ of \mathcal{N} by suppressing all vertices in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}]$ with degree 2. We shall refer to $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}]$ as the *image* of \mathcal{T} in \mathcal{N} . For example in Figure 1, for $\mathcal{T} = ((2, 4), (5, 6))$, the subgraph $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}]$ of \mathcal{N} with leaf set $\{2, 4, 5, 6\}$ is indicated in bold. Note that an image of \mathcal{T} in \mathcal{N} is isomorphic to a subdivision of \mathcal{T} and that \mathcal{T} could have several images in \mathcal{N} . Usually the image of \mathcal{T} in \mathcal{N} that we are considering is clear from the context, but in case we want to make this clearer we shall refer to it explicitly. Note that if T is a subtree of \mathcal{T} , then we define the *image* $\mathcal{N}[T]$ of T in \mathcal{N} to be the subgraph of $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}]$ that corresponds to T in the natural way.

Suppose that \mathcal{F} is a forest on X . Then we say that \mathcal{N} *displays* \mathcal{F} if every tree in \mathcal{F} is displayed by \mathcal{N} , and we can choose an image $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}]$ for each tree \mathcal{T} in \mathcal{F} such that for any distinct trees $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{F}$ the images $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}]$ and $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}']$ do not share a vertex. In that case, we refer to the set $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}] = \{\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}] : \mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}\}$ as an *image* of \mathcal{F} in \mathcal{N} . For example, considering again the two forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' and the phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} pictured in Figure 1, the subgraph $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$ of \mathcal{N} is indicated in bold.

3. CHERRY PICKING SEQUENCES

In this section, we define the concept of a cherry picking sequence for two forests having the same leaf set, and show that such a sequence always exists for any pair of forests. We begin by making a simple but important observation, whose proof is straight-forward and thus omitted.

Observation 3.1. *If we are given two forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' on X and two elements $x, y \in X$ distinct such that (x, y) is a cherry in \mathcal{F} then precisely one of the following must hold: (i) (x, y) is a cherry in \mathcal{F}' ; (ii) (x, z) or (y, z) is a cherry in \mathcal{F}' , some $z \in X - \{x, y\}$; (iii) x and y are in the same tree in \mathcal{F}' , but neither x nor y is in a cherry of \mathcal{F}' ; or (iv) x and y are in different trees in \mathcal{F}' , but neither x nor y is in a cherry of \mathcal{F}' .*

Exploiting this observation, we shall now define a cherry picking sequence for two forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' on the same leaf set X as follows: We call a sequence $\sigma = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$, $m \geq n$, of elements in X a *cherry picking sequence* for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' (of length m) if there are forests $\mathcal{F}[i]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[i]$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, such that $\mathcal{F}[1] = \mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{F}'[1] = \mathcal{F}'$, $\mathcal{F}[m] = \mathcal{F}'[m] = \{x_m\}$ and, for each $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$, precisely one of the three following cases holds:

- (C1) (x_i, y) is a cherry in both $\mathcal{F}[i]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[i]$, $\mathcal{F}[i+1] = \mathcal{F}[i] - x_i$, and $\mathcal{F}'[i+1] = \mathcal{F}'[i] - x_i$.
- (C2) (x_i, y) is a cherry in $\mathcal{F}[i]$ and one of the following three cases holds:
 - (a) (x_i, z) is a cherry in $\mathcal{F}'[i]$ with $y \neq z$, $\mathcal{F}'[i] = \mathcal{F}'[i+1]$ and either (α) $\mathcal{F}[i+1]$ equals $\mathcal{F}[i] - e_{x_i}$ or $\mathcal{F}[i] - e_y$; or (β) $((x_i, y), p)$ is a proper pendant subtree of a tree in $\mathcal{F}[i]$, $p \in X$, and $\mathcal{F}[i+1] = \mathcal{F}[i] - e_{\mathcal{S}}$ for some $\mathcal{S} \in \{p, ((x_i, y), p)\}$; or (γ) $((x_i, y), (p, q))$ is a proper pendant subtree of a tree in $\mathcal{F}[i]$, $p \neq q \in X$, and $\mathcal{F}[i+1] = \mathcal{F}[i] - e_{\mathcal{S}}$ for some $\mathcal{S} \in \{p, q, (p, q), (x_i, y)\}$;
 - (b) x_i and y are both leaves in some tree $\mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{F}'[i]$ and neither x_i nor y is contained in a cherry in \mathcal{T}' , and either (α) $\mathcal{F}'[i+1] = \mathcal{F}'[i]$ and $\mathcal{F}[i+1] = \mathcal{F}[i] - e_{x_i}$ or $\mathcal{F}[i+1] = \mathcal{F}[i] - e_y$; or (β) for e the edge in \mathcal{T}' that contains the vertex adjacent to x_i and is not on the path between x_i and y , $\mathcal{F}'[i+1] = \mathcal{F}'[i] - e$ and $\mathcal{F}[i+1] = \mathcal{F}[i]$;
 - (c) x_i and y are contained in different trees of $\mathcal{F}'[i]$, neither of them is an isolated vertex or contained in a cherry of $\mathcal{F}'[i]$, $\mathcal{F}'[i] = \mathcal{F}'[i+1]$ and $\mathcal{F}[i+1] = \mathcal{F}[i] - e_{x_i}$ or $\mathcal{F}[i+1] = \mathcal{F}[i] - e_y$;
- or the same holds with the roles of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' reversed.
- (C3) x_i is a component of $\mathcal{F}[i]$ and a leaf in $\mathcal{F}'[i]$, $\mathcal{F}[i+1] = \mathcal{F}[i] - x_i$, and $\mathcal{F}'[i+1] = \mathcal{F}'[i] - x_i$, or the same holds with the roles of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' reversed.




FIGURE 2. For the two depicted forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' the sequence $(1, 1, 3, 3, 4, 5, 6)$ is a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . The reductions applied within the sequence are indicated to the left of the arrows.

Note that in cases (C1) and (C3), $\mathcal{F}[i + 1]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[i + 1]$ both have one leaf less than $\mathcal{F}[i]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[i]$, whereas in all subcases of (C2) one of $\mathcal{F}[i + 1]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[i + 1]$ is obtained by removing an edge from $\mathcal{F}[i]$ or $\mathcal{F}'[i]$. For simplicity, we shall call

the removal of a leaf or an edge as described in each of the cases in (C1)–(C3) a *reduction*, or, if we want to be more specific, we may, for example, say that we use a (C2)(a)(β)-reduction (applied to x_i).

For future use, if $\sigma = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$, $m \geq 1$, is a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' , then we define $c(x_i)$ to be 0 if one of the reductions in (C1) and (C3) is applied at stage i and 1 else, $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$. In addition, we define the *weight* of σ by $w(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} c(x_i)$ if $m \geq 2$ and 0 if $m = 1$. To illustrate these definitions, let $X = \{1, \dots, 6\}$ and consider the two forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' on X in Figure 1. Then $(1, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 2)$ gives a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' with weight 1, as can be verified by looking at the reductions depicted in Figure 2.

We now show that a cherry picking sequence always exists for any pair of forests with the same leaf set.

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' are forests on X . Then there exists a cherry picking sequence σ for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' of length m , some $m \geq n = |X|$.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' are two forests on X , $n = |X| \geq 1$. We use induction on n . If $n = 1$, then we can assume $X = \{x\}$, and so $\sigma = (x)$ is a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' (since $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}' = \{x\}$).

So suppose that $n > 1$, and that for any two forests \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 on a set Y with $1 \leq |Y| \leq n - 1$, there exists a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 of length at least $|Y|$.

First, suppose that there is no cherry in either \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{F}' . Then the edge sets of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' must both be empty. Pick any $x \in X$ and apply a (C3)-reduction to obtain forests $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F} - x$ and $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}' - x$ on $X - \{x\}$. By induction, there is a cherry picking sequence (x_1, \dots, x_p) for \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 with $p \geq n - 1$. Hence (x, x_1, \dots, x_p) is a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' with length at least n .

Now suppose that there exist $x, y \in X$ such that (x, y) is a cherry in one of the forests, say \mathcal{F} . If x or y is a component of \mathcal{F}' then, as in the previous case, applying a (C3)-reduction and our induction hypothesis yields a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . So assume that neither x nor y is a component of \mathcal{F}' . Then, by Observation 3.1, setting $\mathcal{F}[i] = \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'[i] = \mathcal{F}'$, without loss of generality we must be in the situation given in (C1) or one of the cases given in (C2) in the definition of a cherry picking sequence with $x = x_i$.

In case (C1), we can apply the reduction $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}[i] - x$ and $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}'[i] - x$ to $\mathcal{F}[i]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[i]$. By induction, there is a cherry picking sequence (x_1, \dots, x_p) for \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 with $p \geq n - 1$. Hence (x, x_1, \dots, x_p) is a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' with length $p + 1$ which is at least n .

For case (C2), since one of the cases (a), (b) or (c) must hold, we can apply the reduction $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}[i] - e_x$ and $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}'[i]$ (which occurs in cases (a)(α), (b)(α) and (c)). This implies that x is a component in \mathcal{F}_1 . So, we can then apply a (C3)-reduction to \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 with $x_i = x$ which results in two forests \mathcal{F}_1'' and \mathcal{F}_2'' on $X - \{x\}$. By induction, there is a cherry picking sequence (x_1, \dots, x_p) for \mathcal{F}_1'' and

\mathcal{F}'_2 with $p \geq n - 1$. It therefore follows that (x, x, x_1, \dots, x_p) is a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' with length $p + 2 > n$. \square

Note that in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we did not need to apply either a (C2)(a)(β), a (C2)(a)(γ), or a (C2)(b)(β)-reduction. However, as we shall see below, we require these additional reductions to ensure that we obtain a cherry picking sequence with the desired weight in the proof of Theorem 6.1.

4. BOUNDING THE HYBRID NUMBER FROM ABOVE USING CHERRY PICKING SEQUENCES

The *hybrid number* $h(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}')$ of two forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' on X is defined to be

$$h(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}') = \min\{r(\mathcal{N}) : \mathcal{N} \text{ displays } \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}'\},$$

where $r(\mathcal{N})$ denotes the reticulation number of \mathcal{N} . Note that this number always exists (this follows immediately from Proposition 3.2 and Theorem 4.3 below). In this and the next two sections we shall focus on proving the main result of this paper:

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' are forests on X . Then*

$$h(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}') = \min\{w(\sigma) : \sigma \text{ is a cherry picking sequence for } \mathcal{F} \text{ and } \mathcal{F}'\}.$$

To prove Theorem 4.1, first note that the right hand side of the equality in Theorem 4.1 exists by Proposition 3.2. In this section we shall prove a result (Theorem 4.3 below) from which it directly follows that the hybrid number for two forests can be no larger than the weight of an optimal cherry picking sequence for the two forests. Then, after proving two supporting lemmas in the next section, in Section 6 we shall prove a result (Theorem 6.1), from which it directly follows that the weight of an optimal cherry picking sequence for two forests is no larger than the hybrid number for the forests. The proof of Theorem 4.1 then follows immediately.

Before proceeding, denoting by $d_{TBR}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$ the *TBR distance* between two phylogenetic trees \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' on X [1, 22], we note that as an immediate corollary of Theorem 4.1 and [12, Theorem 3] we obtain:

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' are phylogenetic trees in X . Then*

$$d_{TBR}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = \min\{w(\sigma) : \sigma \text{ is a cherry picking sequence for } \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \mathcal{T}'\}.$$

We now prove the aforementioned theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that σ is a cherry picking sequence for two forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' on X . Then there is a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} on X that displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' with $w(\sigma) \geq r(\mathcal{N})$.*

Proof: Let $\sigma = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m)$, $m \geq n$, so that $\mathcal{F}[1] = \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'[1] = \mathcal{F}'$ in the definition of a cherry picking sequence. We use induction on the weight $w(\sigma)$ of σ .

To establish the base case, suppose that $w(\sigma) = 0$. Then only the reductions in (C1) or (C3) are applied at stage i in σ , for all $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$. We claim that \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' are displayed by some phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T}^* on X , from which the base case follows since then we can take $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{T}^*$ so that $w(\sigma) = 0 = r(\mathcal{T}^*)$.

To see that the claim holds, we use induction on $n = |X|$. If $n = 1$, then the claim clearly holds. So, suppose the claim is true for all Y with $1 \leq |Y| < n$. Since a (C1) or (C3) reduction applied to x_1 results in the forests $\mathcal{F}[2]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[2]$ both of which are on $X - \{x_1\}$, it follows by induction that there is a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T} which displays $\mathcal{F}[2]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[2]$.

Now, if we have applied a (C1)-reduction, and (x_1, y) , $y \in X$, is cherry in $\mathcal{F}[1]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[1]$ to which we have applied the reduction, then we can insert a pendant edge containing x_1 into the pendant edge in \mathcal{T} containing y to obtain a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T}^* which displays $\mathcal{F}[1]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[1]$.

So, suppose we have applied a (C3)-reduction. Then x_1 is a component in $\mathcal{F}[1]$ and x_1 is a leaf in some tree \mathcal{T}' in $\mathcal{F}'[1]$. If \mathcal{T}' is equal to x_1 , then we can insert a new pendant edge containing x_1 into any edge of \mathcal{T} to obtain a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T}^* that displays $\mathcal{F}[1]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[1]$, and if \mathcal{T}' is the cherry (x_1, y) , $y \in X$, then we can insert a new pendant edge containing x_1 into the pendant edge in \mathcal{T} for y to obtain a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T}^* that displays $\mathcal{F}[1]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[1]$. So, suppose $|L(\mathcal{T}')| \geq 3$. Then there exists a vertex u in \mathcal{T}' that is adjacent with x_1 and two further edges in \mathcal{T}' which we call f and g . Let e be the edge in $\mathcal{T}' - x_1 \in \mathcal{F}'[2]$ which resulted from suppressing u . Since \mathcal{T} is a phylogenetic tree that displays $\mathcal{F}'[2]$ and the leaf set of $\mathcal{F}'[2]$ is $X - x_1$ there exist unique pairwise vertex-disjoint images of the trees in $\mathcal{F}'[2]$ in \mathcal{T} . Similarly, there exist unique pairwise vertex-disjoint images of the trees in $\mathcal{F}[2]$ in \mathcal{T} . So we can insert a pendant edge with leaf x_1 anywhere into an edge in the image of e in \mathcal{T} to obtain a phylogenetic tree \mathcal{T}^* that displays $\mathcal{F}[1]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[1]$. This establishes the claim, and hence the base case.

Now suppose that the theorem holds for all cherry picking sequences σ' for two forests with $0 \leq w(\sigma') \leq w(\sigma) - 1$, and that $w(\sigma) \geq 1$. Let $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$ be the smallest i such that $c(x_i) = 1$, i.e. i is the first time that we apply a (C2)-reduction in σ .

Case 1: $i = 1$. Put $x = x_1$ so that we apply a (C2)-reduction to x , resulting in the forests $\mathcal{F}[2]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[2]$ on X coming from $\mathcal{F}[1]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[1]$, respectively. Since $\sigma' = (x_2, \dots, x_m)$ is a cherry picking sequence for $\mathcal{F}[2]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[2]$ with $w(\sigma') < w(\sigma)$, by induction there exists some phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}_1 on X that displays $\mathcal{F}[2]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[2]$ with $w(\sigma') \geq r(\mathcal{N}_1)$.

We now show how to obtain a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} on X from \mathcal{N}_1 which displays $\mathcal{F}[1]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[1]$ and such that $r(\mathcal{N}) = r(\mathcal{N}_1) + 1$. This will complete the proof for Case 1, since then $w(\sigma) = w(\sigma') + 1 \geq r(\mathcal{N}') + 1 = r(\mathcal{N})$.

As we are in case (C2), without loss of generality we can assume that there is a tree \mathcal{T} in $\mathcal{F}[1]$ that contains the cherry (x, y) , some $y \in X$. Choose an image $\mathcal{N}_1[\mathcal{F}[2]]$ of $\mathcal{F}[2]$ in \mathcal{N}_1 and an image $\mathcal{N}_1[\mathcal{F}'[2]]$ of $\mathcal{F}'[2]$ in \mathcal{N}_1 , both of which must

exist since \mathcal{N}_1 displays $\mathcal{F}[2]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[2]$. We now construct \mathcal{N} for each of the possible (C2)-reductions.

(C2)(a): In this case, there exists some tree $\mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{F}'[1]$ such that (x, z) is a cherry of \mathcal{T}' with $z \in X - \{x, y\}$, and $\mathcal{F}'[2] = \mathcal{F}'[1]$.

(C2)(a)(α): Here, either $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_x$ or $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_y$. Suppose first that $\mathcal{T} = \{x, y\}$ (so that in particular, $|L(\mathcal{T})| = 2$ and $\mathcal{F}[1] - e_x = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_y$). Then to obtain \mathcal{N} from \mathcal{N}_1 , we insert a new vertex v into the pendant edge for x in \mathcal{N}_1 , a new vertex w into the pendant edge for y in \mathcal{N}_1 , and add in the edge $\{v, w\}$.

Now, if $|L(\mathcal{T})| \geq 3$, then (x, y) is a proper pendant subtree of \mathcal{T} . We explain how to obtain \mathcal{N} from \mathcal{N}_1 in case $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_y$; the case $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_x$ is similar. Let \mathcal{T}'' be the tree in $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_y$ that contains x , and let e be the edge in \mathcal{T}'' that results from suppressing the degree 2 vertex in $\mathcal{T} - y$ which arises from removing e_y . To obtain \mathcal{N} from \mathcal{N}_1 , insert a new vertex v anywhere in an edge e within the image $\mathcal{N}_1[e] \subseteq \mathcal{N}_1[\mathcal{T}'']$, a vertex w into the pendant edge for y in \mathcal{N}_1 , and add in the edge $\{v, w\}$.

(C2)(a)(β): For this reduction, $((x, y), p)$ is a proper pendant subtree of \mathcal{T} , some $p \in X$, and $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_{\mathcal{S}}$ where $\mathcal{S} \in \{p, ((x, y), p)\}$. Assume first that $\mathcal{S} = p$. Then $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_p$. Let e denote the edge in $\mathcal{T} - p$ that arises from suppressing the vertex of degree 2. To construct \mathcal{N} from \mathcal{N}_1 , insert a vertex v into any edge in the image $\mathcal{N}_1[e]$ of e in $\mathcal{N}_1[\mathcal{T} - p]$, a vertex w into the pendant edge for p in \mathcal{N}_1 , and add in the edge $\{v, w\}$.

Now assume $\mathcal{S} = ((x, y), p)$. Then $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_{\mathcal{S}}$. Out of the two trees resulting from applying the reduction under consideration, let \mathcal{T}'' be the phylogenetic tree whose leaf set does not contain $\{x, y, p\}$. Assume first that $|L(\mathcal{T}'')| > 1$. Let $e \in E(\mathcal{T}'')$ denote the edge in \mathcal{T}'' that arose from suppressing a vertex of degree 2 as part of the reduction. To construct \mathcal{N} from \mathcal{N}_1 , insert a vertex v into any edge in the image $\mathcal{N}_1[e]$ of e in $\mathcal{N}_1[\mathcal{T}'']$, a vertex w into the pendant edge for p in \mathcal{N}_1 , and add in the edge $\{v, w\}$. If $|L(\mathcal{T}'')| = 1$, then let $L(\mathcal{T}'') = \{q\}$. To obtain \mathcal{N} from \mathcal{N}_1 , we define w as before, subdivide the pendant edge for q in \mathcal{N}_1 by a vertex v , and add the edge $\{v, w\}$.

(C2)(a)(γ): For this reduction, $((x, y), (p, q))$ is a proper pendant subtree of \mathcal{T} and $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_{\mathcal{S}}$, where $\mathcal{S} \in \{p, q, (p, q), (x, y)\}$. If $\mathcal{S} \in \{p, q\}$ then \mathcal{N} is obtained from \mathcal{N}_1 by subdividing the pendant edges for p and q in \mathcal{N}_1 by adding vertices v and w , respectively, and adding in the edge $\{v, w\}$.

We now suppose $\mathcal{S} = (x, y)$; the case $\mathcal{S} = (p, q)$ is similar. Let \mathcal{T}'' be the tree in $\mathcal{T} - e_{\mathcal{S}}$ whose leaf set does not contain x and y . Let e denote the edge in \mathcal{T}'' that arose from suppressing a vertex of degree two. Similarly, let e' denote the edge $\{x, y\}$ which is a tree in the forest $\mathcal{T} - e_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then to obtain \mathcal{N} from \mathcal{N}_1 , insert a vertex v into any edge of the image $\mathcal{N}_1[e]$ of e in $\mathcal{N}_1[\mathcal{F}[2]]$, a vertex w into any edge of the image $\mathcal{N}_1[e']$ of e' in $\mathcal{N}_1[\mathcal{F}[2]]$, and add the edge $\{v, w\}$.

(C2)(b): In this case, there exists a tree $\mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{F}'[1]$ such that x and y are both leaves in \mathcal{T}' and neither x nor y is contained in a cherry of \mathcal{T}' .

(C2)(b)(α): Here, $\mathcal{F}'[2] = \mathcal{F}'[1]$ and $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_x$ or $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_y$. We then obtain \mathcal{N} from \mathcal{N}_1 in a similar way to (C2)(a)(α) above.

(C2)(b)(β): Here, $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[2] = \mathcal{F}'[1] - e$, where e is the edge in \mathcal{T}' such that e contains the vertex adjacent to x but does not lie on the path from x to y in \mathcal{T}' . Let \mathcal{T}'' and \mathcal{T}''' denote the two phylogenetic trees such that $\mathcal{T}' - e = \{\mathcal{T}'', \mathcal{T}'''\}$. Assume without loss of generality that x is a leaf of \mathcal{T}''' . Then \mathcal{T}'' cannot be an isolated vertex as x is not contained in a cherry in \mathcal{T}' . Let $e'' \in E(\mathcal{T}'')$ and $e''' \in E(\mathcal{T}''')$ denote the edges resulting from suppressing the vertices of degree two when removing e from \mathcal{T}' . Note that e''' is the pendant edge for x in \mathcal{T}''' . To obtain \mathcal{N} from \mathcal{N}_1 , we insert a vertex v into any edge in the image $\mathcal{N}_1[e'']$ of e'' in $\mathcal{N}_1[\mathcal{F}'[1]]$, a vertex w into the pendant edge of x in \mathcal{N}_1 , and add in the edge $\{v, w\}$.

(C2)(c): Here, the elements x and y are contained in different trees in $\mathcal{F}'[2]$ and neither of them is an isolated vertex or contained in a cherry in $\mathcal{F}'[2]$, $\mathcal{F}'[2] = \mathcal{F}'[1]$ and $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_x$ or $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] - e_y$. To obtain \mathcal{N} from \mathcal{N}_1 , we proceed in a similar way to (C2)(a)(α) above.

We now show that the network \mathcal{N} constructed in each of the above cases displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . Note that, in all cases except for (C2)(b)(β), \mathcal{N} clearly displays \mathcal{F}' since \mathcal{N}_1 displays $\mathcal{F}'[2] = \mathcal{F}'[1] = \mathcal{F}'$ (in particular, the new edge $\{v, w\}$ is not contained in the image of \mathcal{F}') and, similarly, \mathcal{N} displays \mathcal{F} . For Case (C2)(b)(β), \mathcal{N} clearly displays \mathcal{F} since \mathcal{N}_1 displays $\mathcal{F}[2] = \mathcal{F}[1] = \mathcal{F}$, and to see that \mathcal{N} displays \mathcal{F}' a similar argument to the one used for the base case $w(\sigma) = 0$ can be employed (in particular, in every case except (C2)(b)(β) the new edge $\{v, w\}$ is contained in the image of \mathcal{F} , and in (C2)(b)(β), the new edge $\{v, w\}$ is contained in the image of \mathcal{F}').

Finally, it is straight-forward to check that $r(\mathcal{N}) = r(\mathcal{N}_1) + 1$ since, in each of the above cases, to construct \mathcal{N} we added in two new vertices and three new edges into \mathcal{N}_1 . This completes the proof of the theorem for Case 1.

Case 2: $i > 1$. Clearly, the subsequence $\sigma' = (x_i, \dots, x_m)$ of σ is a cherry picking sequence for $\mathcal{F}[i]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[i]$. To obtain a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}_1 with $w(\sigma') \geq r(\mathcal{N}_1)$ which displays $\mathcal{F}[i]$ and $\mathcal{F}'[i]$ we apply Case 1 to σ' . Since σ is a cherry-picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' , the choice of i implies that either a (C1) or (C3) reduction is applied to each of the elements x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i-1} in σ . We can then use a similar argument as in the base case with \mathcal{T} replaced by \mathcal{N}_1 to insert the elements $x_{i-1}, x_{i-2}, \dots, x_1$ into \mathcal{N}_1 to obtain a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N} on X which displays $\mathcal{F}[1] = \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'[1] = \mathcal{F}'$ and such that $w(\sigma) = w(\sigma') \geq r(\mathcal{N}_1) = r(\mathcal{N})$. \square

5. TWO TECHNICAL LEMMAS

In this section, we shall prove two technical lemmas that are concerned with how we can reduce the reticulation number of a phylogenetic network displaying two forests whilst respecting the displaying property. We shall use these lemmas to prove Theorem 6.1 in the next section.

We start by introducing some further definitions. A *pseudo-network* \mathcal{N} on X is a connected multi-graph with leaf set $X \subseteq V(\mathcal{N})$ such that all non-leaf vertices have degree 3. Note that any multi-edge in a pseudo-network can contain only two edges, and that any pseudo-network that does not contain a multi-edge is a phylogenetic network. Also, we extend the notions introduced for phylogenetic networks to pseudo-networks in the natural way.

Now, suppose that \mathcal{N} is a pseudo-network on X . A maximal 2-connected component of \mathcal{N} that is not an edge is called a *blob* of \mathcal{N} . A blob \mathcal{B} in \mathcal{N} is called a *pendant blob* in \mathcal{N} if \mathcal{B} is pendantless (i.e. any proper pendant subtree of \mathcal{B} is a leaf), and it has at most one cut-edge that is not a pendant edge. We say that a blob \mathcal{B} in \mathcal{N} is *incident* with an edge e of \mathcal{N} if precisely one of the vertices in e is contained in $V(\mathcal{B})$; if e is in addition a pendant edge containing a leaf x , then we say that \mathcal{B} is *incident* with x . We denote the set of leaves of \mathcal{N} that are incident with a blob \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{N} by $L(\mathcal{B})$.

In what follows, we shall be interested in understanding what can happen to the reticulation number of a phylogenetic network if we remove certain leaves or edges. To this end, suppose that \mathcal{N} is a pseudo-network on X . We shall call a sequence $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k$, $k \geq 2$, of distinct pseudo-networks on X a *simplification sequence* for \mathcal{N} if either (i) $|X| \geq 2$, $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_1$, \mathcal{N}_{i+1} is obtained from \mathcal{N}_i by suppressing a single multi-edge in \mathcal{N}_i and suppressing the resulting vertices of degree two for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, and \mathcal{N}_k is a phylogenetic network on X , or (ii) $|X| = 1$, $k = 2$ and \mathcal{N}_2 is the isolated vertex on X . Note that by definition of a simplification sequence, \mathcal{N}_i is a phylogenetic network only if $i = k$.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' are two forests on X , $|X| \geq 2$, and that \mathcal{N} is a pseudo-network on X with precisely one multi-edge which displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . In addition, suppose that the blob in \mathcal{N} which contains the multi-edge is incident with at least two cut-edges of \mathcal{N} . Then there exists a unique simplification sequence $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k$ for \mathcal{N} . Moreover, \mathcal{N}_k displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' and $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}_k)$.*

Proof. Suppose that \mathcal{N}' is a pseudo-network that contains precisely one multi-edge, and that the blob that contains this multi-edge is incident with at least two cut-edges of \mathcal{N}' . Then it is straight-forward to check that the multi-graph \mathcal{N}'' obtained by suppressing the unique multi-edge is either a phylogenetic network on X , or it is a pseudo-network on X with a unique multi-edge that is contained in a blob which is incident with at least two cut-edges of \mathcal{N}'' . This implies immediately that there is a unique simplification sequence $\mathcal{N}_1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_k$ for \mathcal{N} .

We now show that \mathcal{N}_i displays the forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' , for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. Suppose \mathcal{N}_i displays the forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' , and that, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$, the edge e of the multi-edge in \mathcal{N}_i is suppressed to obtain \mathcal{N}_{i+1} . Choose images for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' in \mathcal{N} , respectively. It is straight-forward to check that if e is not contained in the image of \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{F}' , then the pseudo-network \mathcal{N}_{i+1} displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . Moreover, if one of the edges in the multi-edge is contained in the image of \mathcal{F} and the other in the image of \mathcal{F}' , then clearly we can alter the image of \mathcal{F} , say, so that only one of the edges in the multi-edge is contained in the image of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . Since \mathcal{N} displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' , it follows that \mathcal{N}_{i+1} also does for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$.

Finally, we note that $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}_k)$ since clearly $r(\mathcal{N}_i) = r(\mathcal{N}_{i+1}) + 1$, for all $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$. \square

We now consider the effect of removing certain leaves from a phylogenetic network that displays two forests. We first make a simple observation.

Observation 5.2. *Suppose $\mathcal{N} = (V, E)$ is a phylogenetic network on X , $|X| \geq 2$. If $x \in X$ and $\{u, x\}, \{u, v\}, \{u, w\} \in E$ where $u, v, w \in V - \{x\}$ are distinct, then the pseudo-network obtained by removing the pendant edge $\{u, x\}$ and suppressing u is a phylogenetic network on $X - \{x\}$ if and only if $\{v, w\} \notin E$.*

Using this observation we obtain:

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' are two forests on X , $|X| \geq 2$, and \mathcal{N} is a phylogenetic network on X which displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . In addition, suppose that there is a pendant blob \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{N} with $|L(\mathcal{B})| \geq 2$ and some $x \in L(\mathcal{B})$ such that the pseudo-network on $X - \{x\}$ obtained from \mathcal{N} by removing x , the pendant edge $e_x \in E(\mathcal{N})$ and suppressing the resulting degree two vertex is not a phylogenetic network. Then there exists a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}' on $X - \{x\}$ such that $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}')$ and \mathcal{N}' displays $\mathcal{F} - x$ and $\mathcal{F}' - x$.*

Proof: Suppose $|X| = 2$ and $X = \{x, y\}$. Then we can take \mathcal{N}' to be the vertex y to complete the proof of the lemma.

Now, if $|X| \geq 3$, then let \mathcal{N}'' be the pseudo-network obtained from \mathcal{N} when removing x as described in the lemma. Note that \mathcal{N}'' clearly displays $\mathcal{F} - x$ and $\mathcal{F}' - x$. Moreover, by Observation 5.2, \mathcal{N}'' contains a unique multi-edge that is contained in a blob \mathcal{B}' of \mathcal{N}'' and, as \mathcal{B} is a pendant blob of \mathcal{N} and $|L(\mathcal{B})| \geq 2$, \mathcal{B}' is incident with at least two cut-edges of \mathcal{N}'' . The proof of the lemma now follows immediately by applying Lemma 5.1 to \mathcal{N}'' and \mathcal{B}' . \square

We now consider what happens when we remove certain edges from a phylogenetic network that displays two forests.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' are two forests on X , $|X| \geq 2$, and \mathcal{N} is a phylogenetic network on X that displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . Let $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ and $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$ denote a choice of images of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' in \mathcal{N} , respectively. If e is an edge in a pendant blob \mathcal{B} of \mathcal{N} with $|L(\mathcal{B})| \geq 2$ and*

- (a) *e is neither contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ nor in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$, then there is a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}' on X that displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' with $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}')$.*
- (b) *there exists an edge f in some tree $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that e is in the image $\mathcal{N}[f]$ of f in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}]$ but there exists no edge f' in a tree \mathcal{T}' in \mathcal{F}' such that e is in the image $\mathcal{N}[f']$ of f' in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}']$, then there is a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}' on X that displays $\mathcal{F} - f$ and \mathcal{F}' and $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}')$.*

Proof: Let e be as in the statement of the lemma. Remove e from \mathcal{B} and suppress the two resulting degree two vertices. Then it is straight-forward to check that the resulting multi-graph \mathcal{N}' is a pseudo-network on X with $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}')$ which displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' in case (a) and $\mathcal{F} - f$ and \mathcal{F}' in case (b).

If \mathcal{N}' is a phylogenetic network, this completes the proof of the lemma. Otherwise, since by assumption \mathcal{B} must be incident with at least two cut-edges, it follows that we can apply Lemma 5.1 to complete the proof. \square

6. BOUNDING THE WEIGHT OF A CHERRY PICKING SEQUENCE FROM ABOVE BY THE HYBRID NUMBER

In this section, we complete the proof of Theorem 4.1 by establishing Theorem 6.1. Within the proof of Theorem 6.1, we shall use the *concatenation* $\sigma \circ \sigma'$ of two sequences $\sigma = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$, $m \geq 1$, and $\sigma' = (y_1, \dots, y_l)$, $l \geq 1$, which is defined to be the sequence $(x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_l)$.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose that \mathcal{N} is a phylogenetic network on X that displays two forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' on X . Then there is a cherry picking sequence σ for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' with $r(\mathcal{N}) \geq w(\sigma)$.*

Proof: The proof of the theorem essentially works as follows. We successively use a combination of Lemmas 5.3 and 5.4 on \mathcal{N} and cherry-picking reductions on \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' plus induction to show that we may assume that the network \mathcal{N} has a special structure, and that the forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' satisfy Observation 3.1(ii). We then use this approach to show that we may also assume that \mathcal{N} has a pendant blob with at least 3 leaves, which allows us to also assume that $(x, y), p$ or $((x, y), (p, q))$ is a pendant subtree of one of the forests for some $x, y, p, q \in X$ distinct, which permits us to carry out a careful case analysis to complete the proof.

We can clearly assume that $|X| \geq 2$. We also note that we can assume without loss of generality that \mathcal{N} does not contain a pendant blob \mathcal{B} with $L(\mathcal{B}) = \emptyset$. Indeed, suppose that \mathcal{N} contains such a blob \mathcal{B} . Then remove \mathcal{B} from \mathcal{N} by taking away the cut-edge associated to \mathcal{B} , and then repeatedly suppressing any resulting degree 2 vertices or multi-edges until a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}' is obtained (which is possible as $|X| \geq 2$). Clearly, the network \mathcal{N}' displays the forests \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' and $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}')$, and so we can take \mathcal{N} to be \mathcal{N}' instead. This process can then be repeated if necessary until a phylogenetic network is obtained with the desired property.

We now claim that we can also assume without loss of generality that \mathcal{N} is pendantless. Indeed, suppose that \mathcal{N} has a proper pendant subtree \mathcal{T} , say, with $|L(\mathcal{T})| \geq 2$. Pick any cherry (x, y) in \mathcal{T} . If either x or y is a tree in \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{F}' , say x , then we can remove x from \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' by using a (C3)-reduction to obtain forests $\mathcal{F} - x$ and $\mathcal{F}' - x$. And, if neither x nor y is a tree in \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{F}' , then (x, y) is a cherry in both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' because it is a cherry in \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{N} displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . So we can remove x , say, from \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' using a (C1)-reduction. Since \mathcal{N} displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' it follows that in either one of these two cases there exists a phylogenetic network on $X - \{x\}$ that displays the forests $\mathcal{F} - x$ and $\mathcal{F}' - x$. We can repeatedly remove elements $(x_1 = x, x_2, \dots, x_m)$, $m = |L(\mathcal{T})| - 1$, in the leaf set of \mathcal{T} from \mathcal{F} , \mathcal{F}' and \mathcal{N} in this way until only one leaf of \mathcal{T} remains in the resulting phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}'' . Clearly, \mathcal{N}'' has leaf set $Y = X - \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$, \mathcal{N}'' displays the forests $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}|Y$ and $\mathcal{F}'_1 = \mathcal{F}'|Y$ resulting from restricting \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' to Y , respectively,

and satisfies $r(\mathcal{N}) = r(\mathcal{N}'')$. Now, if \mathcal{N}'' is pendantless and there is a cherry picking sequence σ' for \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}'_1 with $r(\mathcal{N}'') \geq w(\sigma')$, then $\sigma = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \circ \sigma'$ is a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' with $r(\mathcal{N}) = r(\mathcal{N}'') \geq w(\sigma') = w(\sigma)$ and so we can take \mathcal{N} to be \mathcal{N}'' instead as well as $\mathcal{F}[1] = \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{F}'[1] = \mathcal{F}'$. Otherwise, we can repeatedly apply the same argument starting with \mathcal{N}'' , \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}'_1 until we obtain a pendantless phylogenetic network which has the desired properties. This completes the proof of the claim.

To complete the proof of the theorem, we use induction on $r(\mathcal{N})$. In what follows we choose images $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ and $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$ of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' in \mathcal{N} , respectively. For all trees $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$ (respectively $\mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{F}'$), let $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}]$ (respectively $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}']$) denote the image of \mathcal{T} in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ (respectively, \mathcal{T}' in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$), and therefore in \mathcal{N} .

Base Case: Suppose $r(\mathcal{N}) = 0$. Then \mathcal{N} is a phylogenetic tree. By the previous claim, we may assume that \mathcal{N} is pendantless. But then \mathcal{N} is an edge $\{x, y\}$, $x, y \in X$. Taking $\sigma = (y, x)$ clearly gives a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' with $w(\sigma) = 0$. This completes the proof of the theorem in this case.

Now suppose that the theorem holds for all phylogenetic networks \mathcal{N}' with $0 \leq r(\mathcal{N}') < r(\mathcal{N})$. Since $r(\mathcal{N}) \geq 1$ and \mathcal{N} contains no pendant blob \mathcal{B} with $L(\mathcal{B}) = \emptyset$, it follows that \mathcal{N} must contain a pendant blob \mathcal{B} with $|L(\mathcal{B})| \geq 1$. We present the remainder of the proof as a case analysis based on $|L(\mathcal{B})|$.

If $|L(\mathcal{B})| = 1$ then $L(\mathcal{B}) = \{x\}$, some $x \in X$. Suppose $\{u, v\}$ is the cut-edge that disconnects \mathcal{B} from \mathcal{N} with $v \in V(\mathcal{B})$, which must exist since clearly $\mathcal{B} \neq \mathcal{N}$. Let \mathcal{N}' be the graph obtained by removing \mathcal{B} from \mathcal{N} and replacing $\{u, v\}$ with $\{x, u\}$ (i.e. the graph obtained by replacing \mathcal{B} with leaf x). Clearly, \mathcal{N}' is a phylogenetic network on X that displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . Since $L(\mathcal{B}) = \{x\}$ and \mathcal{B} is a blob of \mathcal{N} , it is straight-forward to check that $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}')$. So, the proof can be completed by applying the induction hypothesis to \mathcal{N}' .

So assume that $|L(\mathcal{B})| \geq 2$. We now claim that we can assume without loss of generality that no element in $L(\mathcal{B})$ is a tree in \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{F}' . Indeed, suppose that some leaf $x \in L(\mathcal{B})$ is a tree in \mathcal{F} , say. Consider the pseudo-network \mathcal{N}' obtained by removing x and its pendant edge $\{x, u\}$, $u \in V(\mathcal{N})$, and suppressing u . If \mathcal{N}' is a phylogenetic network on $X - \{x\}$, then \mathcal{N}' is pendantless, it displays the forests $\mathcal{F} - x$ and $\mathcal{F}' - x$ which result from applying a (C3)-reduction, and $r(\mathcal{N}) = r(\mathcal{N}')$. So, we can take \mathcal{N} to be \mathcal{N}' and \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' to be $\mathcal{F} - x$ and $\mathcal{F}' - x$, respectively, instead. Moreover, after this substitution we can repeat this argument if necessary until we obtain a pendantless phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}'' with a pendant blob \mathcal{B}'' that displays forests \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}'_1 with $L(\mathcal{F}_1) = L(\mathcal{F}'_1) \subseteq X - \{x\}$ such that $r(\mathcal{N}) = r(\mathcal{N}'')$ and either (1) $|L(\mathcal{B}'')| \geq 2$ and there is no element in $L(\mathcal{B}'')$ that is a tree in \mathcal{F}_1 or \mathcal{F}'_1 , (2) $|L(\mathcal{B}'')| = 1$, or (3) $|L(\mathcal{B}'')| \geq 2$, some element $y \in L(\mathcal{B}'')$ is a leaf in \mathcal{F}_1 or \mathcal{F}'_1 , and for every such y the pseudo-network obtained by removing y from $L(\mathcal{B}'')$ and its incident edge from \mathcal{B}'' and suppressing the resulting degree 2 vertex is not a phylogenetic network. In case (1) we can take \mathcal{N} to be \mathcal{N}'' and $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}'$ to be $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}'_1$, respectively, to complete the proof of the claim. In case (2) we can apply the argument in the previous paragraph for $|L(\mathcal{B})| = 1$ to complete the proof of the theorem. And in case (3), we can take any $y \in L(\mathcal{B}'')$ that is a leaf in \mathcal{F}_1 or \mathcal{F}'_1 ,

apply a (C3) reduction to y , and apply Lemma 5.3 to $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}'_1, \mathcal{N}'$ and y to complete the proof of the theorem by induction. This completes the proof of the claim.

So, assume that \mathcal{N} is pendantless and that it has a pendant blob \mathcal{B} with $|L(\mathcal{B})| \geq 2$ such that no leaf in $L(\mathcal{B})$ is a tree in either \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{F}' . Then there must be some cherry $c = (x, y)$ in \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{F}' , say in \mathcal{F} , so that x and y are both in $L(\mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{F}$ denote the tree that contains c , and let $\{x, u\}$ and $\{y, v\}$ be the pendant edges of \mathcal{N} incident with x and y , respectively. Let γ denote the path in \mathcal{T} from x to y . Note that u and v must be contained in the image $\mathcal{N}[\gamma]$ of γ in \mathcal{N} and that $\mathcal{N}[\gamma]$ must contain at least three edges because $u \neq v$ since \mathcal{N} is pendantless. Let $\mathcal{N}_s[\gamma]$ denote the subpath of $\mathcal{N}[\gamma]$ from u to v so that, in particular, $\mathcal{N}_s[\gamma]$ must be contained in \mathcal{B} and must contain at least one edge.

Note that we can assume from now on that every pendant edge incident to \mathcal{B} and every edge in \mathcal{B} is contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ or $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$ (or both). Indeed, if a pendant edge was not in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ or $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$, then either \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{F}' would contain an element in $L(\mathcal{B})$ that is a tree in \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{F}' , which contradicts our above assumption. And, if there is some $e \in E(\mathcal{B})$ such that e is not contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ or $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$, then by Lemma 5.4(a) there exists a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}' on X that displays \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' and $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}')$. Applying our induction hypothesis would then complete the proof of the theorem

We now claim that for the four cases in Observation 3.1, we may assume that only case (ii) must hold for x and y .

Suppose Observation 3.1(iv) holds, i.e. x and y are contained in different trees in \mathcal{F}' and neither x nor y is in a cherry of \mathcal{F}' . Then as x and y are in different trees of \mathcal{F}' , there must exist an edge e' in $\mathcal{N}_s[\gamma]$ that is not in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$. So, by applying Lemma 5.4(b) to e' , there exists a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}' on X with $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}')$ that displays \mathcal{F}' and either $\mathcal{F} - e_x$ or $\mathcal{F} - e_y$, say $\mathcal{F} - e_x$. Since $x, y \in L(\mathcal{B})$ neither x nor y is an isolated vertex in \mathcal{F}' , and so we have applied a (C2)(c)-reduction to \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' . Moreover, by induction, there is a cherry picking sequence σ' for $\mathcal{F} - e_x$ and \mathcal{F}' with $r(\mathcal{N}') \geq w(\sigma')$. Hence, $\sigma = (x) \circ \sigma'$ is a cherry picking sequence for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' such that $r(\mathcal{N}) \geq r(\mathcal{N}') + 1 \geq w(\sigma') + 1 = w(\sigma)$, and so the theorem follows.

Now, suppose Observation 3.1(iii) holds, i.e. x and y are leaves in the same tree \mathcal{T}' in \mathcal{F}' , but neither x nor y is in a cherry of \mathcal{T}' . If there exists an edge in $\mathcal{N}_s[\gamma]$ that is not contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$ then we can apply a similar argument to the one used in the previous paragraph to conclude the proof of the theorem using a (C2)(b)(α) reduction. So, suppose every edge in $\mathcal{N}_s[\gamma]$ is contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$. Let e and e' be the edges in $E(\mathcal{B})$ incident to u and v , respectively, but not in $\mathcal{N}_s[\gamma]$ (so, in particular, neither e nor e' is a cut-edge). Note that $e \neq e'$ since if $e = e'$, then as every edge in \mathcal{B} is contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ or $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$, this would imply that either \mathcal{F} or \mathcal{F}' contains a cycle, a contradiction. Moreover, since every edge in \mathcal{B} is contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ or $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$ and (x, y) is a cherry in \mathcal{F} , it follows that one of the edges e, e' , say e' , is in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$ but not in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$, and that e is in the image $\mathcal{N}[f]$ of the edge f in \mathcal{T} that is not in γ and that contains the vertex in \mathcal{T} adjacent to x . So, by Lemma 5.4(b), there exists a phylogenetic network \mathcal{N}' that displays \mathcal{F} and $\mathcal{F} - f$

with $r(\mathcal{N}) > r(\mathcal{N}')$. So applying a (C2)(b)(β)-reduction, we can apply induction again to \mathcal{N}' to complete the proof of the theorem.

Last, suppose Observation 3.1(i) holds, i.e. (x, y) is a cherry in \mathcal{F}' . Let e and e' be the edges in $E(\mathcal{B})$ incident to u and v , respectively, but not in $\mathcal{N}_s[\gamma]$, as in the previous paragraph, so $e \neq e'$. Then as (x, y) is a cherry in both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' it follows that either e or e' is contained in at most one of the images of $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ or $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$, say e . Hence, if e is in neither image we can use Lemma 5.4(a) to complete the proof of the theorem by induction, and if e is in only one image, we can use Lemma 5.4(b) and a (C1)-reduction to complete the proof by induction.

So, as claimed above, we can now assume that only Observation 3.1(ii) holds, i.e. that there is a cherry in \mathcal{F}' , say (x, z) , with $z \in X - \{y\}$. Let \mathcal{T}' denote the tree in \mathcal{F}' that contains (x, z) .

We now claim that we may assume that $|L(\mathcal{T})| \geq 3$. Indeed, suppose $L(\mathcal{T}) = \{x, y\}$. Then \mathcal{T} is a cherry in the form of the isolated edge $\{x, y\}$. Let e be the edge in \mathcal{B} that is not in $\mathcal{N}[\gamma]$ and contains the vertex adjacent to x . Then e is not a cut-edge and e is not contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$. Hence, e must be contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$ since, by assumption, every edge incident with a vertex in \mathcal{B} is in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ or $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$. As (x, y) is a tree in \mathcal{F} , we can therefore apply Lemma 5.4(b) with the roles of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' reversed. It follows that we can use a reduction as described in (C2)(a)(α) and apply induction to complete the proof. So, we can assume that \mathcal{T} has at least 3 leaves.

Note that we can also assume that $|L(\mathcal{B})| \geq 3$. If not, then $L(\mathcal{B}) = \{x, y\}$, from which it follows that (x, y) is a cherry in both \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' , which is not possible as we are assuming that Observation 3.1(i) does not hold.

We now claim that we can assume $|L(\mathcal{B}) \cap L(\mathcal{T})| \geq 3$. If not then $L(\mathcal{B}) \cap L(\mathcal{T}) = \{x, y\}$ and \mathcal{T} is not equal to (x, y) . So, if $\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{B}$, it follows immediately that $|L(\mathcal{B}) \cap L(\mathcal{T})| \geq 3$. And, if $\mathcal{N} \neq \mathcal{B}$, then as $|L(\mathcal{B})| \geq 3$ it follows that there is some $s \in L(\mathcal{B}) - \{x, y\}$. If $s \in L(\mathcal{T})$, then the claim holds. Otherwise there must be some tree \mathcal{T}'' in \mathcal{F} with $s \in L(\mathcal{T}'')$. But $L(\mathcal{T}'') \neq \{s\}$ by our above assumptions. Moreover, if $|L(\mathcal{T}'')| = 2$ then \mathcal{T}'' is a cherry in the form of an isolated edge. As $L(\mathcal{T}'') \subset L(\mathcal{B})$ (since $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}'']$ must contain the non-pendant cut-edge of \mathcal{N} incident to \mathcal{B} and $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}]$ and $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{T}'']$ are disjoint) we can apply the argument used for $L(\mathcal{T}) = \{x, y\}$ above to the cherry \mathcal{T}'' to complete the proof of the theorem. So the claim holds.

Now, as $|L(\mathcal{B}) \cap L(\mathcal{T})| \geq 3$, we can assume that either $((x, y), p)$ or $((x, y), (p, q))$ is a pendant subtree of \mathcal{T} with $x, y, p, q \in L(\mathcal{B})$ distinct. Let δ be the path in \mathcal{F}' between x and z and let $\mathcal{N}[\delta]$ be its image in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$. Note that $\mathcal{N}[\delta]$ must have length at least 3, and that we can assume that every edge in $\mathcal{N}[\gamma]$ is contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$, since otherwise there would exist some edge in $\mathcal{N}_s[\gamma]$ that is only in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$, and we could apply Lemma 5.4(b) and a (C2)(a)(α)-reduction to complete the proof of the theorem.

Let e be the edge in \mathcal{N} that is *not* in the path $\mathcal{N}_s[\gamma]$ and that contains u .

First, note that we can assume that e is in $\mathcal{N}[\delta]$. Indeed, suppose e is not in $\mathcal{N}[\delta]$. If e is in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$, then since we are assuming that the path $\mathcal{N}_s[\gamma]$ is in the image of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' , we get a contradiction (as then (x, z) would not be a cherry in \mathcal{F}'). And, if e is not in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$, then it must be in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$. Hence there must exist some edge in \mathcal{B} that is in $\mathcal{N}[\delta]$ but not in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$. So we can apply Lemma 5.4(b), a (C2)(a)(α)-reduction removing e_z from \mathcal{F}' (with the roles of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' reversed) and induction to complete the proof.

Second, note that we can also assume that e is in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$. Indeed, if e is not in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$, then we can apply Lemma 5.4(b) and a (C2)(a)(α)-reduction removing e_z from \mathcal{F}' (with the roles of \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' reversed) and induction to complete the proof of the theorem.

Third, note that we can assume that every edge in $\mathcal{N}[\delta]$ is contained in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$, since otherwise we can apply Lemma 5.4(b) and a (C2)(a)(α)-reduction removing e_z from \mathcal{F}' and induction to complete the proof of the theorem.

Now, suppose that $((x, y), p)$ is a pendant subtree of \mathcal{T} . If $\mathcal{T} = ((x, y), p)$ and $z = p$, then \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' both have the cherry (x, z) which is not possible by our assumptions. So $p \neq z$, which implies that $\mathcal{N}[\delta]$ must contain an edge that is not in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$, which is not possible. Moreover, if $((x, y), p)$ is a proper pendant subtree of \mathcal{T} , then using a similar argument, we can apply Lemma 5.4(b) and a (C2)(a)(β)-reduction with $\mathcal{S} = ((x, y), p)$ plus induction in case $p = z$ and a Lemma 5.4(b) and a (C2)(a)(β)-reduction with $\mathcal{S} = p$ plus induction in case $p \neq z$ to complete the proof of the theorem.

Finally, suppose $((x, y), (p, q))$ is a pendant subtree of \mathcal{T} . Using similar arguments to the last paragraph, if $\mathcal{T} = ((x, y), (p, q))$ then, since $\mathcal{N}[\delta]$ is in $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}]$ and $\mathcal{N}[\mathcal{F}']$, it follows that z equals p (or by symmetry q), and so we can apply Lemma 5.4(b) and a (C2)(a)(β) reduction with $\mathcal{S} = ((x, y), p)$ plus induction to complete the proof of the theorem. And if $\mathcal{T} \neq ((x, y), (p, q))$ and (i) z equals p (or by symmetry q), then we can apply a (C2)(a)(γ) reduction with $\mathcal{S} = q$, or (ii) $z \neq p, q$, then we can apply a (C2)(a)(γ) reduction with $\mathcal{S} = (p, q)$, plus Lemma 5.4(b) and induction to complete the proof of the theorem. \square

7. DISCUSSION

In this paper, we have proven that the hybrid number of two binary phylogenetic trees can be given in terms of cherry picking sequences. There are several interesting future directions of research. For example, in [9] cherry picking sequences for an arbitrary set of rooted, not necessarily binary, phylogenetic trees all having the same leaf set are considered. Is it possible to extend our results to give cherry picking sequences to arbitrary collections of not-necessarily phylogenetic trees (or forests) all having the same leaf set? Also, in [9] it was shown that minimum weight cherry picking sequences for collections of rooted phylogenetic trees lead to phylogenetic networks which have a special structure (time consistent and tree-child). Do we get phylogenetic networks with some special structure when we consider cherry picking sequences for unrooted phylogenetic trees?

As mentioned in the introduction, the hybrid number of two unrooted binary trees is equal to the TBR distance between the two trees. Recently, there has been some interest in improving algorithms to compute the TBR distance (see e.g. [18, 19]), and some of the data reductions rules introduced in these papers are similar to the rules that we used to define cherry picking sequences (for example, the reduction described in (C2)(a)(β) is similar to the (*,3,*)-reduction in [18, Section 3.1]). It would be interesting to see if there is a deeper connection between these two concepts, and to investigate whether, for example, the results presented here could be used to improve depth-bounded search tree algorithms to compute the TBR distance. To investigate this connection, a first step might be to understand whether or not all of the reductions in the definition of a cherry picking sequence are needed, or whether a somewhat simpler list of reductions might be found to define a cherry picking sequence so that Theorem 4.1 still holds.

Finally, we have considered the hybrid number $h(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}')$ for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{F}' an arbitrary pair of forests on X . In case we restrict h to pairs of phylogenetic trees on X , h is the TBR distance on the set of phylogenetic trees on X . It would be interesting to understand properties of h for pairs of forests in general (e. g. is h related to some kind of TBR distance on the set of forests on X ?).

REFERENCES

- [1] Allen, B., Steel, M. (2001) Subtree transfer operations and their induced metrics on evolutionary trees. *Annals of Combinatorics*, 5:1–15.
- [2] Baroni, B., Grünewald, S., Moulton, V., Semple, S. (2005) Bounding the number of hybridization events for a consistent evolutionary history. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*. 51:171–182.
- [3] Bernardini, G., van Iersel, L., Julien, E., Stougie L. (2022) Reconstructing phylogenetic networks via cherry picking and machine learning. In: *Proceeding of the Workshop on Algorithms in Bioinformatics (WABI 2022)*. 16:1–16:22, Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [4] Bryant, D., Lagergren, J. (2006) Compatibility of unrooted phylogenetic trees is FPT. *Theoretical Computer Science*. 351:296–302.
- [5] Chen, J., Fan, J.-H., Sze, S.-H. (2015) Parameterized and approximation algorithms for maximum agreement forest in multifurcating trees. *Theoretical Computer Science*. 562:496–512.
- [6] Döcker, J., van Iersel, L., Kelk, S., Linz, S. (2019) Deciding the existence of a cherry-picking sequence is hard on two trees. *Theoretical Computer Science*. 260:131–143.
- [7] Huber, K. T., Moulton, V., Steel, M., and Wu, T. (2016) Folding and unfolding phylogenetic trees and networks. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*. 73:1761–1780.
- [8] Humphries, P. J, Linz, S., Semple, C. (2013) On the complexity of computing the temporal hybridization number for two phylogenies. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 161:871–880.
- [9] Humphries, P. J., Linz, S., Semple, C. (2013) Cherry picking: a characterization of the temporal hybridization number for a set of phylogenies. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology*. 75:1879–1890.
- [10] Huson, Daniel H., Regula Rupp, and Celine Scornavacca. *Phylogenetic networks: concepts, algorithms and applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [11] van Iersel, L., Janssen, R., Jones, M., Murakami, Y., Zeh, N. (2018) Polynomial-time algorithms for phylogenetic inference problems. In: *International Conference on Algorithms for Computational Biology*. pp. 37–49, Springer, Cham.
- [12] van Iersel, L., Kelk, S., Stamoulis, G., Stougie, L., Boes, O. (2018) On unrooted and root-uncertain variants of several well-known phylogenetic network problems. *Algorithmica*. 80:2993–3022.

- [13] van Iersel, L., Semple, C., Steel, M. (2010) Locating a tree in a phylogenetic network. *Information Processing Letters*. 110:1037–1043.
- [14] Janssen, R., Murakami, Y. (2021) On cherry-picking and network containment. *Theoretical Computer Science*. 856:121–150.
- [15] Kanj, I. A., Nakhleh, L., Than, C., Xia, G. (2008) Seeing the trees and their branches in the network is hard. *Theoretical Computer Science*. 401:153–164.
- [16] Kelk, S., Linz, S. (2019) A tight kernel for computing the tree bisection and reconnection distance between two phylogenetic trees. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*. 33:1556–1574.
- [17] Kelk, S., Linz S., Meuwese R. Deep kernelization for the Tree Bisection and Reconnect (TBR) distance in phylogenetics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04451* (2022).
- [18] Kelk, S., Linz, S. (2020) New reduction rules for the tree bisection and reconnection distance. *Annals of Combinatorics*. 24:475–502.
- [19] Kong S, Pons JC, Kubatko L, Wicke K. Classes of explicit phylogenetic networks and their biological and mathematical significance. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*. 2022 May;84(6):1-44
- [20] Linz, S., Semple, C. (2019) Attaching leaves and picking cherries to characterise the hybridisation number for a set of phylogenies. *Advances in Applied Mathematics*. 105:102–129.
- [21] St John, K. (2017) The shape of phylogenetic treespace. *Systematic Biology*, 66:e83.
- [22] Semple, C., Steel, M. (2003) *Phylogenetics*. Oxford University Press.
- [23] Whidden, C., Beiko, R. G., Zeh, N. (2103) Fixed-parameter algorithms for maximum agreement forests. *SIAM Journal on Computing*. 42:1431–1466.
- [24] Zhang, L., Ng, Y .K., Wu, T., Zheng, Y. (2011) Network model and efficient method for detecting relative duplications or horizontal gene transfers. In: *IEEE 1st International Conference on Computational Advances in Bio and Medical Sciences (ICCABS)*. pp. 214–219.

8. STATEMENTS AND DECLARATIONS

The authors declare that no funds, grants, or other support were received during the preparation of this manuscript.

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

All authors contributed to the study conception and design. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

SCHOOL OF COMPUTING SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA, NORWICH, UK

Email address: `k.huber@uea.ac.uk`

SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND, AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND

Email address: `s.linz@auckland.ac.nz`

SCHOOL OF COMPUTING SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA, NORWICH, UK

Email address: `v.moulton@uea.ac.uk`