## Nu aly

# Perfect Phylogeny 

Not in textbook

## Outline



- Thus far
- distance-based evolutionary trees
- Additive guarantees that the tree would reproduce all pairwise distances, but not all distance matrices are additive
- Sequences $\rightarrow$ Distances $\rightarrow$ 万 Sequences
- character-based evolutionary trees
- Trees directly from sequences
- The most general version is hard (Large parsimony)
- Infinite Sites Model
- Perfect Phylogeny
- Local vs Global Phylogenetic Trees


## Character State Matrix M



- M has $n$ rows (samples)
- M has $m$ columns (characters)
- Mij denotes the state object $i$ has for character $j$
- Sequence Diversity Patterns (SDPs) often reoccur



## Infinite Sites Model



- Assumes mutations are rare events
- Assumes DNA sequences are large
- Multiple mutations at the same site are extremely rare
- Infinite Sites Model assumes that multiple mutations never occur at the same sequence position

- Thus, all states are "Binary" or "Biallelic"


## A Different Kind of Tree



- Unrooted "Perfect Phylogeny" Tree
- Nodes correspond to sample sequences (haplotypes), both current and ancestral
- Edges correspond to actual mutations (SNPs)
- Removal of an edge creates a bipartition (each part is distinguished by a character at some position)
- SDPs can occur multiple times, and their frequency can be used as a edge

- Tree leaves correspond to mutations (allele variants) that are unique to a sequence, i.e. a SDP with only one minority allele instance, private


## Unrooted Trees



- Unrooted phylogenetic trees are less specific than evolutionary trees
- The edges are undirected, thus the direction from ancestor to descendent are unknown
- All but one leaf, however, and possibly all leafs (if the root is an interior node) must be descendents
- Slightly fewer labeled unrooted trees than labeled rooted tree

$$
u T(n)=\frac{(2 n-4)!}{2^{n-2}(n-2)!} \quad \text { vs } \quad T(n)=\frac{(2 n-3)!}{2^{n-2}(n-2)!}
$$

- Moreover, any node can be an "observed" sample in a phylogenetic tree whereas only leaf nodes are observed an evolutionary tree


## Unrooted Binary Tree


Three different evolutionary (rooted) trees that are consistent with a common phylogenetic (unrooted) tree


## Building a Phylogenetic Tree



- Assume we only have direct access to current haplotypes
- Construct a pair-wise distance matrix between haplotypes using Hamming distances
- Add smallest edge between all nodes which do not introduce a loop
- If the smallest distance is greater than 1 add d-1 "hidden" nodes between the pair so that adjacent

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{5}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| $\mathrm{H}_{3}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| $\mathrm{H}_{4}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | nodes have a hamming distance of 1

- Augment the distance matrix with the new nodes and claim the introduced edges
- Repeat finding the smallest distance, and augmenting until the graph is connected



## Four-Gamete Test



- Our tree construction method will not work for any arbitrary set of character sequences; it only works for those that satisfy the assumptions of the infinite sites model
- Under the assumption of the infinite sites model all SNP pairs exhibit the property no more that 3 out of the possible 4 allele combinations occur
- Direct consequence of only one mutation per site
- Showing that all SNP pair combinations satisfy the four gamete test is a necessary and sufficient condition for there to exist a perfect phylogeny tree

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{3}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{4}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

## Questions



- Does there exist SDPs that are compatible with all others?

Private SNPs are compatible with any other SNP

- Given N distinct haplotype sequences resulting from an infinite sites model what is minimum number of SDPs?

N -1 edges are the fewest necessary to connect N haplotypes into a "linear" tree. How many singleton SNPs occur in such a tree? 2

- Given N distinct haplotype sequences resulting from an infinite sites model what is maximum number of SDPs?
$2 \mathrm{~N}-3$ edges, the number of edges in an unrooted tree with N leaves


## Exercise



- Consider the following SNP panel

|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{5}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{3}$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{4}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\mathrm{H}_{5}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

- Satisfies the four gamete test?
- Construct the tree
- Is the SDP $11001^{\mathrm{T}}$ possible?


## Complications



- There are two issues that limit the use of Perfect Phylogeny, both are violations of our infinite-sites model assumptions
- In addition to mutations, haplotype diversity is generated by recombination, exchange of subsequences between haplotypes

- Mutations reoccur at the same position (Homoplasy)
- Thus, global (over the entire genome) perfect phylogenies are rare, but local perfect phylogenies are common
- How do we locate recombinations and recurrent mutations?


## Non-sequence Complications



- Evolutionary Convergence:
- Wings on birds and bats
- Fins on Seals and Fish
- Evolutionary Reversals:
- Fish $\rightarrow$ Lizard $\rightarrow$ Snake
- Fish $\rightarrow$ Mammal $\rightarrow$ Manatee
- (gain and later loss of legs)
- Such paths also violate the infinite sites model



## SNP Compatibility



- How do we find local genomic regions where our assumptions are valid?
- Apply 4-gamete test
- Issues
- Can we efficiently find all compatibility intervals
- How many intervals? (fewest necessary to cover the entire genome)
- Unique?

- Common properties


## Algorithms



- Left-to-right scan
- Is this solution unique?



## Algorithms



- Left-to-right scan
- Is this solution unique? No.
- Right-to-Left scan
- Given that the solution is not unique, which do we choose?
- The most parsimonious



## Algorithms



- Questions
- Of all scans, which has the fewest intervals?
- Is there a solution with fewer intervals?
- What is a better solution?
- Clearly the intervals could be larger
- What is the maximal size of the intervals?



## Algorithms



- Theorem
- Left-to-right and right-to-left scans have the same number of intervals, $k$
$-k$ is the minimum number of intervals possible
 large


## Cores

- The interval overlaps tell us something important
- Pair the L-R and R-L scan intervals from left to right. The overlap of these pairs are the interval cores.
- The $i^{\text {th }}$ core essentially is the SNPs that the $i^{\text {th }}$ interval of the L-R and R-L scan agree should be included in the $i^{\text {th }}$ interval of any minimal set of intervals
- A refinement of Parsimonious:
- Use this to find the minimal set of maximally-sized intervals
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## Uber Scan



- But first, lets backup momentarily
- The left-to-right scan found a minimal set of nonoverlapping intervals
- Can we find the set of all intervals of maximal size?
- These were clearly not found in our left-to-right or right-to-left scans



## Uber Scan



- Simple modification to the left-to-right scan algorithm
- Instead of restarting when an incompatibility is found, only remove a portion of it
- Specifically remove everything before (in the scanning direction) and including the closest newly introduced incompatibility
- Open a new interval starting at the first SNP in the queue
- Continue as before



## Uber Scan



- Properties
- Will contain more than the minimal number of intervals, $k$
- Each interval is maximal in size (bounded on each side by an incompatibility)
- Maintains a linear runtime



## Max- $k$ cover



- Minimal set of $k$ maximally-sized intervals
- Must be a subset of the Uber scan, since Uber includes all intervals of maximal size
- Search all subsets of size k?

$$
\binom{\text { Uber } \mid}{ k}
$$

- No. Combinatorial Explosion
- Instead restructure the problem as a graph problem


## Max- $k$ cover



- Minimal set of $k$ maximally-sized intervals
- We know any minimal set must include the cores
- Find all intervals from the Uber scan that overlap each core
- Construct a $k$-partite graph
- Vertices are intervals
- Edges are weighted with the amount of overlap
- Solve for maximal path (dynamic program)



## Max- $k$ cover



- Properties
- May not be unique
- Theoretical runtime $O(k u)$, where $u$ is the number of intervals in Uber scan
- In practice, we never see more than 3 intervals in any part, thus $O(k)$



## Uses



- Phylogeny trees
- Represent the data with the fewest possible trees
- Maximal intervals provide maximal support for each tree
- Recombination
- $k$ gives us a lower bound on the minimum number of recombinations needed to make the dataset
- Although, not very tight
- But it scales to large datasets


## Critical SNPs



- How stable are these intervals?
- If we remove any given SNP, will the minimal number of intervals needed, $k$, be reduced?
- Algorithm
- Only consider the flagging SNPs of the Uber intervals
- Intervals are bounded by incompatibilities. Unless they are removed, the interval cannot change size



## Some Context




346866 of 689472 Perlegen SNPs on Chr 1, 60 Billion pairwise relationships, >7.5 GBytes

## Chromosome 14

15059098-15230790



## Local to Global Trees



- Given a forest of local phylogeny trees, how do we construct a global tree?
- Generally, by combining tree metrics (Sum of distances from $i$ to $j$ ) across all trees and then applying either neighbor joining or UPMGA
- Evolution is more complicated than a simple tree
- Common introgressions near species splits
- Gene flows when branches interact

