
DEFINING BINARY PHYLOGENETIC TREES USING PARSIMONY: NEW BOUNDS

A PREPRINT

Mirko Wilde

Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science
University of Greifswald
Walther-Rathenau-Str. 47, Greifswald, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Germany
mirko.wilde@uni-greifswald.de

Mareike Fischer*

Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science
University of Greifswald
Walther-Rathenau-Str. 47, Greifswald, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Germany
email@mareikefischer.de
*Corresponding author

July 31, 2023

ABSTRACT

Phylogenetic trees are frequently used to model evolution. Such trees are typically reconstructed from data like DNA, RNA, or protein alignments using methods based on criteria like maximum parsimony (amongst others). Maximum parsimony has been assumed to work well for data with only few state changes. Recently, some progress has been made to formally prove this assertion. For instance, it has been shown that each binary phylogenetic tree T with $n \geq 20k$ leaves is uniquely defined by the set $A_k(T)$, which consists of all characters with parsimony score k on T . In the present manuscript, we show that the statement indeed holds for all $n \geq 4k$, thus drastically lowering the lower bound for n from $20k$ to $4k$. However, it has been known that for $n \leq 2k$ and $k \geq 3$, it is not generally true that $A_k(T)$ defines T . We improve this result by showing that the latter statement can be extended from $n \leq 2k$ to $n \leq 2k + 2$. So we drastically reduce the gap of values of n for which it is unknown if trees T on n taxa are defined by $A_k(T)$ from the previous interval of $[2k + 1, 20k - 1]$ to the interval $[2k + 3, 4k - 1]$. Moreover, we close this gap completely for the nearest neighbor interchange (NNI) neighborhood of T in the following sense: We show that as long as $n \geq 2k + 3$, no tree that is one NNI move away from T (and thus very similar to T) shares the same A_k -alignment.

Keywords maximum parsimony, phylogenetic tree, Buneman theorem

MSC Classification 05C05 , 05-08 , 05C90 , 92B05 , 92-08

1 Introduction

Reconstructing evolutionary relationships between different species and ultimately even the so-called “Tree of Life” [1], i.e., the tree describing the relationships of all living species on earth, is one of the big goals in biology. In order to pursue this goal, mathematical tree reconstruction methods are required. Such methods usually take data in the form of aligned DNA, RNA, or protein sequences and then use an optimization criterion to return the “best” tree, i.e., the

tree describing the data best according to a given criterion. One such criterion is maximum parsimony (MP): methods based on this criterion seek to find the tree with the minimal number of nucleotide substitutions (cf. [2, 3]).

However, just as other methods, MP may err, i.e., it may return the wrong tree (e.g., in the so-called “Felsenstein zone”, cf. [4, 5]), or it may be indecisive between several trees. On the other hand, it has been observed that in many cases, MP seems to work well when the number of nucleotide substitutions in the data is low [6]. Analyzing and proving this “folklore knowledge” has inspired various mathematical manuscripts in the recent literature. In particular, the special case of the so-called $A_k(T)$ alignment plays an important role. For a given phylogenetic tree T , $A_k(T)$ is the set containing all binary characters that require precisely k nucleotide substitutions on T . It is a consequence of the classic Buneman theorem [7] in mathematical phylogenetics, which is also known as “splits equivalence theorem” [3], that $A_1(T)$ defines T and that T can be uniquely reconstructed from $A_1(T)$ using the MP criterion. In [8], it was shown that T can be uniquely defined by $A_2(T)$ and moreover, if $n \geq 9$, uniquely reconstructed from $A_2(T)$ using MP. However, in the same manuscript it was also shown that unfortunately, $A_k(T)$ does *not* generally define T for $k \geq 3$ if the number of leaves n of T equals $2k$. On the other hand, more recently it has been shown that T is indeed uniquely defined by $A_k(T)$ whenever $n \geq 20k$ [9].

So for all cases with $k \geq 3$, the literature so far leaves a big gap between the cases of $2k$ and $20k$: We know that in case that $n = 2k$, T is not necessarily defined by $A_k(T)$, but we also know that if $n \geq 20k$, it definitely is. In the present manuscript, we drastically reduce this gap: We show that any binary phylogenetic tree T is uniquely defined by $A_k(T)$ whenever $n \geq 4k$. We obtain this result by exploiting both the classic version of Menger’s theorem known from graph theory (cf. [10, 11]) as well as a stronger and more recent version of it [12]. Thus, our result nicely links modern phylogenetics to classic graph theory, and it can be considered an important first step to proving the conjecture that whenever $k < \frac{n}{4}$, T is the unique maximum parsimony tree of $A_k(T)$, which was stated by [8] and inspired by [13]. Furthermore, we show that for all $k \geq 3$, there are cases of different trees with $n = 2k + 1$ as well as $n = 2k + 2$ and identical A_k -alignments, hence also improving the lower bound of the gap, i.e., the range of values of n for which we do *not* know if $A_k(T)$ defines the binary phylogenetic tree T with n leaves. Previously, this gap contained all values of n in the interval $[2k + 1, 20k - 1]$, and our manuscript reduces this interval to $[2k + 3, 4k - 1]$.

Moreover, we even manage to close the gap completely within the so-called NNI neighborhood. In particular, we show that for all $n \geq 2k + 3$, we have $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$ whenever \tilde{T} is an NNI neighbor of T .

In summary, our manuscript drastically reduces the gap of values of n for which we do not know if binary phylogenetic trees on n leaves are uniquely defined by their respective A_k -alignments, and we are even able to show that in the NNI neighborhood of any such tree, the gap can be closed affirmatively, in the following sense: The A_k -alignment of a given tree T with $n \geq 2k + 3$ leaves is indeed unique within its NNI neighborhood.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Definitions and notation

Before we can state our results, we need to introduce some basic phylogenetic and graph theoretical concepts. We begin with trees and tree operations.

Phylogenetic trees

In the following, a *phylogenetic X -tree* $T = (V, E)$ is a connected acyclic graph without vertices of degree 2 whose leaves (i.e., vertices whose degree is at most 1) are bijectively labeled by X . We may assume without loss of generality that $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$. We call T *binary* if every vertex has degree either 1 or 3. Similarly, a *rooted phylogenetic X -tree* $T = (V, E)$ is a connected acyclic graph whose leaves are bijectively labeled by X and with exactly one designated *root* vertex $\rho \in \hat{T}$. Note that for technical reasons, in the following we will consider a tree consisting of only one vertex to be rooted, too – in this case, the only vertex is at the same time considered to be the root and the only leaf of the tree.

Two phylogenetic X -trees $T = (V, E)$ and $\tilde{T} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$ are *isomorphic* if there exists a bijection $\phi : V \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ with $\{v, \tilde{v}\} \in E(T) \Leftrightarrow \{\phi(v), \phi(\tilde{v})\} \in E(\tilde{T})$ and $\phi(x) = x$ for all $x \in X$. In other words, ϕ is a graph isomorphism preserving the leaf labeling. As is common in mathematical phylogenetics, whenever T and \tilde{T} are isomorphic, we denote this by $T \cong \tilde{T}$.

Basic graph theoretical concepts

We need some concepts from classical graph theory. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple graph and let A and B be subsets of V . Then, a path P connecting some vertex in A with some vertex in B and with no interior vertex in either A or B is called an A - B -path. A subset F of E is called an A - B -cut set, or simply *cut set* for short whenever there is no ambiguity, if the graph $G' = (V, E \setminus F)$ resulting from G when edge set F gets deleted contains no A - B -path. If \mathcal{P} is a collection of A - B -paths, we denote by $\mathcal{P}(A)$ the union of all sets $V(P) \cap A$ with $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and by $\mathcal{P}(B)$ the union of all sets $V(P) \cap B$ with $P \in \mathcal{P}$, i.e., $\mathcal{P}(A)$ contains all *endpoints* of P that lie in A , and $\mathcal{P}(B)$ contains all *endpoints* of P that lie in B . In the special case of a phylogenetic X -tree with $A = B = X$, we call an A - B -path with at least one interior vertex a *leaf-to-leaf-path*.

Similar to an A - B -cut set, an A - B -separator can be defined as follows. For a subset $V' \subseteq V$ we consider the graph $G' = (V \setminus V', E')$ induced by $V \setminus V'$, where $E' \subseteq E$ contains all edges both of whose endpoints are contained in $V \setminus V'$. Then, V' is an A - B -separator of G (or separator for short, if there is no ambiguity) for $A, B \subseteq V$, if G' contains no A - B -path.

Phylogenetic tree operations

When considering various binary phylogenetic X -trees, it is often useful to measure their distance using a tree metric. One of the most frequently used such metrics is d_{NNI} , which simply counts the minimum number of so-called *nearest neighbor interchange (NNI) moves* needed to get from the first tree under consideration to the second one. An NNI move simply takes an inner edge e of a binary phylogenetic X -tree T and swaps two of the four subtrees of T which we get when deleting the precisely four edges adjacent to e in a way that the resulting tree is not isomorphic to T , i.e., in a way that changes the tree. A tree resulting from T by performing one NNI move is called an *NNI neighbor* of T , and all NNI neighbors of T together with T form the *NNI neighborhood* of T . Note that this implies that we consider T to belong to its own neighborhood.

Another operation often used to change a binary phylogenetic X -tree T is a *cherry reduction*. A cherry $[x, y]$ for $x, y \in X$, $x \neq y$, is a pair of leaves of T adjacent to the same vertex u . We distinguish between a *cherry reduction of type 1*, which deletes only one of the two leaves x and y of the cherry, without loss of generality x , and suppresses the resulting degree-2 vertex, and a *cherry reduction of type 2*, which deletes both leaves x and y of the cherry as well as their unique neighbor, and subsequently suppresses the resulting degree-2 vertex. Note that other than NNI moves, which transform a binary phylogenetic X -tree into another binary phylogenetic X -tree, a cherry reduction of type 1 results in a phylogenetic $X \setminus \{x\}$ -tree and a cherry reduction of type 2 results in a phylogenetic $X \setminus \{x, y\}$ -tree, i.e., both cherry reductions reduce the number of taxa under consideration. However, as long as $|X| \geq 4$, the resulting trees will be binary, too. Such reductions are thus often used in mathematical phylogenetics in inductive proofs. Note that every binary phylogenetic tree with at least three leaves has at least one cherry ([3, Proposition 1.2.5]), so that in such trees, both types of cherry reductions can be performed.

Characters, X -splits and alignments

In evolutionary biology, we often want to reconstruct phylogenetic trees from a data set on the species in question. In this regard, we often consider *binary characters* $f : X \rightarrow \{a, b\}$. An *extension* of such a character f on a given phylogenetic X -tree $T = (V, E)$ is a function $g : V \rightarrow \{a, b\}$ with $g(x) = f(x)$ for $x \in X$. We call an edge $\{v, w\}$ with $g(v) \neq g(w)$ a *changing edge* of g . By $ch(g, T)$ we denote the number of changing edges or the *changing number* of g on T .

Another basic notion in phylogenetics is the following: If $X = A \cup B$ is a bipartition of X into two non-empty subsets, we call $\sigma = A|B$ an X -split. The *size* of an X -split σ is defined by $|\sigma| = \min\{|A|, |B|\}$. Every X -split of size 1 is called *trivial*.

Note that there is a natural relationship between phylogenetic trees and X -splits in the sense that every phylogenetic tree T on taxon set X induces a collection of X -splits: If e is an edge of T , removing e leads to a forest consisting of two rooted phylogenetic trees T_A and T_B on taxon sets A and B , respectively (cf. Fig. 1). Clearly, $A|B$ is an X -split, and we call it an X -split *induced* by T . We denote the set of all X -splits induced by T by $\Sigma(T)$. It is well-known that $|\Sigma(T)| = 2n - 3$ if T is binary and $|X| \geq 2$ [3, Proposition 2.1.3]. Moreover, as clearly all trivial X -splits are contained in *every* phylogenetic X -tree, we denote by $\Sigma^*(T)$ the set of all non-trivial X -splits induced by T .

Note that not only is there a connection between phylogenetic X -trees and X -splits, but there is also a connection between X -splits and binary characters: Given a binary character $f : X \rightarrow \{a, b\}$, let $A_f = f^{-1}(\{a\})$ and $B_f = f^{-1}(\{b\})$. Then, $A_f|B_f$ is an X -split, and we call it the X -split *induced* by f .

Given some phylogenetic tree T with taxa X and some binary character $f : X \rightarrow \{a, b\}$, we call $l(f, T) := \min_g ch(g, T)$ the *parsimony score* of f on T . Here, the minimum runs over all extensions g of f on T . Note that an extension g of f on T with $ch(g, T) = l(f, T)$ is called *most parsimonious*.

We can extend the definition of the parsimony score to *alignments*, i.e., to a multiset of characters $A = \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$:

$$l(A, T) = \sum_{i=1}^k l(f_i, T).$$

Now, the most important concept in our manuscript is a particular alignment: For a given binary phylogenetic tree T , we define the alignment $A_k(T)$ as the set of all characters with parsimony score k on T . If A is an alignment, then we call it an A_k -*alignment* if there exists some binary phylogenetic tree T with $A = A_k(T)$.

2.2 Known results

Before we can state our own results, we need to introduce various known results both from the phylogenetic and graph theoretical literature, which we later on use to derive our own findings.

We start by considering edge-disjoint and vertex-disjoint paths and first recall the following useful lemma, which was recently proven in [9].

Lemma 1 (Lemma 1 in [9]). *Let T be a binary phylogenetic X -tree with $|X| = n$. Then T has at least $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf-paths.*

Next, we state Menger’s classic theorem, which is well-known from graph theory ([10], [11, Theorem 3.3.1]).

Theorem 1 (Menger’s theorem). *Let G be a graph with vertex set V and $A, B \subset V$. Then the minimum number of vertices needed to separate A from B is equal to the maximum number of vertex-disjoint A - B -paths.*

The following classic result from mathematical phylogenetics is based on Menger’s theorem.

Proposition 1 (Corollary 5.1.8 in [3]). *Let T be a binary phylogenetic X -tree, and let $f : X \rightarrow \{a, b\}$ be a binary character. Then $l(f, T)$ is equal to the maximum number of edge-disjoint A_f - B_f -paths in T .*

From Proposition 1, one can easily derive the following corollary, which is based on the fact that in *binary* trees, the notions of “edge-disjoint” and “vertex-disjoint” coincide when considering leaf-to-leaf paths.

Corollary 1. *Let T be a binary phylogenetic X -tree, and let $f : X \rightarrow \{a, b\}$ be a binary character. Then $l(f, T)$ is equal to the maximum number of vertex-disjoint A_f - B_f -paths in T .*

Proof. Note that for graphs with maximum degree 3, and thus in particular for binary phylogenetic trees, we have that two paths P_1, P_2 are edge-disjoint only if there is no vertex which is internal vertex in P_1 as well as in P_2 . Thus, the statement follows directly from Proposition 1 (using the fact that the endpoints of A_f - B_f -paths are leaves). \square

The argument used in the proof of Corollary 1 implies that – as we are only considering leaf-to-leaf paths in binary phylogenetic trees in this manuscript unless stated otherwise – whenever one of the terms “edge-disjoint” or “vertex-disjoint” is used, it can be replaced with the other one. In particular, whenever a version of Menger’s theorem is used to obtain some statement on vertex-disjoint leaf-to-leaf-paths, one automatically obtains an analogous statement on edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf-paths and vice versa.

The following statement, which we need to prove our own results, is a stronger version of Menger’s classic theorem.

Proposition 2 (adapted from [12, 11]). *Let G be a graph with vertex set V . Consider some subsets A and B of V such that A cannot be separated from B by a set of fewer than j vertices. Let \mathcal{P} be a set of i vertex-disjoint A - B -paths in G with $i < j$ with endpoints $\mathcal{P}(A)$ in A and $\mathcal{P}(B)$ in B . Then there exists a set \mathcal{Q} of j vertex-disjoint A - B -paths in G with $\mathcal{P}(A) \subset \mathcal{Q}(A)$ and $\mathcal{P}(B) \subset \mathcal{Q}(B)$, where $\mathcal{Q}(A)$ denotes the endpoints of \mathcal{Q} in A and $\mathcal{Q}(B)$ denotes the endpoints of \mathcal{Q} in B .*

Note that actually, the version of Proposition 2 proven in [12] as well as in [11, Chapter 3.3, 2nd proof of Menger’s theorem] is slightly weaker than the version stated here. In particular, the authors used the case of i vertex-disjoint A - B -paths to derive the case of $i + 1$ vertex-disjoint A - B -paths. However, the above stated stronger version can be easily derived by an iteration of the arguments used to derive the case $i + 1$.

We are now in the position to consider alignment $A_k(T)$, which is one of the most important concepts of the present manuscript. Here we recall the following result, which we seek to generalize in the present manuscript.

Proposition 3 (adapted from Corollary 1 [9] and Proposition 1 in [8]). *Let $k \in \{1, 2\}$. Let T and \tilde{T} be two binary phylogenetic X -trees. Then, $T \cong \tilde{T}$ if and only if $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$.*

Note that the case of $k = 1$ is a direct consequence of the well-known Buneman theorem, which states that $T \cong \tilde{T}$ if and only if $\Sigma(T) = \Sigma(\tilde{T})$ [7] (see also [3, Theorem 3.1.4]), whereas the case $k = 2$ can be derived from the first case [8].

We are now finally in a position to turn our attention to new results.

3 Results

The aim of this section is threefold: First, we state our main result, which is a generalization of Proposition 3 to all $3 \leq k \leq \frac{n}{4}$, or, equivalently, to all $n \geq 4k$ for $k \geq 3$.

Our second result, however, has a somewhat different flavor: In this setting, we do not analyze the entire space of binary phylogenetic X -trees to see if for a given such tree T , there is another tree \tilde{T} with $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$. Instead, we investigate the NNI neighborhood of T and present a lower bound on n such that we can guarantee $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$ if \tilde{T} lies in this neighborhood. While this second result is doubtlessly of relevance in its own right, we can also use it to prove our third main result, namely that if $n = 2k + 1$ or $n = 2k + 2$ and $k \geq 3$, there are pairs of binary phylogenetic X -trees, where $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$, which share the same A_k -alignments. Note that it has already been known that there are such cases with $k = \frac{n}{2}$, i.e., $n = 2k$, [8], so our new result shows that this problem can still occur for smaller values of k or larger values of n .

So together, our results reduce the “gap” in the literature quite significantly: Before, it was only known that if $n \leq 2k$, $A_k(T)$ does not necessarily define T [8], and that if $n \geq 20k$, $A_k(T)$ indeed does define T [9], leaving the cases $2k + 1 \leq n \leq 20k - 1$ open. Now, our results narrow this gap down to $2k + 3 \leq n \leq 4k - 1$ and close it completely for pairs T and \tilde{T} , where \tilde{T} is from the NNI neighborhood of a given tree T .

We begin with our main result.

3.1 An extension of Proposition 3

It is the main aim of the present manuscript to extend Proposition 3 to other values of k . However, it has already been known for some time that the statement does not generally hold for $k \geq 3$. For instance, if the number n of leaves equals $2k$, it is known that there are pairs of trees which share the same A_k -alignment [8].

However, it was recently shown in [9, Theorem 3] that if $n \geq 20k$, $A_k(T)$ defines T in the sense that in this case $T \cong \tilde{T}$ if and only if $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$ (where T and \tilde{T} are binary phylogenetic X -trees with $|X| = n \geq 20k$). In the present section, we will drastically improve this lower bound from $n \geq 20k$ to $n \geq 4k$ as stated by the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 4k}$. Let T and \tilde{T} be two binary phylogenetic X -trees with $|X| = n$. Then, $T \cong \tilde{T}$ if and only if $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$.*

Before we can prove this theorem, we first need to state and prove the following useful lemma, which is a simple extension of Lemma 1.

Lemma 2. *Let T be a binary phylogenetic tree on taxon set X with $|X| = n \geq 2$. Let $x \in X$. Then, T contains $p = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf paths P_1, \dots, P_p such that x is an endpoint of P_1 .*

Proof. We first use Lemma 1 to derive a set of p edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf paths P'_1, \dots, P'_p , where $p = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \geq 1$, and then show that we can modify these paths so that leaf x is an endpoint of one of the paths.

We define sets A and B with $A, B \subset X$ such that A contains precisely one endpoint of each path P'_1, \dots, P'_p and B contains the other endpoint of each path P'_1, \dots, P'_p . If x is an endpoint of one of these paths, there is nothing to show. So we now consider the case that x is not an endpoint of these paths and add x to A . If then there are leaves left that are not contained in any P'_i , we add them to B . This way, we ensure that $A \cap B = \emptyset$ and $A \cup B = X$, so $A|B$ is an X -split.




Figure 1: (taken from [8, 9]) By removing an edge $e = \{u, v\}$ from an unrooted binary phylogenetic tree T , it is decomposed into two rooted subtrees, T_A and T_B . If, as in this figure, both of them consist of more than one node, then we can further decompose them into two subtrees T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} or T_{B_1} and T_{B_2} , by removing u or v , respectively.

Now, consider some arbitrary $\{x\}$ - B -path P in T , which is also an A - B -path as $\{x\} \subseteq A$. Let j be the minimum number of vertices needed to separate A from B . Applying Proposition 2 to T with $\mathcal{P} := \{P\}$ (and thus $i = 1$), we get a collection \mathcal{Q} of j vertex-disjoint A - B -paths. Note that in particular, as $\mathcal{P} = \{P\}$ and as P is an A - B -path with endpoint $x \in A$, we have $x \in \mathcal{P}(A)$.

Now, by Theorem 1 we know that j is also equal to the maximum number of vertex-disjoint A - B -paths. Moreover, by Corollary 1, j is also equal to the maximum number of edge-disjoint A - B -paths. By choice of $A|B$, we know that there are at least p edge-disjoint A - B -paths (namely P'_1, \dots, P'_p), so $j \geq p$. Therefore, \mathcal{Q} contains at least p edge-disjoint paths P_1, \dots, P_p with endpoints $\mathcal{P}(A) \subseteq \mathcal{Q}(A)$ by Proposition 2.

So x is endpoint of one of the p edge-disjoint paths P_1, \dots, P_p in \mathcal{Q} , and we may assume without loss of generality that x is an endpoint of P_1 . This completes the proof. \square

We are now in the position to prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. As the case $k = 1$ follows directly from Proposition 3, we may in the following assume $k \geq 2$.¹

Let $n \geq 4k$ and let T and \tilde{T} be two binary phylogenetic X -trees as specified in the theorem. If $T \cong \tilde{T}$, we clearly have $l(f, T) = l(f, \tilde{T})$ for all binary characters f on X , and thus we also have $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$, which completes the first direction of the proof.

So now we assume that $T \neq \tilde{T}$, in which case we know by the Buneman theorem that $\Sigma(T) \neq \Sigma(\tilde{T})$. Using the fact that $|\Sigma(T)| = |\Sigma(\tilde{T})| = 2n - 3$, we can conclude $\Sigma(T) \setminus \Sigma(\tilde{T}) \neq \emptyset$. Let $\sigma = A|B \in \Sigma(T) \setminus \Sigma(\tilde{T})$ be of minimal size. Moreover, we may assume without loss of generality that $|A| \leq |B|$, which implies $|B| \geq \frac{n}{2}$. As all trivial splits are contained in both $\Sigma(T)$ and $\Sigma(\tilde{T})$, we conclude that σ cannot be trivial, and thus we have $|A| \geq 2$. Moreover, as σ is contained in $\Sigma(T)$, it corresponds to an edge $e = \{u, v\}$ whose removal would divide T into two subtrees T_A and T_B , with T_A being further subdividable into T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} by the removal of u , cf. Figure 1 for an illustration.

Note that clearly, $|A_1| < |A|$ and $|A_2| < |A|$. Furthermore, the two X -splits $\sigma_1 = A_1|(X \setminus A_1)$ and $\sigma_2 = A_2|(X \setminus A_2)$ must both be contained in $\Sigma(T)$ as T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} are subtrees of T inducing these splits. By the minimality of σ , σ_1 and σ_2 are actually contained in $\Sigma(T) \cap \Sigma(\tilde{T})$. Therefore, the X -splits σ_1 and σ_2 are also induced by subtrees of \tilde{T} (as are all other splits induced by edges in T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} , respectively), which implies that \tilde{T} contains the two subtrees T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} . However, as $\Sigma(\tilde{T})$ does not contain σ , there is a path $S = \rho_1, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m, \rho_2$ in \tilde{T} from the root ρ_1 of T_{A_1} to the root ρ_2 of T_{A_2} with $m \geq 2$ (otherwise, \tilde{T} would also contain σ), cf. Figure 2. This also implies that besides T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} , there are m more subtrees \tilde{T}_i obtained by deleting the edges of S , with each such subtree \tilde{T}_i containing β_i as a leaf, cf. Figure 2. Moreover, each of the trees \tilde{T}_i can be thought of as a binary phylogenetic tree with taxon set $X_i = B_i \cup \{\beta_i\}$, where B_i is a subset of B .

Next, our goal is to show that we can construct a binary character f on X which satisfies all of the following properties:

1. Each taxon in A is assigned state a by f .

¹Note that by Proposition 3, we could even assume $k \geq 3$, but our proof does not depend on this requirement. This also implies that our proof supersedes Proposition 1 of [8].




Figure 2: (adapted from [9]) Tree \tilde{T} as described in the proof of Theorem 2. Subtree \tilde{T}_1 is exemplarily highlighted in bold (note that it does contain β_1 as a leaf); the other subtrees \tilde{T}_i are formed analogously. Moreover, note that the subtree \tilde{T} might be empty, i.e., the dashed parts of the tree might not exist, namely if $m = 2$.

2. There are two edge-disjoint paths P_1 and P_2 with P_1 connecting some leaf $x_1 \in T_{A_1}$ with some leaf $y_1 \in \tilde{T}_1$ and with P_2 connecting some leaf $x_2 \in T_{A_2}$ with some leaf $y_2 \in \tilde{T}_m$, and f assigns both y_1 and y_2 state b .
3. There are additional $k - 2$ paths P_3, \dots, P_k from a leaf in B to another leaf in B , respectively, such that P_1, \dots, P_k form a collection of edge-disjoint paths in \tilde{T} . The endpoints of each path in this collection are assigned different states by f .
4. Every taxon in B which is not contained in some path P_i is assigned state b by character f .

Note that if we succeed to find a character f with all these properties, then A_f is the union of A and a set of $k - 2$ elements of B , which are exactly the endpoints of paths P_3, \dots, P_k to which a is assigned, and B_f is a proper subset of B obtained by deleting the mentioned endpoints from B .

The proof strategy now is as follows: We continue to show that we can indeed choose f as described above. Subsequently, we will show that for this character f , we have $f \in A_k(\tilde{T}) \setminus A_k(T)$. The latter implies $A_k(\tilde{T}) \neq A_k(T)$ and will thus complete the proof.

So in order to find f fulfilling the above properties, the first and the fourth property do not pose any problem. The crucial point to show is that we can choose the k edge-disjoint paths with the described properties.

First, recalling that each \tilde{T}_i is a binary phylogenetic tree with taxon set $X_i = B_i \cup \{\beta_i\}$, we apply Lemma 2 to \tilde{T}_1 and \tilde{T}_m . To simplify notation, let $b_i = |B_i| + 1$ and $c_i = \lfloor \frac{b_i}{2} \rfloor$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Then, Lemma 2 implies that \tilde{T}_1 contains at least c_1 edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf paths R_1, \dots, R_{c_1} such that β_1 is an endpoint of R_1 . Analogously, \tilde{T}_m contains at least c_m edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf paths R'_1, \dots, R'_{c_m} with β_m being an endpoint of R'_1 .

Next, we choose and fix a leaf x_1 in T_{A_1} as well as a leaf x_2 in T_{A_2} . Let P'_1 be the unique path from x_1 to β_1 and P'_2 be the unique path from x_2 to β_m in \tilde{T} . Then, let P_1 be the concatenation of P'_1 and R_1 , i.e., P_1 connects x_1 in T_{A_1} with some leaf y_1 in \tilde{T}_1 , and let P_2 be the concatenation of P'_2 and R'_1 , i.e., P_2 connects x_2 in T_{A_2} with some leaf y_2 in \tilde{T}_m . Clearly, P_1 and P_2 are edge-disjoint (as they are on opposite sides of edge $\{\beta_1, \beta_2\}$ in \tilde{T}). Thus, by construction of R_1, \dots, R_{c_1} and R'_1, \dots, R'_{c_m} , the set $\{P_1, P_2, R_2, \dots, R_{c_1}, R'_2, \dots, R'_{c_m}\}$ of $c_1 + c_m$ paths is also edge-disjoint. Moreover, clearly P_1 and P_2 with x_1 and x_2 assigned state a and y_1 and y_2 assigned state b fulfill Property 2 of the list above.

Consider $B' := \bigcup_{i=2}^{m-1} B_i$. In the following, let $c' = \lfloor \frac{|B'|}{2} \rfloor$. We now distinguish three cases.

- If $m = 2$, B' is empty and thus $|B'| = 0$. In this case, we set \mathring{T} to be the empty tree (with empty leaf set $B' = \emptyset$). In particular, \mathring{T} does not contain any leaf-to-leaf paths, which implies that the number of edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf paths can be denoted by $0 = c'$.
- If $m = 3$, we consider the tree \mathring{T}'_2 , which is derived from \tilde{T}_2 by deleting taxon β_2 and subsequently suppressing the resulting degree-2 vertex. Clearly, the leaf set of \mathring{T}'_2 is precisely $B' = B_2$, which is why, by Lemma 1, it contains at least c' many edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf paths. As each of them naturally corresponds to a path in \tilde{T}_2 (by re-introduction of the suppressed degree-2 vertex, if applicable), \tilde{T}_2 contains at least c' many edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf paths $\mathring{P}_1, \dots, \mathring{P}_{c'}$.
- If $m > 3$, we define \mathring{T} to be the tree derived from \tilde{T} by cutting the edges $\{\beta_1, \beta_2\}$ and $\{\beta_{m-1}, \beta_m\}$ and keeping only the tree that does neither contain x_1 nor x_2 , cf. Figure 2. Let \mathring{T}' be the tree derived from tree \tilde{T} by suppressing both β_2 and β_{m-1} . Then, \mathring{T}' is a binary phylogenetic tree on taxon set B' , which is why by Lemma 1, it contains at least c' many edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf paths. As each of them naturally corresponds to a path in \tilde{T} (by re-introduction of β_2 and β_{m-1}), \tilde{T} contains at least c' many edge-disjoint leaf-to-leaf paths $\mathring{P}_1, \dots, \mathring{P}_{c'}$.

So in all these cases, we can find c' many leaf-to-leaf paths, namely $\mathring{P}_1, \dots, \mathring{P}_{c'}$, which by construction are also edge-disjoint to the paths in the set $\{P_1, P_2, R_2, \dots, R_{c_1}, R'_2, \dots, R'_{c_m}\}$, as none of these paths are using edges $\{\beta_1, \beta_2\}$ or $\{\beta_{m-1}, \beta_m\}$, which means that these edges keep the paths apart.

Considering the set $\{R_2, \dots, R_{c_1}, R'_2, \dots, R'_{c_m}, \mathring{P}_1, \dots, \mathring{P}_{c'}\}$, it is obvious that if this set of $(c_1 - 1) + (c_m - 1) + c'$ many edge-disjoint paths contains at least $k - 2$ paths, then Property 3 of the above list can be fulfilled by a suitable choice of f .

Thus, we next show that $(c_1 - 1) + (c_m - 1) + c' \geq k - 2$, or, equivalently, that $c_1 + c_m + c' \geq k$. Using $|B_1| + |B_m| + |B'| = |B| \geq \frac{n}{2}$ and $k \leq \frac{n}{4}$, we can easily bound the term $c_1 + c_m + c'$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 + c_m + c' &= \left\lfloor \frac{b_1}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{b_m}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{|B'|}{2} \right\rfloor \\ &\geq \frac{b_1 - 1}{2} + \frac{b_m - 1}{2} + \frac{|B'| - 1}{2} \\ &= \frac{|B_1| + |B_m| + |B'| - 1}{2} = \frac{|B|}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \geq \frac{n}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \geq k - \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

As $c_1 + c_m + c'$ and k are integers, $c_1 + c_m + c' \geq k$ follows as desired.

In summary, so far we have shown that we can construct a character f as follows: All taxa in A are assigned state a (Property 1). Taxa y_1 and y_2 , the endpoints of the edge-disjoint paths P_1 and P_2 in \tilde{T}_1 and \tilde{T}_m , respectively, are assigned state b (Property 2). There at least $k - 2$ more edge-disjoint paths which we refer to as P_3, \dots, P_k (namely $\{R_2, \dots, R_{c_1}, R'_2, \dots, R'_{c_m}, \mathring{P}_1, \dots, \mathring{P}_{c'}\}$), all of which get assigned state a to one endpoint and b to the other endpoint (Property 3). All remaining taxa, if any, get assigned state b (Property 4). So indeed, it is possible to construct a character f with Properties 1–4.

It remains to show that the existence of this character f implies $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$. In this regard, we will prove that $f \in A_k(\tilde{T}) \setminus A_k(T)$.

Each of the paths P_1, \dots, P_k connects some taxon in A_f with some taxon in B_f , so by Proposition 1 we know that $l(f, \tilde{T}) \geq k$. To show that we also have $l(f, T) \leq k$ (which then implies that $l(f, \tilde{T}) = k$), we consider the following extension g of f on \tilde{T} :

$$g(v) = \begin{cases} f(v) & \text{if } v \in X, \\ a & \text{if } v \in \mathring{V}(T_{A_1}) \cup \mathring{V}(T_{A_2}), \\ b & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, g induces no changing edges within T_{A_1} or T_{A_2} (as all vertices in these subtrees of \tilde{T} are assigned state a). As the rest of tree \tilde{T} contains only $k - 2$ leaves in state a and all inner vertices outside of T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} are assigned state b , g induces at most k changes in total, namely one on edge $\{\rho_1, \beta_1\}$, one on edge $\{\rho_2, \beta_m\}$ and potentially $k - 2$

more changes on the pending edges leading to those leaves in state a that are contained in $\bigcup_{i=1}^m \tilde{T}_i$. The existence of this extension g of f with $ch(g, \tilde{T}) \leq k$ shows that we indeed have $l(f, \tilde{T}) \leq k$, and thus in total $l(f, \tilde{T}) = k$ and $f \in A_k(\tilde{T})$ as required.

It remains to show that $f \notin A_k(T)$. In order to see this, like above, we consider an extension g of f , but this time on T . We define g as follows:

$$g(v) = \begin{cases} f(v) & \text{if } v \in X, \\ a & \text{if } v \in \dot{V}(T_A), \\ b & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Clearly, g induces no changing edges within T_A (as all vertices in this subtree of T are assigned state a). As the rest of tree T contains only $k - 2$ leaves in state a and all inner vertices outside of T_A are assigned state b , g induces at most $k - 1$ changes in total, namely one on the edge on which T_A is pending (i.e., the edge $\{u, v\}$ connecting the unique vertex u adjacent both to ρ_1 and ρ_2 in T with its third neighbor $v \neq \rho_1, \rho_2$) and potentially $k - 2$ more changes on the pending edges leading to those leaves in state a that are contained in $B = X \setminus A$. The existence of this extension g of f with $ch(g, T) \leq k - 1$ shows that we indeed have $l(f, T) \leq k - 1$, and thus $f \notin A_k(T)$ as claimed.

In summary, we have found a character $f \in A_k(\tilde{T})$ for which we know that $f \notin A_k(T)$, which shows that $A_k(\tilde{T}) \neq A_k(T)$. This completes the proof. \square

As stated before, Theorem 2 generalizes Proposition 3 to all cases of k with $k \leq \frac{n}{4}$ and thus significantly improves the known bound of $k \leq \frac{n}{20}$ from [9]. In the next section, we show that at least within the NNI neighborhood of a binary phylogenetic X -tree, the bound can be improved even further in the following sense: If T is a binary phylogenetic tree with $n > 2k + 2$ leaves (for $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$) and if \tilde{T} is an NNI neighbor of T , we can guarantee $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$.

3.2 Investigating the NNI neighborhood

It is the main aim of this section to show that the generalization of Proposition 3 to all cases of k with $k \leq \frac{n}{4}$ provided by the previous section can at least locally be further improved to all $k \leq \frac{n}{2} - \frac{3}{2}$. In particular, we will show that if $k \leq \frac{n}{2} - \frac{3}{2}$ and if \tilde{T} is an NNI neighbor of T , then we have $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$.

Theorem 3. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$ and let $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>2k+2}$. Let T and \tilde{T} be two binary phylogenetic X -trees with $|X| = n$ such that \tilde{T} is in the NNI neighborhood of T . Then, $T \cong \tilde{T}$ if and only if $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$.*

In order to prove this theorem, we first need to establish some preliminary results. We start with the following definition followed by two technical lemmas, which connect $A_k(T)$ to smaller trees derived by cherry reductions of types 1 and 2, respectively. Such reductions will turn out to be useful for subsequent inductive proofs.

Definition 1. *Let T be a binary phylogenetic X -tree. Let T^1 and T^2 be the two trees derived from T when performing a cherry reduction of type 1 or 2, respectively, to cherry $[x, y]$ of T . Moreover, let $f : X \rightarrow \{a, b\}$ be a binary character.*

1. *If $f(x) = f(y)$, we define f^1 as the restriction of f to the taxa of T^1 .*
2. *If $f(x) \neq f(y)$, we define f^2 as the restriction of f to the taxa of T^2 .*

Lemma 3. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 4}$ and let $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let T be a binary phylogenetic X -tree. Let T^1 and T^2 be the two trees derived from T when performing a cherry reduction of type 1 or 2, respectively, to cherry $[x, y]$ of T . Moreover, let $f \in A_k(T)$. Then, we have:*

1. *If $f(x) = f(y)$, then $f^1 \in A_k(T^1)$.*
2. *If $f(x) \neq f(y)$, then $f^2 \in A_{k-1}(T^2)$.*

Proof. We prove both parts of the lemma separately.

1. Let $f(x) = f(y)$. As $f \in A_k(T)$, we know $l(f, T) = k$, which by Proposition 1 implies that there are k edge-disjoint A_f - B_f -paths in T . This set of edge-disjoint A_f - B_f -paths naturally corresponds to a set of k edge-disjoint paths in T^1 by deleting one leaf of cherry $[x, y]$, say x , and suppressing the resulting degree-2 vertex. This procedure might shorten one of the paths by two edges (if it ended in x) or by one edge (if it

ended in y), but as $f(x) = f(y)$, we know that none of the original A_f - B_f -paths connected x and y , so as $n \geq 4$, if such a path ended in x or y , it must have had a length of at least 3. So the shortening does not actually delete a path, and if one of the paths in T actually ended in x , we can extend it to y in T^1 in order to make it a leaf-to-leaf path again. All this shows that in T^1 , there are k edge-disjoint A_{f^1} - B_{f^1} -paths. As the deletion of a leaf obviously cannot increase the maximum number of such paths, this implies that the maximum number of edge-disjoint A_{f^1} - B_{f^1} -paths in T^1 is indeed k , implying that $l(f^1, T^1) = k$ and thus $f^1 \in A_k(T^1)$, which completes the proof of the first assertion.

2. We now consider the case $f(x) \neq f(y)$. As $f \in A_k(T)$, we have $l(f, T) = k$, which by Corollary 1 combined with Theorem 1 (Menger's Theorem) shows that A_f and B_f cannot be separated by fewer than k vertices. Now, let P be the unique path connecting x and y in T . As $f(x) \neq f(y)$, P is an A_f - B_f -path. We now apply Proposition 2 to $\mathcal{P} = \{P\}$ and conclude that there exists a set \mathcal{Q} of k vertex-disjoint A_f - B_f -paths such that x and y are endpoints of some of the paths. However, as $[x, y]$ is a cherry of T , this is only possible if $P \in \mathcal{Q}$ (otherwise the two paths ending in x and y would both employ the vertex adjacent to both x and y , which would contradict their vertex-disjointness). This immediately implies that when we delete cherry $[x, y]$ by a cherry reduction of type 2 to get T^2 , $\mathcal{Q} \setminus \{P\}$ is a set of $k - 1$ edge-disjoint A_{f^2} - B_{f^2} -paths in T^2 . Moreover, this must be the maximum number of edge-disjoint A_{f^2} - B_{f^2} -paths in T^2 , because every collection of at least k edge-disjoint paths of T^2 combined with P would give a collection of at least $k + 1$ edge-disjoint paths in T , a contradiction to k being the maximum number of edge-disjoint A_f - B_f -paths in T by Proposition 1. Thus, we can conclude $l(f^2, T^2) = k - 1$ (again by Proposition 1), which shows that $f^2 \in A_{k-1}(T^2)$. This completes the proof of the second assertion.

□

Note that the previous lemma shows that some elements of $A_k(T^1)$ and $A_{k-1}(T^2)$ can be derived from the elements of $A_k(T)$. Indeed, the following lemma shows that *all* elements of $A_k(T^1)$ and $A_{k-1}(T^2)$ can be derived from the elements of $A_k(T)$ in this way. Together, Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 imply that the opposite is also true, i.e., the elements of $A_k(T)$ can be derived from the elements of $A_k(T^1)$ and $A_{k-1}(T^2)$, respectively.

Lemma 4. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 4}$ and let $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let T be a binary phylogenetic X -tree. Let T^1 and T^2 the two trees derived from T when performing a cherry reduction of type 1 or 2, respectively, to cherry $[x, y]$ of T . Then, we have:*

1. *If $g \in A_k(T^1)$, then there exists precisely one character $f \in A_k(T)$ with $f(x) = f(y)$ and $f^1 = g$. Moreover, we have $f(x) = f(y)$.*
2. *If $h \in A_{k-1}(T^2)$, then there exist precisely two characters f_1 and f_2 in $A_k(T)$ with $f_i(x) \neq f_i(y)$ (for $i = 1, 2$) and $f_1^2 = f_2^2 = h$. Moreover, we have $f_i(x) \neq f_i(y)$ for $i = 1, 2$.*

Proof. We again prove both assertions separately.

1. Let $g \in A_k(T^1)$ and let f be the character as uniquely defined by Lemma 4(1), i.e. $f^1 = g$ and $f(x) = f(y)$. Clearly, as $f(x) = f(y)$, no most parsimonious extension of f will ever require a change on cherry $[x, y]$, which shows that $l(f, T) = l(g, T^1) = k$ and thus $f \in A_k(T)$.
2. Let $h \in A_{k-1}(T^2)$ and let f_1 and f_2 be as described in Lemma 4(2), i.e., $f_1^2 = f_2^2 = h$ and $f_i(x) \neq f_i(y)$ for $i = 1, 2$. As the two leaves x and y are in different states in both f_1 and f_2 and form a cherry in T , every most parsimonious extension will require a change on this cherry. This shows that $l(f_1, T) = l(f_2, T) = l(h, T^2) + 1 = (k - 1) + 1 = k$. Thus, $f_1, f_2 \in A_k(T)$. As clearly there is no other character \hat{f} on X for which \hat{f} restricted to $X \setminus \{x, y\}$ equals h and \hat{f}^2 is defined (i.e., $\hat{f}(x) \neq \hat{f}(y)$), this completes the proof.

□

The following corollary is a simple conclusion from Lemma 4, which will be useful later on.

Corollary 2. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$. Let T be a binary phylogenetic X -tree and let \tilde{T} be an NNI neighbor of T . Let $[x, y]$ be a cherry contained in both T and \tilde{T} such that $A_k(T^1) = A_k(\tilde{T}^1)$ and $A_{k-1}(T^2) = A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}^2)$, where T^1 and \tilde{T}^1 as well as T^2 and \tilde{T}^2 result from T and \tilde{T} by cherry reductions of types 1 and 2, respectively, using cherry $[x, y]$. Then, we have $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$.*

Proof. Assume the statement is not true, i.e., assume $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$. Let $f \in A_k(T) \setminus A_k(\tilde{T})$. If we have $f(x) = f(y)$, we perform a cherry reduction of type 1 with $[x, y]$ in T and \tilde{T} and, by Lemma 3, find that $f^1 \in A_k(T^1) = A_k(\tilde{T}^1)$. On the other hand, $f^1 \in A_k(\tilde{T}^1)$ implies $f \in A_k(\tilde{T})$ by Lemma 4, a contradiction to the choice of f .

So we must have $f(x) \neq f(y)$. We perform a cherry reduction of type 2 with $[x, y]$ in T and \tilde{T} and, again by Lemma 3, find that $f^2 \in A_{k-1}(T^2) = A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}^2)$. On the other hand, $f^2 \in A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}^2)$ implies $f \in A_k(\tilde{T})$ by Lemma 4, again a contradiction to the choice of f .

As both cases lead to a contradiction, we cannot choose such an f , which shows $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$. \square

Before we can finally prove Theorem 3, we need to establish one more preliminary result. In fact, the following proposition turns out to be the main ingredient in our proof. It characterizes all trees \tilde{T} in the NNI neighborhood of a binary phylogenetic tree T for which we have $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$.

Proposition 4. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$. Let T be a binary phylogenetic X -tree with $n = |X| \geq 4$ and $A|B \in \Sigma^*(T)$ inducing subtrees T_{A_1} and T_{A_2} , whose leaves are subsets of A , as well as T_{B_1} and T_{B_2} , whose leaves are subsets of B , cf. Figure 1. Let $n_1 = |A_1|$, $n_2 = |A_2|$, $n_3 = |B_1|$ and $n_4 = |B_2|$. Moreover, let \tilde{T} be the tree obtained from T by exchanging T_{A_2} with T_{B_2} (i.e., T and \tilde{T} are NNI neighbors). Set $s(T, \tilde{T}) = \sum_{i=1}^4 \lfloor \frac{n_i-1}{2} \rfloor$. Then, we have:*

$$A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T}) \iff s(T, \tilde{T}) < k - 2.$$

Before we continue with the proof of this proposition, we first analyze $s(T, \tilde{T})$ a bit more in-depth. As by definition, $s(T, \tilde{T})$ formally depends both on T and the specific X -split $A|B$, the notation $s(T, \tilde{T})$ suggesting that s depends on T and \tilde{T} may seem counter-intuitive at first. However, if \tilde{T} is obtained from T by a single NNI move performed on some inner edge e of T , then T, \tilde{T} and the X -split $A|B$ induced by e fulfill the assumptions of Proposition 4. So in fact, $s(T, \tilde{T})$ depends only on the specific NNI move performed on T to obtain \tilde{T} , which justifies the notation.

Proof. In the following, whenever there is no ambiguity, we refer to $s(T, \tilde{T})$ simply as s . Now, we subdivide the proof into two parts, one for each direction of the statement.

1. In order to show that $s \geq k - 2$ implies $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$, we use induction on k and assume $s \geq k - 2$.

Note that for $k = 2$, by Proposition 3, there is nothing to show as in this case, we already know that $T \not\cong \tilde{T}$ implies $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$. This completes the base case of the induction. Therefore, in the following we may assume $k \geq 3$ and that for all pairs T'_1, T'_2 of binary phylogenetic X -trees that are NNI neighbors with $s(T'_1, T'_2) \geq (k - 1) - 2 = k - 3$, we already know that $A_{k-1}(T'_1) \neq A_{k-1}(T'_2)$. Therefore, for any such pair we can assume without loss of generality that there is a character $h \in A_{k-1}(T'_1) \setminus A_{k-1}(T'_2)$ (else we may swap the roles of T'_1 and T'_2). Our aim now is to construct a character $f \in A_k(T) \setminus A_k(\tilde{T})$, which will, in turn, imply that $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$.

So now we have trees T and \tilde{T} which are NNI neighbors with $s = s(T, \tilde{T}) \geq k - 2$. Note that if we had $s = 0$, the fact that $s \geq k - 2$ would imply $k = 2$; i.e., this would refer to the base case of the induction, which we have already considered. Thus, we can now assume $s > 0$. By the definition of s , this implies that there is an $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ such that $n_i \geq 3$ (because at least one of the summands $\lfloor \frac{n_i-1}{2} \rfloor$ needs to be at least 1). Without loss of generality, assume $n_1 \geq 3$. Then, T_{A_1} contains a cherry $[x, y]$ whose deletion by a cherry reduction of type 2 does not eradicate T_{A_1} (i.e., the remaining tree after the cherry reduction is non-empty). Note that as T and \tilde{T} differ only in one NNI move (and thus T_{A_1} is subtree in T as well as in \tilde{T}), both trees necessarily contain cherry $[x, y]$. If we denote by T' and \tilde{T}' the trees resulting from a cherry reduction of type 2 performed on $[x, y]$, it is clear that T' and \tilde{T}' are also NNI neighbors. Moreover, as (compared to T and \tilde{T}) only n_1 was reduced by 2 and all other n_i remained unchanged, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
s(T', \tilde{T}') &= \left\lfloor \frac{(n_1 - 2) - 1}{2} \right\rfloor + \sum_{i=2}^4 \left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 1}{2} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{n_1 - 1}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 + \sum_{i=2}^4 \left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 1}{2} \right\rfloor \\
&= s(T, \tilde{T}) - 1 \geq k - 3,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to $s(T, \tilde{T}) \geq k - 2$. By the inductive hypothesis, this shows that there exists a character $h \in A_{k-1}(T') \setminus A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}')$. By Lemma 4, this implies the existence of two characters f_1 and f_2 with $f_1^2 = f_2^2 = h$ and $f_i(x) \neq f_i(y)$ for $i = 1, 2$ and such that $f_1, f_2 \in A_k(T)$ and $f_1, f_2 \notin A_k(\tilde{T})$ (as otherwise we would necessarily have $f_1^2, f_2^2 \in A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}')$).

This implies that we have found two characters f_1 and f_2 with $f_1, f_2 \in A_k(T) \setminus A_k(\tilde{T})$, showing that $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$ and thus completing the first part of the proof.

2. Next, we need to show that if we have $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ as well as two trees T and \tilde{T} which are NNI neighbors with $s(T, \tilde{T}) < k - 2$, we have $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$. We will prove this assertion by induction on s . In particular, we first show that the statement holds for $s = 0$ and all values of $k \geq 3$. (Note that considering $k \geq 3$ indeed covers all values of k that we have to consider, as we have $s \geq 0$, which together with $s < k - 2$ implies $k \geq 3$.) Then, we proceed to prove that if the assertion holds for the combinations $s - 1$ and $k - 1$ as well as $s - 1$ and k , it also holds for s and k .

- We start with the base case $s = 0$. In this case, as $0 = s = \sum_{i=1}^4 \lfloor \frac{n_i - 1}{2} \rfloor$, we conclude that $1 \leq n_i \leq 2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 4$. We now consider several subcases in order to show that either $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T}) = \emptyset$ or that every element $f \in A_k(T)$ is also contained in $A_k(\tilde{T})$. By symmetry, the latter will lead to $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$, showing that the two sets are equal in all cases.
 - If all n_i equal 1, we have $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4 = n = 4$, i.e., T and \tilde{T} both have four leaves. As $k \geq 3$ and as there are no binary characters f on four taxa with $l(f, T) \geq 3$ (or $l(f, \tilde{T}) \geq 3$), we have $\emptyset = A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$, so indeed both sets are equal.
 - Next, assume that $n_i = 2$ for at least one $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and that $A_k(T) \neq \emptyset$. Let $f \in A_k(T)$. Note that every i for which this is the case implies a taxon set $U_i \in \{A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2\}$ such that T_{U_i} consists of a cherry $[x_i, y_i]$. Now assume all i with $n_i = 2$ induce a cherry $[x_i, y_i]$ with $f(x_i) = f(y_i)$. If this was the case, we could apply a cherry reduction of type 1 to T to the first of these cherries to derive a character $f^1 \in A_k(T^1)$ according to Lemma 3. Repeating this step for all i with $n_i = 2$, we would end up with a character $g \in A_k(T^*)$, where T^* is the four taxon tree resulting from T by iteratively performing cherry reductions of type 1 to the cherries induced by $n_i = 2$. However, as $k \geq 3$ and as T^* has only four leaves, as above we know that $A_k(T^*) = \emptyset$, so such a character g cannot exist, which would be a contradiction.
 - By the above considerations, we know that if we have at least one $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ such that $n_i = 2$ and $f \in A_k(T) \neq \emptyset$, there must be $U \in \{A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2\}$ with $U = \{x, y\}$ (i.e., T_U consists of the cherry $[x, y]$) such that $f(x) \neq f(y)$. Note that by assumption, $[x, y]$ is a cherry of \tilde{T} , too. We now perform a cherry reduction of type 2 to $[x, y]$, both for T and \tilde{T} . However, note that this eliminates subtree T_U completely (as it only consists of cherry $[x, y]$) and thus leads to $T^2 \cong \tilde{T}^2$. In particular, we have $A_{k-1}(T^2) = A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}^2)$. However, as $f^2 \in A_{k-1}(T^2) = A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}^2)$, we know by Lemma 4 that f^2 corresponds to precisely two characters in $A_k(T)$ and $A_k(\tilde{T})$, namely the two characters that assign different states to x and y and otherwise agree with f^2 . Clearly, one of these characters is f , so we have $f \in A_k(\tilde{T})$.

So in all possible cases, either $A_k(T) = \emptyset$ or the arbitrarily chosen character $f \in A_k(T)$ is also contained in $A_k(\tilde{T})$, which shows $A_k(T) \subseteq A_k(\tilde{T})$. Swapping the roles of T and \tilde{T} shows the converse inclusion, too, so we conclude $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$ as desired. This completes the proof of the base case $s = 0$.

- We now consider the case $s > 0$. We assume the assertion already holds for the pairs $(s - 1, k - 1)$ as well as $(s - 1, k)$ and show that this implies it also holds for the pair (s, k) . As we are now considering the case $s > 0$, we must have $n_i > 2$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Moreover, it is important to note that with $s > 0$ and $s < k - 2$, we must have $k \geq 4$.

First, we note that by $n_i > 2$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ the existence of some T_U with $U \in \{A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2\}$ and $|U| = n_i > 2$ and thus also the existence of some cherry $[x, y]$ contained in T_U (as well as in T and \tilde{T}) is implied.

We first show that for such a cherry T^1 and \tilde{T}^1 fulfill the induction hypothesis. Then, using a case distinction, we will analyze in which case also T^2 and \tilde{T}^2 fulfill the induction hypothesis and in which case another argument is needed.

As $n_i \geq 3$, a reduction does not completely eliminate T_U (even if we perform a cherry reduction of type 2). So $T^1, T^2, \tilde{T}^1, \tilde{T}^2$ can be constructed by applying cherry reductions of types 1 and 2 to cherry $[x, y]$ both in T and \tilde{T} , respectively. Clearly, \tilde{T}^1 is an NNI neighbor of T^1 and \tilde{T}^2 is an NNI neighbor of T^2 . Let $s^1 = s(T^1, \tilde{T}^1)$ and $s^2 = s(T^2, \tilde{T}^2)$.

Now, we first show that $A_{k-1}(T^2) = A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}^2)$. Using the fact that $\lfloor m-1 \rfloor = \lfloor m \rfloor - 1$ for every $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} s^2 &= s - \left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 1}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 3}{2} \right\rfloor \\ &= s - \left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 1}{2} \right\rfloor + \left(\left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 1}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) = s - 1. \end{aligned}$$

By the inductive hypothesis, we thus must have $A_{k-1}(T^2) = A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}^2)$ (using the assumption on $(s-1, k-1)$).

Finally, we analyze in which case we additionally have $A_k(T^1) = A_k(\tilde{T}^1)$ by the induction hypothesis and in which case we have to establish this equality by an additional argument. In order to do this, we distinguish the following subcases.

- (a) Suppose that additionally to $n_i > 2$, we have that n_i is odd. We already know $A_k(T^2) = A_k(\tilde{T}^2)$. Using $\lfloor \frac{n_i-1}{2} \rfloor = \frac{n_i-1}{2} = \lfloor \frac{n_i}{2} \rfloor$ as n_i is odd, we then have

$$s^1 = s - \left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 1}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 2}{2} \right\rfloor = s - \frac{n_i - 1}{2} + \left(\left\lfloor \frac{n_i}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) = s - 1.$$

By the inductive hypothesis, we thus must have $A_k(T^1) = A_k(\tilde{T}^1)$ (using the assumption on $(s-1, k)$).

Thus, with $A_k(T^1) = A_k(\tilde{T}^1)$ and $A_{k-1}(T^2) = A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}^2)$, we can use Corollary 2 to conclude $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$.

- (b) Now, additionally to $n_i > 2$, we assume that n_i is even. As n_i is even, we have $\lfloor \frac{n_i-1}{2} \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{n_i-2}{2} \rfloor$, which implies $s^1 = s$. So we cannot use the inductive assumption. However, note that if we denote by $n_i^1 = n_i - 1$ the subtree size of U after the cherry reduction of type 1 in both T and \tilde{T} , then clearly, as n_i is even, we have that n_i^1 is odd. This implies that still $n_i^1 > 2$ and we can find a cherry in the reduced subtree fulfilling the assumptions of Case (a). So we can actually apply Case (a) to T^1 and \tilde{T}^1 (using n_i^1 instead of n_i) and conclude that $A_k(T^1) = A_k(\tilde{T}^1)$.

So as before, using Corollary 2, we conclude from $A_{k-1}(T^2) = A_{k-1}(\tilde{T}^2)$ and $A_k(T^1) = A_k(\tilde{T}^1)$ that $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$.

So in all cases, we can conclude that $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$, which completes the second part of the proof. \square

Finally, we can now turn our attention to the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3. If $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$, obviously $T \not\cong \tilde{T}$, so for the first direction, there is nothing to show.

So now assume $T \cong \tilde{T}$. We need to show that then, $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$. Using the inequality $\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor \geq \frac{m-1}{2}$, which holds for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, as well as the fact that $n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4 = n$, we easily derive the following lower bound for

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \left\lfloor \frac{n_i-1}{2} \right\rfloor:$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 1}{2} \right\rfloor \geq \sum_{i=1}^4 \frac{n_i - 2}{2} = \frac{n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + n_4 - 8}{2} = \frac{n}{2} - 4 > k - 3,$$

where the last inequality uses $n > 2k + 2$ as assumed by Theorem 3. As the left-most sum is an integer, in summary we get $\sum_{i=1}^4 \left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 1}{2} \right\rfloor \geq k - 2$, which by Proposition 4 implies $A_k(T) \neq A_k(\tilde{T})$ and thus completes the proof. \square

3.3 Constructing cases with $n = 2k + 2$ and non-unique A_k alignments

In the previous section, for the case $k \geq 3$ we have seen in Theorem 3 that if $n > 2k + 2$ and if \tilde{T} is in the NNI neighborhood of T , we can guarantee that we have $T \cong \tilde{T}$ if and only if $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$ (note that for the cases $k \in \{1, 2\}$, by Proposition 3, the same equivalence is guaranteed for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, even outside the neighborhood of T). Moreover, in [8] for every $k > 2$ a construction of two trees T and \tilde{T} with $T \not\cong \tilde{T}$ and $n = 2k$ leaves was shown for which $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$. This leads to the natural question if there exist trees T and \tilde{T} with $T \not\cong \tilde{T}$ and with $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$ if $n = 2k + 1$ or $n = 2k + 2$. It is the aim of this section to show that in both of these cases, there indeed exist such trees.

Corollary 3. *For every $k > 2$ there exists a pair T and \tilde{T} , $T \not\cong \tilde{T}$, of binary phylogenetic X -trees with $|X| \in \{2k + 1, 2k + 2\}$ and $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$.*

Proof. Let $k \geq 3$ and $n = 2k + 1$ or $n = 2k + 2$. Let T_1 and T_2 be the two trees on n leaves depicted in Figure 3. Then, T_1 and T_2 are NNI neighbors: A swap of either leaf 4 (if $n = 2k + 1$) or cherry $[3, 4]$ (if $n = 2k + 2$) with cherry $[5, 6]$ around the bold edge e turns T_1 into T_2 . Now let us analyze this case a bit more in-depth. Let $A|B$ be the split induced by e in T . Let T_{A_1} be the subtree of T_1 and T_2 containing leaves 1, 2 as well as 9, \dots , n . Let T_{A_2} denote the subtree of both T_1 and T_2 that contains taxon 4 (if $n = 2k + 1$) or the cherry $[3, 4]$ (if $n = 2k + 2$), respectively. Let T_{B_1} denote the subtree of T_1 and T_2 consisting of cherry $[7, 8]$, and let T_{B_2} denote the subtree of T_1 and T_2 consisting of cherry $[5, 6]$. Then, T_{A_1} has $n_1 = 2 + ((2k + 2) - 8) = 2k - 4$ many leaves, T_{A_2} has $n_2 = 1$ or $n_2 = 2$ leaves, respectively, T_{B_1} has $n_3 = 2$ leaves and T_{B_2} has $n_4 = 2$ leaves. This leads to

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \left\lfloor \frac{n_i - 1}{2} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{2k - 5}{2} \right\rfloor + \underbrace{\left\lfloor \frac{0 \text{ or } 1}{2} \right\rfloor}_{=0} + \underbrace{\left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor}_{=0} + \underbrace{\left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor}_{=0} = k - 3 < k - 2.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 4, we have $A_k(T_1) = A_k(T_2)$. This completes the proof. \square

4 Discussion and outlook

In this manuscript, we have shown that binary phylogenetic trees with n leaves are fully characterized by their A_k -alignments whenever $n \geq 4k$ (cf. Theorem 2). Thus, we drastically narrowed the gap resulting from the most recent result in the literature [9], which required $n \geq 20k$, and the fact that was known that for $n = 2k$, the statement does not generally hold [8]. Additionally, we narrowed the gap further by showing that the statement does not generally hold for up to $n = 2k + 2$ (cf. Corollary 3). One very intriguing question for future research is, however, if this gap can be closed completely. We have shown that it can indeed be closed completely for pairs T, \tilde{T} with \tilde{T} from the NNI neighborhood of T (cf. Theorem 3). In particular, we have shown that the A_k -alignment of a binary phylogenetic tree T with n leaves is, for all values of $k \leq \frac{n}{2} - \frac{3}{2}$, unique within the NNI neighborhood of T ; i.e., no neighbor of T shares the same A_k -alignment with T . In fact, we conjecture that the following statement holds, which would close the gap in the interval from $2k + 3$ to $4k - 1$ affirmatively.

Conjecture. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$ and let T and \tilde{T} binary phylogenetic trees on taxon set X with $|X| \geq 2k + 3$. Then, $T \cong \tilde{T}$ if and only if $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$.*




Figure 3: Two trees T_1 and T_2 . Note that leaf 3 may or may not be there (i.e., there might be $2k+1$ or $2k+2$ leaves in each tree). Note that T_1 and T_2 are NNI neighbors: A swap of either leaf 4 (if $n = 2k+1$) or cherry $[3, 4]$ (if $n = 2k+2$) with cherry $[5, 6]$ around the bold edge e turns T_1 into T_2 . For these trees, we have $A_k(T_1) = A_k(T_2)$ for all $k \geq 3$.

Related to this conjecture is the following question: If \tilde{T} is obtained from T by an NNI operation and given some natural number $k \geq 2$, we call this NNI operation a *problematic move* if it satisfies the condition $s(T, \tilde{T}) < k - 2$, where $s(T, \tilde{T})$ is defined as in Proposition 4. Clearly, by Proposition 4, if \tilde{T} is obtained from T by a series of problematic moves, then $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$ (which is why we consider it problematic – it destroys the uniqueness of the A_k -alignment). Now it is tempting to investigate if the converse statement is also true, which leads to the following question.

Question. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$ and let T and \tilde{T} be binary phylogenetic trees on taxon set X and $A_k(T) = A_k(\tilde{T})$. It is true that \tilde{T} can be obtained from T by a series of problematic moves?

By Theorem 3, a positive answer to this question would imply the correctness of the above conjecture, because it can easily be seen that for $n \geq 2k+3$ there are no problematic NNI moves.

Another interesting aspect for future research is tree reconstruction with parsimony based on A_k -alignments. Note that just because an alignment characterizes a tree, this does not necessarily mean that MP (or any other tree reconstruction method) will recover the correct tree. While we know that the unique maximum parsimony tree of $A_1(T)$ is always T (a consequence of the famous Buneman theorem [7, 3, 8]), we know that for $A_2(T)$ this is only true if $n \geq 9$ [8]. Exhaustive searches of the tree space performed in [13] suggest that possibly the latter result can be generalized, i.e., that the unique maximum parsimony tree of $A_k(T)$ might be T whenever $n \geq 4k+1$. This conjecture was formally stated in [8]. Note that for MP to be able to recover the “true” tree from $A_k(T)$, it is a necessary prerequisite that $A_k(T)$ defines T . If this was not the case, i.e., if two trees shared the same A_k -alignment, there would not be any hope for any tree reconstruction method to distinguish the two trees sharing this alignment from one another.

In summary, as we know that in case $k = 2$ we require $n > 4k$ for the reconstruction of trees from their A_k -alignments using MP and as we conjecture that this assertion can be generalized to larger values of k , the present manuscript, which shows that for $n \geq 4k$ binary phylogenetic trees are defined by A_k , is a very useful first step in this regard. Note that the factor of 4 is precisely the one needed to tackle the reconstruction problem. Thus, the improvement from factor 20 to 4 given by the present manuscript is highly relevant, even if the interval $n \in [2k+3, 4k-1]$ is still open concerning the characterization of trees by their A_k -alignment.

References

- [1] D.R Maddison, K.-S. Schulz, and W.P. Maddison. The Tree of Life web project. In *Linnaeus Tercentenary: Progress in Invertebrate Taxonomy*, volume 1668, pages 19—40. Zootaxa, Magnolia Press, Auckland, New Zealand, 2007. URL <http://tolweb.org>.
- [2] W. M. Fitch. Toward defining the course of evolution: minimum change for a specific tree topology. *Systematic Biology*, 20(4):406–416, 1971.
- [3] C. Semple and M. Steel. *Phylogenetics (Oxford lecture series in mathematics and its applications)*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003. ISBN 0198509421.
- [4] J. Felsenstein. Cases in which parsimony or compatibility methods will be positively misleading. *Systematic Zoology*, 27(4):401–410, 1978. ISSN 00397989. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2412923>.
- [5] J. Felsenstein. *Inferring phylogenies*. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Massachusetts, USA, 2004. ISBN 9780878931774.
- [6] J. Sourdis and M. Nei. Relative efficiencies of the maximum parsimony and distance-matrix methods in obtaining the correct phylogenetic tree. *Molecular biology and evolution*, 5,3:298–311, 1988.
- [7] P. Buneman. The recovery of trees from measures of dissimilarity. In F.R. Hodson, D.G. Kendall, and P. Tautu, editors, *Mathematics in the Archaeological and Historical Sciences*, pages 387–395. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh, Scotland, 1971.
- [8] M. Fischer. On the uniqueness of the maximum parsimony tree for data with up to two substitutions: An extension of the classic buneman theorem in phylogenetics. *Molecular phylogenetics and evolution*, 137:127–137, 2019.
- [9] M. Fischer. Defining binary phylogenetic trees using parsimony. *Annals of Combinatorics*, Dec 2022. ISSN 0219-3094.
- [10] K. Menger. Zur allgemeinen kurventheorie. *Fundamenta Mathematicae*, 10:96—115, 1927.
- [11] R. Diestel. *Graph Theory*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer, Heidelberg; New York, 5 edition, 2017. ISBN 978-3-662-53621-6.
- [12] T. Böhme, F. Göring, and J. Harant. Menger’s theorem. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 37(1):35–36, 2001.
- [13] P.A. Goloboff and M. Wilkinson. On defining a unique phylogenetic tree with homoplastic characters. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 122:95 – 101, 2018.

Declarations

The authors wish to thank Linda Knüver and Sophie J. Kersting for helpful discussions on the topic. MF also wishes to thank Mike Steel for bringing the topic to her attention.

Declarations

- Funding: No funding was received to assist with the preparation of this manuscript.
- Conflict of interest/Competing interests: The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.
- Ethics approval: not applicable
- Consent to participate: not applicable
- Consent for publication: All authors have given their consent to publish the research findings of the present manuscript.
- Availability of data and materials: not applicable
- Code availability: not applicable
- Authors’ contributions: All authors contributed equally.