

## WEAKLY DISPLAYING TREES IN TEMPORAL TREE-CHILD NETWORKS

KATHARINA T. HUBER, SIMONE LINZ, AND VINCENT MOULTON

**ABSTRACT.** Recently there has been considerable interest in the problem of finding a phylogenetic network with a minimum number of reticulation vertices which displays a given set of phylogenetic trees, that is, a network with minimum hybrid number. Even so, for certain evolutionary scenarios insisting that a network displays the set of trees can be an overly restrictive assumption. In this paper, we consider the less restrictive notion of displaying called weakly displaying and, in particular, a special case of this which we call rigidly displaying. We characterize when two trees can be rigidly displayed by a temporal tree-child network in terms of fork-picking sequences, a concept that is closely related to that of cherry-picking sequences. We also show that, in case it exists, the rigid hybrid number for two phylogenetic trees is given by a minimum weight fork-picking sequence for the trees, and that the rigid hybrid number can be quite different from the related beaded- and temporal-hybrid numbers.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Phylogenetic networks are a generalization of evolutionary trees. They come in various forms, and are commonly used to represent the evolutionary history for a set  $X$  of species in which events such as hybridization or recombination are suspected to have occurred [13]. For this paper, a phylogenetic network (on species set  $X$ ) is a connected directed acyclic graph, with a single root vertex and leaf-set  $X$  in which every internal vertex has degree 3 except for the root which has outdegree 2. We call the number of vertices in a phylogenetic network with indegree 2 the network’s *reticulation number*, so that a *phylogenetic tree* is a network with reticulation number 0. We shall mainly focus on *temporal tree-child* networks in which each non-leaf vertex has a child whose indegree is 1, whose vertices can be labelled with times that move strictly forward on treelike parts of the network and so that vertices with indegree 2 have parents with the same time label (also known as tree-child, time-consistent networks [5]).

Any phylogenetic network on the set  $X$  *displays* a set of phylogenetic trees on  $X$ , where a phylogenetic tree is *displayed* by a network if there is a subgraph of the network that is isomorphic to a subdivision of the tree [19]. It is therefore natural to try to construct phylogenetic networks by reversing this process, i.e. by trying to find a network which displays a given set of trees. These trees are usually obtained from genomic data, by considering different genes (which leads to “gene trees”) or regions of the species’ genomes. For a given set of phylogenetic trees, this also leads to the concept of the *(temporal) hybrid number*,

---

*Date:* January 8, 2022.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 05C05; 92D15.

*Key words and phrases.* Keywords: Phylogenetic network, hybrid number, cherry-picking sequence, fork-picking sequence, weakly displaying, rigidly displaying, temporal tree-child network.

which is the minimum reticulation number taken over all (temporal tree-child) networks that display each tree in the set [2, 10]. While the hybrid number exists for any set of phylogenetic trees, it is worth noting that the temporal hybrid number does not always exist, i.e. there are sets of trees that cannot simultaneously be embedded in a temporal tree-child network.

Several results have been presented in the literature concerning displaying phylogenetic trees and hybrid numbers, mainly for pairs of trees. These include structural information on how the hybrid number is related to the so-called *maximum acyclic agreement forest* for two phylogenetic trees [1], characterizations for when collections of trees are displayed by special types of networks [10, 15] and related algorithms/complexity results [3, 4, 7, 11, 12]. However, all of these results rely on the fact that the networks *display* the set of trees in question, a notion that may not appropriately model certain evolutionary scenarios, such as incomplete lineage sorting [20, 21].

A possible solution to this problem is to relax the displaying condition. Roughly speaking, a phylogenetic tree is *weakly displayed* by a network [9] if it can be embedded in the network in such a way that the tree follows along the directed paths in the network (see Section 3 for the definition). In this paper we will consider the problem of deciding when a pair of phylogenetic trees is weakly displayed by a temporal tree-child network under the assumption that there exist simultaneous embeddings of both trees that do not permit more than three branches of the trees to come together at a reticulation vertex. In this case we shall say that the pair of trees is *rigidly displayed* by the network. Note that related problems were recently considered in [20] (the Parental Tree Network Problem) and in [14] (The Beaded Tree Problem). In the Parental Tree Network Problem the aim is to find a network with a minimum number of reticulation vertices that weakly displays all trees in a given set of phylogenetic trees; in the Beaded Tree Problem, however, networks with parallel edges are permitted and a different concept of displaying is used which can lead to different solutions (see Section 4 for more details).

We now summarize the rest of the paper, including statements of our main results. After presenting some definitions in Section 2, in Section 3 we present the definition of weakly displaying, and we prove some basic facts concerning this concept and its relationship with displaying. In Section 4, we then consider the weak hybrid number of two trees. In particular, we determine the weak hybrid number for a specific pair of phylogenetic trees and show that for this pair of trees we get a different number to the analogous hybrid number defined in [14]. This example shows that the beaded trees introduced in [14] can lead to a quite different solution when aiming to find a network in which to embed the given trees.

In Sections 5 and 6, we introduce the concepts of rigidly displaying and fork-operations, respectively and prove some results on these concepts which we use later on. Then in Section 7 we give a characterization for when a pair of phylogenetic trees can be rigidly displayed in terms of fork-picking sequences (Corollary 7.2), a generalization of cherry-picking sequences [10]. In Section 8, we go on to show that when the rigid hybrid number of two trees exists, it is equal to the weight of a minimum fork-picking sequence (Corollary 8.2). These results can be regarded as analogues of [10, Theorem 1] and [10, Theorem 2], respectively. In Section 9 we show that there is a pair of phylogenetic trees on a set  $X$  with  $|X|$  arbitrarily large, so that the difference between the temporal and rigid hybrid numbers

for these two trees is at least  $\frac{|X|}{4} - 3$  (Theorem 9.1). We conclude with a discussion on possible future directions in Section 10.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $G$  denote a directed, acyclic graph with a single root vertex, i.e., a vertex with indegree 0. We let  $V(G)$  denote the vertex set of  $G$ ,  $E(G)$  the set of (directed) edges of  $G$ , and  $\rho_G$  the unique root of  $G$ . A vertex in  $G$  with indegree 1 and outdegree 0 is called a *leaf*; an edge of  $G$  incident with a leaf of  $G$  a *pendant edge* of  $G$ . Furthermore, we denote the set of all leaves of  $G$  by  $L(G)$ .

Suppose  $v \in V(G)$ . We say that a vertex  $u \in V(G)$  is *above*  $v$  if there exists a directed path from the root of  $G$  to  $v$  that contains  $u$  (note that  $u$  could equal  $v$ ). If  $u$  is above  $v$ , then we also write  $u \preceq_G v$  or simply  $u \preceq v$  if  $G$  is clear from the context. Furthermore, we also say that  $v$  is *below*  $u$ . We call any vertex above  $v$  an *ancestor* of  $v$  and any vertex below  $v$  a *descendant* of  $v$ . Finally, we say that two distinct edges  $e$  and  $e'$  of  $G$  are *comparable* if  $\text{head}(e)$  is above  $\text{tail}(e')$  or  $\text{head}(e')$  is above  $\text{tail}(e)$ . Otherwise we say that  $e$  and  $e'$  are *incomparable*.

Let  $X$  be a finite set of size at least 2. Following e.g. [9, p.1764] a rooted, directed acyclic graph  $\mathcal{N}$  is called a *phylogenetic network (on  $X$ )* if the leaf-set of  $\mathcal{N}$  is  $X$ , the root  $\rho_{\mathcal{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  has outdegree two and any non-root, non-leaf vertex  $v \in V(\mathcal{N})$  either has indegree one and outdegree two or zero (in which case  $v$  is called a *tree vertex*) or  $v$  has indegree two and its outdegree is one (in which case  $v$  is called a *reticulation vertex*). The set of reticulation vertices of  $\mathcal{N}$  is denoted by  $\text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$ . We put  $h(\mathcal{N}) = |\text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})|$ . Unless stated otherwise, phylogenetic networks do not contain parallel edges. Moreover, we call a directed path in a phylogenetic network  $\mathcal{N}$  of length one or more in which every vertex, except possibly the first vertex, is a tree vertex a *tree-path* in  $\mathcal{N}$ .

A *phylogenetic tree (on  $X$ )* is a phylogenetic network on  $X$  that does not have any reticulation vertices. We say that two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  are *isomorphic*, denoted by  $\mathcal{T} \cong \mathcal{T}'$ , if there exists a bijection  $V(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow V(\mathcal{T}')$  that induces a graph isomorphism between  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  that is the identity on  $X$ . If  $\mathcal{T}$  is a phylogenetic tree on  $X$ , and  $Y \subseteq X$ , then the *last common ancestor of  $Y$* , denote by  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(Y)$ , is the unique vertex  $v$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  that is an ancestor of every element in  $Y$  and there is no vertex  $w$  such that  $w$  is a descendant of  $v$  and  $w$  is an ancestor of every element in  $Y$ . For any  $2 \leq l \leq |X|$  elements  $x_1, \dots, x_l \in X$ , we sometimes also write  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x_1, \dots, x_l)$  rather than  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(\{x_1, \dots, x_l\})$ . In addition, we denote by  $\mathcal{T}(Y)$  the minimal subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$  spanned by all leaves in  $Y$  and by  $\mathcal{T}|_Y$  the *restriction* of  $\mathcal{T}$  to  $Y$ , that is, the phylogenetic tree on  $Y$  obtained from  $\mathcal{T}(Y)$  by suppressing all resulting vertices of both indegree and outdegree one. Note that the root of  $\mathcal{T}(Y)$  is the last common ancestor of all elements in  $Y$ .

Suppose  $\mathcal{N}$  is a phylogenetic network on  $X$ . Following [18], we say that  $\mathcal{N}$  is *temporal* [17] if there exists a map  $t : V(\mathcal{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$  such that, for all  $(p, q) \in E(\mathcal{N})$ , we have  $t(p) = t(q)$  whenever  $q$  is a reticulation vertex and  $t(p) < t(q)$ , otherwise. In that case, we call  $t$  a *temporal labelling* of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Unless of relevance to the discussion, we always omit the temporal labelling when depicting a temporal network. We say that  $\mathcal{N}$  is *tree-child* [6] if, for each non-leaf vertex  $v \in V(\mathcal{N})$  at least one of the children of  $v$  is a tree vertex.

Note that a tree-child network was called a phylogenetic network in [10, p.1883]. Also note that a temporal tree-child network (in our sense) has also been called a (binary) *time-consistent tree-child network*, or *TCTC-network* in [5]. Finally, we say that  $\mathcal{N}$  is *normal* if in addition to being tree-child it does not contain a *shortcut*, that is, if there is a directed path from a vertex  $u \in V(\mathcal{N})$  to a vertex  $v \in V(\mathcal{N})$  with at least two edges, then there is no directed edge  $(u, v)$  [16]. Note that any temporal tree-child network is normal [18, Proposition 10.12]

### 3. WEAKLY DISPLAYING TWO TREES IN A NETWORK

In this section, we derive some basic properties for the notion of weak displaying which will be useful later. In the following, assume that  $\mathcal{T}$  is a phylogenetic tree on  $X$  and that  $\mathcal{N}$  is a phylogenetic network on  $X$ .

We call a map  $\psi : V(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow V(\mathcal{N})$  that is the identity on  $X$  a *display map* for  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\mathcal{N}$  if the following additional properties hold

- (i) for all  $v \in V(\mathcal{T})$ ,  $\psi(v)$  is a tree vertex or the root of  $\mathcal{N}$ ,
- (ii) for every edge  $e$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  there exists a directed path  $\psi[e]$  having at least one edge from  $\psi(\text{tail}(e))$  to  $\psi(\text{head}(e))$  in  $\mathcal{N}$ , and
- (iii) for any two distinct edges  $e$  and  $e'$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  that share the same tail the first edge of  $\psi[e]$  is not the first edge of  $\psi[e']$ .

Following [9], we say that  $\mathcal{T}$  is *weakly displayed* by  $\mathcal{N}$  if there exists a display map for  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\mathcal{N}$ . To reduce notation, we will sometimes not explicitly refer to the display map. Note that if  $\mathcal{T}$  is weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}$ , then there could be more than one display map for  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\mathcal{N}$ . In addition, note that if  $\mathcal{N}$  displays  $\mathcal{T}$  then  $\mathcal{N}$  also weakly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  (but not necessarily conversely).

The notion of weakly displayed was introduced in [9] in terms of a construction that allows the “unfolding” of a phylogenetic network on  $X$  into a so-called “multi-labelled tree on  $X$ ” [8]. Such trees are similar to phylogenetic trees in that they have no vertices with in- and outdegree one and the root has indegree zero. However the requirement that the leaf-set is  $X$  is relaxed to the requirement that an element of  $X$  can “label” more than one leaf (which is not allowed in the case of phylogenetic trees).

Note that although closely related, display maps are not *weak embeddings* sensu [14]. Stated within our framework, such embeddings are maps  $\psi : V(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow V(\mathcal{N})$  from a multi-labelled tree  $\mathcal{M}$  into a phylogenetic network  $\mathcal{N}$  such that (a) all leaves of  $\mathcal{M}$  that share the same “label”  $x \in X$  are mapped to the leaf  $x$  of  $\mathcal{N}$ , (b) every edge  $e$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  is mapped to either a vertex of  $\mathcal{N}$  or a directed path from  $\psi(\text{tail}(e))$  to  $\psi(\text{head}(e))$ , and (c) for every non-leaf vertex  $v$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  with outgoing edges  $a_1$  and  $a_2$ , the directed paths associated to  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  which each has at least one edge) start with different outgoing edges of  $\psi(v)$ . Since a phylogenetic tree is clearly also a multi-labelled tree, it follows that the map  $\psi : V(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow V(\mathcal{N})$  that is the identity on  $X$  and maps all non-leaf vertices of  $\mathcal{T}$  to the root of  $\mathcal{N}$  is a weak embedding of  $\mathcal{T}$  into  $\mathcal{N}$  as Property (c) vacuously applies. However  $\psi$  is not a display map for  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\mathcal{N}$  as Property (ii) does not hold. Even so, a display map is always a weak embedding.

Now, suppose that  $\psi : V(\mathcal{T}) \rightarrow V(\mathcal{N})$  is a display map for  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\mathcal{N}$ . For any edge  $e = (u, v) \in E(\mathcal{T})$ , we denote by  $\psi[e] - \psi(u)$  the set of all vertices in  $V(\mathcal{N})$  that lie on the path  $\psi[e]$  except for  $\psi(u)$ . Let  $w \in V(\mathcal{N})$ , and let  $e = (u, v)$  be an edge of  $\mathcal{T}$ . If  $\psi(v) = w$ , we say that the path  $\psi[e]$  *ends at*  $w$  and if  $w \in \psi[e] - \psi(u)$ , but  $\psi(v) \neq w$  we say that  $\psi[e]$  *passes through*  $w$ . In addition, we define the number

$$\gamma_\psi(w) = |\{e = (u, v) \in E(\mathcal{T}) : w \in \psi[e] - \psi(u)\}|,$$

i.e.,  $\gamma_\psi(w)$  counts the number of edges in  $\mathcal{T}$  such that their image under  $\psi$  either ends or passes through  $w$  so that in particular  $\gamma_\psi(\rho_{\mathcal{N}}) = 0$ . Finally, if  $\mathcal{T}'$  is a further phylogenetic tree on  $X$  that is also weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}$  via a map  $\psi'$ , then we put

$$\gamma(w) = \gamma_{\psi, \psi'}(w) = \gamma_\psi(w) + \gamma_{\psi'}(w)$$

(see e.g. Figure 1). To reduce notation we sometimes drop the subscript in  $\gamma_{\psi, \psi'}$  as indicated when no confusion can arise about which maps are being used to weakly display  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ .

We now prove two lemmas about these concepts which will be useful later. The first concerns temporal tree-child networks.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a temporal tree-child network on  $X$  that weakly displays a phylogenetic tree  $\mathcal{T}$  on  $X$  via a display map  $\psi$ . Then  $\mathcal{N}$  displays  $\mathcal{T}$  if and only if for all  $w \in V(\mathcal{N})$ , we have  $\gamma_\psi(w) \leq 1$ . In addition,  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(\rho_{\mathcal{T}}) = \rho_{\mathcal{N}}$  so that, in particular, if  $\mathcal{N}$  displays  $\mathcal{T}$  then  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(\rho_{\mathcal{T}}) = \rho_{\mathcal{N}}$ .*

*Proof:* Consider the first statement. Suppose  $w \in V(\mathcal{N})$ , then by the definition of displaying, it is straight-forward to see that, for all  $w \in V(\mathcal{N})$ , we have  $\gamma_\psi(w) \leq 1$ . Conversely, first note that if  $w \in \text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$  then, by assumption, there exists at most one edge  $e \in E(\mathcal{T})$  such that  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}[e]$  either passes through or ends in  $w$ . As  $w$  is a reticulation vertex,  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}[e]$  cannot end at  $w$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}$  has no shortcuts, by deleting each edge  $e$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  that is directed into a reticulation vertex  $w'$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  and for which there exists no  $e' \in E(\mathcal{T})$  such that  $e$  is an edge on  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}[e']$  and  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}[e']$  passes through  $w'$ , we obtain a subgraph of  $\mathcal{N}$  that is isomorphic to a subdivision of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{N}$  displays  $\mathcal{T}$ .

To see that the last statement in the lemma holds, assume for contradiction that  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(\rho_{\mathcal{T}})$  is not the root  $\rho_{\mathcal{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}$  is temporal tree-child and, therefore, normal [18, Proposition 10.12], the two children  $u$  and  $v$  of  $\rho_{\mathcal{N}}$  must be distinct and tree vertices. Moreover, there must exist a tree-path  $p_x$  in  $\mathcal{N}$  from  $u$  to some leaf  $x$  and a tree-path  $p_y$  from  $v$  to some leaf  $y$ . Note that since  $p_x$  and  $p_y$  cannot intersect, we must have  $x \neq y$ . Since  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}$  is a display map for  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $x$  and  $y$  are also leaves of  $\mathcal{T}$  it follows that  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$  is mapped to an ancestor of  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\mathcal{N}$  under  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Extending the paths  $p_x$  and  $p_y$  to tree-paths starting at  $\rho_{\mathcal{N}}$  implies that that ancestor must be  $\rho_{\mathcal{N}}$ . Thus,  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(\rho_{\mathcal{T}}) = \rho_{\mathcal{N}}$ .  $\square$

To state the second lemma we require some further definitions. We call a subgraph  $\mathcal{N}'$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  a *pendant subnetwork* of  $\mathcal{N}$  if there exists a tree vertex  $v$  in  $\mathcal{N}$  such that when deleting the incoming edge of  $v$  the network decomposes into two connected components such that the component that contains  $v$  in its vertex set is a phylogenetic network  $\mathcal{N}'$  on  $L(\mathcal{N}') \subseteq L(\mathcal{N})$ . A *pendant subtree* of  $\mathcal{N}$  is a pendant subnetwork of  $\mathcal{N}$  that is a phylogenetic tree. Note that a pendant subnetwork and therefore also a pendant subtree must have at least two leaves.




FIGURE 1. Two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X = \{a, b, c, d\}$  that are weakly displayed by the network  $\mathcal{N}$  on  $X$  for which  $\gamma(w) \leq 2$  holds for all  $w \in V(\mathcal{N})$ . However,  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are *not* both displayed by  $\mathcal{N}$  (the tree  $\mathcal{T}'$  is not displayed).

**Lemma 3.2.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N}$  is a phylogenetic network on  $X$  that weakly displays two distinct phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  via display maps  $\psi$  and  $\psi'$ , respectively.*

- (i) *If  $v$  is a tree vertex in  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\gamma_{\psi, \psi'}(v) \geq 3$ , then there is a vertex  $w \in \text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$  which is an ancestor of  $v$  in  $\mathcal{N}$ .*
- (ii) *If  $v$  is tree vertex in  $\mathcal{N}$  with  $\gamma_{\psi, \psi'}(v) = 2$  and  $v$  has a child that is the root of a pendant subtree, say  $\mathcal{T}^*$ , of  $\mathcal{N}$  then  $\mathcal{T}^*$  is a pendant subtree of both  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ .*

*Proof:* (i) Suppose that  $v$  is a tree vertex of  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\gamma(v) \geq 3$ . Then, without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\mathcal{T}$  is such that  $\gamma_{\psi}(v) \geq 2$ . Hence, there are two distinct edges  $e$  and  $e'$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  with tails  $u$  and  $u'$  respectively, such that  $v \in \psi[e] - \psi(u)$  and  $v \in \psi[e'] - \psi(u')$ . Note that  $u \neq u'$  may or may not hold. In either case, the definition of a display map combined with the fact that  $\mathcal{N}$  does not contain parallel edges implies that the heads of the outgoing edges of  $\psi(u)$  and  $\psi(u')$ , respectively, must be distinct. Thus,  $\psi[e'] \neq \psi[e]$ .

We claim that  $e$  and  $e'$  are incomparable in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Indeed, assume for contradiction that  $e$  and  $e'$  are comparable. Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\text{head}(e)$  is above  $\text{tail}(e')$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then the directed path  $P$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  starting at  $u$  and ending at the head of  $e'$  is mapped by  $\psi$  to a directed path in  $\mathcal{N}$  with edge set  $\bigcup_{e \in E(P)} E(\psi[e])$ . Since  $v \in \psi[e] - \psi(u)$  it follows that  $v \notin \psi[e'] - \psi(u')$ , a contradiction which yields the claim.

In particular, since  $\mathcal{T}$  is weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}$  there must be a vertex  $q$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $q \preceq_{\mathcal{T}} u$  and  $q \preceq_{\mathcal{T}} u'$  such that (a) the two directed paths in  $\mathcal{T}$  from  $q$  up to and including the heads of  $e$  and  $e'$ , respectively, are mapped by  $\psi$  to two directed paths  $p_e$  and  $p_{e'}$  in  $\mathcal{N}$ , (b) the first edge on  $p_e$  is different from the first edge on  $p_{e'}$ , and (c),  $v$  is a vertex on both  $p_e$  and  $p_{e'}$ . Hence there must be some vertex in  $\text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$  which lies on  $p_e$  and  $p_{e'}$  and which is an ancestor of  $v$ .

(ii) Note that every leaf  $x$  in  $\mathcal{T}^*$  must be contained in the image under  $\psi$  of some directed path in  $\mathcal{T}$  from the root of  $\mathcal{T}$  to  $x$ , and similarly for  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Since, by assumption,  $\gamma(v) = 2$ ,

there can be at most one such path in  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ , respectively which has this property for every leaf in  $\mathcal{T}^*$ . Hence  $\mathcal{T}^*$  must be a pendant subtree of both  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ .  $\square$

#### 4. THE WEAK HYBRID NUMBER

Given two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$ , we define the *weak hybrid number*  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  as

$$h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = \min\{h(\mathcal{N}) : \mathcal{N} \text{ is a phylogenetic network that weakly displays } \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \mathcal{T}'\}.$$

Note that for any two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  there always exists a phylogenetic network that displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  and so  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  is well-defined. In addition, the weak hybrid number has been implicitly considered in The Parental Tree Network Problem [20, Definition 5]. In this section, we give an example which shows that the weak hybrid number is different from the related beaded hybrid number [14], whose definition we next recall.

A *beaded tree*  $\mathcal{B}$  on  $X$  is a phylogenetic network on  $X$  in which parallel edges are allowed, and in which each reticulation  $v$  has a unique parent  $u$  such that there are two parallel edges from  $u$  to  $v$  [14, Definition 7]. Now for two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$ , we define the *beaded hybrid number*  $h_b(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  to be

$$h_b(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = \min\{h(\mathcal{B}) : \mathcal{B} \text{ is a beaded tree such that there exist weak embeddings of } \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \mathcal{T}' \text{ into } \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Note that [14, Lemma 9] implies that any phylogenetic network  $\mathcal{N}$  on  $X$  that weakly displays two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  can be transformed into a beaded tree  $\mathcal{B}$  on  $X$  such that there exist weak embeddings of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  into  $\mathcal{B}$  for which  $|Ret(\mathcal{N})| = |Ret(\mathcal{B})|$  (so in particular  $h_b(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  exists for any pair of trees  $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}'$ ). Hence,  $h_b(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \leq h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$ .

We now use Lemma 3.2 to show in Proposition 4.1 that there exist phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  such that  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \neq h_b(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$ . First, consider the two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  depicted in Figure 2. Note that  $h_b(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = 1$  since  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are not isomorphic, and there exist weak embeddings of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  into the pictured beaded tree  $\mathcal{N}$ , respectively. Hence,  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \geq 1$ . We now show that  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = 2$ .

To this end, we call two leaves  $x$  and  $y$  of a phylogenetic tree  $\mathcal{T}$  with  $x \neq y$  a *cherry* of  $\mathcal{T}$ , denoted by  $\{x, y\}$ , if  $x$  and  $y$  share a parent.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  denote the two phylogenetic trees on  $X = \{1, \dots, 6\}$  pictured in Figure 2. Then  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = 2$ .*

*Proof:* As  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are not isomorphic we have  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \geq 1$ . Moreover, as the phylogenetic network  $\mathcal{N}'$  pictured in Figure 2 is also on  $X$  and weakly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  we have  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \leq 2$ . We now show that  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \neq 1$ , from which the proposition follows.

Suppose to the contrary that  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = 1$ . Then there exists a phylogenetic network  $\mathcal{N}^*$  that weakly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  such that  $h(\mathcal{N}^*) = 1$ . Let  $v$  be the unique vertex in



$Ret(\mathcal{N}^*)$ . Let  $u \in V(\mathcal{N}^*) - \{\rho_{\mathcal{N}^*}\}$  be a parent of  $v$ . Note that since  $\mathcal{N}^*$  has no parallel edges,  $u$  must exist. Also note that  $u$  must be a tree vertex of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  as  $v$  is the sole reticulation vertex of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . Finally, note that the other child of  $u$  cannot be  $v$  as  $\mathcal{N}^*$  does not contain parallel edges.

Denoting that child by  $x$  we next claim that  $x$  must be a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . Assume for contradiction that  $x$  is not a leaf. Let  $\mathcal{T}^*$  the subtree of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  rooted at  $x$ . Let  $x'$  be a leaf of  $\mathcal{T}^*$  and, thus, of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . Then since  $\mathcal{N}^*$  weakly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  via a map  $\psi$  say, and  $v$  is the sole reticulation vertex of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  we obtain  $\gamma_\psi(u) \geq 1$ . Similarly, as  $\mathcal{N}^*$  weakly displays  $\mathcal{T}'$  via a map  $\psi'$  say,  $\gamma_{\psi'}(u) \geq 1$  must hold. Thus,  $\gamma_{\psi, \psi'}(u) \geq 2$ . Since Lemma 3.2(i) implies that  $\gamma_{\psi, \psi'}(u) \leq 2$  as  $v$  is the sole reticulation vertex of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ , it follows that  $\gamma_{\psi, \psi'}(u) = 2$ . Hence, by Lemma 3.2(ii),  $\mathcal{T}^*$  is also a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$  and of  $\mathcal{T}'$ ; a contradiction as  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are the two trees depicted in Figure 2. Thus,  $x$  is a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ , as claimed.

Since every element in  $X$  is contained in a cherry of either  $\mathcal{T}$  or  $\mathcal{T}'$ , we may choose some  $y \in X - \{x\}$  such that  $\{x, y\}$  is a cherry in either  $\mathcal{T}$  or  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Without loss of generality, assume that  $\mathcal{T}$  is that tree. Since the only two cherries of  $\mathcal{T}$  are  $\{1, 3\}$  and  $\{4, 6\}$  we may assume without loss of generality that  $\{x, y\} = \{1, 3\}$ . Let  $m$  denote the parent of  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Let  $w \in V(\mathcal{N}^*)$  be the parent of  $u$  which must exist as  $u \neq \rho_{\mathcal{N}^*}$ . Then  $w \neq \rho_{\mathcal{N}^*}$  as otherwise the fact that  $\{x, y\}$  is a cherry of  $\mathcal{T}$  but not of  $\mathcal{T}'$  implies that  $y$  is below  $v$ . But then  $\mathcal{T}$  is not weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}^*$  because  $(\rho_{\mathcal{N}^*}, u)$  is an edge of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  and  $(\rho_{\mathcal{T}}, m)$  is not an edge in  $\mathcal{T}$ ; a contradiction.

We next claim that  $(w, v)$  cannot be an edge in  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . To see this, assume for contradiction that  $(w, v)$  is an edge in  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . Then since  $\mathcal{T}$  is weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}^*$  and  $x$  is contained in a cherry of  $\mathcal{T}$  but not of  $\mathcal{T}'$  it follows that  $y$  must be a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  below  $v$ . If there existed another leaf of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  below  $v$  then that leaf would have to be “5”. Since  $\{5, 6\}$  is a cherry of  $\mathcal{T}'$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  is weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}^*$  it follows that that cherry must also be below  $v$ ; a contradiction as  $\mathcal{T}$  is the phylogenetic trees depicted in Figure 2. Thus,  $y$  is in fact the sole leaf of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  below  $v$ . But then  $\{x, y\}$  must also be a cherry of  $\mathcal{T}'$ ; a contradiction since  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are the phylogenetic trees depicted in Figure 2. Thus,  $(w, v)$  cannot be an edge in  $\mathcal{N}^*$ , as claimed. Hence, the other child of  $w$ , call it  $z$ , must either be a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  or is the root of a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ .

Note first that arguments similar to the case of  $x$  imply that  $z$  must be a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . Let  $p \in V(\mathcal{N}^*)$  denote the parent of  $w$ . We next distinguish between the cases that  $z = y$  and that  $z \neq y$ .

If  $z = y$  then  $p \neq \rho_{\mathcal{N}^*}$ . To see this, assume for contradiction that  $p = \rho_{\mathcal{N}^*}$ . Then  $(\rho_{\mathcal{N}^*}, w)$  is an edge in  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . Since  $\{x, y\}$  is a cherry of  $\mathcal{T}$  and the parent  $m$  of  $x$  and  $y$  is not adjacent with  $\rho_{\mathcal{T}}$  it follows that  $\mathcal{T}$  is not weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}^*$ ; a contradiction. Thus,  $p \neq \rho_{\mathcal{N}^*}$ , as required.

We next claim that  $(p, v)$  also cannot be an edge of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . Assume for contradiction that  $(p, v)$  is an edge of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . Then since  $\{x, y\}$  is a cherry of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  is weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}^*$ , similar arguments as before imply that “5” must be the sole leaf of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  below  $v$  and that the unique directed path from  $\rho_{\mathcal{N}^*}$  to leaf “2” does not cross  $w$ . Since  $\mathcal{T}'$  is one of






FIGURE 2. Two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X = \{1, \dots, 6\}$  whose beaded hybrid number  $h_b(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  is 1 ( $\mathcal{N}$  is a beaded tree into which  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  can be weakly embedded), and whose weak hybrid number  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  is 2 (the network  $\mathcal{N}'$  weakly displays both trees).

the two phylogenetic trees depicted in Figure 2 it follows that  $\mathcal{T}'$  is not weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}^*$ ; a contradiction. Thus,  $(p, v)$  cannot be an edge of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  either.

Let  $q$  denote the other child of  $p$ . Then similar arguments as in the case of  $z$  imply that  $q$  must also be a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . Hence,  $(q, (x, y))$  is a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Since  $p$  is a tree vertex of  $\mathcal{N}^*$ , Lemma 3.2(ii) implies that  $(q, (x, y))$  is a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$  and of  $\mathcal{T}'$ ; a contradiction in view of Figure 2. Hence,  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \neq 1$  in case  $z = y$ .

Assume for the remainder that  $z \neq y$ . Then  $y$  is a descendant of  $v$  in  $\mathcal{N}^*$ . Since  $z$  is a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}$ , it follows that  $(z, (x, y))$  is a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Since  $\{x, y\} = \{1, 3\}$  we must have  $z = 5$ . But then  $x = 6$  as  $\{5, 6\}$  is a cherry of  $\mathcal{T}'$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  is weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}^*$ ; a final contradiction. Hence,  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \neq 1$  and, so, the proposition follows.  $\square$

This example is important as it indicates that the beaded hybrid number could potentially underestimate the number of reticulations required to weakly display two phylogenetic trees in a network. It would be interesting to understand how large the difference between  $h_b(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  and  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  could be in general.

## 5. RIGIDLY DISPLAYING

We now introduce and present some basic properties of the notion of rigidly displaying. We begin with a lemma which will help to motivate our definition. In Figure 1 we present an example where two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are weakly displayed by the depicted phylogenetic network  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $\gamma(w) \leq 2$  for all  $w \in V(\mathcal{N})$  but  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are *not* both displayed by  $\mathcal{N}$ . So, in general, it does not suffice to insist that  $\gamma(w) \leq 2$  for all  $w \in V(\mathcal{N})$  for two phylogenetic trees to be displayed by a phylogenetic network. However, if we insist that the network is temporal tree-child, we now show that this condition actually suffices.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N}$  is a temporal tree-child network on  $X$  and that  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are two phylogenetic trees on  $X$  that are weakly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}$  via display maps  $\psi$  and  $\psi'$ , respectively. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (i)  $\mathcal{N}$  displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ .
- (ii)  $\gamma_{\psi, \psi'}(v) = 2$  for all  $v \in V(\mathcal{N}) - \{\rho_{\mathcal{N}}\}$ .
- (iii)  $\gamma_{\psi, \psi'}(v) = 2$  for all  $v \in \text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$ .

*Proof:* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) We show first that  $\gamma(v) \geq 2$  must hold for all  $v \in V(\mathcal{N}) - \{\rho_{\mathcal{N}}\}$ . Assume for contradiction that there exists some vertex  $v \in V(\mathcal{N})$  such that  $\gamma(v) \leq 1$ . Then one of  $\gamma_{\psi}(v) = 0$  or  $\gamma_{\psi'}(v) = 0$  must hold. Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\gamma_{\psi}(v) = 0$ . Then there exists no edge  $e \in E(\mathcal{T})$  such that  $\psi[e]$  either passes through  $v$  or ends in  $v$ . But then there cannot exist a leaf  $x$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  that can be reached from  $v$  via a tree-path. Thus,  $\mathcal{N}$  is not tree-child; a contradiction. Since, by assumption,  $\mathcal{N}$  displays both  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ , Lemma 3.1 implies that  $\gamma(v) \leq 2$  for all  $v \in V(\mathcal{N}) - \{\rho_{\mathcal{N}}\}$ . Thus,  $\gamma(v) = 2$  must hold for all  $v \in V(\mathcal{N}) - \{\rho_{\mathcal{N}}\}$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) This is trivial.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) By Lemma 3.1 it suffices to show that  $\gamma_{\psi}(v) \leq 1$  and  $\gamma_{\psi'}(v) \leq 1$  holds for all  $v \in V(\mathcal{N})$ . Assume for contradiction that there exists some  $v \in V(\mathcal{N})$  and some tree in  $\{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}'\}$ , say  $\mathcal{T}$ , such that  $\gamma_{\psi}(v) \geq 2$ . Then  $v \neq \rho_{\mathcal{N}}$ . In view of the assumptions on  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ , the last statement in Lemma 3.1 implies that there must be a directed path in  $\mathcal{T}'$  that starts at  $\rho_{\mathcal{T}'}$  such that the image under  $\psi'$  of the last edge in this path passes through or ends at  $v$ . Hence,  $\gamma_{\psi'}(v) \geq 1$  must hold too. Thus,  $\gamma(v) \geq 3$ . By assumption, it follows that  $v$  must be a tree vertex of  $\mathcal{N}$ . In view of Lemma 3.2(i), there must exist some vertex  $w \in \text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$  that is an ancestor of  $v$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $w$  is such that no vertex in  $V(\mathcal{N})$  distinct from  $w$  that is above  $v$  and below  $w$  is contained in  $\text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$ . By assumption, it follows that  $\gamma(w) = 2$ ; a contradiction to the choice of  $w$  and the fact that  $\gamma(v) \geq 3$ .  $\square$

Motivated in part by this lemma, we say that a phylogenetic network  $\mathcal{N}$  on  $X$  *rigidly displays* two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  if  $\mathcal{N}$  weakly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  via display maps  $\psi, \psi'$  respectively, and, for all  $v \in \text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$  we have  $\gamma_{\psi, \psi'}(v) \leq 3$  and, for each parent  $w \in V(\mathcal{N})$  of  $v$ , we have  $\gamma_{\psi, \psi'}(w) \leq 2$ . For example, the network  $\mathcal{N}'$  pictured in Figure 2 rigidly displays the two phylogenetic trees depicted in that figure.

Note that, in contrast to the definitions of displaying and weakly displaying which refer to a single tree, rigidly displaying always refers to two trees. In addition, by Lemma 5.1 it follows that if  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are two phylogenetic trees on  $X$  that are displayed by a temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}$  on  $X$ , then  $\mathcal{N}$  also rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . We also have the following:

**Lemma 5.2.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{N}$  is a temporal tree-child network on  $X$  and that  $\mathcal{N}$  rigidly displays two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  via display maps  $\psi$  and  $\psi'$ . Then  $2 \leq \gamma(v) \leq 3$  for all  $v \in V(\mathcal{N}) - \{\rho_{\mathcal{N}}\}$ .*

*Proof:* Suppose  $v \in V(\mathcal{N}) - \{\rho_{\mathcal{N}}\}$ . Then since  $\mathcal{N}$  rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  it also weakly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Since  $v \neq \rho_{\mathcal{N}}$  it follows that  $\gamma_{\psi}(v) \geq 1$  and that  $\gamma_{\psi'}(v) \geq 1$ . Hence,  $2 \leq \gamma(v)$ .

For the remainder, assume for contradiction that there exists some  $v \in V(\mathcal{N}) - \{\rho_{\mathcal{N}}\}$  such that  $\gamma(v) \geq 4$ . Then  $v$  must be a tree vertex of  $\mathcal{N}$  as  $\mathcal{N}$  rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  and  $\gamma(\rho_{\mathcal{N}}) = 0$ . Let  $P : v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k, v$  be a longest directed path of tree vertices in  $\mathcal{N}$  that ends at  $v$ . Note that  $\gamma(v_i) \geq \gamma(v)$ , for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Also note that since  $\rho_{\mathcal{N}}$  is not a tree vertex of  $\mathcal{N}$ , we cannot have  $v_1 = \rho_{\mathcal{N}}$ . Let  $w \in V(\mathcal{N})$  denote the parent of  $v_1$ . Note that  $\gamma(w) \geq 4$ . Hence, we cannot have  $w = \rho_{\mathcal{N}}$ . Since  $\mathcal{N}$  rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  it follows




FIGURE 3. The two phylogenetic trees on the left are weakly displayed by the network depicted on the right. However, they are not rigidly displayed by that network because  $\gamma(v) = 3$  and  $v$  is the parent of a reticulation vertex.

that  $w$  must be a tree vertex of  $\mathcal{N}$ . But then the extension of  $P$  by  $w$  results in a directed path of tree vertices of  $\mathcal{N}$  that ends in  $v$  and that is longer than  $P$ ; a contradiction.  $\square$

Note that the converse of the last lemma does not hold in general (see e.g. Figure 3). We conclude this section with one more lemma that will be useful later.

**Lemma 5.3.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N}$  is a tree-child network on  $X$  that rigidly displays two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$ , and that  $\mathcal{T}$  is weakly displayed via the display map  $\psi$ . If  $e = (u, v)$  is an edge of  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $\psi[e]$  passes through a vertex  $w \in \text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$ , then  $\psi(u)$  must be a parent of  $w$  in  $\mathcal{N}$ .*

*Proof:* Suppose  $e = (u, v)$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  is such that  $\psi[e]$  passes through a vertex  $w \in \text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$ . Assume for contradiction that  $\psi(u)$  is not a parent of  $w$ . Let  $p$  be the parent of  $w$  in  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $p$  lies on  $\psi[e]$ . Then  $\psi(u) \neq p$ . As  $\mathcal{N}$  is tree-child, there must be a tree-path in  $\mathcal{N}$  starting at  $p$  and ending at some leaf  $x \in X$ . So, as  $x$  is a leaf of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\psi_{\mathcal{T}}(u) \neq p$ , there must be some edge  $e' \neq e$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $\psi[e']$  passes through  $p$ . Moreover, considering the leaf  $x$  again, there must be an edge in  $\mathcal{T}'$  which maps to a path in  $\mathcal{N}$  via  $\psi$  that either ends at or passes through  $p$ . It follows that  $\gamma(p) \geq 3$ ; a contradiction as  $\mathcal{N}$  rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  and  $p$  is the parent of a vertex in  $\text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$ .  $\square$

Note that as the example of the two phylogenetic trees and the network  $\mathcal{N}'$  in Figure 1 shows, the assumption that  $\mathcal{N}$  is tree-child is necessary for Lemma 5.3 to hold.

## 6. FORK OPERATIONS

In the next section we shall characterize when two trees are rigidly displayed by a temporal tree-child network in terms of sequences of certain operations on these trees. The basis for these sequences are fork-operations which we shall now introduce.




FIGURE 4. Four operations (type-0, type-1, type-2, type-3) on two phylogenetic trees each applied to leaf  $x$ . In the 2nd and 3rd columns, subconfigurations of the two trees are represented (so, for example, for a type-0 operation, both trees have cherry  $\{x, y\}$ ). In the 4th and 5th columns the result of applying the operation  $o(x)$  is pictured (so, for example, applying a type-2 operation to the 3-fork and the cherry in row 3 results in a phylogenetic tree with cherry  $\{z, y\}$  and a phylogenetic tree with the cherry  $\{x, y\}$  replaced by  $y$ ).

By a *fork* we mean a 2-leaved tree (i. e. a cherry), a 3-leaved rooted tree (a *3-fork*) or a 4-leaved fully-balanced rooted tree (a *4-fork*). The following basic fact concerning forks is straight-forward to show.

**Lemma 6.1.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{T}$  is a phylogenetic tree with  $n \geq 3$  leaves. If  $n = 3$  then  $\mathcal{T}$  is a 3-fork and if  $n \geq 4$  then  $\mathcal{T}$  must contain a pendant subtree that is either a 3-fork or a 4-fork.*

A *fork-operation*  $o = o(x)$  for a pair of phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  consists of a leaf  $x \in X$ , together with a fork in each of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  containing  $x$  as depicted in the second and third columns of Figure 4. In case the type of fork-operation is relevant to the discussion we also write  $o_i(x)$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ , where  $o_i$  is a type- $i$  operation. In addition, we shall call  $x$  the leaf *associated* to the operation. When we *apply* an operation  $o$  to some element  $x \in X$ , we remove the leaf  $x$  from both trees, and suppress any resulting vertices of degree 2 (removing the root and both edges incident with it in case  $|X| = 2$ ).

Now, given two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on the set  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ ,  $m \geq 3$ , we call a sequence  $(o(x_1), o(x_2), \dots, o(x_l))$  of  $l$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq m - 2$  fork-operations a *special sequence* for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  if  $o(x_l)$  is a type-1 operation on  $\mathcal{T}|_{X - \{x_1, \dots, x_{l-1}\}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_{X - \{x_1, \dots, x_{l-1}\}}$  and, in case  $l > 1$ , the following properties hold:

- (i) There exists some  $\mathcal{T}^* \in \{\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}'\}$  such that each  $o(x_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq l - 1$  is a type-2 or a type-3 operation applied to  $x_i$  and the associated 3- or 4-fork is a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{T}^*|_{X - \{x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}\}}$ ,
- (ii) the last-but-one operation  $o(x_{l-1})$  is a type-2 operation with fork  $(p, (x_{l-1}, x_l))$  and cherry  $(x_{l-1}, p)$  some  $p \in X - \{x_1, \dots, x_{l-1}\}$ , and the last operation  $o(x_l)$  is

- a type-1 operation with cherries  $(p, x_l)$  and  $(q, x_l)$ , some  $p, q \in X - \{x_1, \dots, x_{l-1}\}$  distinct, and
- (iii) if  $l > 2$  then  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}^*}(x_{l-1}, x_l) \preceq \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}^*}(x_i, x_{l-1}, x_l)$  must hold for all  $1 \leq i \leq l-2$  for the tree  $\mathcal{T}^*$  in (i).

To illustrate this definition, consider the phylogenetic network on  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_6\}$  depicted in Figure 5. Then  $(o_3(x_5), o_2(x_3), o_1(x_4))$  is a special sequence for the two phylogenetic trees on  $X$  also pictured in that figure where, for example,  $o_3(x_5)$  is a fork-operation of type-3 and the tree with cherry  $\{x_4, x_5\}$  is the tree  $\mathcal{T}^*$  mentioned in the definition. Note that an application of a special sequence always results in phylogenetic trees with at least two leaves. The following proposition will be key to the proof of our main results.

**Proposition 6.2.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N}$  is a temporal tree-child network on  $X$ ,  $|X| \geq 3$ , that rigidly displays two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$ . If no type-0 operation can be applied to  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ , then there is a special sequence  $\sigma$  for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Moreover, the two phylogenetic trees resulting from applying  $\sigma$  can be rigidly displayed by a temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}'$  with  $h(\mathcal{N}') = h(\mathcal{N}) - 1 \geq 0$ .*

*Proof:* Note first that  $h(\mathcal{N}) > 0$  as otherwise  $\mathcal{N}$  would be a phylogenetic tree that is isomorphic with both  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  implying that a type-0 operation can be applied to  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ ; a contradiction.

Now, let  $t : V(\mathcal{N}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$  denote a temporal labelling for  $\mathcal{N}$  and pick some  $v \in \text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$  whose value is maximum under  $t$ . Let  $u$  and  $w$  be the parents of  $v$ . Note that  $u \neq w$  as  $\mathcal{N}$  does not contain parallel edges. Also note that since  $\mathcal{N}$  does not contain shortcuts as it is normal,  $u$  cannot be an ancestor of  $w$  and  $w$  cannot be an ancestor of  $u$ . In particular, this implies that  $u$  and  $w$  must be tree vertices. Let  $p$  be the child of  $u$  that is not  $v$  and, similarly, let  $q$  be the child of  $w$  that is not  $v$ . We claim that  $p$  is a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}$ .

To see that this claim holds, assume for contradiction that  $p$  is the root of a pendant subgraph  $\mathcal{N}^*$  of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Note that the choice of  $v$  implies that  $\mathcal{N}^*$  is in fact a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Moreover, Lemma 5.2 implies that there are display maps for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  in  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $\gamma(u) = 2$ . By Lemma 3.2(ii) it follows that  $\mathcal{N}^*$  is a pendant subtree of both  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  have a common cherry and, so, we can apply a type-0 operation to  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ ; a contradiction. Thus  $p$  must be a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Applying similar arguments to  $q$  implies that  $q$  must also be a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}$ .

Since  $\mathcal{N}$  is temporal, the choice of  $v$  implies that the child  $s$  of  $v$  is a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}$  or the root of a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Assume first that  $s$  is a leaf of  $\mathcal{N}$ . Then since  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are rigidly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  do not contain a common cherry, it is straight-forward to see using Lemma 5.3 that, without loss of generality,  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  must contain the cherries  $\{p, s\}$  and  $\{q, s\}$ , respectively. Hence we can apply a type-1 operation to  $s$ . This gives a special sequence of length 1 for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ , from which the first part of the proposition follows.

So, suppose that  $s$  is the root of a pendant subtree  $\mathcal{T}^*$  of  $\mathcal{N}$ , so that  $\mathcal{T}^*$  has at least two leaves. Note first that  $\gamma(v) = 3$ . Indeed since  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are rigidly displayed by  $\mathcal{N}$  we obtain  $2 \leq \gamma(v) \leq 3$  in view of Lemma 5.2. If  $\gamma(v) = 2$  held then  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  would have a common cherry which implies that a type-0 operation can be applied to  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ ;

a contradiction. We can therefore assume without loss of generality that  $\mathcal{T}^*$  is a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$ , and that this tree together with the leaf  $p$  also forms a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

In case  $\mathcal{T}^*$  has only two leaves  $x$  and  $y$ , say, then since  $\gamma(v) = 3$  it follows that  $\mathcal{T}$  contains the 3-fork  $(p, (x, y))$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  contains, without loss of generality, the cherries  $\{p, y\}$  and  $\{q, x\}$ . Hence we can apply a type-2 operation to  $y$  and then apply a type-1 operation to  $x$  (since  $\mathcal{T}|_{X-\{y\}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_{X-\{y\}}$  must contain the cherries  $\{p, x\}$  and  $\{q, x\}$ , respectively). This gives a special sequence of length 2, from which the first part of the proposition again follows.

Assume for the remainder that  $\mathcal{T}^*$  has at least three leaves. We claim that we can perform a sequence of type-2 and type-3 operations involving the removal of an element from  $L(\mathcal{T}^*)$  one at a time, and at no stage creating a common cherry, followed by a type-1 operation which, when applied, results in a special sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . We prove the claim by induction on the number  $k \geq 2$  of leaves of  $\mathcal{T}^*$ . Note that we have just shown that the claim holds for the base case  $k = 2$ . So suppose the claim holds for all  $k, k \geq 2$ , and that  $\mathcal{T}^*$  contains  $k + 1$  leaves. Note that as  $k + 1 \geq 3$ , Lemma 6.1 implies that  $\mathcal{T}^*$  contains either a 3-fork or a 4-fork.

Suppose  $\mathcal{T}^*$  contains a 3-fork  $t = (a, (b, c))$  where  $a, b, c \in X$  are distinct. Then  $t$  must be a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$ . As  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  have no cherries in common and  $\gamma(v) = 3$ , it follows that we may assume without loss of generality that  $\mathcal{T}'$  contains the cherry  $\{a, c\}$ . Hence, we can apply the type-2 operation  $o(c)$ . Note that this creates a cherry  $\{a, b\}$  in  $\mathcal{T}|_{X-\{c\}}$  which is not a cherry in  $\mathcal{T}'|_{X-\{c\}}$ . Moreover, by induction we obtain a special sequence  $\sigma_c = (o(x_1), o(x_2), \dots, o(x_l))$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq n - 2$  for  $\mathcal{T}|_{X-\{c\}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_{X-\{c\}}$ . Put  $x = x_l$  and, if  $l \geq 2$ , put  $y = x_{l-1}$ . Note that if  $l = 1$ , then  $(o(c), o(x_1))$  is a special sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . So assume  $l \geq 2$ . If  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y) \preceq \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y, c)$  then  $(o(c), \sigma_c)$  is clearly a special sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . And if  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y, c) \prec \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$  then  $\sigma_c$  is also a special sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  since applying the operation  $o(c)$  to  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  does not affect any of the operations  $o(x_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq l$ .

Suppose  $\mathcal{T}^*$  contains a 4-fork  $t = ((a, b), (c, d))$  where  $a, b, c, d \in X$  are distinct. Then  $t$  must again be a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{T}$ . As  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  have no cherries in common and  $\gamma(v) = 3$ , it follows that, as before, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\mathcal{T}'$  contains the cherries  $\{a, c\}$  and  $\{b, d\}$ . Hence, we can perform the type-3 operation  $o(c)$ . Note that this creates a 3-fork  $(d, (a, b))$  in  $\mathcal{T}|_{X-\{c\}}$  and that  $\{a, b\}$  is not a cherry in  $\mathcal{T}'|_{X-\{c\}}$ . Moreover, by induction, we obtain a special sequence  $\sigma_c$  for  $\mathcal{T}|_{X-\{c\}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_{X-\{c\}}$ . Let  $x$  denote the leaf to which the (sole) type-1 operation is applied and let  $y$  denote the leaf to which the last type-2 operation is applied. Then similar arguments as in the previous case imply that  $(o(c), \sigma_c)$  is a special sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  in case  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y) \preceq \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y, c)$  and that  $\sigma_c$  is a special sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  otherwise. This concludes the proof of the induction step and, therefore, the proof of the claim. This completes again the proof of the first part of the proposition.

To complete the proof, note that as  $\mathcal{T}^*$  is a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{N}$ , we can remove  $\mathcal{T}^*$  and  $v$  (plus all its incident edges) from  $\mathcal{N}$ , and suppress the resulting vertices of degree two to obtain a network  $\mathcal{N}'$  with  $h(\mathcal{N}') = h(\mathcal{N}) - 1 \geq 0$ . As  $\mathcal{N}$  rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{N}'$  rigidly displays their restrictions  $\mathcal{T}|_{X-L(\mathcal{T}^*)}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_{X-L(\mathcal{T}^*)}$ .

Moreover, as  $\mathcal{N}$  is tree-child and  $v \in \text{Ret}(\mathcal{N})$ , we have that  $\mathcal{N}'$  is also tree-child. Since  $p$  and  $q$  are leaves of  $\mathcal{N}$  and  $\mathcal{N}$  is temporal, it follows that  $\mathcal{N}'$  is temporal.  $\square$

## 7. FORK-PICKING SEQUENCES

In this section we characterize when two trees are rigidly displayed by a temporal tree-child network, in terms of a generalization of special sequences which we now introduce. Suppose that  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are two phylogenetic trees on  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  where  $n \geq 2$  and that  $\sigma = (o(x_1), o(x_2), \dots, o(x_{n-1}))$  is a sequence of fork-operations for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Then we call  $\sigma$  a *fork-picking sequence* for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  if  $\sigma$  is of the form  $(C_1, S_1, C_2, S_2, \dots, C_k, S_k, C_{k+1})$ , some  $k \geq 0$ , such that

- (i) for all  $1 \leq i \leq k+1$ , we have that  $C_i$  is a (possibly empty, except in case  $i = k+1$ ) sequence of solely type-0 operations for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ , and
- (ii) for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $S_i$  is a special sequence for  $\mathcal{T}|_Y$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_Y$ , where  $Y = \{y_1 = x_p, y_2 = x_{p+1}, \dots, y_{n-p+1} = x_n\}$  and  $o(x_p)$  is the first operation in  $S_i$  (so that, in particular,  $n - p + 1 \geq 3$ ).

To ease readability, we omit all those  $C_i$  that are empty when writing down fork-picking sequences. Note that it follows from the definition that any fork-picking sequence can be decomposed in a unique way into the form  $(C_1, S_1, C_2, S_2, \dots, C_k, S_k, C_{k+1})$ , and that all of the subsequences  $S_i$  are non-empty.

To illustrate this definition, consider again the phylogenetic network on  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_6\}$  pictured in Figure 5. Then  $\sigma^* = (o_3(x_5), o_2(x_3), o_1(x_4), o_0(x_1), o_0(x_2))$  is a fork-picking sequence for the two phylogenetic trees also depicted in that figure, since it is of the form  $(S_1, C_2)$  where  $S_1 = (o_3(x_5), o_2(x_3), o_1(x_4))$  is the special sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  considered in the previous section,  $C_2 = (o_0(x_1), o_0(x_2))$ , and  $C_1$  is the empty sequence.

We now provide a link between  $h(\mathcal{N})$  for a temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}$  that rigidly displays two trees and fork-picking sequences for these trees. We define the *weight*  $w(\sigma)$  of a fork-picking sequence  $\sigma$  to be the number of special sequences in  $\sigma$  (or, equivalently, the number of type-1 operations in  $\sigma$ ).

**Theorem 7.1.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{N}$  is a temporal tree-child network on  $X$  that rigidly displays two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$ . Then there is a fork-picking sequence  $\sigma$  for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  with  $h(\mathcal{N}) \geq w(\sigma)$ .*

*Proof:* We prove the theorem by induction on  $h(\mathcal{N})$ . If  $h(\mathcal{N}) = 0$ , then  $\mathcal{N}$ ,  $\mathcal{T}$ , and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are all isomorphic to one another. But then we can take a fork-picking sequence  $\sigma$  for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  consisting solely of type-0 operations (i.e.  $\sigma = (C_1)$ ), and so  $w(\mathcal{N}) = 0 = h(\mathcal{N})$ .

Now, assume that  $h(\mathcal{N}) = k$ , some  $k > 0$ , and that the theorem holds for all temporal tree-child networks  $\mathcal{N}'$  with  $0 \leq h(\mathcal{N}') < k$ .

Apply type-0 operations to  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  until no more can be applied. If this sequence  $C_1$  of operations has length  $|X| - 1$ , then it is a fork-picking sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  and  $w(\sigma) = 0 < k = h(\mathcal{N})$ , and so the theorem holds. Otherwise, let  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_1$  be the






FIGURE 5. For the two pictured phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_6\}$  and the phylogenetic network  $\mathcal{N}$  on  $X$  that rigidly displays them, we depict a fork-picking sequence  $(S_1, C_2)$  for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  which has weight 1. In that sequence  $S_1$  is the indicated special sequence, and  $o_0(x_1)$  and  $o_0(x_2)$  make up  $C_2$ . The forks in  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  to which a fork-operation is applied is indicated by dotted triangles.

phylogenetic trees resulting after applying the operations in  $C_1$ , noting that  $|\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}_1)| = |\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}'_1)| \geq 3$ .

Since by construction no type-0 operation can be applied to  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_1$ , by Proposition 6.2 it follows that there is a special sequence  $S_1$  for  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_1$ , and that the two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}_2$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_2$  resulting from applying  $S_1$  can be rigidly displayed by a temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}'$  with  $h(\mathcal{N}') = h(\mathcal{N}) - 1 \geq 0$ .

It follows by induction that there is a fork-picking sequence  $\sigma' = (C'_1, S'_1, \dots, C'_{k'+1})$ , some  $k' \geq 1$ , for  $\mathcal{T}_2$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_2$  such that  $k - 1 = h(\mathcal{N}') \geq w(\sigma') = k'$ . Hence,  $\sigma = (C_1, S_1, C'_1, S'_1, \dots, C'_{k+1})$  is a fork-picking sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  such that  $h(\mathcal{N}) = k \geq w(\sigma)$ .  $\square$

Now, as defined in [10], we say that an ordering  $\sigma = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n)$  of  $X$  is a *cherry-picking sequence* for two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  if for all  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ ,  $x_i$  is contained in a cherry in both  $\mathcal{T}_i = \mathcal{T}|_{X - \{x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}\}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_i = \mathcal{T}'|_{X - \{x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}\}}$ . In addition, the *cherry-count*  $c_i(\sigma) - 1 \in \{0, 1\}$  associated to  $x_i$  is 1 if the cherries in  $\mathcal{T}_i$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_i$  containing  $x_i$  are different and 0 else.

Note that every cherry-picking sequence  $\sigma = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  for two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  gives rise to a fork-picking sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Namely, we make a sequence of operations  $(o(x_1), \dots, o(x_{n-1}))$  with a type-1 operation applied to  $x_i$  if  $c_i(\sigma) = 1$  and a type-0 operation applied to  $x_i$  if  $c_i(\sigma) = 0$ . In addition, any fork-picking sequence  $(o(x_1), \dots, o(x_{n-1}))$  for two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  clearly gives rise to the cherry-picking sequence  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ . For example, the cherry-picking sequence  $(x_5, x_3, x_4, x_2, x_1)$  with cherry counts  $(1, 1, 1, 0, 0)$  arises from the fork-picking sequence  $\sigma^*$  given above for the two trees in Figure 5. Using these observations we obtain the following result.

**Corollary 7.2.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are two phylogenetic trees on  $X$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are rigidly displayed by a temporal tree-child network on  $X$ .
- (ii)  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are displayed by a temporal tree-child network on  $X$ .
- (iii) there is a cherry-picking sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$
- (iv) there is a fork-picking sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$

*Proof:* (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) If two phylogenetic trees are displayed by a phylogenetic network then they are rigidly displayed by that network.

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) Apply [10, Theorem 1], which states that two phylogenetic trees are displayed by a temporal tree-child network if and only if there is a cherry-picking sequence for them.

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv) Apply Theorem 7.1.

(iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) Apply the observation stated before the statement of the corollary i. e. that a fork-picking sequence gives rise to a cherry-picking sequence.  $\square$

Note that the temporal tree-child networks whose existence is guaranteed in Corollary 7.2(i) and (ii) need not be the same.

Corollary 7.2 also sheds light on the following decision problem:

**RIGIDLY DISPLAYING**

**Input:** Two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$ .

**Output:** Does there exist a temporal tree-child network on  $X$  that rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ ?

Indeed, Corollary 7.2 and the main result in [7, Theorem 1] (which states that it is NP-complete to decide whether or not there is a cherry-picking sequence for two phylogenetic trees) immediately imply:

**Corollary 7.3.** *The decision problem RIGIDLY DISPLAYING is NP-complete.*

## 8. A CHARACTERIZATION OF THE RIGID HYBRID NUMBER OF TWO TREES

In this section we show that in case two phylogenetic trees can be rigidly displayed by a temporal tree-child network, then their rigid hybrid number is equal to the weight of a minimum weight fork-picking sequence for the two trees.

To this end, if there is some fork-picking sequence for two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  (or equivalently by Corollary 7.2,  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are rigidly displayed by some temporal tree-child network on  $X$ ), we define

$$s_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = \min\{w(\sigma) : \sigma \text{ is a fork-picking sequence for } \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \mathcal{T}'\},$$

and

$$h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = \min\{h(\mathcal{N}) : \mathcal{N} \text{ is temporal tree-child and rigidly displays } \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \mathcal{T}'\}.$$



FIGURE 6. Two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X = \{a, \dots, e\}$  whose weak hybrid number  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  is 1 (see  $\mathcal{N}$  for a phylogenetic network that weakly displays both trees), whose rigid hybrid number is  $h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = 2$  (see  $\mathcal{N}'$  for a temporal tree-child network which rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ ; the fact that  $h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \neq 1$  can be proven using similar arguments to those used in the proof of Proposition 4.1), and whose hybrid number  $h(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = 2$ .

We call  $h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  the *rigid (temporal tree-child) hybrid number* for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Note that in case this number exists it can be different from the weak hybrid number, which must also exist (e.g. see Figure 6).

**Theorem 8.1.** *Suppose  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are two phylogenetic trees on  $X$  and that  $\sigma$  is a fork-picking sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Then there exists a temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}_\sigma$  on  $X$  which rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  and such that  $w(\sigma) \geq h(\mathcal{N}_\sigma)$ .*

*Proof:* We establish the theorem using induction on  $w(\sigma)$ .

If  $w(\sigma) = 0$  then  $\sigma = (C_1)$ , where  $C_1$  consists solely of type-0 operations. Hence  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are isomorphic and the required temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}_\sigma$  is given by  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Now suppose that  $\sigma$  is a fork-picking sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  with weight  $w(\sigma) = k$ , some  $k > 0$ , and that the theorem holds for all fork-picking sequences  $\sigma'$  with  $w(\sigma') < k$ .

As  $w(\sigma) = k$ ,  $\sigma$  is of the form  $(C_1, S_1, C_2, S_2, \dots, S_k, C_{k+1})$ . Let  $Y$  be the set of elements  $y$  in  $X$  such that  $o(y)$  is *not* in the sequence  $(C_1, S_1)$ . Then, as  $C_{k+1}$  is not the empty sequence,  $\sigma' = (C_2, S_2, \dots, S_k, C_{k+1})$  is a fork-picking sequence for  $\mathcal{T}|_Y$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_Y$ , with  $w(\sigma') = k - 1$ . By induction, it follows that there is a temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}'$  with  $h(\mathcal{N}') \leq w(\sigma')$  that rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}|_Y$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_Y$ . Let  $t'$  denote a temporal labelling for  $\mathcal{N}'$ .

We now construct a temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}_\sigma$  from  $\mathcal{N}'$ . We first consider the case that  $(C_1)$  is the empty sequence. Let  $Y_l = \{y_1, \dots, y_l\}$ ,  $l \geq 1$ , be such that  $S_1 = (o(y_1), \dots, o(y_l))$ . To ease notation, put  $x = y_l$  and, if  $l \geq 2$ ,  $y = y_{l-1}$ .

Since  $o(x)$  is a type-1 operation, there exist  $p \neq q \in Y$  such that, without loss of generality,  $\{p, x\}$  is a cherry in  $\mathcal{T}|_{Y \cup \{x\}}$  and  $\{q, x\}$  is a cherry in  $\mathcal{T}'|_{Y \cup \{x\}}$ . Subdivide the pendant edges in  $\mathcal{N}'$  incident with  $p$  and  $q$  by adding two new vertices  $u_p$  and  $u_q$ , respectively. Also, add in the leaf  $x$  below a newly added reticulation vertex  $v$  which has parents  $u_p$  and  $u_q$ . Denote the resulting phylogenetic network by  $\mathcal{N}''$ . Note that since  $\mathcal{N}'$  is tree-child we also have that  $\mathcal{N}''$  is tree-child. Set  $t(v) = t(u_p) = t(u_q)$  where  $t(u_p) = t(u_q)$  is chosen appropriately so that, together with  $t'$ , we obtain a temporal labelling  $t''$  for  $\mathcal{N}''$ . Clearly,

$\mathcal{N}''$  rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}|_{Y \cup \{x\}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_{Y \cup \{x\}}$ . Putting  $\mathcal{N}_\sigma = \mathcal{N}''$  this completes the proof of the theorem in case  $l = 1$  since  $h(\mathcal{N}'') = h(\mathcal{N}') + 1 \leq w(\sigma') + 1 = w(\sigma)$ .

Assuming  $l \geq 2$ , we now insert  $y$  into  $\mathcal{N}''$ . By definition of a special sequence,  $o(y)$  is a type-2 operation. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\mathcal{T}|_{Y \cup \{x,y\}}$  has a fork  $(p, (x,y))$  and that  $\mathcal{T}'|_{Y \cup \{x,y\}}$  has a cherry  $\{y,p\}$  some  $p \in X - \{x,y\}$ . Then we can construct a new temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}'''$  which rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}|_{Y \cup \{x,y\}}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_{Y \cup \{x,y\}}$  by inserting a pendant edge containing  $y$  into the pendant edge of  $\mathcal{N}''$  incident with  $x$  to form a cherry  $\{x,y\}$  in  $\mathcal{N}'''$  and defining the temporal labelling  $t'''$  of  $\mathcal{N}'''$  appropriately using  $t''$ . Note that  $h(\mathcal{N}''') = h(\mathcal{N}'')$  and so the theorem is also proven for  $\mathcal{N}_\sigma = \mathcal{N}'''$  if  $l = 2$ .

Assume  $l \geq 3$ . Bearing in mind Property (iii) of a special sequence, suppose we have created a temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}^*$  from  $\mathcal{N}'''$  by successively inserting, for all  $i+1 \leq j \leq l-2$ , the leaves  $y_j$  below the parent of the cherry  $\{x,y\}$  in  $\mathcal{N}'''$  to create a pendant subtree  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$  with leaf set  $Y_2 = \{y_{i+1}, \dots, y_{l-2}, y, x\} \subseteq Y_1$  so that  $\mathcal{N}^*$  rigidly displays the phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}|_{Y \cup Y_2}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_{Y \cup Y_2}$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\mathcal{T}$  is the tree  $\mathcal{T}^*$  in the definition of a special sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ .

Consider operation  $o(y_i)$ . Then, by definition of a special sequence,  $o(y_i)$  is either a type-2 operation or a type-3 operation, for which the 3-fork and 4-fork, respectively, is a pendant subtree of  $\mathcal{T}_1 = \mathcal{T}|_{Y \cup Y_2 \cup \{y_i\}}$  and  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(y_i, y, x) \succeq \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(y, x)$ . Put  $\mathcal{T}'_1 = \mathcal{T}'|_{Y \cup Y_2 \cup \{y_i\}}$ .

If  $o(y_i)$  is a type-2 operation, then let  $(a, (y_i, b))$  denote the 3-fork of  $\mathcal{T}_1$  where  $a, b \in X - \{y_i\}$  distinct. Then  $\{a, b\}$  must be a cherry in  $\mathcal{T}'_1$ . Since  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(y_i, x, y) \succeq \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(x, y)$  it follows by the choice of  $\mathcal{T}^*$  that  $\{a, b\}$  is a cherry in  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ . We can therefore first insert  $y_i$  into the pendant edge of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  incident with  $b$  and then extend the temporal labelling of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  so as to obtain a temporal tree-child network that rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_1$ .

If  $o(y_i)$  is a type-3 operation, then let  $((a, y_i), (b, c))$  denote the 4-fork in  $\mathcal{T}_1$  where  $a, b, c \in X - \{y_i\}$  are pairwise distinct. Then  $(a, (b, c))$  must be a 3-fork in  $\mathcal{T}_1|_{Y \cup Y_2}$ . As  $\text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(y_i, y, x) \succeq \text{lca}_{\mathcal{T}}(y, x)$  the choice of  $\mathcal{T}^*$  implies that this 3-fork must be a pendant subtree of  $\overline{\mathcal{T}}$ . We can therefore first insert  $y_i$  into the pendant edge of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  incident with  $a$  and then extend the temporal labelling of  $\mathcal{N}^*$  so as to obtain a temporal network that rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}'_1$ .

In summary, we can insert all of the elements of  $Y$  into  $\mathcal{N}'$  in this way until we obtain a temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}_\sigma$  with  $h(\mathcal{N}_\sigma) = h(\mathcal{N}') + 1$  which rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . It follows by induction that

$$w(\sigma) = w(\sigma') + 1 \geq h(\mathcal{N}') + 1 = h(\mathcal{N}_\sigma),$$

which completes the proof of the theorem in case  $C_1$  is empty.

If  $C_1$  is not empty then we first insert all elements of  $Y_1$  into  $\mathcal{N}'$  as described in the previous case to obtain a network  $\mathcal{N}_1$  which rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}|_{Y \cup Y_1}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'|_{Y \cup Y_1}$  and for which  $w(\sigma) \geq h(\mathcal{N}_1)$  holds. Into  $\mathcal{N}_1$  we then insert all elements  $z \in X$  for which  $o(z)$  is contained in  $(C_1)$  in any order to obtain a new temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}_\sigma$  which rigidly displays  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . Clearly,  $h(\mathcal{N}_\sigma) = h(\mathcal{N}_1)$ . Since  $\sigma'' = (C_1, S_1, C_2, S_2, \dots, S_k, C_{k+1})$  is




FIGURE 7. Two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on the set  $X = \{1, 2, \dots, 2^m + 2\}$  as defined in the text. Both are rigidly displayed by the depicted temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}$  on  $X$ .

a fork-picking sequence for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  and  $w(\sigma) = w(\sigma'')$  the theorem holds in this case too.  $\square$

As an immediate consequence of Theorems 7.1 and 8.1, we have the following result.

**Corollary 8.2.** *If two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  are rigidly displayed by some temporal tree-child network on  $X$ , then  $s_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$ .*

## 9. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE TEMPORAL AND RIGID HYBRID NUMBERS

For two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$  that can be displayed by some temporal tree-child network, the *temporal hybrid number* of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  [10] is defined as

$$h_t(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = \min\{h(\mathcal{N}) : \mathcal{N} \text{ is a temporal tree-child network that displays } \mathcal{T} \text{ and } \mathcal{T}'\}.$$

Note that in case this number exists, the temporal hybrid number for the two trees is not necessarily equal to their hybrid number [10, Figure 1; also p. 1889].

Now, given two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X$ , Corollary 7.2 implies that the temporal hybrid number  $h_t(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  exists if and only if the rigid hybrid number  $h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  exists. Thus it is of interest to understand how the quantities  $h_t(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  and  $h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  are related to one another. Clearly, if these numbers both exist, then  $h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \leq h_t(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$ . In this section, we show that the difference  $h_t(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') - h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  can grow as a linear function of  $|X|$ .

To this end, assume that  $m \geq 3$ . Consider the two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X = \{1, \dots, 2^m, 2^m + 1, 2^m + 2\}$ , given in Figure 7. In that figure,  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2$  are both fully balanced phylogenetic trees with  $2^{m-1}$  leaves each (as indicated in Figure 8 for the case  $m = 4$ ) and  $\mathcal{T}_3$  is a fully balanced phylogenetic tree with  $2^m$  leaves (again as indicated in Figure 8 for the case  $m = 4$ ). In  $\mathcal{T}_3$ , we label the pendant subtrees of size 4 with the labels  $\{4i - 3, \dots, 4i\}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq 2^{m-2}$  as indicated in Figure 8, and in  $\mathcal{T}_1$  and  $\mathcal{T}_2$  we label the pendant subtrees of size 4 by interchanging the labels as also indicated in Figure 8.

**Theorem 9.1.** *For the two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  on  $X = \{1, \dots, 2^m + 2\}$ ,  $m \geq 3$ , pictured in Figure 7, we have  $h_t(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') - h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \geq \frac{|X|}{4} - 3$ .*

*Proof:* First note that  $h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = 1$ , as  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  are rigidly displayed by the temporal tree-child network  $\mathcal{N}$  pictured in Figure 7.




FIGURE 8. The two phylogenetic trees  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  in Figure 7 for the case  $m = 4$ .

We now show that  $h_t(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') \geq 2^{m-2} - 1$  from which the theorem follows. First note that, by Corollary 7.2, there must exist a temporal tree-child network that displays both  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ . By [11, Theorem 3.3], it follows that  $h_t(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  is equal to the number of components in a maximum temporal agreement forest for  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  minus 1, where such a forest is defined as follows. All phylogenetic trees considered in the definition are “planted” by adding a new root plus an edge to their roots, and trees with one leaf are also allowed. A collection  $\{\mathcal{T}_0, \dots, \mathcal{T}_k\}$  of  $k = h_t(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  planted trees  $\mathcal{T}_i$  is a maximum temporal agreement forest for (planted versions of)  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  if the following three properties hold, where  $X_i := L(\mathcal{T}_i)$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq k$ :

- (P1) The set  $Z = \{X_0, \dots, X_k\}$  is a partition of  $X$ .
- (P2) For all  $0 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_i \cong \mathcal{T}|_{X_i} \cong \mathcal{T}'|_{X_i}$ .
- (P3) Denoting for  $0 \leq i \leq k$  the root of  $\mathcal{T}_i$  by  $\rho_i$ , there exist injective maps  $\chi : \{\rho_0, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_k\} \rightarrow V(\mathcal{T})$  and  $\chi' : \{\rho_0, \rho_1, \dots, \rho_k\} \rightarrow V(\mathcal{T}')$  such that any two trees in  $\{\mathcal{T}(X_i \cup \{\chi(\rho_i)\}) : 0 \leq i \leq k\}$  and  $\{\mathcal{T}'(X_i \cup \{\chi'(\rho_i)\}) : 0 \leq i \leq k\}$  are edge-disjoint rooted subtrees of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$ , respectively.

We now claim that for every set  $\{4i-3, \dots, 4i\}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq 2^{m-2}$ , at least one of the sets  $\{4i-3\}$ ,  $\{4i-2\}$ , or  $\{4i-3, 4i-2\}$  must be contained in  $Z$ . This implies that  $k+1 \geq 2^{m-2}$  from which the theorem immediately follows.

For simplicity, we prove the claim for the case  $i = 1$ ; the argument for the remaining cases  $2 \leq i \leq 2^{m-2}$  is similar.

We show that at least one of the subsets  $\{1\}$ ,  $\{2\}$  and  $\{1, 2\}$  of  $\{1, \dots, 4\}$  is contained in  $Z$ . Suppose  $\{1, 2\}$  is not contained in  $Z$ . Then, using Properties (P1) – (P3) it is straightforward to check that either (a)  $\{1\}$  and  $\{2\}$  are both contained in  $Z$ , (b)  $\{1\} \cup Y$  and  $\{2\}$  are both contained in  $Z$  for some non-empty  $Y \subseteq X - \{1, 2\}$  or (c)  $\{1\}$ ,  $\{2\} \cup Y$  are both contained in  $Z$  for some non-empty  $Y \subseteq X - \{1, 2\}$ . Moreover, by Property (P3), we cannot have that  $\{1, 4\}$  and  $\{2, 3\}$ , or  $\{1, 3\}$  and  $\{2, 4\}$  are contained in  $Z$ . Finally, since the restrictions of  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{T}'$  to  $\{1, 2, 3\}$ , or to  $\{1, 2, 4\}$ , or to  $\{1, 2\} \cup Y$ , some non-empty set  $Y \subseteq X - \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , are non-isomorphic, the claim follows.  $\square$

**Remark:** Note that the trees in Figure 7 also provide an example where  $h_t(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') - h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}')$  grows as a function of  $|X|$  since  $h_{wd}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = h_r(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}') = 1$ .

## 10. DISCUSSION

In this paper we have introduced the concept of a network rigidly displaying a set of phylogenetic trees. We have shown that the rigid hybrid number is different from the beaded hybrid number, and that it can be quite different from the temporal hybrid number. We have also characterized when two trees can be rigidly displayed by a temporal tree-child network.

There remain several open problems. First, it is well-known that the hybrid number is closely related to the size of a maximum agreement forest for two phylogenetic trees [1]. It would therefore be of interest to know if there is some analogue of a maximum agreement forest for rigidly displaying two trees. Results in [11], including the one mentioned above, concerning temporal agreement forests for two phylogenetic trees displayed by temporal tree-child networks could be useful for studying this question. In addition, it could be interesting to define and study rigid hybrid numbers for three or more trees. For example, we could try to understand  $r$ -rigidly displaying, where  $r$  is the maximum number of edges that come together at each reticulation (note that in this paper we have investigated the concept of  $r$ -rigidly displaying for  $r = 3$ ). Recently, there has been work on understanding the hybrid number for arbitrary sets of trees [15] which might be relevant.

More generally, several questions remain concerning the notion of weakly displaying. For example, it would be interesting to know how large the difference can potentially be between the hybrid number and the weak hybrid number for a collection of phylogenetic trees. As this appears to be a difficult problem, it might be worth first restricting to the case of understanding the “weak temporal tree-child hybrid number”; how much different can this number be from the rigid hybrid number, and can we decide when a set of trees is weakly displayed by a temporal tree-child network? To answer these questions it could be worth first trying to decide whether or not two phylogenetic trees are rigidly displayed by some temporal tree-child network if and only if they are weakly displayed by some temporal tree-child network.

**Acknowledgement** KTH and VM thank the London Mathematical Society and SL thanks the New Zealand Marsden Fund for their financial support. All authors thank the Biomathematics Research Centre, University of Canterbury, and The Lorentz Center, Leiden, where they discussed parts of this work.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Baroni M, Grünewald S, Moulton V, Semple C (2005) Bounding the number of hybridisation events for a consistent evolutionary history. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 51(2):171–182
- [2] Baroni M, Semple C, Steel M (2005) A framework for representing reticulate evolution. *Annals of Combinatorics* 8(4):391–408
- [3] Bordewich M, Semple C (2007) Computing the hybridization number of two phylogenetic trees is fixed-parameter tractable. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* 4(3):458–466



- [4] Bordewich M, Semple C (2007) Computing the minimum number of hybridization events for a consistent evolutionary history. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 155(8):914–928
- [5] Cardona G, Llabres M, Rossello F, Valiente G (2009) Metrics for phylogenetic networks ii: Nodal and triplets metrics. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics (TCBB)* 6(3):454–469
- [6] Cardona G, Rossello F, Valiente G (2009) Comparison of tree-child phylogenetic networks. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics (TCBB)* 6(4):552–569
- [7] Döcker J, Van Iersel L, Kelk S, Linz S (2019) Deciding the existence of a cherry-picking sequence is hard on two trees. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 260:131–143
- [8] Huber KT, Moulton V (2006) Phylogenetic networks from multi-labelled trees. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 52(5):613–632
- [9] Huber KT, Moulton V, Steel M, Wu T (2016) Folding and unfolding phylogenetic trees and networks. *Journal of Mathematical Biology* 73(6-7):1761–1780
- [10] Humphries PJ, Linz S, Semple C (2013) Cherry picking: a characterization of the temporal hybridization number for a set of phylogenies. *Bulletin of Mathematical Biology* 75(10):1879–1890
- [11] Humphries PJ, Linz S, Semple C (2013) On the complexity of computing the temporal hybridization number for two phylogenies. *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 161(7-8):871–880
- [12] Huson DH, Linz S (2016) Autumn algorithm computation of hybridization networks for realistic phylogenetic trees. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* 15(2):398–410
- [13] Huson DH, Rupp R, Scornavacca C (2010) *Phylogenetic networks: concepts, algorithms and applications*. Cambridge University Press
- [14] 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*, Springer, pp 37–49
- [15] 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
- [16] McDiarmid C, Semple C, Welsh D (2015) Counting phylogenetic networks. *Annals of Combinatorics* 19(1):205–224
- [17] Moret BM, Nakhleh L, Warnow T, Linder CR, Tholse A, Padolina A, Sun J, Timme R (2004) Phylogenetic networks: modeling, reconstructibility, and accuracy. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* 1(1):13–23
- [18] Steel M (2016) *Phylogeny: discrete and random processes in evolution*. SIAM
- [19] Van Iersel L, Semple C, Steel M (2010) Locating a tree in a phylogenetic network. *Information Processing Letters* 110(23):1037–1043
- [20] Zhu J, Yu Y, Nakhleh L (2016) In the light of deep coalescence: revisiting trees within networks. *BMC Bioinformatics* 17(14):415
- [21] Zhu S, Degnan JH (2016) Displayed trees do not determine distinguishability under the network multispecies coalescent. *Systematic Biology* 66(2):283–298

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

*E-mail address:* `s.linz@auckland.ac.nz`

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

*E-mail address:* `v.moulton@uea.ac.uk`